



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement
June 29, 2020

Verbatim Comments

Verbatim comments include all of the suggestions, comments and messages that were collected online and in-person. This document is over 1600 pages. We do not recommend printing the whole document. Please be cautious if you choose to print a portion of the document as each section is extremely long as well.

Verbatim comments from phase one of the public engagement are included here. While there are duplicate comments in this report, this did not in any way impact the themes in the What we Heard report. Offensive words and personally identifying information have been removed and replaced with either, [removed] or [personal information removed]; otherwise, verbatim comments are completely un-edited.

Comments that state 'see above' or some version of this are referencing the previous survey question that was answered. All comments were reviewed by the question that was asked. Click on any of the links below to go directly to a particular section.

- [What does responsible pet ownership mean to you?](#)
- [Cats](#)
 - [Roaming Cats](#)
 - [Feral Cats](#)
 - [Expectations of City](#)
- [Wildlife](#)
 - [Co-exist](#)
- [Vicious dogs](#)
 - [Expectations of owners](#)
 - [Expectations of City](#)
- [Urban Agriculture](#)
 - [Beekeeping](#)
 - [Livestock](#)
 - [Pigeons](#)
- [Administration](#)
 - [What pet owners need from the Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw](#)
 - [What non-pet owners need from the Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw](#)
 - [Reasonable expectations in or near off-leash parks for dog owners](#)
 - [Reasonable expectations in or near off-leash parks for people without dogs](#)
 - [Expectations of dog behavior in other public spaces that are not off-leash areas](#)
 - [Reasonable number of dogs](#)
 - [Reasonable number of cats](#)
 - [Exceptions to placing limits on number of cats and dogs](#)
- [Licensing](#)
 - [Primary reason for not licensing cats](#)



- [Primary reason for not licensing dogs](#)
- [What would encourage pet owners to license more consistently](#)
- [Benefits that owners expect to get from licensing](#)
- [What other pets should be licensed, why?](#)
- [Expectations for dog-walking businesses](#)
- [Expectations for individual dog walkers](#)
- [Rules for retail sale of animals](#)
- [Criteria for accepting imported animals in Calgary](#)
- [City of Calgary role regarding imported animals](#)

What does responsible pet ownership mean to you?

- Learning and communicating through schools and communities that all creatures are equal. Teaching kindness and understanding plus information of healthy non aggressive teaching behaviours to help aid your dog. Clearing Dog mess and learning about breeds.
- To me, responsible pet ownership means everyone feels safe, comfortable, and their property is respected. Whether you own a pet or not.
- -leash your pet
-don't roam
-clean up after your pet
-minimize noise
- Ensuring your pet is not a nuisance to anyone
- Keeping control of my pets, cleaning up after them, providing for their health and welfare.
- Knows where to unleash their dogs. I think City should do better job at putting up the signs and posters for unleashed area and/ or enforce the rules and fine pet owners who unleash their dogs in open area especially around playground where small children can be playing
- It means giving any pet you own a good quality of life and ensures that all animals are treated well.
- Caring for the needs of your pet. Grooming feeding mental stimulation etc
- Keeping your dog on a leash and under control at all times. Always picking up after your pet. Not allowing pets to create excessive noise.
- Responsible pet ownership to me means that every pet owner should be taking care to ensure their pet is not a danger nor a nuisance to other Calgarians. Owners are also responsible for ensuring the safety of their owner pets. Licensing and tagging are two good minimum standards.
- Proper humane care for pets while ensuring they are not disturbing citizens/neighbourhoods
- It means caring for the pets in your home through proper vetting, appropriate food, shelter and training. It means managing them in a way that does not impact the general public while still enjoying the activities needed for an enriched life.
- Cleaning up after your pet. Taking your dog for walks. Training your pet. Knowing yours dogs limitation. Respecting other dogs limitations when their owners express them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be no pets allowed in retail or service businesses!! Owners seem to think they can bring their pets into my business (a spa). It's disgusting and other clients may have allergies...not to even mention how disgusting it is when the pet decides to piddle or poo! Rude and inconsiderate.
- Keeping an animal healthy and doing what's right for them. Picking up dog poop when on a walk and actually putting it into a garbage can. Training a dog, especially if planning on going to off leash dog park. Not letting a dog be off leash in public spaces. Properly socializing dogs.
- It means that pets are treated with respect and dignity, almost like they are your children. For dogs specifically, responsible ownership means that a dog is under owner's control at all times, even in an off-leash park where owners must be focused and proactive in conflict resolution.
- Ensuring that domestic animals and wildlife are protected, safe, healthy and able to thrive, while minimizing costs to The City.
- Picking up after dog, on leash where required, dog in control. But also having safe closed in spaces to be able to train dogs in life saving skills like recall
- Having your pet under control at all times needs enforcement with badges not pitting neighbour against neighbour over bad dog ownership. Start posting \$Fees + fines at Parks. thx
- I'd consider responsible pet ownership to focus on two areas. One would be to keep your pet within yourself own property (especially cats), and the other would focus on controlling and cleaning up after your pet when visiting shared property (community spaces including parks and sidewalks).
- - Having the facilities/space to BE responsible owners and exercise/socialize our dogs. This includes indoor space for rainy or very cold days
 - Being able to bring my well-behaved, trained, leashed dog to public spaces instead of leaving them at home
 - Pets are family
- It means providing a safe and clean living environment while providing fresh food, water, shelter, exercise and up to date veterinary care. It means not owning more pets then I can reasonably provide these necessities for and severe consequences for those that refuse to provide the necessities.
- All aspects of bringing up a well socialized, healthy and behaved pet.
- Loving and caring for a pet, conscientiously for the pet's entire life, without inconveniencing or stressing others in the community.
- Providing a safe, secure, comfortable and loving home for an animal and also abiding by the animal by-laws of the applicable jurisdiction
- Ensuring the health, safety and quality of life of pets. Ensuring that pet are not a nuisance to neighbors (collecting waste, staying on top of noise). Ensuring spaces for people and animals to coexist.
- Protecting the health and wellbeing of pets.
- Appropriate animal welfare. Respectful of city space but also city space has to be provided
- Enforce the cats are not allowed to roam bylaw it's not enforced now I have at least 3 cats that wonder in my yard



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Keep only the type and number of pets for which you can provide appropriate food, water, shelter, health care and companionship.
Properly socialize and train your pet.
Recognize that pet ownership requires an investment of time and money.
Don't contribute to our nation's pet overpopulation problem
- It means having control over your pets at all times and not disturbing those that do not want pets or are allergic. I should not have to deal with cats living in my yard or dogs jumping up on me off leash. If I wanted pets, I would have them.
- Responsible pet ownership means caring for your pets to give them a great life, as well as ensuring that they are not a nuisance to others.
- not walking your damn dog offleash in leashed pet areas!!!!
- Keeping pets under supervision at all times. Not letting pet cats or dogs free roam to terrorize the neighbourhood and wildlife.
- Administering more fines to people who have their dogs unleashed in areas where a leash is required (ie, many people walk their dogs off leash, which is dangerous for drivers and the pets)
- There needs to be a rule that people must pick up dog poop in their own yard within 24 hours of it being deposited there. Mice infestations are happening because mice eat undigested food in the poop and owners are just letting their dogs poop in yards and not picking it up.
- Meeting the animals.als needs, for food water, shelter and training, and an environment free of abuse.
- Provide good health conditions , good nutrition, enough exercise to pets. And also Make sure that the pets don't bother neighbors and don't have aggressive behaviour
- Primarily Cleaning up after dogs
For dog walkers who use the park: keep dogs on leash until they've pooped, then clean up. If they can't find their dog's poop they should pick up someone else's. 12 dogs in, 12 poop bags out. "Karma poop".
- Providing food, shelter and LOVE to your animal. Picking up after them outside, abiding by the offleash areas.
Meeting all of your pets needs.
- Providing pets their best life
- Responsible pet ownership means taking care of your pet, and ensuring that it does not negatively impact your neighbors. This means no continuous noise, cleaning up your pet's poop (including cats who are allowed to roam free), and keeping dogs on a leash except in designated areas.
- Animals who are kept well, kept healthy, who don't disturb neighbours through noise or biological waste.
- Providing for the physical and mental health needs of dependant animals without impacting the peaceful enjoyment of home ownership/rental of neighbors.
- Being responsible for caring for your pet, keeping it safe and looked after. It also means that you are responsible for cleaning up after your pet. You must also ensure that if your pet is a danger to other pets that it is kept on a leash and not allowed to harm others - animals and humans.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Following the bylaws.....but unfortunately some people just don't take the initiative to learn bylaws when they get a dog. Using school yards/sports parks as off leash areas cause they are too lazy to drive 5 minutes to a dog park. Then their dogs are so far away from them, they don't pick up poo.
- It means caring for all the needs of the pet. Food, shelter, mental/physical and vet care. It means having the animal be a part of the family and not left tethered outside for days/nights on end or roaming free around the neighborhood. It means caring full circle for all their needs.
- Food, water, medical care, shelter, on leash outdoors, feces removal/disposal, barking curbed, licensed.
- Ensuring the needs of your pet are met. Understanding that not all pets are equal. Ensuring the safety of your pet and others when in public.
- Ensuring its wellness by providing food, water, and veterinary care both annual and emergency. Not leaving your dog outside in all weather or your cat to roam the neighborhood. It means cleaning up after your pet and maintaining due care and control whether off or on leash.
- Providing love and companionship in a safe and secure environment with proper water, food, medical care, exercise, mental stimulation, training, comfort and lots of spoiling
- - Providing oversight and care of your animals
 - Ensuring positive relations and safety of your animals, as well as the people, other animals and environment they interact with
 - Being knowledgeable about regulations and understanding the risks associated with not abiding by them
- A responsible pet owner must be able to care for their pet , training , give it daily exercise, proper nutrition, vaccinations , loving home , interactive with other people & dogs
- Taking care of your pet and respecting others around you.
- Providing basic level of care (food, shelter, water, vet). Preventing uncontrolled breeding by spaying and neutering. Being aware of pet's personality, skills, and shortcomings and catering to those (e.g., don't bring an aggressive dog to an off-leash park).
- Following the rules, taking care of your pet as if they were your child, insuring your pet is safe and others around you are as well.
- -Basic obedience training; always having bags to clean up after him; regular walks; vaccinated, neutered and microchipped; ensuring litter boxes / aquariums / terrariums are cleaned regularly, proper food and water are available to the animal, regular vet check ups and grooming as required.
- Responsible pet ownership means: that an individual has control of their animal, that the animal does not threaten others safety, the owner cares for the animal in a way that is humane and is in no way cruel.
- Pet ownership is not a right that everyone is entitled to.
- Registering your pet. Updated shots. Picking up after your pet. On leash except in off leash areas. Social enough for off leash.
- Caring for the needs of your animal (preventing neglect), and ensuring your animal does not diminish the quality of life for other Calgarians.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Taking care of your pet's physical and emotional needs while considering the quality of life of neighbours.
- Treating our pets like a member of our family, caring for them as such, and having control over their behaviour when away from the family home.
- Providing a safe, loving home for the life of the pet. Providing routine, regular vet visits. Have properly trained dogs & follow the rules of off leash & picking up after your pet. Keeping cats indoors and only outdoors when monitored or in an enclosed area. Having all licenses and vaccinations.
- Making sure that pets do not adversely affect the lives of others. Examples include: animals intentionally on the loose, poop left behind, barking outside late in the night.
- Cleaning up after your pet, not allowing pets offleash unless in marked offleash areas and only for dogs that show no aggression and owner has control at all times. Sick of my puppy being attacked for no reason and owners not taking responsibility and have no control.
- It means cleaning up after your dog, only taking your dog to areas where you can trust them not to hurt themselves or others and it means obeying the rules of wherever you go. If it is an on leash area, your dog should be on leash. Always!!
- responsible pet ownership means providing the necessities of a comfortable life for any companion animal.
- Integrating a pet into your life in a way that is respectful and accommodating to the people you share your community with.
- Keeping however many and whatever type of pet(s) you desire in your household provided that they do not unduly negatively impact any other party outside of your household
- Knowing at all times where your pet is, what they are doing, and ensuring they are well taken care of and safe
- It means having healthy, happy, well adjusted dogs that are a part of our family.
- Training the animal in front of me, taking into account it's natural and genetic needs. Not treating nor considering it as a human, but respecting the qualities it presents as an animal. Providing food, shelter and enrichment to ensure its abilities are explored and if possible fulfilled.
- It means registering your pets, controlling your pet, spay and neutering your pet and being a considerate and respectful owner
- Ensuring your pet is safe and well cared for, that other animals (pets and wildlife) are safe from your pet, and your pet is neutered and not able to contribute to the homeless pet population in Alberta.
- Your pet is also a family member so treat them as one and take care of them, vaccinate and train them properly. Scoop the poop, summer and winter!! Pet peeve people not being responsible and cleaning up after doggy poops in the winter! Don't let your dog run off leash if it is not an off leash area.
- Pets are well fed, healthy, and can interact with their owners often. They are not allowed to be a nuisance to others.
- - looking after your pet in a kind and caring way.
- - cleaning up after your pet



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- not let your pet jump up on other people
- not let your pet bark aggressively at other people
- not letting your pet wander freely around the neighbourhood
- not letting your pet disturb the peace of others.
- Someone that provides appropriate training, food, and shelter for their pets. And someone that doesn't allow their pet to be a burden to others.
- Having control over your animal. Proper Outdoor housing if the pet is kept outdoors. Control barking in neighborhoods.
- Keeping your pet safe from harm, ensuring minimal disturbance of your neighbourhood, protecting others from your pet if it has the potential to cause harm
- Safety. Noise control. Respect for pets, respect for neighbours.
- Feed, water, house and walk and play with your dog. If you rescue your dog much harder to train and make the dog become a great family dog in the neighborhood.
- Dogs and cats should be licensed regardless whether or not indoor. Cats should be allowed to roam, they don't get out on walks like dogs and it is their natural behaviour. I'm good with chickens in the city. It also means cleaning up after your pets, on walks, in your yard (including chickens).
- Owners that have pets have responsibility to house and feed them properly, have regular Vet visits, license them and have them under control. If not able to care for a pet a responsible pet owner surrenders them to an animal facility where they can be re-housed.
- "Responsible pet ownership" - owners assume all stewardship for their pets, namely that they will ensure that their pets are afforded the 5 freedoms: Freedom from hunger+thirst, Freedom from pain, injury and disease, Freedom from distress, Freedom from discomfort, Freedom to express natural behavior
- Ensuring 1) the safety of my pet, and 2) my pet and I don't interfere with the lifestyle of other Calgarians.
- Responsible Pet Ownership should not be relative to each person and animal but a standard that is expected by both the public and city by-law, enforced by the city and carried out by the owner. I should not be fined for having a well trained, non aggressive dog, that is cleaned up after in public.
- It means providing for an animal, that has been domesticated in our society and therefore is not meant to be wild and roam free. It means keeping it from disturbing others in the city in the forms of noise, damage and feces. It means providing proper/safe food and shelter as if it were a child.
- Ensuring your pets are properly taken care of, receive adequate health care, are not bothersome to others in the community
- Mostly, that your pets are *your* pets. My dog stays on the leash, and urinates/deficates where I allow it to, not where it wants. Your cat is your cat, and shouldn't be in my yard. Your dog Can be out in the yard as long as it doesn't bark or escape. My dog is no longer mine if it bites. And so on.
- I shouldn't have to leash a well trained, non aggressive dog in an open public space due to someone elses fear of dogs or because of what they've read in the media. Why put in the work to train if you're only going to be lumped in with someone that has not done the work. 300 characters isn't enough
- Taking care of your pets to the best of your abilities and knowing when to stop or ask for help.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responsible pet ownership means ensuring your pet is provided for physically and socially. It also means being responsible to society in general on behalf of your pet. ie) vaccines, picking up waste, muzzling if not socialized to people or other animals. It's about doing what's best
- Taking good care of my pets. This includes food, housing, water, exercise, love and attention. For me it also means enriching their lives with something that they love. For my one dog it means doing agility, for another she loves being close to me and doing obedience...not all are the same.
- Keeping your pet healthy, well looked after, loved, and, most importantly, under control. Having a pet should not impinge on the enjoyment of others to use public spaces or walk on the community sidewalks. Picking up after your pet and properly disposing of the bag is also important.
- getting the appropriate licensing. Taking care of your animal.
- It means being kind respectful to animals- right to warmth, food, water, freedom from violence and isolation. It means that people should be held responsible for allowing cats to suffer and run at large and that there is a body who can intervene if people choose to ill use animals and real penalty.
- That dogs are kept on a leash in residential areas outside of their yards. We live on a path system/playground in Mountain Park/McKenzie Lake and have dogs loose while our children are out. Please find a way to get dogs on leash.
- Keeping your pet secure under control and picking up their feces.
- Having a pet that is taken care of, and does not cause any negative consequences for neighbours and the community. It should complement a happy life- not cause harassment issues or decrease the safety of people in public spaces.
- Taking care of your animals
- Someone has the means and capacity to care for the lifelong well being of an animal in their care.
- It means to be keeping and maintaining full responsibility for your animal. By standards of enforcing stricter rules on free roaming cats in all communities. All birds(chicken and turkeys) to be kept outside of city limits.
- Having animals in a way which does not interfere with others in the community.
- A responsible pet owner feeds, grooms, exercises, treats the pet with respect and gives it a safe home. The owner should ALWAYS keep their pet on a leash anywhere outside the home. The owner should ALWAYS pick up the poop. I would like to see more bylaw officers around fining offenders.
- Keeping your pet safe, while keeping those around you safe as well. Cleaning up after your pet and keeping your pet on leash AT ALL TIMES when not in an off leash area. Respecting other people's rights.
- Providing good care, veterinary care and mental engagement for the animals that belong to a person.
- Treating your animals humanely, cleaning up after they defecate, control barking dogs outside, not letting them run around loose outside of property, license them, controlling them around other animals and people. Follow through by owners of proper discipline if they are harming other animals /humans



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Taking care of pet and results of pet (faeces), being considerate of neighbours (barking, not allowing to poop/pee on yard/plants)
- proper nutrition, grooming, vet care, wise spay / neuter decisions (not pediatric or arbitrary spay neuter), safe living situation relevant to the breed (ie: not mandated by external agencies without regard to the breed / family situation) - all NOT legislated or top down but through education
- Providing proper care, feeding, housing, medical care the any animals owned.
- Providing food, shelter and love for your pet from the moment you get them to the very end. Pets should be considered a member of your family and as such, you should never be allowed to get rid of them - by either give them up or leaving them in the wild alone.
- Taking responsibility for the health, safety, and training of my pet so that both they and the other people and animals that they might interact with are also safe. Also, ensuring any pet related waste is taken care of by the owner.
- Providing the best life for your pet and managing it in all aspects such as training and cleaning up after them
- Keeping your pet safe and healthy. And minimizing disruption to neighbours.
- Responsible owners should leash their dog when not on their property or in an off-leash area. They should be more respectful of other people's property. Not letting dogs urinate or defecate on someone else's yard killing grass/plants.
- Providing care and training to your pet. Being responsible means you understand the needs of that pet (each one is unique) and that you meet those needs. You also need to understand how your pet interacts with others (human and animal) and ensure that your pet does not harm others in any way.
- Caring for the physical needs of the pet (food, water, shelter, heat, sleep, exercise, medical care), social needs (pet is free from fear & feels safe and secure, interacts w/humans, interacts w/other animals), maintaining safe boundaries (enclosure/fencing/etc.), & appropriate enrichment activities.
- Obey by-laws, Respect neighbours and be kind and loving to your pets
- Clean up and pick up after your Dog!
- I believe that responsible pet ownership is defined as Being responsible for the actions of your pet. Be it picking up their poop, extensive barking, and control of your pet.
- Responsible pet owner is someone who takes care of the animals that they have on their property, maybe it is something that someone else thinks is different then a cat or a dog. As long as it isn't a nuisance to the neighbours, and the well-being of the animal is taken care of.
- Keeping ALL cats inside. Cats kill many millions of song birds in Canada every year so all cats should be kept inside, via an educational program and enforced bylaw.
- Pets are under control at all times, whether on leash or not. Animals do not roam around communities in their own. Owners are responsible to pick up and dispose of all waste. Care taken when animals are aggressive towards other animals or humans.
- MUST follow rules/regulations along with respect to their neighbors and private properties...
- Taking care of them. Cleaning up after them. Ensuring they are good canine citizens. Not roaming off lead. Not outside barking incessantly.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Calgary bylaw need to put in
Can changed someone for stolen puppies and dogs
- Thanks
- This is stupid and a waste of time. How much is this costing the tax payer? This should be changed to: What does responsible city council mean to you.
- -No noise (barking bylaws are lax, I am a dog lover)
- -No poop or pee on neighbours property
Pee is semi acceptable if walking on sidewalk but not free range onto lawn
Poop should be discouraged and removed thoroughly
- -No farm agriculture animals disease etc (Infectious Laryngotracheitis (ILT))ON"
"no chickens or pigs farm agricultural animals
Period
Surrounding MDs (foothills) don't all chickens on lots =
- Humans must be trained prior to acquisition of dogs and cats. The human is what needs licensing, to prove capable pet ownership. Dogs further must be trained prior to being allowed in public.
- It means getting a pet to be quiet during quiet hours, same as machinery.
- Proper care of your animals and respectable behavior with regards to your neighbors.
- Ensuring that pets are well cared for, properly socialized, and that safety is ensured for the pet, the owners, and bystanders.
- It means taking care of the emotional & physical needs of your animals. Having a healthy relationship with them that is mutually beneficial is significant too. And being considerate of your neighbours, and the general public.
- I believe that responsible pet ownership means licensing my dog, cleaning up after my dog, and keeping my dog under control (i.e. leashes/barking). It also means providing proper shelter/food/medical attention. Of course, responsible owners also need to obey bylaws.
- Love animals, but you have to show kindness, respect and trust not just for the animal but the surrounding area too. There is too much neglect and disrespect going on within City of Calgary.
- taking full responsibility for the wellbeing of your pet and how it interacts with the public (if that is the case).
- That the animals are well cared for, including the right environment.
- Ensuring all pets are treated humanely, that public access is widely permitted and owners are held accountable for breaches, not penalizing the animals.
- Providing a great quality of life for our pet which includes walks, nutrition, love, and engagement. There are not enough off leash park inthe city for dogs. Why can't we consider major green spaces like Fish Creek Provincial Park to be off leash?
- Urban Agriculture: I do not want animals other than cats & dogs allowed in the city. Please do not turn our city into a farm! No chickens, no sheep, no horses or cattle, no pigeons and no bees!
I am happy with the bylaws governing the other five areas of focus
- Animals are well cared for and neighbours are unaffected, e.g. feces

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Redefine the word 'pet'. Emotional support animal definition has broadened. Time to do the same for ALL Calgary's citizens.

- Taking care of your animals
- Following bylaws such as picking up after pets, noise low, pets on leash, licensed, and taking care of pets as family with due care
- Licence your pet. Train, Socialize, and Ensure proper veterinary care. Ensure all needs both nutritional, comfort and care are met. Spay or neuter your pet. Ensure your pet is not roaming free around the neighbourhood. Clean up after your pet and have your pet under control in public areas.
- People who have pets that take care of them and don't allow the pet to become a a nuisance to their neighbours via noise or property destruction for example.
- A limit on the number of animals one property can have within city limits.
- taking good care of, cleaning up after, housing them, keep others safe from them, not let them roam, not let them bother neighbors
- that no matter the pet, that I provide every comfort, care, responsibility and pet obligations towards my pet WHILE ensuring my pet is of no hazard, nuisance or able to cause negative consequences to any of my neighbors.
- Taking care of basic needs, grooming environment that they spend their time in. I believe dogs should be socialized to prevent dangerous behaviours. And maintaining a leash (big or small) for the dog no matter the breed. Offleash areas are fine however on sidewalks and in tight spaces safety is best
- Don't make your problems other people's problems
- Taking care of your pets like your children. Don't leave them outside unsupervised. Regular vaccinations and vet visit.
- To maintain the health and safety of your pet. To ensure your pet is not a danger to anyone else or any other pet. To walk your dog on a leash and not allowed to run free in the city.
- Having the time, space, and financing to take care of your pet to give them a good quality of life.
- Stop allowing cats to run at large (dogs can't so cats shouldn't be able to either). Tag or no Tag leash them. Some are vicious but you can't catch the little b***ards after they claw you for chasing them out of your garbage/yard/garden. They also kill the wild song birds.
- Responsible pet ownership is consistently providing the essentials to maintain life of the animal and ensuring the animal and the public are not effected negatively by human actions or inactions. Stronger repercussions for those that fail to do so is required as many offenders can own again.
- Exercising the right to own a pet that doesn't infringe on my neighbour's use or enjoyment of their property. Urban settings are not appropriate for livestock unless it remains indoors and is Doctor prescribed. Well trained Dogs should have more off leash areas and be allowed in more areas.
- Licensing your pet, Spaying or neutering your pet; huge problem with unwanted kittens and puppies who end up with no home. If you want a pet, go to the shelter. Animal abuse policies need to be stricter, people abandon or abuse animals, that should be on a registry and not allowed to have pets!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Restricting the sale of intact rabbits or eliminating the ability to have them sold in pet stores at all (At least without spay/neuter). The number of dumped/feral rabbits in the city is rising because of the ease of which people can get them. Stopping the source should help.
- I think cats should be able to roam outside. This would keep the mouse population down.
- Taking good care of your pet and minimizing it's impact on your community - i.e. cleaning up after your pet, licencing it, ensuring it's not destroying others property or bothering neighbours, etc.
- Ensuring that my pets don't bother other people
- caring for the well being of an animal emotionally and physically. Cleaning up after the animal.
- Protecting, Loving, Feeding and abiding by CofC bylaws to ensure your pet/family member is licensed and not at large. Having readily available funds should your pet/family member require emergency vet care /yearly vet check ups and vaccinations are up to date. Providing Love and asafe environment
- Keeping your pet on your property and under control on your property. If they are outside your boundaries then they need to be on a leash and under control on the leash.
- If you have animals your make sure they respect everyone around you and you take care of them and your property
- As a person in a family with several pets and an owner/operator at CiTy Dogs, my focus is always the safety of my own pets and those in my care. We always work hard to be sure that our actions (at home and in the dogs parks) do not negatively impact others.
- Loving and caring for my pet(dog) to the best of my ability. Provide safe, clean environment, proper food, shelter, mental and physical engagement and health care. Force free training and reinforcement. Safe fenced and gated dog parks where all dogs can engage in doggy play and safe from roadways.
- Being aware of your animal's welfare along with your animal's impact on the community you live in.
- Ensuring your pet (e.g. dog/cat) are on a leash or contained when outside of your own home at all times, except for City designated off-leash areas. There are citizens who are scared of/allergy/dislike dogs/cats, their rights should be respected in public space just as pet owners are.
- Being able to provide for all my dogs needs; food, shelter, but also being able to take them outside and have them at off leash parks (responsibly) to interact with other dogs and run.
- Having your dog under control and within 25 meters of you if you are in off leash. Picking up after your dog. Staying on the sidewalk or boulevard and not on peoples yards. If an area is not designated off leash dogs must be on leash.
- Pets become members of my family. I know I need to provide financial, medical, and emotional support as required.
- Keeping your dog on a leash when not in a off leash area. More sign's are needed on the bike paths or walking paths saying that it is not a off leash area. People react to signs better than relying on knowledge off the law or they just claim ignorance. More bylaw patrols around Peak times of the day
- Ensuring people and pets can co-exist in our city, keeping both safe from harm. It also ensures Pet owners are responsible for minimizing any possible negative impacts on their neighbours and their neighbours' pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responsibility
- Safety and well-being of the animal as well as it relates to the public.
- Responsible pet ownership means that owners care for and maintain appropriate living conditions for their pets, while at the same time, having appropriate consideration for their neighbours. At the same time, appropriate neighbours do not overly assert their wish for a pet free society.
- An animal in full control. No barking all day. No off leash on city land. Picking up animal waste on city land. More bylaw to enforce
- Being responsible with your pets by getting them spayed and neutered, following laws about off-leash areas, picking up your animal's poops, etc.
- It means taking of physically, emotionally and medically any animal in your home or care
- Pets are well cared for, have suitable and safe outdoor access and under control when outside. Pets must be socialized for human encounters and are not a nuisance, ie: don't bark incessantly or damage property of neighbours. If wildlife comes into their yard, aren't harassed or harmed.
- Taking responsibility to train and keep a pet in order to not be a harm to others
- Providing pets with appropriate shelter, food, water, care, supervision and in the case of dogs, training and socializing.
- Being able to enjoy what the city has to offer with my dog. While also respecting municipal bylaws and other individuals respect and boundaries. I think every pet owner should have to take Canines good neighbor test if you want your dog in public. I believe retractable leashes should be banned!
- Ensures the pets are clean, cleaned up after, well-behaved, in control and not disruptive to neighbours
- Providing for your pet, vet check ups, walks, cleaning up after your pet, providing love, keeping a pet for life, they aren't disposable as they age.
- People take care of the health and wellbeing of their pets, and take precautions to keep the public and pets safe.
- Treating pets like part of your family. Providing for them and giving them a safe place to live. Loving them always.
- Looking after your pet.
- keep my dog under my control, pick up after her and making sure she is well cared for and loved
- Have a pet for your own reasons (enjoyment, emotional support, etc) without interfering with other people's life or property.
- Training your dog to be around others, walking your dog, picking up after your dog and keeping it from barking for no reason.
- I feel that homeless people should not be aloud to own or have a pet with them while they are on the street. I feel that it is very cruel to make an animal endure the harsh weather and that an animal has the right to have shelter, food and live in a happy healthy home and not on the street.
- To me this means having control over your pet at all times and cleaning up after your pet. Being responsible also means keeping your pet vaccinated, groomed and fixed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Registering your pet with the city. Picking up your dog poop. Keeping your pet on a leash when required. Controlling pets behavior. Muzzling aggressive dogs when out in the public.
- Owners must provide food shelter and doctor care for animals that the have in their household. No animals should ever be abused every animal should be cared for with love that as humans provide to each other. Animals provide us with unconditional love and we as must return the same.
- Spay and neutering, recognizing/understanding that not everyone is comfortable around animals and being respectful of that. Sturdy yard fencing and providing training for larger dogs.
- Keep pets and people safe, Spay and neuter.
- It means respecting the bylaws that are in place. I regularly encounter dog owners with their dogs off leash in leashed areas. I believe that the owners know that they are going against the bylaw but they don't seem to care due to lack of bylaw enforcement.
- It means cleaning up after your dog and putting it in the proper disposal bin. Keeping cats inside or on a leash when outside. Walking dogs on a leash while in a community setting. Allowing dogs off leash in proper areas. Not chaining up dogs or leaving out side unattended for long periods of time.
- Cleaning up after them, licensed, and a healthy clean environment to live in.
- Licensing pets, cleaning up after them, spay and neuter, keeping care and control of your pet on and off your property.
- Meeting the physical and emotional needs of a pet, while also limiting the negative impact such pet may have on others (people and animals) -- both at home in the neighbourhood and on outings to parks and other venues. Currently, many pet owners are not controlling their dogs or picking up feces.
- Care and control of any animal in your care.
- Keeping you dog under control, cleaning g up after it. No excessive barking, licensed & chipped. Cats inside only.
It would be nice to walk my dog without being stalked by Coyotes. What is the city doing about that?
- Giving animals the best life while having respect for your fellow citizens.
- It means updates immunization, regular grooming and ensuring good behaviours in public.
- Providing care for animals in your home or your property so that they are healthy and not a nuisance to the neighborhood.
- ensuring that your pet has a warm home to live in, is fed food and water, is provided proper training when interacting with other animals, is not left at home for long periods of time, is taken to the vet when needed, and its given at least one walk a day for at least 30 minutes
- Being accountable for the actions of your pet.
- To love And care for an animal, clean up after them, to protect them and everyone around you
- Beyond looking after basic needs, food, water, shelter & medical love and attention. Having consideration for others. .clean up your dogs mess, keep cats indoors & dogs on leashes. Off leash areas are dangerous for dogs since not all owners are responsible or provide proper training.
- I would like to see a minimum of 12 chickens allowed in any household that has a yard with in Calgary.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Following the rules
- Backyard hens should be allowed as many other very large centres already do. Calgary is behind the times in this arena. The city can ask Portland or any other center on how they manage and the rules surrounding chicken husbandry. Let's get with the times
- Dogs are part of the family and it should not be allowed that condo bylaws have dog restrictions. Some communities have ended the ability for condo bylaws to do this.
- Responsible pet ownership to me means that pet owners should be considerate and aware of both the pet(s) and the community in which they live. This includes having the financial means to properly care for that animal and ensuring the safety of nearby residents at all times.
- owners should have: licenses for pets, identity chips, animals fixed, clean up after pets, no more than 2-3 pets, not leaving pets outside alone for hours on end, not allowing pets to interfere with neighbours, animals that are not aggressive, not leaving pets alone all day in the house barking
- Dog walkers should not be allowed to have more than 3 dogs in an off leash area. They are not able to pick up poop while having 12 dogs to watch! I see several dog walkers at Sue Higgins who are looking after 10-12 dogs at a time. They often act like a pack, and a danger to other dogs.
- Way too many things for the city to be able to monitor or make a meaningful contribution to.
 - Regular check ups
 - Brush their teeth
 - Proper diet
 - Proper exercise
 - Grooming
 - Adoption only
- Provide food, shelter and medical care for pets. When pets are in public, owners should have control of their pets so they do not harm people. Owner should cleanup after their pets in public areas as well as their own property, keep their pet from disturbing others with loud and constant noise.
- Dogs, cats, conventional support animals. Proper care, with veterinary, cleanup and registration of the animals. No chickens and other non-conventional animals. System to register support animals. Too many fakes to get special treatment.
- Taking care of dogs my animals, picking up after them in public places and, not letting them harm others.
- Keeping your pets safe and healthy and not allowing them to be a bother to your neighbors (smells, noises, predators).
- Training your pet, vaccinating it and daily exercise and having it as part of your family, not roaming on other people's property or chained/kennelled or left alone outside in a dog house all the time.
- making sure that pets are not being a nuisance or a danger to the neighbors or other pets in the area. keeping the area clean and not turning the yard into a large litter box for dogs or cats.
- My husband takes our dog to AuburnBay dog park every morning and he says people constantly ignore the cleanup signs and there is always a lot of poop left laying around. Can nothing be done to enforce the need to clean up after the dog? My husband always does his part.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Taking responsibility for the behaviour and actions of your pet (keeping it from harming itself, other pets and animals, and other people) and ensuring your pet is leading a healthy life.
- It means not having any animals U cannot control to avoid neighbours quality of life. People should train their dogs not to bark for hours on end & every time someone walks by or parks within 3 houses . We are selling our house due to 3 neighbours who refuse to learn this simple lesson.
- Vaccinations for pets, Spay and neuter, licensing. Keeping dangerous animals under control on leash or in yard. Pick up after your dog!
- Keeping my pet safe and not negatively impacting the ability of others to enjoy their lives.
- Taking ownership of your animal & not disturbing your neighbours .
- responsible pet ownership is providing high-quality care that enriches the life of the animal, enriches the life of the owner, and does not impose on others.
- It means picking up after your pet, doing your best to not allow them to chase wildlife. It means knowing dog body language and being mindful that not all dogs or people like other dogs. It means committing to taking care of them no matter the financial repercussions and the time/energy required.
- having rules to keep pet ownership and neighbours safe and copacetic
- Not only taking care of your pets' dietary needs and warm shelters (inside home during winter) but also "properly" socializing your dogs. This does not mean letting poorly trained / poorly socialized dogs to run at the off leash park to be "socialized"! My dog has been attacked by 3 vicious dogs!
- Licensing, vaccinations and respecting on leash areas and not allowing your pet to roam (dog or cat)
- Ensuring animals are under control and cleaned up after at all times. Pets should not infringe on other people's enjoyment of their environment (eg off leash dogs or cats, waste left in parks or other people's yards, dogs that bark constantly).
- Providing for the welfare of your pet and not letting it infringe on neighbour's nerves.
- At off leash parks, new signs need to be posted at every entrance saying: Absolutely no vicious dogs allowed! Cameras should be set up so that irresponsible owners can be caught and fined. If dogs have bitten another dog or person in the past they shouldn't be allowed in &no "humping" allowed either
- An owner that picks up after their dog, has taken the time to teach their dogs basic manners and basic commands, and that has a well socialized dog — not aggressive or doesn't knock people over or bite. Dogs need that structure to be good canine neighbors but it's the owners that are responsible
- Doing your best to make sure your pet does not negatively impact others - within reason, of course. Life is not a Disney movie!
- Ensuring the animals I have are trained, not a nuisance and are vaccinated on a regular basis.
- having the ability to take my trained/nonaggressive pup to areas in my own neighborhood and allow them to be off lease close to home. Right now I live in Coventry hills and have NOWHERE close to take my active dog (Australian Shepard) for a run off-leash.
- Are you out of your mind, dogs ,cats ok nothing else,you want farm animals leave the city ,another city stupid move



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Having a sense of accountability, knowing your bylaws, keeping pets and people safe.
- Taking the necessary steps to ensure the Health safety of your pet and other pets and owners around you; whether that be vaccinations, training, or simply knowing their limitations and socializing according
- Having proper licence and behavior items for dogs and cats and educating owners
- We have been interested in getting a few chickens and having a coop or bee hive in our backyard. I don't see the harm in having this ability. If the city is worried about disposing of chickens after they stop laying maybe the chickens can be put down at an animal shelter and food shared
- It means not letting your dogs off leash unless you are in an off leash park and cleaning up after them and not leaving them outside barking for hours. For cats it means not letting your cat roam freely.
- That my pet is taken care of emotionally, physically, medically and is provided a safe, fun and engaging environment. It also means that while my pet doesnt interfere with someone else's quality of life I have the right to ensure that someone else does not interfere with my pet's quality of life
- Having your pet microchipped and/or tattooed. Getting vet checks annually. Dogs on leashes or under your control; cats inside or in your own yard. Pets spayed/neutered.
- Ensuring their pet is properly trained, socialized and well taken care of.
- Being a respectful citizen who has the means to properly look after their pet and by ensuring the pet is not a nuisance to other neighbours with noise pollution eg barking dog. Ensuring pet is cared for and any mess related to pet is cleaned up
- Dog behaviours should be taken into consideration, not just weight and size. There are very loud small dogs and quiet large dogs who are more well behaved but are restricted in buildings where loud dogs are allowed. It doesn't seem fair to the well behaved large dogs and their owners.
- Responsible pet ownership means not affecting others with the animals you keep. Our current society focuses on instant gratification. Laws around urban chickens should updated allowing small flock 4-6 enough to feed a family, teaching patience and outcome awarded behavior.
- cleaning up after your pet
- Being a responsible pet owner means properly taking care of your animal (safe home/environment, proper training, exercising in a safe/healthy manner, being able to control your animal, grooming/cleaning up after your animal, taking animal in for proper vet visits). I could go on.
- It means that you are always physically in control of your pet, that you clean up after your pet and that you ensure that your pet does not damage another persons property.
- Caring for, providing for and keeping track of the pets in your household.
- Ensuring all pets get their needs met and owners enjoy having them without affecting others negatively!
- Owning animals or livestock & caring for them responsibly, including finding a balance between their quality of life & urban living.
- Picking up your dog's poo and not lot leaving poo bags on paths. Having control of your dog. Dog owners will yell, "Don't worry he's friendly as their dog jumps up on you". Dog owners frequently allow their dogs off-leash in an on-leash area. Allowing their dogs to run back & forth along the path.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Being capable of meeting your pets needs.
Understanding the emotional, physical & financial responsibilities.
Understanding what it takes to have a happy, safe and healthy pet.
Animals need interaction, companionships and love every bit as much, if not more than food and water.
- Taking care of your pet's health and behavior in ways that help him/her to be a good citizen :)
- Someone who takes care of their pet along with the area they go in.
- Caring for the emotional and physical well being of your animal and making sure they are not a danger to themselves or other.
- Caring for your pet to the best of your ability
- Loving animals is a right. Respecting others is necessary but living next to an animal hater is hard.
- I think the Calgary bylaw is fair and comprehensive there are not many areas that need updating but I think that education is important as a lot of pet owners do not know the rules or what it means. More work on the ambassador program is a good way of getting that info out
- Proper care, training and management of any and all pets in a household
- Being able to provide the best food, physical and emotional health for a animal throughout its life.
- dont bring your dog to my lawn to do is business front or backyard
Dont leave your dog in your house barking all day while you are at work
- I believe Pitbull dog should not allowed as a pet.
- Obeying the law! Too many dog owners in Calgary ignore the rules when it comes to keeping dogs under control.
- Appropriate behaviour from you and your pet while enjoying the city
- Ensuring your pets are safe, provide food shelter and health care, and not bothering anyone else.
- I love animals, but in the city, I believe we need to be courteous and keep house animals arms pets. I believe cats should be kept inside for their safety. I believe that bees and chickens are NOT city animals and cause much disturbance to neighbors and our close proximity. Thank you.
- care of the pets, care for the community
- Unneutered dogs should not be allowed at the off leash parks. In addition, male dogs should not be allowed to "hump" other dogs (some immature owners just stand there and think it's funny that their dog is humping another dog!). More free run areas are needed in each area!
- Should be enforcement of dangerous and nuisance animals, but technical enforcement just for the sake of enforcement when there is no nuisance or danger being created by the pet should not be a part of the bylaw.
- Pets are adequately fed, have medical care, are not abused, are trained to live in a human world
- Taking proper care of a pet, respecting other people rights not to be "bothered " by your pet.
- By providing the necessities of life; food, water, shelter, healthcare. And owner must also provide appropriate mental and physical stimulation, companionship and affection
- Being responsible for a pet at all times, not letting the pet free roam, nor distract neighbours with noise/smell.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Adhering to the bylaws and understanding that not everyone is or wants to be a pet owner and that that perspective needs to be respected.
- Anyone who has a pet needs to take care of it mentally and physically!! This means to me that your pets should be spayed /neutered! Only responsible breeders should be allowed to have intact dogs.
- Registered with the city with tags, microchipped, cleaning up after your pet, not leaving them outside 24/7, spayed/neutered to help population control, yearly vet checkups, de-worming medication especially during summer months
- Taking care of your pet(s), providing adequate food, shelter, support and care. Doing your best to keep your pet safe from harm, but also keeping others safe from harm due to your pet(s).
- Animal safety
- Your pet is taken care of, registered with city if required, regular food, exercise, vet, healthy; owner look after their pet and ensures it doesn't bother neighbours, pick up after your pet
- Caring for you pet, to ensure both the pet's and the community's health.
- Not letting your pet roam, making sure vaccines are up to date and ensuring your pet goes to the vet if they are sick. Making a pet part of your family.
Anyone who lets an animal suffer sickness I abuse should be fined heavily, hailed in some cases and be banned from having any pet.
- Clean up after your pet. Ensure they are not neglected or treated poorly. I believe leashes should be optional if your dog is well trained and heels beside you.
- I am responsible for my pet and its actions
- It means that an animal is being fed daily with fresh water. They are not left outside without shelter, or long periods of time. They need to be taken to the vet in emergency situations. Also spay/ neutered is a must! There should be a 5 pet limit per household. That includes bunnies, reptiles etc.
- Making sure your pets don't affect other people or wildlife.
- Citizens should be responsible for their pets, bees and chickens. The city should allow responsible ownership to occur rather than have antiquated ideas regarding chickens. If I pay taxes, I should be able to do as I please on my property. & stop the parks poop education program, stupid waste money.
- Being respectful of the city we share with others and my relationship with my dog
- Taking care of your pet
- Providing care to animals in your home.
- Spay and neuter your pets , keep them and others safe,
- Caring for pets, cleaning up after them in public places (including neighbour lawns!), ensuring they are not too noise or disturbing neighbours, ensuring they are safe to be around public if you have them in public areas/around people
- Caring for an animal in a way that cares for the animals needs while not decreasing the quality of life of others.
- Mandatory pet insurance.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- making sure your dog is healthy and well behaved - not harming or damaging people/property. Picking up after your dog and respecting other people and dogs around you.
- Your pet does not impact other people in any way.
- Providing appropriate and safe (fenced) off leash area in north calgary. Sue Higgins park in the south is amazing. North residents do not have a similar location. It is needed. I am tired of irresponsible owners letting dogs run at large in the field behind my home!
- It means licensing your animals and being in control of them at all times. Picking up after them and be courteous to other people
- Pet ownership is a privilege not a right. Pet dmust be physically and emotionally nourished.
- People who follow bylaw's. Keep pets on a leash or property and clean up after them. Don't abuse or neglect their pets.
- Pet owners keep their pets off MY property. Pet owners clean up after their pets on THEIR property. Pet owners ensure that their pets DO NOT become a nuisance in the neighbourhood. And finally, all animals MUST be treated humanely.
- Responsible breeding, first and foremost. Mandatory training
- Our neighbor has three medium sized dogs. When outside their bark is very annoying early AM, when she gets home from work and again in the evening. If she leaves them out all day it spoils the enjoyment of my outdoor and indoor solitude. Only one dog should be allowed.
- Raising and caring for animal in responsible fashion with same care and attention a reasonable adult would show a human child
- Providing your pet with food and water, safe shelter, and medical care when needed.
- Taking care of your animals for their benefit and your neighbours
- Taking care of your animal and not creating a nuisance
- People keeping their pets on their property, and not letting their cats roam the neighborhood. Dog owners picking up after their dog.
- It's multi faceted, including health, welfare, socialization, walks/exercise, training, obedience, Respect and love for the pet. Many humans don't deserve the pet in their custody.
- Ensuring you have full control of your pet at all times, clean up after them and ensure your pet is well cared for and treated like a member of the family.
- Having safe outdoor spaces to bring your animals to play, have resources available for their health, a lot of time spent with them, access to clean water and food daily, dogs should be safe in common areas for dogs
- Healthy animals. Have enough space for the # of pets on property. registered
- Being responsible for the care and behaviour of your pet. Cleaning up after sndcensuting your pet is not a nuisance to neighbors.
- Owning appropriate pets for the style of home you reside in (eg. Large dogs in apartments should not be allowed), picking up dog poop, only domesticated pets in city limits, proper training for your pet, aggressive dog breads should be banned.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Being a responsible pet owner or pet parent means providing for the animal's basic needs. That means food, water, shelter, social interaction and growth.
- Looking after the mental and physical wellbeing of my pets. Making sure they are properly vetted, socialised, and are well behaved citizens.
- Paying a one time registration fee instead of yearly. City can do a poll at the beginning of each year (like census) to know if our pet is still alive.
- giving animals a loving, healthy home. Providing all the necessities to maintain their health and socialize to ensure a well rounded personality. Taking full responsibility for your animals no matter what
- Taking care if your pets licenseing them and clean after them. Making there contolled and there safe around people.Taking care of them on a everyday basis.
- Polite and courteous as best you can. Not allowing cats to roam, and not owning too many pets in one house. It's cruel.
- A better way to license cats so they don't have to wear a collar, and risk getting caught on something and getting strangled to death. A spay a neuter program in place for dog and cat owners, alot of people don't get it done due to the price alone. More support for those individuals would be amazing
- Training dogs to be good citizens. Picking up after them in yard or public, respecting your neighbours and not letting them bark howl growl or act aggressive to anyone at any time, proper socialization, respecting the bylaws of on/off leash areas and not letting your dog just run up to strange dogs!
- Proper feeding, veterinary and psychological care (affection, toys/environment, non-abuse, etc.). Responsible breeding, where applicable.
Keeping pets & companion/support animals that do not bother your neighbours/communities.
Responsible Pet Ownership DOES include care & regulation of support anima
- Doing your research to learn how to properly care for that pet before deciding to bring one home. Providing the necessities of life such as food, water, shelter and medical care. Cleaning up after your dog, minimizing excessive noise and ensure your pet is not a danger to people or other pets.
- That you are responsible for your dog behaviour
- Provide a warm / cool shelter , food, care , training and absolute unconditional love
- Keeping our pets safe from cruel humans, poison, cars and taking care of their medical needs.
- Consistently caring for the animals health- physical, mental and emotional. Providing a safe home. Ensuring that guests are safe when around the animal. Dogs and cats are cleaned up after dedicating and the waste is properly disposed of.
- Ensuring your pets are licensed and trained
- Responsible pet ownership means to be in control of your dog at all times on or offleash as well as to properly train, feed and clean up after pets daily. As well as getting medical attention when necessary as well having as many dogs as you can properly maintain and care for fairly.
- Take responsibility for your pet. Don't let the cat out to roam around and licence your dog. Make sure their shots are up to date. A person is responsible for the health and wellbeing of their pets as well as cleaning up after them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- What pet a person owns doesn't really matter. However, it must be contained within reasonable regulations strong noise and health. Chickens, for example, are very noisy, stink and have habitats that easily cause disease (if their defecation isn't regularly clean). By laws most take this into account
- 1. Healthy happy dog
- 2. Control over your own dog
- 3 . Responsible for all damage messes caused by dog and removal of all fecal matter leaving your dogs butt cheeks
- 4. Mindfulness of other dogs and people - being considerate .
- The proper care and training of your pet. Being familiar with and following bylaws within your area. Microchipping your pet and having pet ID. Responsible breeding, no backyard breeding.
- Responsible pet ownership means spaying or neutering your pet. It means ensuring you have the funds necessary to provide food and veterinary care for your pets. It means having your pets microchipped and/or tattooed in case they are lost. It also means giving your pets a home for life.
- Means animals are safe, controlled, maintained and not a nuisance to those around them. That they live in an environment that allows them to be happy and safe.
- For Dog Owners: picking up the poop and bark control (banning surgeries cutting vocal cords!!) For Cat Owners: keeping them on a leash (it can be done) and keeping them indoors! Spay and neuter for both.
- Picking up after your dog. Staying close by to supervise your dog especially if there is an issue.
- Animals are well taken care of, receive training, vet care, exercise and mental stimulation.
- Being knowledgeable about your pet and knowing, while enjoying your time with them, making sure other people can enjoy their time too.
 - picking up their pop
 - LEASHING YOUR DOG
- Being provided affordable spay and neuter
- Spaying/neutering/proper vet care; not allowing disturbances - noise, smell, danger - to others; proper safety precautions in your yard; cleaning up excrement while on walks; proper licensing.
- Responsible pet owners take care of all facets of pet ownership, including providing adequate shelter and food, being responsible for any damages caused by their animal, keeping their pets under control (including off their property) and taking the necessary steps to address problem behavior
- Spaying and neutering, pet insurance, force free training, providing mental enrichment and healthy food, caring for an animal to the standard you would treat a human child but species appropriate care. Knowing your dog and keeping them and others safe if utilizing dog parks.
- I have been a responsible owner of 4 dogs and 3 cats during the past 30 years in Calgary. Our family always tried to abide with the appropriate City bylaws concerning our pets. I am generally not in favour of expanding the description of "pets" under the bylaws to include "farm animals".



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Training the pet and it's owners in good behaviours and safety of the pet and handling. Cleaning the pet and cleaning up after the pet. Providing the best life for the pet, making decisions that improve its overall life.
- Making a commitment to an animal for the life of the animal to care for it's physical and emotional needs. This includes such examples as feeding a healthy diet, clean water, vet care
- Pets should be controlled if presenting an obvious safety issue, but the mitigation of stray cat populations within the city has allowed rodent infestations to rise and become an issue. I frequently find mice and their damages in businesses and homes, and it's easily prevented this way.
- Not letting them roam, providing them with a safe and loving home.
- Exactly as it sounds, taking full responsibility for owning a pet.
- It means being able to have a companion that enriches your life and possibly the lives of others. The animal needs to be respectful to ones around it and that can only be taught to it by us if at all. Pets need not encroach on anyone else's life without their willingness.
- Owning an animal, taking proper care of it, and taking responsibility for its behaviour in the community.
- Putting your pet before yourself
- That your dog is properly housed, exercised, fed & vetted. Is well trained and can be trusted with strangers.
- With the ever changing environment and demise of bees globally we need to rethink our strategy for urban agriculture. Our neighboring cities have allowed chicken and goats amongst to promote urban agriculture, why are we so behind???
- Dealing with my pet, making sure they are healthy, fed and taken care of, and making sure all the city guidelines are followed.
- Care, courtesy, and safety
- Going beyond the min standards of conduct (by laws) by educating oneself in the animal's body language, care and needs (including nutritional) and offering a socially, physically and mentally enriched life for the animal.
- Properly looking after your animal. Caring for it. Protecting it. And preventing accidents/injury
- Having my dog license and fixed as well as taking care of their overall health.
- Being able to care for yourself and a animal with same regard for how would care for members of your family
- It means that you are capable and prepared to continuously focus on what is required to provide for a pet, including ensuring the animal does not impose a nuisance or danger to others.
- Enjoy your pet but ensure that it does not negatively impact the rights and lifestyle of others in your surrounding community.
- Being able to care properly for animals in a clean safe environment
- The pets are well cared for and receive appropriate care from a veterinarian. They do not roam the streets unaccompanied and the owner respects on and off-leash areas.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Someone who cares for their animals as well as the impact the animals have on people around them. So, for example, if people are walking their dogs off leash in a regular neighbourhood, that is not responsible ownership!
- Keeping cats inside and not roaming and doing their business in other neighbours yards. Controlling dogs on the street and not harassing people walking on the street. Limiting number of pets in a household.
- Providing appropriate nutrition, water, housing, exercise.
- Responsible pet ownership means respecting public spaces and making sure your pet is not a nuisance to fellow citizens. Good animal husbandry practices regarding the care for your animal should also be maintained.
- Providing a safe and caring environment so pets are healthy and happy. Being aware of one's pets impacts on the community. Clean up messes and not allowing pets to wander unattended or disturb others
- Realizing pets can be at risk if let out to roam and being respectful of others with respect to barking, pooping and other behaviors.
- Making sure you take care of your animals. Keeping them in your yard and not wandering around the neighbourhood.
- Being responsible for everything my dog does - including barking pooping scaring people or biting
- Not owning a pit bull. They should be banned.
- Taking care and provide for your pet while at the same time not causing any harm to others and the area that we share. Obey the bylaws.
- Licensing animals, not owning more animals than can be properly cared for (without a breeding license), only breeding purebred, CKC registered and health tested dogs. No backyard breeding. Spaying/neutering.
- It means dogs or cats. No livestock. No pigs or chickens. If you need a comfort animal, get a dog or cat. Clean up after them and don't make them a nuisance to your neighbours.
- For me it's all about quality of life. Do you look after them by not just doing the basics but do you give them what they need such as attention. Or if it's a cat letting them go out occasionally. Especially when they are crying at the door to be let out.
- Ensuring dogs are trained and have completed training. Ensuring training facilities have adequate licensing. Ensuring owners pick up after their dogs, obey leashed area signage, and enroll reactive dogs into courses regardless of size or breed of dog.
- Licensed, desexed, microchipped, proper housing, proper socialization. A cat which does not roam. A dog which can be taken into public without incident. Knowing what your dog can and cannot handle and acting appropriately. And finally, obeying leash laws throughout the city.
- We have a dog. Pet ownership is animals who are companions and where the animal is controlled and not "livestock" or a direct or indirect commercial enterprise, and will not become a nuisance or worse for neighbours or the community.
- Being educated and studious about the well being of both my pets and the public. Engaging in training and diligence with my dog's behavior as well as supporting and educating the public and



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

those around me of canine behavior. (leash reactivity) Respecting species and their innate natural tendencies.

- Pets are family members for life so are the responsibility of the 'owner' for physical and emotional well being.
- Enjoying the company of companion animals. Providing for their physical and mental well being including behavioural training when required. Promoting the preservation of healthy well-being bred dogs. Allowing dogs to work to their potential.
- Having an animal that is well cared for, trained, and is safe to have in the city.
- Care and responsibility for the life and well being of an animal
 - 1.) Having your furbabies vaccines upto date
 - 2.) Des
 - 2.) Add more off leash parks for furbabies is a must to give them good exercise and burn some energy to roam and be free
 - 3.) Microchip is a must.
- Lifelong care, properly identified, following in-laws, spaying/neutering, health care, socializing and appropriate training, providing exercise and mental stimulation, preventing pets from negatively impacting other people and animals, understanding pets are an investment of time and money
- C
- Controlling your pet in public spaces so that other citizens or their property are not impacted. I.e. on many occasions a walk/hike in public parks can be disrupted due to out of control pets jumping all over you.
Another major issue is ensuring the pet owners clean up after their pet.
- Taking proper care of your pet physically, ensuring you pet is not a threat to people or other animals, cleaning up after your pet, not acquiring pets that are unsuitable for your accomodations, or that you are not knowledgeable on, providing medical attention when necessary NOT ABUSING YOUR ANIMAL.
- Proper care of the pets in your household and respect towards other people (ie. keeping pets quiet at home, properly trained in public, keeping cats inside, etc.).
- Providing an animal the necessaries for life.
- Give my pet the good life they deserve
- Caring for your pets physical and emotion health and respecting your community. For example dogs should live inside with us, loved fed and protected from weather extremes, trained and socialized. They should be on leash when outside except in a designated off leash area, and poop picked up always.
- Someone who licenses their pet. Picks up after their pet. Trains their pet in appropriate behaviours. Takes their pet to the vet on a regular basis for shots.
- Ensuring the health and safety of your pet while making sure that your having one doesn't infringe on others. Keep the bylaw against free roaming cats and dogs and beef up enforcement. I hate seeing cats kill wild birds.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Licensed. Quiet. Able to live indoors. No noise or smell impacting others. No barnyard “comfort “ animals in the city. Only registered service animals that have been fully trained.
- It means to take care of your pet, no matter the species, with care, love, compassion and kindness....to ensure it is healthy and loved. It also means to follow and respect the laws of the city/town where you live, which often means licensing your pet, picking up after your pet, etc.
- Taking care of your pets and ensuring their safety and well-being.
- This is what I would like to see change. Remove pet restrictions on housing and also the nonrefundable pet cleaning fee for rentals. Ontario allows all housing regardless of renting/owning to have a pet. If there is no damage caused by my pet why should I pay more?
- It means taking care of your animals and being courteous to neighbors, others and the environment you are in with you pets.
- Keeping your pet on a leash and picking up their waste.
- Keep the animal on your own property and quiet and clean up after it.
- License your pet, regular vet visits, take care of health and well-being of pet, compassion for the pet, normal grooming,
- Purchase from an ethical, responsible, REGISTERED breeder or rescue. Provide healthy nutrition & breed appropriate mental and physical exercise. Give all basic medical care (vaccines, deworming, neuter, etc) on schedule. Get immediate medical care for emergencies. Get training. Keep pet for life.
- Not allowing your dog to be outside barking for 15 minutes every night at supper time. Be aware that your neighbours do not appreciate this. The City should also do something about it rather than tell me to fill out paperwork so they can send a letter to the owner.
- It means looking after your pet and ensuring it doesn't bother neighbors ect
- Providing a balance between good neighbours and safety and health of pets
- Providing food, shelter, and love to your pet. Domesticated animals should be kept indoors for their safety and the safety of others, including cats. Leaving pets outside for extended periods of time is NEGLECT.
- Main concern is people not cleaning up after pets, both on property and on public land. Believe there should be penalties for not cleaning up after pets. Also, if you have no intention of breeding your pet (primarily dogs and cats), then you should be required or incentivized to neuter or spay.
- Owners maintain the health of the animal. When animal is not on owner's property, animal is leashed (unless in designated area).
- In my experience, neighbours are only somewhat concerned about looking after animals on their property. On our street, domestic rabbits have escaped and are now multiplying rapidly. The population of another neighbour's pigeons quadrupled in two weeks. Bad idea - no effective recourse if this happens
- No barking, no off leash, no pit bull like dogs, no agriculture animals in city for any reason.
- Caring for the social, emotional and physical well-being of all animals in your care while also ensuring the safety of your neighbours and broader community.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 1) Pet owners keeping their pets healthy (regular vet visits enforced by city)
- 2) Keeping their pets on their properties (no free running around)
- 3) More stringent enforcement and high fines for letting pets loose in the neighbourhood. The ability to sue pet owners for damages created by their pets.
- Maintaining property by cleaning up after pets, licensed and mandatory owner chips for all pets including bunnies, no 'farm' animals in city limits. Strong penalties for vicious dogs. Dogs in dog park should be kept under control. Leave the wildlife alone, except if they become aggressive.
- Securing your animals, I.e. leashing in public. Spaying and neutering animals to avoid unwanted breeding, limit the number of animals in your home to what is manageable for you, having safe interactions with your dog and the public (I.e. people and other dogs)
- Means keeping your pet happy and healthy by taking care of their basic dietary, medical, physical, and psychological needs. It also means monitoring their behavior and environmental impact in public spaces so that you and your pooch are good members of your community.
- - not bringing a leashes dog to an offleash park- not only does it cause tension at the offleash the dog on leash feels trapped and can't defend himself.
- - picking up after your pet
- - watching your dog play and stepping in when they get to excited/too dominant.
- Not allowing your dog to bark every time it thinks it sees or hears something - I'd like to be able to enjoy my backyard without being constantly barked at - current bylaws only apply during the night but I want to enjoy my yard during the day. Stop cats from roaming & pooping in gardens.
- Cleaning up after your dog. The state of "off leash areas" all over the city is disgusting and embarrassing. Dog owners need to be held accountable
- Responsible pet ownership means: Not forcing your pets on people that do not like pets or more important have health issues with pets of any kind .
Also, people STILL let their cats run all over the streets & into people's private property.
Also have issues with the number of pets some people own.
- Picking up after your animal. Listening to the community who call out bad animal owners (behavior, picking up after them, off-leash). Responsible pet owners look after their animals, do not let them loose in neighbourhoods and pick up after them.
- Being the guardian of an animal, keeping the animal safe and happy and keeping others safe from your animal.
- To me, pet ownership means adequately meeting the needs of the animals under your care. It means strictly enforced animal rights, and support systems that reflect a city that prioritizes animal welfare.
- Ensuring the health & safety of your pet and minimizing any disruption to your neighbours and community.
- Caring for and giving them health, love, exercise and the attention and needs, putting them first when they need it.
- DOGS IN PROHIBITED AREAS
- 15. (1) The Owner of a dog shall ensure that such dog does not enter or remain in or on:



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

(a) a School Ground, Playground, Sports Field, Golf Course, Cemetery, Wading or Swimming Area, or a Pathway; or

(b) any other area where dogs are prohibited by posted signs.

Pathways??

- Non predatory pets from bees to pot belly pigs should be allowed, but cats should kept indoors unless they are harnessed with cow bells. A bit strong, but gardeners and bird lovers will agree that the mousers are terrors if left to roam. Licensing, forced neutering might help.
- Having control of your pet at all times so they are not a danger to themselves or other pets / people. Caring for the pet with proper foot, shelter, and veterinary care. Ensuring the pet is not a nuisance to others (e.g. constantly barking dogs, roaming cats, etc.)
- Clean up after your dog and keep it on a leash unless in an offleash area. Provide for the animal's needs and treat it well.
- It means providing the necessities of life to your pet which includes management, supervision and training as well as food, shelter, medical care and water.
- Knowing you have the time and resources to care for a pet before acquiring one, understanding it's requirements for love, food, exercise, grooming etc, keeping it under control (leashed) at all times, owning and removing its waste from public and private property.
- Pets should mean cats and dogs only. No backyard chickens pigs or even bees. When one has dogs and cats , they must be treated properly , fed and kept warm in cold weather. They are a member of your family. Treat them like that!!!
- Where the welfare of domesticated animals is a priority and the people responsible for them are held accountable to provide for them in a manner that aligns with having all basic needs met and is safe from harm.
- If you have an aggressive animal it is taking the necessary precautions to protect it from other animals. Having had a dog that would be picked on by the aggressive ones at dogs parks made us avoid parks at certain times of the day because we didn't want to risk our dogs well-being.
- It means that your animal(s) are spayed/neutered, provided with permanent ID in the form of a Tattoo or a microchip and that your animal is provided with enrichment and a good quality of life"not left out in the yard all day/night, or left out on a chain"
- Taking care of the needs of the animal while being respectful to neighbors and the community
- Taking medical care of pets, ensuring they are not causing property damage, population control
- Not having the city interfere with my business. I have two animals that I do not pay for registration for. I do not need another tax in my life. My pets are safe in my home, vaccinated, and well trained. Heck off I don't need no government telling me what to do.
- A leashed pet, picking up pet waste - every time
- Providing for the health and happiness of our pets for their full lives, including housing them indoors, never leaving them unattended outdoors, promptly picking up their waste on and off your property, regular exercise, and accessing behavioral training as needed to promote good canine citizenship.
- Keeping animals healthy, spayed/neutered, properly socialized, and knowing the characteristics of your breed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Control of your pet and pick up waste
- It means taking care of your pets needs including health, exercise, socialization as well as making sure they are not bothering anyone else (i.e. barking) and also cleaning up after them.
- That the pet owner takes all steps necessary to ensure their pet(s) are safe in all respects: that they are provided with appropriate food, fresh water, shelter, veterinary care, love and companionship. Also that their pet is not an on-going nuisance to any of their neighbours.
- Do not leave dogs outside if they're barking non stop. This negatively impacts the psychological well being of neighbors.
- Being able to care for (financially, physically and emotionally) for the pets that you own.
- Responsible pet ownership means taking care of your pet, picking up after them and ensure that they do not infringe on others
- Someone that understands the needs of their pets and is in good control of that pet. They have their safety in mind as well as balancing their needs with the publics.
- Has their pets spayed/neutered, microchipped & licensed with the city. Appropriately exercises their pets & cleans up after them (in public and in their yard). Has trained their dog & always keeps them in sight & under control when at the dog park. Doesn't have 2 many pets for the size of their home
- Caring for your animals, containing your animals, providing necessary veterinary care for your animals, and managing their interactions with and within the community.
- Put a proper comprehensive survey for Calgary can really have a meaningful measure on this issue.
- City should limit the number of dogs and cats in a home to 5 each or 8 all together. City should be more strict on dog owners for having their dogs off leash on sidewalks, paths etc.
- Backyard chickens should be allowed! They're a clean animal when properly cared for, fantastic way to provide fresh eggs for the family, as well as fresh fertilizer for the garden.
- Providing food, water, exercise and companionship to your pet
- Cleaning up after your pet and not having dangerous animals in common public areas.
- Not letting pets of-leash Especially in public narrow spaces e.g,bridges, staircases,& elevators.As much as we love dogs,some people might have been attacked by them in their childhood and are to this day scared of them.Dogs getting close to them causes fatal injuries by them trying to escape.
- It means being respectful to your neighbours.
- Control of your pet - giving your pet exercise and making them part of the family outings
- Providing the necessities for your pet: food, water, shelter, medical treatment, exercise, love etc. Following the by laws and keeping your pet on leash where required, inside your house/yard where required. Making sure that your pet doesn't cause trouble for others, ie constant barking, odor, etc
- providing shelter and care for an animal without forcing your neighbours to address it
- Cleaning up after your pets and consequences for those that don't.
- Taking care of animals and giving them a healthy playful clean life.
- Providing water, food, shelter, cleanliness, stimulation, love and the willingness to spend the money needed to care for an animal. Food and vet bills can be expensive!
- Keeping animals safe and healthy while respecting your neighbours and their animals



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It means your pet ownership does not affect other members of the community. Your pet's mess should always be cleaned up so it doesn't bother anyone. Your pet should always be under your control, whether on or off leash so it does not bother other people's pets or other people.
- Keep your pets indoors on a leash while in public space, unless you enjoy paying monster fines. The city milks drivers for minor infractions but allows pet owners to get away with letting fluffy roam all over the place killing birds and crapping on my lawn. Bust out the big fines.
- To actually follow the laws, too many people have their dogs off leash everywhere, with the "it's ok they are friendly" excuse. Actually enforcing the laws that exist would be a great improvement. Not all people or dogs want to meet everyone's off leash dog, on walkways parks etc. enforce the laws
- Being aware of your dog's behaviour and doing what is required to keep everyone comfortable - keep your dog on a leash, stop your dog from jumping on people, stop excessive barking, pick up your dog's poop(!) in your yard and out on a walk, get vaccines and get help if dog is aggressive.
- Keeping your pets safe, healthy and living lives that are as stress free as possible. Buying responsibly from non-mills, keeping cats inside and licencing and microchipping of pets.
- It means healthy pets that aren't a nuisance.
- a person who takes good care of their animals. and contributes to them having a good quality of life
- Maintaining safety for our pets, other animals and humans in public areas. Providing adequate shelter, nutrition, veterinary care and exercise for our pets.
- Cleaning up after your dog. City needs more enforcement, get bylaw out into the parks and fining people leaving shit everywhere.
- Having control of your pet at all times, licensing and vaccinating on time. Spaying and neutering your pets!
- Keeping your dog on a leash in public when they are aggressive
Not bringing aggressive dogs to dog parks
Not waiting in your vehicle while your dog is at the dog park
Cleaning up after your pet with city provided bags
City maintained water fountains for dogs
Not inbreeding animals for sale
- Ensuring the animals in my care are well cared for, live a healthy life with enrichment and that they do not cause damage or issues to neighbours or people, property outside of my direct reach.
- Knowing the laws, knowing where you can take your reactive dog (NOT AN OFFLEASH DOG PARK), owning up to your animals actions and not running away when their dog attacks another. Willing to work out solutions to problems, yearly vaccinations when needed, registration, knowing behaviors of your animal
- Pick up after your pets! Do not let your dogs off leash in areas that require leashes! (Especially dangerous breeds like pitbulls!)
- They don't allow their pets to roam alone outside.
They walk dog and pick up poo and throw away in garbage and not leave bag on ground.
They don't leave dog barking outdoors.
- It means picking up after your pet which many people don't bother doing. Stiffer fines may help.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ensuring that the animals are healthy and living in a clean environment and not negatively impacting their neighbors.
- Caring for the animals' needs, lots of opportunity for off leash play for dogs, keeping outdoor cats on property, recognizing your dog's weaknesses and getting help from a professional
- Owning a pet responsibly should mean that your pet ownership doesn't have any adverse effect on your surroundings. Unfortunately as increased density takes place there is more and more frequency of occurrences with pet owners that are irresponsible and ruin it for the good pet owners.
- Maintaining control of your dog in public. A dog should not be off-leash, except in specified off-leash areas.
Owners MUST pick up after their dog or be penalized.
- Pets are well cared for, and housed in a manner that minimizes the impacts to the surrounding neighbours and wildlife/environment.
- Taking care of your pet within your area and ensuring that they are cleaned up after. In off leash dog areas, picking up your poop, managing them in case they are bothering other dogs or people to ensure everyone is safe. Also being wary of noise bylaws and not leaving your animal out all day.
- Caring for your pet in a humane way which minimizes impact on others
- Having control over your pet on and off leash, cleaning up after them, spray and neuter
- I agree with Licensing your pets and being responsible for what ever your pet does and ensure you always have control of your animal even in off leash areas. My biggest peeve is with cats that are allowed to roam freely mess up my yard but I cannot do anything about it except trap them at my expense
- no farm type animals in city limits- such as chickens, pigs, cows, ponies... they are noisy, smelly and can cause issues if not managed properly.
- Animals should be licensed, trained (dogs), and physical and mental care a top priority. Owners must clean up after their pets. Owners must ensure dogs aren't barking all day. Owners should keep cats indoors unless they are rural barn cats.
- To me it means that only people who can financially afford pets, have the time to look after them and provide their needs, and look after them 100% properly by ensuring they are well trained and cleaned up after should be able to have pets.
- Ensuring your pet is safe and cared for. Ensuring your pet does not create risk or discomfort for other people. Ensure you are cleaning up after your pet.
- That an owner cares for and meets the physical and emotional needs of an animal.
- I think we should look at changes to section 23 regarding noise...define a threshold for unacceptable noise that disturbs others, you can't just say no noise. Dogs bark, cats meow, both can be mitigated but not eliminated. Also define what adequate grounds for complaint might be.
- Being responsible when owning a pet.
- Taking care of a pet in order that the pet's needs for food shelter and companionship are met, and that the pet is not a nuisance or danger to other people or itself.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responsible pet ownership means that people take responsibility for the thoughtful management and actions of their animals. I absolutely support allowing urban hens in Calgary. Citizens should be allowed to responsibly keep them on their property, as with any other pet.
- The animal gets vet visits with yearly vaccinations, don't have more than the by-law allows, dogs get at least some basic command training, pick up after dogs, dogs get some exercise a few times a week, don't leave them outside (dogs mostly) in inclement weather or overnight, etc.... ran out of roo
- Being able to maintain a safe environment for my pet and neighbours
- Allowing urban livestock is completely irresponsible and a terrible, short-sighted idea. Look at what's occurring around the globe with coronavirus. There is a huge risk to allowing more animals to be raised within urban centers. Horrible, risky, irresponsible and potentially dangerous idea.
- Responsible means accountable. We let so many owners get away with not being accountable.
- providing a good quality of life for my pet and my neighbours
- The tag system for the city should have a multi-year option. If your pet dies you can donate the rest to the off-leash park system or to the SPCA (IE Pet memorial fund). Car license plates should be tied to dog tags for dog attacks so the owners can be traced.
- Proper care and treatment of any pet you own.
But I'm here about Chickens. Just make it legal, every other Canadian city has. Also I've lived in Calgary since 2000, we had chickens for 10 years. All the neighbors knew, we had no issues.
- It means ensuring your pet's needs are met mentally and physically so they can have the best life possible. This includes providing enrichment, veterinary care, training, and most importantly time. Your pet should never impact negatively upon other people, as your pet is your responsibility.
- Means ensuring that all pets are safe
- Aggressive dogs shouldn't be allowed in the city. I am a 100% supporter for a pitbull ban. I've seen way too many pitbulls attacking people & dogs!
- To look after your pet and keep it in good health. Make sure the pet you have will not cause the neighbours any problems. Must be respectful of neighbours.
- Having healthy, happy pets and taking care of them properly while being respectful to our neighbours.
- Picking up after your dog. Keeping animal noise to a minimum. Restraining dangerous dogs - ie never off leash - ever.
- Taking care of your animals needs (feeding,medical,training). Picking up after your per
- Following the bylaws and keeping our animals (and humans around them) safe at all times.
- Taking care of your pet. Being responsible for your pet.
- Providing a safe, healthy and positive environment for your animal while respecting the community
- Having your animals cared for, vaccinated, well trained and within your control when in public, not allowing your animals to roam around unsupervised and cleaning up after your pet in public spaces
- Keeping a leash on pets when outside of off-leash zones, REGARDLESS how friendly the pet is. Even if ultimately the pet meant well and started charging towards people out of excitement, not all



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

people are able to tell whether or not the pet is attacking them which could lead to injury on either side

- Adhering to bylaws. I live in Bridgeland, and there are many roaming cats in my neighbourhood. I regularly clean cat feces from my front porch, and throughout my backyard. Its a a health and safety issue for my children as well as myself. Would trap, but due to health issues cannot transport in car.
- 1) Providing for your pet’s health and safety needs with compassion
2) Working to reduce the impact of your pets on your neighbours to zero (it’s your pet, not theirs)
3) Ensuring your pet cannot negatively affect the flora and fauna where you live
- Kindly looking after ALL of the needs of an animal companion and family member.
- Keeping cats indoors, dogs on a leash except for off leash areas. Also registering the animal, spaying or neutering the animal. Proper feeding, grooming and vet visits. Training and obedience school.
- It means happy, healthy animals (whether family pets or livestock) that are a treasured part of our families and our community, supported by local services, said services being paid for (through licensing?) by the owners of these pets and livestock.
- As with the cat bylaw the city should put many more bylaws on the books that they do not bother to enforce. Currently licensing fees by responsible pet owners contributes a disproportionate amount to the cost of animal services
- It means my neighbour’s pets stay on their property and They are not overly loud or smelly. It means being able to own animals (eg. Chickens) but these animals don’t put undue stress on others. It also means sharing- like sharing eggs with your neighbours
- It means respecting leash laws. Picking up after your pet everywhere (including backyards). Not letting dogs bark non-stop. Muzzling certain dogs and respecting that muzzles are a tool and not a sign of a bad dog. Respecting some dogs do not like other dogs. Having verbal control at the park.
- Caring for (food, shelter, medical care, love) and custodial care and control (picking up all waste, proper leashes, crates in back of pick ups, safe fencing, no roaming at large and NO FLEXI LEADS)
- Responsible pet ownership outlines everything included in the current bylaw. I also believe proper vaccination etc is important if the animal is to be out with others. People need to be smart about the breed of dog, it’s characteristics, and what it could mean for owners, public, other animals
- To have a well trained animal that is exercised, socialized and does not wonder the streets. It is also very important to clean up after your pet so bacteria etc. is not spread around.
- It means that I choose to open my house and make them part of my family. It means that I protect them, feed them, love them, register them, train them, take them to the vet, don't leave them outside to bark, microchip them and keep them in a safe/fenced yard.
- Livestock are not pets so livestock such as chickens, ducks, goats, sheep, pigs, horses, cows, turkeys should not be allowed to be kept within city limits on residential or commercial property. Responsible pet ownership means licensing, vet care, vaccination, spaying, neutering, training, leashing.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Giving a pet a loving home and provide for them physically and mentally. For dogs giving them daily exercise, cleaning up after them, socializing them and providing them with good quality food and vet care.
- I do not own a pet
 1. Pets defecate on their own property, not in our city parks and natural spaces!
 2. Pets on lease on regional pathway, lead to be on the outside of the sidewalk, away from oncoming foot traffic.
 3. Do not assume everyone wants to greet your pet.
- licensed. vet/health checked rescues. breeder responsibility in pet placements.
- You are responsible for meeting all your pets needs (basic needs such as food/shelter/health/grooming/dental, physical needs such as exercise/walking, emotional needs such as playtime/engaging activities. You're also responsible for your pets actions and behaviours towards people/animals/property.
 - Providing appropriate care for the animal
 - Keeping animals on-leash unless in a designated off-leash area
 - Cleaning up animal defecation immediately and appropriately
 - Ensuring animals are not a noise nuisance
- Making sure your pet doesn't effect anyone else. Not letting it pee in others peoples lawns, cleaning up the poop, not leaving it to bark and disturb you neighborhood. Keeping you cat indoors. Generally making sure your decision to own a pet doesn't effect anyone else's enjoyment.
- It means that cats are not allowed to freely roam my garden. It is fully organic and cat feces is toxic. Every year a part of my garden patch is ruined for consumption. I also think there needs to be updates to bird feeders - no peanuts. They attract the squirrels who then pull up my garden
- Vaccinating, spaying and neutering, access time food and water, keeping the animal indoors at night and in from the cold or extreme hot, loving home free from abuse and exercise. Taking them to the vet when they require medical care.
- Please send me an email to send a pdf regarding pet behaviour that I was given by BC Provincial Parks. [personal information removed]
- Picking up after your own pet/s.
- Caring for animals
- Providing a safe, happy environment for my pets. Ensuring their health and vet needs are attended to promptly. They are valued members of my home.
- Cleaning up after your pet and making sure it has good manners in social situations
- Making sure your pet is not a harm or threat to anyone, nor other animals. Caring for the pet and giving it the best life possible. Protecting the pet and keeping it safe.
- Not allowing a dog to bark in the back yard for hours on end
- Caring for an animal or creature with diligence and respect. Pets can include animals that provide clean, stable food security in the form of eggs. Knowing that wild pigeons may be captured and eaten within the city seems to compliment the responsible ownership of pets that can produce eggs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Providing care for your pets, no matter how many or how few you have. Keeping pets controlled in public situations, and ensuring the health and safety of your pets, other animals, your family, and the public.
- To me it means making sure that your pet is safe, healthy and not being a nuisance to others
- Responsible pet ownership entails keeping your pets on leash and under control in public spaces, keeping your cats on your own property, picking up your dog waste from private and public places and not disturbing neighbors with your dog's barking.
- First off. Owners being held accountable for the actions of there pets. Stiffer penalties for animal abuse and lack of control over their animals. Also being able to keep animals of our choice for me it's chickens. Of course with that don't disrupt neighbors.
- Ensuring the health and safety of our pets and community, and being an ambassador for those values.
- Taking care of a pet physically and emotionally. Making sure that my pet is a "good citizen" as it lives in a community
- I have many pets, responsible pet ownership means caring for them and living peaceably in my community so as not to impact my neighbors or city systems.
- To be able to care for the pets needs 100%. Cats should always be left inside the house unless on a leash, too many outdoor cats being hit or eaten by animals or attacked. Don't get an animal for children just cuz they are a baby animal.
- Taking care of your pet, all-encompassing care. Providing the environment they need and more.
- Taking ownership for your pets actions. Cats put out doors kill city wild life and defecate where ever they please detractong from others enjoyment of our city. Dog owners must be licensed and the funds generated support city functions such as the animal shelter. All pets should be licensed.
- The biggest issue I have is off leash dogs in non off leash areas.
I believe there needs to be harsher punishment and stricter enforcement of this.
My spouse and our two dogs have been charged more times than I can count - there is zero reason this should happen with the amount of O/L we have.
- Please revise the bylaw applying to leashed dogs being walked/jogged while their handler is on wheels (rollerblades, bicycle etc)on pathways and allow for this to be acceptable.
- Pet ownership that prioritizes the physical and mental/social needs of the animal as an individual creature, as well as ensuring no negative impacts to others (i.e. animal is controlled while in public, picking up after waste, etc)
- I don't think number of pets has anything to do with responsibility. If you can feed them, house them, keep them healthy and CLEAN, not be disruptive to neighbors, and give them love (the pets not the neighbors) then you should be able to have as many as you like. Thank you.
- Being fully committed to care and safety of the animal throughout their life. What ever it takes. Same as having a child.
- When people follow the rules caring for, walking and interacting with their pets and other people.
- That my pets, and everyone pets, are kept as safe as I am.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Being responsible means knowing the rules laid out for your pets and knowing how to apply them respectfully. It also means knowing your pet's needs and being able to provide them. It also means caring for the pet at all times.
- Please make those extenda leashes against the law! People have yes control over their dogs with them and let them come running up into my dogs' faces yelling it's ok they are friendly. My dog doesn't like other dogs so i keep her on leash and don't go to dog parks. And they are dangerous to human
- Individuals and families who choose to include reciprocal care for animals in their lifestyle. Responsible to the welfare of the animal and a compassionate awareness of effect to nearby residents
- Happy and healthy animals
- Actually having your dog on leash in communities.
- Providing food, shelter, water, mental stimulation, training (more for dogs), appropriate socialization and love to any animals in care - recognizing them as individual beings and that they each have different needs.
- pets live in harmony with their humans
- Providing appropriate care for and reasonable control of your pets, regardless of the number you might have.
- Providing adequate care for your pets, taking responsibility for their medical care and their whereabouts.
- If you cannot afford the ancillary costs of owning a pet (spay and neuter, licensing etc) you don't need one. Costs include non monetary considerations like picking up after them (ie excrement) and exercise.
- It means ensuring the health and happiness of your pet. It also means enjoying public spaces with them, without affecting others enjoyment of the space. This means cleaning up feces, not allowing them to enter someone's personal space without permission (jumping on them), etc.
- Providing a high quality of life for the pet, physically (exercise, diet, socialization, shelter from the elements) and emotionally (receiving affection and compassion). Ensuring the pet does not (from lack of oversight by its owner) damage property, people or other animals.
- Keeping you pet in good health, loved and well cared for and not allowing them to be a nuisance to others while still abiding by the rules of pet ownership put into place by the city or town in which you live.
- Knowing your pets' behaviors, social limitations, and understanding how that can affect other people and animals, as well as cleaning up after your pet.
- As a responsible rental housing provider, we understand that importance of having a home that meets our tenant's needs. We always ensure that as long as our tenants are responsible for their furry friends, we always welcome them in our homes.
- Cats being kept indoors. Dogs not fence fighting with other dogs in yards. Dogs always under voice control if off lead.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Having control of your pet. Having the awareness to have the best for a pet by, not leaving them outside at night or hours on end. For people that act in a manner that is not reflective of fairness for an animal should be met with questions of their actions including those of further pet ownership.
- All pets are licensed and their health, social and exercise needs are taken care of
- As someone who walks into strangers houses all the time I can honestly say that I have far more safety issues with small breeds such as chihuahuas and dachshunds as compared to large breeds such as a Rottweiler and pit bulls. I am able to get large breeds to like me quickly and small breeds wont
- Responsible Pet Ownership means taking responsibility for your pets anywhere you have them. An off leash park does not mean you have the right to let an aggressive dog run free, your dogs must be under control no matter where you are!! ☐!! ☐
- Picking up after your pet, following leash laws and ensuring owners are aware of what pets are doing and remain close enough to stop unwanted/negative behaviour. Too many owners are unaware of what their dogs are doing in off leash parks and are blasé regarding control/waste management of their pets
- Pets must be cared for medically as well as physically. Proof of vaccination should be mandatory. Cats need to be kept to their own property period. Dogs on leash unless in a designated offleash. Dogs under control at all times. Dogs kept in yards should have proper shelter water food.
- Responsible pet ownership needs to be enforced by the city of Calgary. With regards to dogs this should be about preventing bites from happening. Be proactive, don't wait and only react when a bite occurs.
- I believe I means residents should have the right to own pets of their choosing so long as they are taken care of properly and there is little or no impact to neighbours. This includes laying hens.
- Responsible pet owner ship is making sure your pets are taken care of and are not disturbing others around you. Picking up and cleaning after them. Restraining them in the proper occasions. Keep a pet is like a family member you need to care for them and not harm them in anyway.
- Being able to look after my pet and give it all the essentials,
- Appropriate care for pets (e.g. vet, food, exercise), licensing, obeying leashed/unleashed areas, not allowing your pet to wander, financially responsible if your animal harms another. Clean up after pet (including cats allowed outdoors if your neighbour requests cat crap cleanup).
- No free running, CLEAN UP, respect personal property/yards, shots, spaying, barking!!!! My yard and garbage not your [removed] recepticles, keep cats out of yard and using garden as litter box
- ... means keeping your pets under your control, on your property, or in designated areas, such that they do not interfere with others' enjoyment of their property, or public areas, and that the pets do not harass wildlife.
- To me this means providing safety, shelter, food, health care, exercise and love for any pets of which I take ownership and responsibility.
- An owner who provides for the health and safety of their pet and helps protect the community from aggressive pets by putting a muzzle only dogs with a history of aggression and not specific breeds.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Abiding by all current laws set out for animal ownership regardless of the personality or character of your pet.
- Ensuring you have a safe and well cared for home, and ensuring that you are not creating any work for any other person in regards to the cleanup after your pet. Last but not least ensuring that your pet is not a treat to any other person or animal in any situation.
- Responsible for my pets activities, ensuring they are safe and healthy and minimal impact to the neighbors and neighborhood. My pets a all been microchipped for safety, I do not let them out loose, they are licensed, I monitor their noise level ie: no barking outside.
- Lifelong care of the pet, ensuring your pet is happy and healthy and safe. Ensuring you clean up after your pet, and your pet is never in a position to harm itself or others. Know your pet's limitations/personality so they are successful and don't bite/harm other animals or people.
- We NEED “no dogs signs” in school fields. We live on a school field and constantly have dogs off leash being walked by owners. There NEEDS to be more signage for “no dog” Areas. Small children play there and it’s being over run with dogs (Hidden Valley School and Valley Creek School Field)
- Free / Low cost spay and neutering for all of pets licensed in Calgary.
- Stiffer penalties for pets off leash. This includes cats. Cats should not be able to roam free.
- Licensing them, spay/neuter, tatto/chip, not allowing them to free roam, cleaning up after them, providing adequate care.
- Responsible pet ownership is ensuring the health and safety of your pets.
- Taking care of an animal and providing it with a safe and healthy home. Also respecting your community and the people and other animals you share it with.
- Your animal should be treated well, and not let loose to roam the streets.
- having suitable coverage for pets (an outdoor house or such) if leaving pets outside on a leash for hours at a time
- Providing your pet with a healthy, safe and fulfilled life, while allow other pet owners to do the same. Participating in training and healthy forms of socialization whilst not interfering with others (ie no off leash dogs in areas with leash laws, limited barking, dog is under control in public)
- Taking the steps to make sure your pets are not a nuisance to others while also being a good pet owner in general.
- Caring for the pets in your home. This includes vet care, positive training, and ensuring the safety of your pets and those that interact with your pets.
- Taking good care of the animal without bothering neighbors. Small number of pets allowed. Higher fines for those who break bylaws.
- Looking after your pet and not allowing it to annoy other people
- taking responsibility for your pet's health and behaviour and being a good neighbour/citizen
- Consistently picking up after your dog, not letting your dog pee on other people's property, respecting on-leash areas like bike paths, respecting other's personal space.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Owners are the sole caregivers of these beloved fur babies, they need to act as such. This does not just mean throwing food at them. Walking pets regularly, NOT leaving them outside all day, picking up after them and ONLY using APPROVED off leash areas for their SOCIALIZED pets.
- Being accountable for the health AND wellbeing of any animals in your care, including ensuring they are able to have positive relationships with their environment and neighbors.
- Responsible pet ownership means spaying or neutering all pets unless they are breeding animals and you vow to find homes for the offspring, keeping pets indoors or on harness and leash under full supervision and providing the pet with the best life including paying for all medical bills.
- be able to train, provide and care for your furry friend
- Looking after your animals in a responsible way for the pet and society.
- Keeping your cats inside at all times. Registering all animals so they can be returned if they go missing. Picking up after your dog. Ensuring your dog is trained, both on and offleash, so it's safe around other people. Ensuring your dog has a good recall command.
- Stricter & actually enforced not picking up after your dog, as well as only using designated off leash areas. I constantly see people using school fields as off leash dog areas. I have had countless encounters with off leash dogs approaching my leashed dog while walking.
- License your pet, keep them indoors and have them vaccinated.
- Spaying/ neutering. Licensing, caring for, and being in control of your animal
- Taking good care of your pets in particular feeding, cleaning, walking (as required) and maybe a limit to the number of animals a person is permitted to have. Responsible pet ownership also means consideration of how your pet will interact with or influence the world around them (eg badly trained do
- Taking good care of your pets and ensure that they are not a danger to others.
- Ensuring that you, your pet, other animals, and citizens can get along
- Walking daily, good recall, PICKING UP POOP!!
- Finding the right balance between pet owners enjoying the company of their pets within the city limits and non-pet owners with concerns.
- Making sure that animals are leashes at all times when not in an off leash area. Making sure that pets are picked up after. I back onto green space and ask owners Countlessly to put a leash on and pick up after them. Not everyone enjoys dogs
- Cleaning up after your pets both out in public and within the home owners yard. And quiet animals.
- Ensuring that pet owners keep their pets under control at all times. This includes under leash at all times, dealing with their pets feces properly. This is one reason I think off leash areas need to be patrolled more diligently. Too much feces not recovered by pet owners.
- Taking care of your pet in all areas to ensure its well being. Food, water, shelter, health care, etc need to be taken care of for each animal in our care.
- Caring for a pets health and safety.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Willing and able to care for your pet, provide routine medical care incl vaccines and deworming to also protect pets they may come in contact with, exercise, emotional stability, ensure not a nuisance to neighbours and properties, cleaning up after them, license in case lost, etc.
- Being responsible and accountable for all animals that you own. Feeding, TRAINING, damages, Li's ending and common sense.
Bylaw needs to actually do their job. Go to dog parks and monitor behaviour. Go to parks and FINE people who are not obeying the bylaws.
Use common sense w: support animal
- Responsible pet ownership is about providing proper care (food, water, vet care) to the animals, ensuring they are not a nuisance to others (free roaming unless where designated, leaving waste) and ensuring they are spayed/neutered. It's not about the number of animals but how they are looked after.
- Maintaining a quality standard of life for animals, improving one's quality of life, while also being a responsible neighbour and citizen.
- Well trained dog who is under control while on walks and at home. When walking all dog poop is scooped up by the person walking the dog. As well as regular veterinary check ups and vaccinations.
- Picking up after your pet. Taking proper care of your pet and being respectful in regards to your neighbors and your pets
- Following the bylaws in place to make sure all people and pets are safe. Way too many offleash dogs in neighborhoods!
- It means knowing the bylaws first and foremost.
Keeping your pets on leash unless it is a designated off leash area - it doesn't matter how well trained your own pet is.
Picking up your pet's waste is also a huge issue in the city.
Ensuring your dog is up to snuff with anything medical related.
- Responsible pet ownership to me means that if you cannot control you dog psychologically then you need to control it physically. Meaning not to let your dog run free at the dog park if it doesn't understand recall.
- I love the idea of having my own chickens on my property as an ethical and sustainable way to harvest eggs. So long as roosters aren't waking everyone up early every morning I don't see an issue with this. Living in Crescent Heights I'm always looking to find ways live more sustainably.
- To be responsible for your pet in every way. To provide a good quality of life that includes vetting, exercise, training and socialization.
- Always know where your dog/cat is. Make sure it's properly taken care of...keep it licensed and up to date on all vaccinations.
- Happy pets, owners, and their neighbors.
- Taking care of my pet; giving it walks and picking up after my pet.
- Taking care of your pet's needs, food, health, safety. Ensuring you pet is safe in the community and under control.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It means keeping them healthy, and having regular vet checks.
Having pets under control.
Cleaning up after their dog.
good size fence (this is for dog owners)
- Providing a safe and secure home for the animals I choose to have as a part of my life, while ensuring that said animals are not causing damage to any public property or causing harm to anyone.
- Not leaving your dogs out in the cold all night and day.
- Being a caretaker for an animal, enduring the animal has proper food/shelter/and enrichment. Maintaining a relationship that is beneficial for you, the animal and the world around you. I have had chickens in the past, and would love to have them again!!
- That you provide a loving & caring home for the pet(s) you have. That includes quality food, sufficient exercise & enrichment. Pet owners should also obey all pet related laws - especially picking up their waste.
- Keeping your pets under control at all times, not allowing them to roam free.
- being responsible for your pets safety and safety of others and their pets. Picking up after your dog . Making sure that your dog is not disturbing anyone. re: barking.. Being a good neighbour.
- Responsible pet ownership means:
Picking up after you dog
Dogs leashed in areas that are not off leash
Allowing dogs to be attached to a bike with an attachment made for dogs and not with a leash hand held by the owner
- Pets are increasingly becoming important social partners for people, and this needs to be recognized. I would like to see pets be able to share more of the public space, but there also needs to be accountability for waste, noise and behavior.
- Providing for the needs of an animal so that they may have a fulfilling life with you.
- Keeping your pets healthy, happy, and safe while ensuring the health and happiness, and safety of those around you. Keeping pets contained, up to date on vaccines, spayed/neutered, and reasonably quiet are all qualities of responsible pet ownership.
- I provide food, shelter, exercise for my pet. I pick up after my dog even if out walking around the neighbourhood. I never let my dog run loose in the streets even if I am with it.
- Taking care of your pets emotional and physical well being at all times. Training and socializing them to their surroundings and ensuring your pet isn't affecting others with their noise, feces, etc.
- Owners take care of their pets while considering the welfare of neighbors and other people/animals.
- Able to properly care for and treat an animal, and in a manner respectful and considerate of the community and others in that community.
- taking responsibility for your pet's actions as the owner of the pet.
- Respecting people's properties and the noise bylaw; that means do not use other people's properties as a toilet, nor does it mean you and your pet can trespass on other peoples' properties, and do not let your dog out past 10:00 PM to bark.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Adequately caring for and providing and enriching life for a pet while providing training so that their pet can functionally live among neighbors in accordance to where they live and creates a controlled environment where the dog is not causing or does not experience harm.
- Being able to care, provide and keep the animal safe, even if asking for help for those provided needs. Be willing to keep the animal long term like a child and give it the needs it requires and be able to obtain help if needed.
- To provide proper diet, coat care, physical and mental exercises.
- Caring for animals in a way that promotes and protects their health, safety and wellbeing as well as the health, safety and wellbeing of other animals and humans around them.
- Looking after your pet so that it has the best life possible. Picking up after your pet and making sure that your pet is not disturbing those around you. Obeying the laws as to where dogs can be off leash and respecting on leash areas.
- I'm not sure what the need is for a new by-law. The existing by-law has been used as a standard across Canada. However, the enforcement and public education has totally been lost in administrative change with retirements. Particularly the retirement of Bill Bruce.
- Providing a safe, healthy and engaging environment for the animal to live in.
- Pick up after your pets. Have poop all over the lawn with lazy neighbors not picking up. Also, enforce pets off leash and running around. Owners say the pets are friendly... As if you want to take a chance with your kids!
- People taking care of their pets and interacting with the community in a responsible way
- Following the laws set forth for that animal, cleaning up after them, not letting them roam unattended, providing good food, water and shelter (daily) and loving them. Larger animals (namely dogs) should be walked daily.
- To me it means ensuring my pets are not a nuisance to anyone.
For my cat, it means he's an indoor cat.
For my dogs it means they are trained, they are brought inside as soon as they bark, I pick up after them, and they are never left unattended except in the house.
- Keeping pet in my own yard and not walking pet on sidewalks/lawns with 20 foot leashes and doing their business everywhere but at their owners property. There are parks especially for this purpose.
- Provide a safe loving environment for your pets. Observe all City Bylaws and rules outlined in any residential leases, if any. Limit pet ownership to a number fitting residence space. Provide a safe and loving environment for your pet.
- Doing the best thing for your animal and other animals not in your care.
- Being responsible for pets well-being, behaviour and keeping the environment clean.
- Having a pet that is controlled, as well as controllable. One that can walk off leash and has good recall. That will not harm others or other animals
- Providing welfare based on Maslow's hierarchy. Science based training. Taking responsibility and accountability for your dog and behavior, good and bad. Registering your dog with the city. Cleaning up after your dog. Making sure your dog is safe for the public



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Taking care of and cleaning up after your pet. Ensuring interactions between your pet and other pets and people are safe and enjoyable.
- Don't interfere with your neighbours' and other fellow citizens' enjoyment of their own property or shared spaces
- Taking care of your pet (food, water, shelter, vet care), taking responsibility for your pet and its actions
- Properly caring for your animals so they are healthy, happy and not a nuisance to others.
- People taking responsibility for the training of their animal
- It means that your pet are not a nuisance to your neighbors. No stench, no noise, no poop on public property. The pets are healthy, happy and well taken care of. I support Calgarians having the right to have chickens as pets.
- The owner should take care of the pet in a responsible manner that has as little as possible negative effects on the environment and neighbours
- Having control is of your dog at the park
Licensing companies who use public property to make a profit and have a limited number of dogs
- Taking care of your pets not only within the house hold but in public. It's taking responsible for their behaviours.
It's ensuring that they have access to good food/Heath care and are treated respectfully and trained through positive reinforcement
- Understanding your species and breed, so you can commit to appropriate care, training, and support. A pet should fit comfortably into your lifestyle without posing a danger or major inconvenience to others.
- Only committing to a pet if you can afford to. Being able to provide for it and ensure it has a healthy & happy life. Being mindful of others.
- Providing total care for a pet- proper training and obedience for dogs, ensuring vaccinations are up to date, spaying/neutering, and other vet care, licensing, ensuring your pets are safe, well fed and cared for along with providing mental/physical stimulation.
- Keeping your dog on a leash, microchipping, keeping your cats inside or on a leash while outside, registering your pet with city, ensuring your pet has the proper vaccinations. Know you dog if they have behavioural issues. Pick up after your dog. Not every park is an off leash.
- Making sure my pets are licensed, seen by a veterinarian annually (and additionally for other concerns), have access to proper food, clean water, a place to go to the bathroom, are excercised and played with and have a warm, dry place to sleep.
- The well-being of animals in your care is a priority. Animals have access to medical care, are kept in safe secure spaces and have a minimum of their basic needs met. An animals social/ emotional, nutritional, environmental and medical needs must all be met.
- It means a well controlled, well trained and quiet pet. A pet that can be enjoyed by the owner but not noticed by anyone else, unless they want to notice the pet. It is also extremely important owners clean up after their pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think being a responsible animal guardian is taking care of them, proper food, water, healthcare, etc. I also think there shouldn't be a limit. I have worked in rescue for a long time & many of my friends have about 10 animals & they all take care of them wonderfully.
- Taking care of the emotional and physical well-being of an animal. Putting in the time to appropriately train your animal so that it is not a danger of itself or others.
- Taking care of an animal properly. Following leash and waste pick up laws. Not letting your dog chase wildlife. (Nosehill leash laws are impossible for owners to follow (how do dogs know to stay off the path?nose hill should just be all leashed).
- Dog owners keeping their dogs on a leash in ALL ON LEASH areas and OUT of school grounds
- Having healthy pets that don't bother others
- Providing necessities of life including proper food, water, shelter, healthcare and safety. Taking ownership of pets actions. Ensuring proper training to prevent harm to other animals or people.
- Spaying and neuturing
- Having pet insurance
- Keeping up with vaccinations and anti-parasite treatment
- Feeding correct, nutritious diet
- Adequate exercise for dogs and cats
- Don't let your pet bother or impact anyone one else in any way
- It is exactly what every city needs. There shouldn't be any BSL. Toronto should get it together as Calgary does. After many years hopefully they will follow our lead.
- Being totally responsible for all aspects of having a pet.
- Making sure your pet has food, water and shelter and does not interfere with or disturb neighbours. Always having control over your pet when they are outside your home and making sure they are wearing tags and/or are microchipped in the even that they are lost.
- Having a licensed, healthy and cared for pet who has its shots and is trained (responds to requests), especially if it's taken to public spaces. Not having more than two pets per home, large dogs in small spaces, unsupervised for hours at a time, barking all the time, especially in condensed housing
- It means respecting other dogs and owners by keeping your dog on leash if he/she is aggressive, pick up after your dog when needed. Treating your dog with the love and respect as any other family member.
- It means looking after your pets, providing basic husbandry and seeing a veterinarian as needed. Having respect for other people and animals. Cleaning up after your animal and not allowing him to be a nuisance to other people and animals.
- It means ensuring that I'm keeping my dogs healthy, happy, engaged and under control. Part of that is expectation that other owners are responsible for properly controlling their own dogs.
- Responsible pet owners ensure their pets do not inconvenience others.
- Training first and foremost— NOT MORE LEASH LAWS AND MISPLACED REGULATIONS THAT AFFECT RESPONSIBLE OWNERS WITH WELL TRAINED DOGS.
Understanding that aversive tools and balanced training absolutely HAVE a place in a well rounded, effective, and stable dog/owner relationship.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Trained and obedient dogs or leashed and controlled. Not all pets should be forced to be on leashes because of irresponsible dog owners. If the dog is properly trained & listens it should be allowed to walk off leash. Fines should be based on behavior not mitigation methods. Training is more effective.
- Respect and understanding.
- I don't see an area for responsible pet owner for dogs off leash in "on leash areas" Residential areas, play parks/fields, sidewalks, alleys owners have their dogs running at large off leash. This is a big issue & should be noted as one of your focus areas, not just off leash park behaviour.
- Responsible pet ownership to me is having respect for your dog and other people's dog. I frickin hate it when people walk their dogs with out a leash and their all in my face. Responsible dog ownership is also picking up their poop. The most important thing tho is positive reinforcement only
- Respectful ownership means keeping your pet healthy, safe and happy while respecting your environment. This means that pet owners respect others using the same public spaces so that others are not affected by messes on pathways or excessive aggression or noise from pets.
- Not having pets locked in kennels for 10 hours a day and then let outside just to go to the bathroom ...I see it everyday with my neighbour and his two dogs
- Responsible pet ownership means being responsible for your pet actions and doing what is required as a result. Spaying and neutering, picking up waste, regular vet check ups, vaccinations, keeping the pet(s) healthy, feeding them healthy food and not letting them roam free.
- Pick up poop. Have control of pet at all times. I don't know your pet and don't need it jumping on me, chasing me or running up to smell me in off leash areas. When I'm playing soccer with my family it's not "cute" to have your dog chasing the ball too. Don't have off leash parks next to playgrounds
- Avoiding idiots that don't understand dog behaviour or how their acts cause problems for myself and my dogs - even other dog owners.
- Picking up your pet's poop!
- Keeping your pets healthy. Not disrupting your neighbors with your pets
- Keeping your pets safe and healthy while respecting your community and neighbours.
- Someone who takes responsibility for their animals. Someone who not only follows the rules but respects them. "If you see something say something". It means you spay and neuter your animals, license them, and keep them up to date on shots. Last but not least, PICK UP YOUR ANIMALS POO!!!
- Following the rules even if you don't like them. Regardless of if you agree the law is the law.
- Safety to pets and people is number 1. Leashed dogs unless in a designated off leash area and heavier fines for infractions
- Giving dogs what they need, training your dog to respect other dogs and humans by keeping a safe distance. So many bite incidents seem to stem from someone offleash when not suppose to, or people not taking responsibility for their dogs. Pointing fingers to the humans always.
- Ethically caring for your pet, providing safe, loving homes.
- Having a pet who is cared for and exercises daily and who is not a problem for people around us



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ensuring pets are very well cared for by providing health care, nutrition and appropriate activities and social interaction. Also ensuring that pets do not annoy or endanger humans. And no barking!
- It means the individual owning the animal keeps it on a leash, doesn't dogs bark endlessly, trains their animal, keeps it in good health, licenses their animal, doesn't not allow the animal to vex or harm others-and doesn't let it damage other people's properties.
- Giving your pet attention, exercise , food and love. Training it properly and being respectful of others.
- We treat our dog fairly as a family member, although we have final decisions. We also ensure she treats other people and animals fairly.
- A healthy and happy pet
- Keeping your pet safe, well cared for and free from harm. Also keeping your pet under control at all times as to not harass wildlife. Leaving a pet outside in the winter should be illegal.
- Taking care of and cleaning up after your pet.
- healthy companions that don't affect wildlife
- Ensure healthy pets that do not damage propoerty or inhibit other people's enjoyment.
- A neighbour who does not irritate their other neighbours by allowing it's dog to consistently bark outdoors while in its yard. Some people do not realize or perhaps care how annoying their dog can be by allowing it to bark non-stop.
- Treating your pet like family. Keeping them indoors, not living outside. Keeping your pet safe and healthy. Treating them with respect.
- Cleaning up after your dog.. sue Higgins park
- to me, it means simply trying to keep pets under control and not disturb others. it does not mean put all sorts of regulations in place to make peoples life more difficult because of disgruntled people that have nothing better to do in life than to complain about things.
- It means I am caring for my pet's health happiness and well being. I don't allow it to frustrate or upset my neighbors. I budget for vet bills and ensure the best life possible.
- Responsible pet ownership means taking responsibility for not only the care and safety of your pet but also the care and safety of the spaces your pet uses. You should have control over your pet whether at the dog park, while out walking or around your yard so they don't harm other people/animals.
- Keeping a pet safe, fed, and happy. Not putting other pets in danger.
- It means providing care to the animals you own regardless of how many. 1 dog in a back yard unattended can be more disruptive than 20 that are well mannered and trained.
- Not just providing food, but also exercise, shelter, companionship. People should have to provide all 3 to social animals. Some pets have mental health too.
- Keeping your pet healthy with a healthy diet and regular vet check up's. Also picking up after your pet!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It means to provide for all pet necessities. It means to remain vigilant regarding the pet's health and also having consideration on how the pet behaviour may affect other people around and take proactive steps in case pet behaviour causes damage to others.
- Responsible pet ownership means limiting the number of animals in your home to an amount that you can routinely provide proper vet care to and a healthy diet. Back yard breeding as well as not sterilizing your family pets is irresponsible when so many animals already need homes.
- Ethically treating animals and caring for them
- It means providing for a pet in the best way possible, providing appropriate positive training and keeping your pet out of harm and from being a nuisance to other people or pets.
- Cleaning up after them. Being responsible and having control over their behaviour (noise & interactions to name two) keeping them in a fenced yard. Leashing them when off home property or in public. Paying a license when required.
- Why don't you review the bicycle bylaws. People are not following the rules when riding their bikes on the public trails and last summer I was hit twice by cyclists.
- All pets that have the ability of escaping from a home/yard must be licensed. All dogs must be on a leash if outside, other than in a off leash dog area.
- Taking care of your pet needs.
Clean after your pet.
Following the rules.
Use dog parks responsibly.
Respect others and be responsible for your pet's behaviour.
- The care and maintenance of your pet that ensures it does not impede on others ie. pick up after your pet, not running at large, not dangerous or viscous, barking or noise (whining all day) does not bother others ie neighbors
- Well trained dogs, cats remain inside, clean yard and household, proper food and nutrition, Licensing and know where a dog can be off leash.
- For me responsible pet ownership means supervising your pet at all times when they are outdoors. Ensuring the safety of your pet is so important.
- Not letting your cats roam around the neighbourhood pooping in peoples yards and gardens. I have contacted bylaw several times and nothing ever gets done. Everyday there are cats roaming around Acadia. The last last time I called, the bylaw officer didn't even return my voicemail. It is a shame
- I have dogs and would love more dog parks through nature. Sue higgins park is getting too busy on weekends.
In the past, i kept bantam hens. I loved them as outdoor pets that laid eggs for my family. I truly believe that 3-4 hens in a heated garage and outdoor coop should be allowed.
- Providing the necessities of care from food, warmth a good home and vet care regardless of the number of animals in the home.
- Being educated in your species of animal, neutering, and being respectful of others and environment around you. Dogs on a leash. Cats always indoors (or a catio), never free outside. Finally, cat



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

licensing is a money grab, but need more characters to explain. Fining bad owners is better than that.

- Responsible pet ownership means that an animal has it's physical (health, food/water, exercise, safety, etc.) and mental (emotional bonding, recreational, security, etc.) needs consistently met by it's owner. These needs are met without detriment to other parties or structures of the city.
- Being able to provide safety, shelter, food, vet care, love, and life time family to an animal.
- Monitoring and having control over your animal when in a public space, being cognizant and sensitive to how your pet is doing in the space. If they are uncomfortable or making other pets/people uncomfortable it is your responsibility to act accordingly to neutralize the situation.
- That pets have all of their needs met according to set, rather than arbitrary & subjective, standards. All cats must be indoors or on a leash, minimum shelter requirements, for example.
- First, responsible pet ownership means taking care of your pets basic needs. This includes quality food, clean water, and quality shelter. Pet owners need to take care of spaying or neutering, veterinary care and costs, supplements and medications. Training, pet and people safety, giving LOVE.
- People should be able to live self-sustaining lifestyles provided that their "pets" are not a nuisance to the community.
- It means that cat owners should not be allowed to let cats roam around the neighborhood, defecating onto others' properties. Cats that are caught, owners should be fined
- A responsible pet owner should take good care of their pets. Giving them lots of love and attention, feeding them good food, regular vet visits to keep them healthy and giving them regular exercise, like daily dog walks. Training and socializing your dog so they will behave and not harm others.
- I want legislation around animals OTHER than cats and dogs. Birds, especially large parrots are often mistreated. The humane society doesnt seem to care about the wellbeing of reptiles at all. please, PLEASE do something about the domestic rabbits that were released even if its trap neuter return.
- Responsible pet ownership to me means that no matter how many animals you have that you take care of them, that you pick up after them and you treat them like family. Number shouldn't matter because one person that has one dog could treat them horrible while one person has a pack treats them amazing
- Balancing the needs of you and your pet with the community around you.
- Having the ability to tell landlords what your dog is like and having them take it into consideration when trying to find an apartment with breeds such as bully breeds, rotties or Dobermans.
- Making sure that your pets do not interrupt other peoples of enjoyment of outdoor places.
- Keep clean, good feeding and training pet.
Keep all the community free of poop.
Always keep the pet on leash or inside your property if is unleash.
Respect the space of non pet persons, specifically kids parks, school areas.
Please respect the amount of pets considered space and time available.
- Registering my pet annually & keeping her safe



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Being in control of your animal at all times (i.e not able to roam the neighbourhood). Treating the animal humanely. Ensuring the animal does not bark and disturb neighbours. Clean up waste from parks.
- Providing your pet with the adequate needs for a good quality of life such as food, water, shelter, love, health needs and appropriate exercise.
- Providing care, and respect to animals in a responsible manner in your community
- Looking after the well-being of your pet, while coexisting with the surrounding area and public.
- -owners follow by-laws and there is some enforcement by by-law officers, such as dogs off leash on pathways when they are supposed to be on leash on the pathways. And dog crap is cleaned up and not just sitting in a bag on the side of the trail. Or I can enjoy Nose Hill
- Balancing public safety with the needs of your pet. Public safety takes priority.
- Be responsible with your pet like if you are outside bring a bag for grabbing the poop, if you are in a store be aware of your dog behavior, keep them close to you, not everybody likes dogs
- I think we need more strict laws on dog walkers . One person can't be responsible for 10 or more dogs off leash. There needs to be rules on number of dogs these people can actually control. They cause a majority of the issues at off leash parks due to no control.cant be as many as they want.
- Putting the time and effort into having a well behaved pet and caring for that pet for their entire lifetime.
- To be accountable that their pets are trained, well looked after in every way like a person. Not to have their dog's leash too long that they will get into my lawn pee or pooped!!!!
- Your pet isn't at large. Your pet doesn't annoy or threaten the public. You pick or clean up after your pet - example dog feces. Don't leave your pet outside in the cold. Don't leave your pet in a hot car. Your pet is fixed. Your pets shots are up to date. Pets are tatood or microchipped.
- Doing your best to care for your animal and minimize its impact on your neighbours and the ecosystem
- Being able and willing to provide the right support that is required for an animals health and well being. Obligated to Utilize programs to help them live a positive life. Education so that they can coexist with positive outcomes. owner receiving all penalties for animal conflict that are preventabl
- Being mindful of your dog for his own sake as well as for others. Ensuring he is well behaved and under control when in public places, especially when off leash.
- Providing a safe environment for your pet, including shelter, food, and health - and understanding what that entails, and doing it properly.
- Happy healthy pets in caring homes
- Taking good care of your pet, feeding and keeping them healthy. Asking for help in difficult economic or other personal struggles.Cleaning after them and avoiding being a nuisance to neighbours
- As a cat owner- I feel like keeping my cat indoors (Or on a leash when outdoors) is the most responsible way to care for our cat. Our neighborhood has many free roaming cats and I worry that if my cat were to escape, no one would stop to check on him assuming he is an outdoor cat.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responsible pet ownership means ensuring your pet has everything they need as far as training, a good relationship with their humans, understanding body language and your specific pet's needs, etc it also means ensuring your pet is a well adjusted member of society
- Pick up !
- Providing all the needs and safety for your pet(s) including but not limited to food, shelter, healthcare, vaccination, and attention, for the duration of the pets natural life. Being vigilant to ensure your pet(s) does no harm to others and their property. Pet(s) harmoniously cohabitating with us.
- Owning a pet of any kind, within the rules set out by the city.
- Responsible pet ownership means providing a safe clean and in crowded residence for your animal of choice. Animals should never be subjected to living outside even if there is shelter present. Animals should never be left chained outdoors.pet ownership is a lifetime commitment no exceptions
- ensuring the pet's physical, mental, and emotional well-being without disrupting the environment, wildlife, or other people.
- Picking up after your dog, keeping your dog on leash unless in an off leash area
- Ensuring your pets are not a nuisance to your neighbours, abiding by city by-laws, licensing your pets, providing necessary veterinary care when needed, keeping your pets groomed and providing a nurturing, loving home for your fur kids
- Making sure your pet and others are always safe
- Responsible pet ownership means being responsible for your pet at all times and understanding your pets behavioral limits. If you're pet is friendly, then off leash parks and pet friendly patios are a go! If your pet is not friendly than you must take the proper precautions in public spaces.
- Animal is in good health and owner is responsible for any bad behaviour.
- Spay/neuter your pets. Vet care. Food. Proper behaviour and training. Well behaved at off leash parks.
I believe that cats that roam keep the mouse population down (always had mice infestation growing up in Bowness).
- People cleaning up after their pets. Also, ensuring that they have a name tag on them.
- Looking after your furry family members while picking up up after them, following the bylaws and reporting animal cruelty. Sick and tired of peoples letting their Dogs running in our community park off leash! It is not a off leash area and I have ever right to walk my dogs in peace !
- Picking up after your dog
- Responsible pet owners meet their pet's needs (love, compassion, shelter, clean water, quality food, healthy exercise, social playtime, medical care); respect their community, the environment, neighbours, ensure they & their pet are assets to their city. They have well mannered pets, they clean up!
- Would be nice to have more fields to go to
- Pet owners should be accountable and humane as well as respectful of their community or neighbors.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- it means keeping your pet off your neighbour's property. it mean not ignoring your dog barking in the back yard. it means training your dog to defecate on your own property, not the neighbour's front yard (even if you do collect the waste). Most dog owners simply do not train their dogs enough.
- It means keeping pets on a leash when off the property, if they poop when off property you clean it up. It means keeping your own animals (including chickens and bees) in a way that there are no major negative impacts on neighbours. Chickens are fine - we allow dogs that bark much louder.
- Not letting pets roam unattended and cleaning up after them. There is a terrible problem of cats running wild in my neighborhood. It is so bad I had to put chicken wire fencing around my tomato beds as I was sick and tired of cleaning up other people's cats' feces. In my front yard no less.
- Provide everything a pet need to be healthy and happy, behave well and don't bother the neighborhood.
- To me responsible pet ownership means treating your pets as a part of the family. This means keeping them warm on our cold days, feeding them appropriately, providing mental and physical exercise, cleaning up after them and seeing to their medical requirements.
- No backyard livestock farming - no to bees, no to chickens (they stink to high heaven - anyone from a real farm knows this). Keep things in a crowded city simple - cats and dogs are ok, emotional support animals that are not cats or dogs need to be banned.
- Looking after your pet, abiding by and fully understand ALL the current bylaws with pet association. ie NOT letting your cat roam, dogs on leash, picking up after them, not dumping waste directly into a bin without a bag RESPONSIBLE pet ownership needs to be enforced with education and fines.
- Being cognizant of neighbours and children when choosing to have pets. Keeping dogs under control and following rules of keeping dogs on-leash in designated areas, as well as cleaning up after your dog. For fowl, researching how to keep them safe and healthy as well as clean.
- Taking care of pets for the health of the animal and the community.
- Actions taken to ensure the safety, care and happiness of our pets within the home, community and society.
- It means guardianship and taking care to ensure my peta are licensed and vaccinated as well as protected from people who may harm or steal them.
- 1. The pet is treated humanely and is well cared for.
 2. The pet is not a danger to other animals or people.
 3. The pet is not doing damage to property or depriving other people from enjoying their own property.
 4. The owner takes responsibility for cleaning up after their pet.
- More off leash areas for dogs! Quit blaming dog owners for littering! I agree everyone should pick up their dog poop but those signs focus on dog owners being the ones who litter and that is not the case!!! Replace those signs and make them focus on LITTER! It is worse than poop!!!!
- Pet owners being respectful community members and caring responsibly for their pets.
- It means ensuring that you have the money, time, and capacity to care for the animal(s) in your home. It means spaying or neutering. It means keeping cats indoors and dogs on a leash.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Making sure owner and pet are equally safe at all times. As much control as possible in every situation and being aware of signals
- Make sure your dogs don't bother your neighbours by barking or making uncomfortable to be in their yard. Keeping your yard clean.
- Ensuring pets are immunized, well behaved (in your control), licensed and that you clean up after them. They do not run at large. If you walk your dog in an off leash area this is their time, get off your phone and pay attention to them and clean up after them!
- A pet that's appropriate for climate, accommodations and urban living. Control, respect, hygiene, financial, size and exercise needs...
- safety, care and cleanliness of the animals, and the people and spaces around them
- Ensuring that the animals within an individual's care has all of its needs met (nutritional, shelter, enrichment, exercise and medical). Ensuring the animal is free from suffering, both physical and mental. Ensuring those around you are unaffected and safe.
- Healthy animals that are well-controlled
- Ensuring that your pets are reasonably fed, vaccinated, exercised, under the owners control and not creating a risk or nuisance to others.
- A responsible pet owner is someone who provides a good quality of life for an animal. Invests the proper time and care to ensure all the necessities of life are provided. Well trained and sociable functioning animal when in public. Makes sure animal is safe in the home, travel and public.
- Allowing Calgarians who have better lives with pets, to live with pets; for Calgarians who choose not to live with pets, they may live without negative influences from pets.
- An owner who keeps animals and people safe and avoids becoming a nuisance to others.
- Ensuring a pet has all the basics of life like food, shelter, healthcare, attention
- It means having the ability and resources to fully care for an animal's welfare which includes proper housing, food, stimulation, and environmental enrichment.
- Providing appropriate environment for your pets and don't allow them to interfere with the enjoyment of any neighbouring properties
- Keeping a leash on a dog and not using the neighbourhood as a toilet in academia
- taking good care of your pets without disrupting anyone else.
- Not in possession of an exotic animal or an animal associated with agriculture within city limits.
I've taken a course in bacteriology and virology.
Have concrete dog runs that are tied to sewage system.
Cats confined to indoors or leashed in yard.
No pets in multiple family dwellings.
IQ > 99
- Enjoyable life with my pet with minimal impact on other people
- Under control at all times even when off leash, not to cause a nuisance (noise - barking, cats not wandering neighbourhood attacking birds and leaving feces in gardens), picking up after pet.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ensuring that all Calgarians are free to move around both indoor and outdoor spaces without fear of being accosted by other people's pets. As a senior with mobility issues I am often forced to walk off the sidewalk while a pet-lover stops to admire someone's pet. Both humans oblivious to my needs.
- Following the bylaws (i.e making sure my dog is on leash in the appropriate areas ,picking of after my dog)
- Being a caregiver to an animal in a way that promotes and protects the health of your animal(s), yourself, the people in your house, and members of your community.
- Responsible pet ownership means that animals in ones care are well-taken care (physically, emotionally and mentally) and well-behaved as to not interfere in a negative way toward others.
- It is ownership of property, first and foremost. Since the property happens to be a living creature, certain additional responsibilities arise that do not normally concern non-living property.
- Pet owners have control of their animals and ensure they do not create a nuisance to others including having them on leash except in designated areas, picking up after them, training them not bark, and politely responding to individual requests for them to control their animals
- keeping your dog in your house and not barking outside for hours. making sure your pet does not encroach on your neighbors
- - caring for your pet(s)
 - respecting your neighbours' homes and privacy by keeping your pet under control at all times in non-offleash areas (all pets, not just dogs -- cats allowed to wander the neighbourhood without restriction can devastate bird populations)
- Keeping pets in a way that:
 - the pet is well cared for (health and emotional needs met);
 - neighbours are not caused any trouble or bothered (at least those with reasonable sensibilities are not bothered); and,
 - when the pet is outside of the owner's residence, it leaves no trace (owner cleans up).
- Managing your pet in a manner that doesn't impact other residents. In other words, no offensive odours, no excessive noise during quiet hours, no feces left for others to deal with, and keeping pets under control.
- providing safe and healthy environment for the pet you chose to own, ensuring that your pet is not an issue to other people or your community by obeying the laws, cleaning up after your pet and ensuring your pet is not a danger to others.
- Not inconveniencing neighbors in any way. This includes sights, sounds smell and any other possible complications. I would not be happy if an incompetent beekeeper creates a situation where a hive invades my house/shed or if it constantly smells and sounds like I am living next to a chicken farm.
- Providing for and creating a peaceful environment
- It means taking accountability for your pet. Choosing to obtain your pet from an ethical source, ensuring bylaws are followed, providing adequate vet care (and general care, of course), and being a strong advocate for your companion animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It means that you have no more animals than you can afford to keep healthy and care for including keeping them clean and picking up after them and ensuring they do not bother others with noise, smell, danger or abundance.
- Cleaning after your dog, not letting your cats out when they go and dig people gardens and use kids sandbox as their litter box. Also, not allowing your dog bark outside half the nights or early mornings. If your dog is a barker don't leave him in backyard and go shopping.
- Caring for an animal while respecting your neighbours and public spaces
- Someone who provides health care, food, shelter and clean water for their pets and treats them with kindness and compassion. Treat them like another member of your family.
- Understanding and following bylaws, respecting off leash areas, and having good control over your pet when in public. Know your pet and put it only in situations that they can thrive and you can control.
- To me, responsible pet ownership means keeping your pet happy and healthy, cleaning up after your pet and making sure your pet does not infringe on the rights of others either with regards to their safety or the enjoyment of public property or their own private property.
- registering, feeding your pet, picking up after it, walking it and loving it
- It means having full control of your pet at all times. If you have a puppy they are still learning obviously. If you have a dog, they should be properly trained to listen to you if they are off leash and on leash. If your dog is aggressive take the right matters into your hands.
- Calgarians should be allowed to have chickens in their backyards.
- A small number of animals. Max of 2 per household.
- Being in control of your animal and obeying the rules. Leash laws NEED to be followed AND enforced. Off leash dogs in parks, particularly those with playgrounds or near schools are a safety hazard. My child should not be afraid to go to the park because of pet owners not following the laws.
- Ensuring the health and wellbeing of your pet as well as taking responsibility for the interactions and impacts your pet has in the community.
- Ensuring that your animal is vaccinated, licensed, well-taken care, not allowed to roam freely
- The owner in question provides sufficient food, water, and shelter/warmth to the pet, exercise and care as necessary for the pet, and does not cause them undue physical or mental stress. Provides medical care when necessary.
- Responsible pet ownership to me would mean enjoying the companionship of a pet or pets while respecting Neighbor and community standards. 8 dogs living behind me in Tuscany is not what I would call meeting anybody's standards.
- Responsible pet ownership means making sure your dogs get enough exercise and stimulation of their mind each day. Of course picking up their shit helps. I don't really think there is a problem with that.
- Chickens, sheep, goats, pigs and other farmstock type animals need to be kept out of our urban/suburban communities and remain on acreages and farms. Pets need to be narrowly defined to be safe and non-disruptive to neighbours and communities.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No Chickens or livestock of any kind. Improper care of these animals lead to diseases, also there is the noise and smell. Houses are very close together and provide no privacy. No Bee keeping due to swarming and stinging risk.
- The pet is not a danger to its self or other. The pet is not a nuisance or disruptive to the owner property and neighboring properties.
- Responsible pet ownership means taking proper care of your pets while ensuring the impact on others in the community is reasonable.
- Responsible pet owners don't allow their pets (cats) to roam the neighborhood and bother and wreck peoples property and gardens.
- Not disturbing your neighbours with your pets, either by their noise or their mess. Enjoy them for yourself but do not provoke disagreements over noise, cleaning up after them or letting them run wild.
- Owning a pet in a manner that is healthy, safe, and comfortable for both yourself, your pet, and others in the community.
- not allowing your pet to bother other people and do damage
- Taking great care of your pet. Not letting it become a nuisance to others. Picking up after your pet.
- Taking excellent care of animals while respecting neighbours and other community members
- Providing safe housing and sufficient nourishment for your pet. Providing emotional care to your pets, as these is a need of all species.
- That people are able to meet the physical AND mental needs of all animals in their care as they relate to husbandry, veterinary care, mental enrichment, physical exercise, and humane training methods (i.e. positive reinforcement/force-free), and do not allow an animal to suffer.
- Personal as well as Financial responsibility
- Providing quality care for your pet. Do not become a nuisance to neighbors. Does not create a safety hazard to family or public. Not having too many pets. Always and immediately cleaning up after your pet, including on your private property not fenced off from the public (i.e. front yards).
- Ensuring that your pets don't detract from other's quality of life. I'm regularly negatively affected by noise, smells, and out of control pets. I wish the city would do more to restrict pet ownership and give me tools to report and enforce those rules.
- The animal(s) are cared for, receiving proper socialization, food, exercise, housing, and medical care. That the animals do not negatively impact the community, and that the owner is responsible for the acts of the animal - including damage to property or person.
- I would like to see more public education campaigns at dog parks and the like talking about responsible pet ownership, including on/off leash, cleaning up after your pet, interacting with problem pets/people, etc. Regarding chickens and bees (and say pigeons) let's set a standard and make a plan.
- People need to take responsibility for their pets. They require time, training and appropriate health care. Also it's the municipality's responsibility to put forward clear rules, monitoring, and penalties for the owner. Never blame breed it's always the person who's responsible for bad behaviour.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There needs to be MORE Enforcement with regards to pet owners who do not feel that their pet requires a leash and More Enforcement with regards to pet owners that use school fields and sports fields as dog toilets.
- Keeping animals without a generally negative impact on the community (including the animals).
- Making sure your dog is cared for properly (trained, not left outside in cold or left barking, in fenced yard so they aren't On the roads, not left in hot cars, well fed and exercised, etc.). Dogs should also be cleaned up after and should be under control.
- It means you provide a safe and happy home to whatever pet you decide to live with. You also consider your immediate neighbors and their complaints and/or concerns. You keep a clean yard and home.
- Fed, loved, trained, safe, be present for /available/ spend time with
- ensuring animals are healthy and well-taken care of.
- Being financially, physically and emotionally capable of caring for an animal in all it's life stages.
- Freedom to have what pets you want and provide them with a great life ethically.
- It means only having animals if you can properly care for them and ensuring that they are not a nuisance for your neighbours.
- Taking care of my pet in terms of shelter, food, water, hygiene and ensuring my pet doesn't cause a nuisance to others.
- Not having wildlife in your backyard
- Enhances quality of life
- Ensuring your pet is well behaved and gentle in public places
- It means providing a safe and secure environment for the pet(s) as well as financial and emotional support for the animal(s).
- Providing humane care to animals and being a good neighbor by accommodating reasonable needs.
- It means educating yourself on the proper care AND TRAINING for your pets. Dog owners specifically should be required to undergo training if they want to buy a dog license and introduce their pet to the general public.
- Owning a couple of hens in my backyard is something I'd like to do. As long as they are kept in coops, hens should be fine. Number allowed should be kept to a minimum.
- Pets and owners who do not intrude, impact or harm their neighbors
- Owning and caring for animals that you can keep happy without making your neighbourhood unhappy.
- The city should post information about when warnings, charges and convictions are given to pet owners so neighbours can be informed, and this would discourage owner from doing the behavior again.
- It means being aware of my ethical and legal responsibilities as a pet owner. These includes the City bylaws that specify the requirements and privileges my pet and I should be aware of especially when using public spaces such as on leash and off leash parks, sidewalks.
- Having funds to take your pet to the vet for regular checkups and also when an emergency arises with your pet.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Simply means that pet owners take care of their pets so they don't bother anyone else.
- Ensuring the health, safety and wellness of animals in a way that does not detrimentally affect others.
- When one gets an animal, it is kept safe, healthy and loved for its whole life. Best way to save a life, is to keep the pet you have. As another measure, it would be helpful to put a photo on the website of animals who are licensed. So much better than a vague description.
- Being kind and good to your pet and those around you. This means taking care of them without impacting your neighbors quality of life.
- Dog owners have forgotten that off-leash are not dog parks but park for everyone where dogs have the PRIVILEGE to go off leash if they are supervised, specifically with Rotary Park the actions of dog owners have made the park unpleasant for kids who also have the same privilege to run free as well
- Caring for an animal that enhances their life while not infringing on your neighbours or general public right to privacy, safety and enjoyment of their property and public spaces.
- Keeping your pet in a way so that other people are not bothered/disturbed by it.
- One of my biggest issues, cats in my yard damaging property, hunting birds, being a nuisance. Dogs barking at the moon or whatever, way too much of that.
- Responsible pet ownership means taking care of those animals you have to the best of your ability and recognizing when you are no longer capable of caring for them and finding them new homes. It also means not adopting/owning pets when you are not capable of doing so in the first place.
- Healthy pet, happier, healthier owner (mentally and physically) and safe neighbours.
- The care and wellbeing of all animals living within your household. So that is adequate food/water, space to run/play, responsible waste disposal, and no disruptions to your neighbours (smells, excessive noise, etc)
- A healthy, active pet in my household. A community with room for wildlife. Use of my community without threat from vicious animals.
Respect your neighbours by controlling annoying pets
- Pick up after your pet
Keep vaccinations up to date
Be a loving and caring pet owner
- Following the rules and taking care of your pets.
- Observing and obeying the by laws. Keeping your animal under control both in public Training your pet. Cleaning up after your pet. Ensuring your pet is not annoying to neighbor (who may not like animals). Ensuring your pet is healthy.
- Responsible pet ownership to me is ensuring your pets do not directly or adversely impact the rights of others. It also means that your pets are well cared for and not subject to any undue harm. Owning a pet means that you are responsible for its well being no matter what the situation.
- A responsible pet owner ensures that their pet stays on their own property, does not impact their neighbours or the urban wildlife, provides their pet with veterinary care and makes sure their pet is vaccinated.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Taking care of animals in your care through basic necessities such as food and water and vet care for regular checkups
- There is no incentive to register your animal. If you register and then forget to renew you get huge fines. If you don't register to begin with there is no impact. And the tags always fall off anyway. There's a slim chance your dog runs away and you get fined at that point.
- Taking care of your pets to keep them healthy and to not affect those living around you. Neighbours should be able to use their property as they'd like to without being bothered by the pet owner.
- pet is being taking care of and don't become a nuisance to others.
- Providing love, food, safety and shelter to your pet. Ensuring you can afford a pet before getting one. Encouraging adoption and neutering. Cleaning up after your pet in off leash areas, etc.
- Pick up after your dog, make sure your dog will not hurt other dogs, make sure if that happens you take responsibility.
- Caring for your pet(s) and ensuring it/they do not bother other people.
- Proper care including feeding, regular medical care, and decent housing (i.e. shelter provided.) Keeping pets under control so that they cannot do damage or harm to people, other animals or property. Ensuring that pets are not a nuisance in terms of noise, etc.
- Meeting your pets' specific needs (ie. walks or no walks as medically/behaviourally needed and capable, veterinary care - both as needed and routinely, participating in activities with your pet that they enjoy) while also ensuring that you are not a nuisance to neighbours/the community.
- Owning a pet that does not injure or frighten people. Ensuring that pets are adequately supplied with the necessities of life. Having minimal impact on the environment (clean parks, barking, killing wildlife).
- Sustainable means being able to grow your own food. Cleanliness has to be maintained and it can't be too loud but it should be allowed. I mean backyard hens should be allowed. Other farm animals maybe not.
- Taking ownership for training your pet and picking up after it, practicing courtesy for others
- Responsible pet ownership is the maintenance of the physical and mental welfare of the pets. This includes providing feed, water, shelter, opportunities for natural behaviours, and preventing fear and stress.
- Clean, polite animals that disturb no one.
- keeping your animals under control
- It means caring for your pet in a way that is respectful to the pet in terms of providing the necessities of life and respect for others in the community in regards to cleanliness, safety, noise.
- Picking up poop, controlling your dog, not being abusive should be obvious but in case it's not, dogs should not be left alone outdoors for hours, fed and kept in appropriately clean condition.
- having pets that you have chosen to own be kept in a safe environment for the animal(s) and for the people in the community.
- Safe environment for the pet and public



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Owning pets ONLY if you can provide an adequate quality of life for them; Urban agriculture ONLY if you can afford to continuously educate yourself on proper care; Indoor cats / LEASHED dogs (except in designated off leash areas); spay + neuter
- Caring for the needs and health of my pet while respecting my neighbours.
- I have bees and the neighbours who know, think this wonderful. They have visited to see the hives, taste the honey, and hear my story of what is happening. Everyone has indicated they are fine with my dog and bees and vegetable garden. I am a single senior citizen, and retired Calgary firefighter.
- Mental, physical, and emotional care of an animal for their lifetime, wand/or while they are in your care.
- Not hoarding cats and dogs. A house should have no more than 4 dogs. Or no more than 3 cats. Walking dogs should be limited to TWO dogs per person at anytime. Aversive training and tools like shock collars, prong collars, electric fences, etc should be BANNED.
- Taking care of your animals like kids, being respectful of neighbors, under control
- Responsible pet ownership means that others around you are not impacted in any way. This means - your dog doesn't bark unnecessarily, your cat doesn't howl or use others backyards as the litter box, we don't smell or see unsightly remnants that pets can bring. We don't hear pets at all hours.
- Training, care, being mindful of the community. Unfortunately not why my neighbors think. I am a non pet owner, tortured by neighbours Pets.
- Responsible pet ownership is keeping and maintaining a cat, dog or small "in-house" animal in such a manner that is respects the animal and the feelings/rights of the people that come in contact with the pet - i.e. family, neighbours, etc. It does not include farm animals such as hens and birds.
- It means keeping pets and/or livestock in such a way as to not endanger or inconvenience the neighbors.
- Being responsible 24 hours for the pet. Having the financial means for licensing, vet bills, all shots up to date, food and cleaning up after the pet in public and in private. It is like a child and if your not willing to take this full responsibility, then don't get a pet and make the pet suffer.
- -having an appropriate number of pets that you can care for well in terms of diet, exercise, vaccinations, health care, grooming, and backyard cleanliness and that don't infringe on the rights of neighbours.
- To keep animals in a safe and compassionate environment whilst not disrupting/negatively impacting the community.
- Ensuring animals are safe and cared for.
- any animal not being a nuisance to their neighbours or the community
- Ensuring that these "dog owners" clean up their dog's fecal matter daily in their backyards! We have a neighbor who's backyard is blanketed stem to stern with poop, and ByLaw does NOTHING about it! We have to put up with the stink and health hazard! SOMEBODY! Please address THIS!
- Not disturbing neighbours with smells or noise. No livestock.
Animals are well cared for and not abused.
People do not assume that everyone loves pets and that pets should be allowed everywhere.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It means committing time and money to the care of your pet for their entire lifetime, and making sure that your pet has the best life they can. This also translates into keeping them safe from any situations where they could be harmed or do harm to the public.
- Knowing what your dog will do or how they will react in certain situations and being responsible enough to set them up for success. Keeping your dog and those around them safe in all situations to the best of your knowledge and ability.
- Responsible pet ownership means that you ensure that you look after your pets and ensure that they do not become a nuisance to others. You clean up after your dog, you do not allow your cat to roam at large. You also look after your pet's health and you do not allow them to suffer from illnesses.
- Spay & neutering your animals. Shelter, food & water. Money to pay for vet bills. Lots & lots of love
- It's extremely important
- It means providing a reasonable level of care, including medical care, for the animals a citizen has responsibility for, and ensuring that those animals are not a nuisance to other citizens.
- Off-leash parks in every community. Stiffer fines for people who continue to let their cats out. I'm tired of my neighbour's cat using my yard as a litterbox and digging up my plants!! But yet nothing can ever be done about it!
- Providing for a pet in way that keeps the pet, yourself and others happy, healthy and safe.
- Enjoying the pleasure of your pets with no negative impact on the community. community
- Caring for your pet's wellbeing in all ways— shelter, food, medical, play, grooming. Safety in a secure yard with an appropriate fence height. Walking with the dog on a secure lead or in a fenced dog park. Keep attention on the dog and refrain from using the cellphone.
- Taking care of a creature (or creatures) in a manner that is respectful, and beneficial for yourself, the creature(s), and others.
- Keeping your animals quiet.
- Treating animals with dignity and respect. Taking care of them as any living being. No overcrowding, limit the number of animals in a home/yard. Vaccinations up to date. Sick animals must be treated, not left to waste away. Don't let dogs bark/stress. No over-breeding or breeding aggressive breeds.
- Maintain their health, respect for neighbors and control
- Responsible pet ownership means maintaining guardianship over an animal or animals in a manner that promotes the health and well-being of the pet(s), and that does not bring harm to other people, animals, or property.
- Proper care including vet for the specific species/breed, management of animal behavior, and cleanliness including animal waste outside
- Taking care of your pets and not letting them bother other people.
- Responsible pet ownership means providing for the well being of your pet, including providing nutrition, health care, stimulation, exercise, affection. It also means taking into consideration the impact your pet has on neighbors, interactions other animals and dealing with proper waste disposal.
- Being responsible for your pet. Taking care of your pet. Including on property and off.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I believe that this should include ducks and chickens in the backyard of people's homes for the purpose of providing eggs, and helping to control pests in a organic way in backyard gardens as well. So long as the animals are well cared for, and are not an incessant nuisance.
- Picking up your poop, even in the winter time.
- Ensuring your pets health, comfort and happiness. Providing them with a warm and safe home, access to healthy food that will prolong their lives and ensuring they have water and any other necessities. Making sure you animals are happy and stimulated. Never abandoning them for any reason!!
- Owner is educated in and mindful of the needs of the pet, and should not have negative impact on neighbors.
- Responsible pet ownership means that pets do not negatively impact anyone else.
- 1. Know your pet
- 2. Know how to meet the pets needs
- 3. Engagement with neighbors
- 4. Handling expertise through available education and certification when necessary.
- Care about your pet - feed it properly, pick up after it, watch it, monitor its health, make sure it does not bother your neighbors etc etc
- make sure you have the time to spend with your pet, take for a walk (if need to) and that you have the right space in your house for the pet.
- providing proper care, including medical and mental. being responsible with licensing and following bylaws. ownership is a privilege and having too many pets means each animal is not getting the care needed.
- RESPECT do not infringe on your neighbors right to peace quiet the pleasure and enjoyment of his property. Do not bring disease! Or discomfort in any way shape or form. Respect individual property rights. Respect seniors!
- off lease areas mean multi-use parks. A pet does not have more value in an off lease park than a human. Mental stress and anxiety is inflicted when a pet charges or chases a human. Even if your pet is "friendly" not everyone wants to engage contact when a pet initiates interaction in off lease
- Dog and Cat owners and those in care and control of animals being held accountable
- Providing the necessary level of care for the pet, e.g. adequate food, clean water, sanitation, regular & incidental vet care, shelter, kindness, training, etc., as well as being responsible to others by ensuring that your pet's behavior is not allowed to affect them adversely - follow bylaws.
- It means providing a level of care for your pets that is full of compassion for the animal and free of mistreatment. It means respecting everyone in your community by following all rules associated with pet ownership - leashing, cleaning up poop, registration etc...
- Providing for the health safety and security of my pet
- Taking care of them, cleaning up after them
- Caring for a pets health. Most importantly, not allowing the pet (whatever it may be) to become a nuisance to neighbours. i.e. dogs left outside barking for extended lengths of time. Also not picking after pet.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- nonaggressive dog's, that come when they are called.
- Doesn't mean a lot !! half of the people out there are not taking their responsibilities seriously at all. we need to have somebody watching what is happening in Calgary. pet owners are lazy and disgusting and what about non pet owners we have no rights seeing dogs in public now ??? So wrong
- Safe and caring environment (basic needs, sense of belonging)
Appropriate vaccines, medications , and vet appointments
Avoiding anthropomorphism of pets and animals
Contribute to improving surrounding home and community
- Keeping my pet safe and content without bothering neighbors. As usual, most people are already doing this but the few ruin it by not caring or are in it for the money.
- It means caring for your pet, giving them all the needs in life and making sure they are safe and feel safe.
- Caring for, protecting and providing my pet with the safest and best possible life.
- It means that pets are well taken care of. They have the basic necessities of life as well as the training and attention required to be a good pet citizen in the city.
- you should be up to date with all vaccinations and the best care possible for your pet day to day.
- Caring for your pet and not letting it disturb or hurt others
- Owning a happy healthy pet in a way that doesn't interfere with their quality of life. Providing a benefit through any interaction with the pet to both parties
- It means no farm livestock in city limits...chickens...pigs...etc.
Corona Virus should make it clear people and animals should not be living in close proximity. This would DESTROY PROPERTY VALUES.
- picking up after your pet, feeding, watering and sheltering them. Love and care that they deserve!
Leashing pets and keeping them off of non leash areas. Loose cats are a nuisance, spray dog houses and litter in flowerbeds.
- Taking care of your pet. Keeping up with vaccinations and not letting them roam unattended.
- Picking up after your animal, register animals, ensuring all pets are spayed/neutered,
- Being able to care for pets adequately.
- Cleaning up after your pet, keeping your pets on a leash in all areas except for designated off leash areas, and being able to keep your pets under control
- Having the freedom, choice, and responsibility to own a pet.
- ensuring the health and safety of your pet and ensuring the health of the public
- To provide a caring home for another creature. A safe and sanitary location for the animal, the owner, and those in the area or neighborhood. Free from physical abuse and provides positive mental stimulation for that animal.
- Being able to provide all aspects of care for my animal. Attending to its safety at all times and ensuring it does not encroach on neighbours rights.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Having trained owners and trained pets! there should be a minimum requirement that in order to own a dog you MUST attend formal training and learn how to properly care for, train and exist with your pet. Owners should also have to do yearly updates on training, and dogs with complaints every 3 months
- Caring for your pets, and ensuring they do not cause physical or environmental damage. The number of pets in a household is less important than how those pets are cared for and handled.
- Taking care of an animal with respect to their health and care. Without impinging on the health or freedom to enjoy other citizens have.
- Ethical care and taking accountability for animals in your household.
- Spaying, neutering, picking up after them. Being friendly and approachable when out with your pet. Watching out for signs of neglect and abuse of animals. Keeping our off leash spaces clean and keeping dogs that can't handle them out of them
- Taking care of your pets in a fashion that does not intrude on anyone else's quality of life especially related to noise and smell.
- Caring for animals in a humane and community conscious way
- It means to me that we are safe with our pets. Not letting I'll trained or aggressive dogs at dog parks, cleaning up after themselves WHENEVER A D WHEREVER your animal makes a mess. Respecting others with barking, manners and vaccination /titre testing. Bigger fines for repeat bad owners
- Use a leash when required ... pick up after your pet ... control the noise ... no aggressive breeds ... farm animals are not pets ... take pets for walks and talk with the neighbours ...
- Providing a healthy setting for animals to live along side humans and in their care. These needs vary widely between species and should be adapted depending on the case.
- Responsible pet ownership means abiding by bylaws set by the city and being able to afford the care that each pet requires from the time you bring your pet home for the first time through to their death. If you cannot be a responsible pet owner, in my mind, you should not own a pet.
- It means to properly care for your animal, ensuring that they are safe and healthy, while respecting the other people around you.
- Responsible pet ownership means owning a pet that you pay attention to, take care of, and are responsible for. "Being personally responsible for them" sums it up perfectly.
- Ensuring pet owners know their pets. The on leash rule is really for those who are not responsible and pets with behavioral issues, pets who are well behaved and properly trained shouldn't be restricted to a leash all the time. Also pet owners who are responsible use critical thinking.
- Understanding that your animal's behavior is ultimately your responsibility. Teaching your animal respect and manners is key, just like teaching human children. Domestic animals spread disease to people, and this must also be understood by pet owners.
- It means taking great care of your pets and investing time and money (if needed) to solve pet behavioural problems that make pets and neighbours alike unhappy (e.g., leaving an anxious dog alone for long periods in a yard can cause them to bark a lot). Owners should be considerate of the community.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The ability of an owner to physically, emotionally and financially provide the appropriate care and lodging for the animal(s) in accordance with accountability and respect for bylaws, neighbours and the community at large. The owner shall ensure that pets do not negatively impact the community.
- Owning pets means that you are taking responsibility for providing a safe home, license fee, and being accountable for their actions outside of the home. I do take time to work on training with my dog, I pick up after my pet and walk her on leash and make sure she acts appropriately at off leash area
- Responsible pet ownership means that a pet owner has made themselves accountable for their family pet within their own household and outside of their household. Every pet is licensed so that they can be safely returned to their owners in a timely manner if lost or stolen. Lost pets would go home.
- Making sure my pet's license is current, that I clean up after it and have it under control whether off or on leash and that it is not a nuisance to my neighbors
- More than this leading survey does. You want input but use leading questions and limit characters for explanations. It also means having a fair bylaw that takes into account the facts of when a dog bite occurs rather than being draconian and punishing animals that do not deserve it.
- Under control, clean up poop
- keeping a leash on your dog all the times Dogs should be destroyed on the first bite no exceptions and the owner face a 50 thousand dollar fine and mandatory jail sentence and banned for life from having a dog
- Providing for your pet in a way that meets their physical and emotional needs.
- Individuals having the freedom to have healthy and cared for companion animals in their home while respecting the needs and well being of the community as a whole. This requires financial and behavioral responsibility by the owners. We also need to respect the indigenous species in our community.
- Amendment to noise = people have varying tolerances to barking. I believe that the noise bylaw, should be changed to a time. If there is noise between 10 pm and 6 am then sure. During daylight hours dogs get excited seeing people. If it is prolonged ie more than 10-15 minutes then sure, complain.
- For starters... How about stop letting research companies buy unwanted dogs/cats from our municipal pounds and use them for research.
Second, stop exporting horses to Japan for slaughter and abolish horse slaughter entirely.
Third, stop letting people capture city pigeons and breed them for food
- Yes to have hens in backyard with proper size.
- It means that you know your dog and don't put them in situations that could harm them or other animals.
- Chickens and bee hives please
- 1. Make sure your pet is quiet and does not disturb neighbours day or night.
2. Clean up after your pet. Pet waste can be odorous and unsightly.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

3. Ensure your pet does not roam. This places a burden on neighbours to 'bring him home' or take him to a vet. There may also be a risk of harm to others.

- People who have invested the time into their pets to keep them quiet, keep them on leash in public residences, who have respect for those around them. Owners who walk their dogs and keep them on the sidewalk and not allow them to walk all over other people's yards and property.
- Own a reasonable number of pets and ensure they are properly cared for and do not disrupt neighbors.
- It means that people know, understand, and love their pets. They understand it is their responsibility to keep their yards and public spaces clean of feces. But it also means that people understand how their pet behaves whether that's timid, aggressive, friendly, etc.
- Taking care of the wellbeing of one's animal while also ensuring that said animal does not become a nuisance to others.
- Providing the best level of care for our pets, ensuring their health, safety and best quality of life
- Pet owners meet or exceed physical and emotional needs of their pets, and doing so in a way that does not negatively impact other citizens, public and private property.
- Licensing, neutering, care and comfort of the animal, picking up animal feces, proper socialization of the animal.
- Take care and responsibility for the health and welfare of your pets, and their impacts on other people.
- Not everyone should have a pet if they want one. It is a lot of responsibility and cost for feed. The pound and rescue agencies are at capacity already. Leave the chickens on farms where they belong. They are a lot of work. Carry disease, mites, lice and not to mention if the coop is not cleaned?
- Unless designated otherwise, owners have all pets on leash at all times. Owners spay and neuter or keep them completely separate from other dogs (meaning no dog parks), their dogs are registered, and dogs are treated equally regardless of breed. Backyard breeding/puppy mills would be eradicated.
- Care and control of pets within the capabilities of providing adequate resources for their safety, health and comfort, while not negatively impacting the health, safety or comfort of the surrounding community.
- To really care about pets as members of the family and be responsible for their wellbeing.
- Provide food & water all the time. Not leaving pets unattended for long periods no matter if on or off private property even if house hold has cameras. Should not be left out in extreme weather regardless of breed. By-law need to be strictly enforced & taken very literally.
- It means dogs and cats ...not hippie farms with chickens etc.
- Taking responsibility for the actions and impacts your pet has on others and your community.
- Being in control of your pet at all times and providing the necessities, love and care required for an animal
- Overseeing the animal's health including regular exercise, feeding, and socialization.
- Being allowed to have chickens inside city limits.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Be able to keep bee's within city limits.

- Having only a reasonable number of pets taking in to account ability to care for them, keep them and public / neighbors safe and free from nuisance of noise, barking etc. Pets housed indoors and not outdoors. No wildlife (eg chickens, ducks etc)
- Not having more animals then you can afford and dedicated time to. Also means fixing cats and dogs so they are not reproducing. It does not mean Breed-bans. as there a no bad dogs just owners.
- Besides the obvious, living and caring for your pet, all dogs should be on leashes, no matter how big or small they are. Nobody wants the guilt of accidentally hitting an uncontrolled dog. Also clean up after your pet and dispose of the bag responsibly!! Too much poop on our boulevards!!
- People should not be aloud to take there dogs to the dog park if they don't have control over them.
- Managing a pet for both its safety and the safety of its family/community.
- Responsible Pet ownership means giving your pet the best life while not damaging property or other persons. They need to be indoor animals and are given water, food, activity, love and medical checkups and treatments.
- Combining all of the following:
 1. Ensuring physical and mental well-being of my pet
 2. Ensuring physical and mental well-being of any other living being, human or animal, that might get in contact with my pet. Exception would be only and attack from another pet due to his owner's neglect.
- Keep my pets safe. Not allowing my pets to bother the neighbours
- Responsibly licensing animals, obeying bylaws, carry liability insurance for dangerous breeds, and paying large fines if you don't do any of the proceeding.
- Responsible pet ownership means having pets under full control, clean (both the animal and the animal's space), healthy, vaccinated, spayed and neutered, quiet, unable to disturb others
- Spaying/neutering, well cared for pets, keeping cats indoors, understanding dog behaviour, picking up your dogs waste always, bringing animals inside when very cold
- Being responsible with your pets.
- Responsible pet ownership means taking full responsibility for my pets actions and well being.
- It means properly caring for any animals kept or owned, and ensuring they don't cause a nuisance, public safety risk, or risk to the economy
 1. Having your dog come when called or don't let them off the leash.
 2. Knowing how to read your dogs body language and others to prevent issues.
 3. Picking up after your dog.
 4. Realizing that although your dog is 'friendly' not all dogs are, that's why some are not let off leash.
- As a pet owner, it's very important to me because I want to make sure I'm following the rules.
- Creating a safe and healthy space for my pet while minimizing any negative impacts of my pet on my neighbors and community.
- It is a responsibility and a commitment that should not be taken lightly. You are responsible for your pet 24/7 and if it is home causing trouble while you are at work, it is definitely NOT "out of sight, out of mind". This needs to be realized when one adopts a pet.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Research how to take care of your pet properly depending on breed. Have enough money to care for those needs including vet bills. Have your pet spay or neutered. DO NOT allow your pet to be a nuisance to others! License according to law!
- Respect for your pet and its environment. Love. Care. Responsibility for a live and loved pet. Safety. Discipline.
- Taking care of your pet, treating them properly, causing no harm. Respecting your neighbours by keeping your pet restrained from their yard. teaching your pet behavior that does not threaten others.
- Providing a safe home for the pet, taking care of the pet, and making sure that it doesn't disturb neighbours.
- Keeping your pet inside your house and never allowing your pet on someone else's property. Also, never allowing your pet's feces to remain on your property or on other property.
- Respecting and abiding by off leash park rules.
Pets should always be within distance where a leash can be out back on quickly if need be.
If pets become aggressive towards others (ie. People or pets) owners should actively step in to remove their pet on a leash, not calling them from a distance
- Bee Keeping in the city (no more than 2 hives as that is responsible mgmt on a city lot)
- Enjoying companion animals. Providing for their physical and mental well being. Promoting well bred dogs.
- It means caring for your pet's social, emotional and physical wellbeing and also ensuring that your pet is a good community citizen.
- To take on full responsibility of mental and physical needs of the animal.
- An owner must ensure the health and safety of a pet(s) at all times. Proper nutritional, physical activity (as required by breed/species) and health (vet care) to be provided for the life of the pet. To ensure the safety of the public/neighbours at all times. To control noise and movement of pets
- Making sure safe community and that all citizens can have quiet enjoyment at home. Pets should be looked after.
- Thinking of your pet, yourself and your community, including how having a pet impacts others.
- Following city by-laws
- Keeping pets and people Safe
- I'd like there to be
A ban on property owners having no pet rentals. Or having to get special allergy rental approvals.
Because I'd I realize people have allergies but other wise our shelters are over flowing and so many more people would adopt if the city property rentals were pet friendly
- Remove breed bans from properties!
It's the owner not the breed. And it's time we updated this out dated rule.
- Taking full responsibility for you pet, their wellbeing, health and the environmental impact of ownership.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Caring for animals in such a way that they would choose you as an owner if they could. Raising physically and psychologically healthy and well adjusted animals, doing your very best, ensuring preventive care, that your animals are not a nuisance to your neighbors,
- Ensuring both your animal is safe while preventing it from becoming a risk or nuisance to others.
- You're responsible for the animal and the behavior of that animal. As well as, being liable for them and their actions.
- Caring for pets whilst not impacting neighbours/others
- Providing your pet with the proper care they need to stay healthy. Do not allow them to trespass on other people's property. If they are a danger to people or other pets they should not be allowed of the owners property at all.
- Ensuring the pet has a happy healthy life, and ensuring that it doesn't encroach on the wellbeing of neighbors.
- providing the pet with the best life while not being a nuisance to those around you
- Having pets that you ensure receive proper care and attention and that do not annoy neighbours in any way....that being noise, smell etc.
- A response since pet owner not only meets the basic needs of their pets but also follows the laws and standards set by society to fulfill these obligations with compassion towards the animal.
- Keeping your pet under control, on-leash where required, picking up after your pet always.
- Ensuring that all efforts are made by the pet owner the ensure the safety of people - this means especially that dogs are Always on a leash outside one's property (except offleash areas) & for dogs that are considered dangerous or have any history of aggression a muzzle is worn as well.
- It means your animal is fully in control in public and cleaning up after their bathroom breaks in public. I also believe it means treating your animal as you would a child ie. not roaming the streets, not left out in bad weather or left alone for extend periods of time(Over 9hr) even if sheltered
- Providing a healthy life for pets whilst ensuring that neighbors are not unduly negatively affected by the pets
- Ensuring the health and safety of our animals and the wellbeing of neighbours.
- Being able to provide all the basic physical and emotional needs of your pet financially and with your time.
- Keeping your cat inside or on a leash.
- Picking up dog poo and no outdoor cats EVER.
- Being able to bring our dog to a trusted FENCED in off leash park that isn't only for small dogs .. And pet friendly businesses.
- Providing your pet or pets with quality food, health care, exercise, attention, and obedience training. Respectful behaviour toward neighbours and compliance with civic bylaws in regards to pet ownership.
- Caring for an animal an provide it with the best life possible. At the same time, make sure that others around you arnt negatively impacted by your choices.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Being a responsible pet owner means providing the necessary care, nutrition, housing and a safe environment for your pet. Where applicable pets should be well trained and should not pose any threat or nuisance to the general public.
- Taking care of the pets you have and respecting neighbors.
- You need to be aware, attentive and care about both your neighbors and pets
- It means all animals (whether "owned" or "unowned" ie feral) experiencing the Five Freedoms and being cared for in a manner which ensures their physical and mental well being.
- people take care of their pets properly giving them adequate shelter, food, and water. they make sure their pets aren't bothering other people and damaging others property.
- Taking responsibility and taking care of his pet
- Responsible pet ownership means respecting other people's space, pets and property. Clean up after your pets, train them well and on leash outside of your yard and off leash areas.
- Picking up after your dog, having control of your dog, training your dog with recall and only bringing a well balanced dog to an offleash area.
- It means being a responsible and respectful pet owner with your dog, for example, on a leash at all times - until you arrive inside the dog park during off leash hours. Post those times please. I do not know your dog and he does not know me. Please keep him on the far side when we pass.
- Responsible pet ownership means you don't have a pit bull. Calgary should ban them.
- Keeping your pet on leash everywhere that isn't off leash. Picking up after your dog!
- Providing shelter, food appropriate to breed and type of animal, access to medical care, not allowing the animal to suffer unnecessarily (including do not harm the animal), provide exercise and stimulation, keeping your pet within view at all times when outside your house, not allowed to roam freely
- Being responsible to obey city bylaws regarding pets in Calgary.
- Cleaning up after dogs mess.
Keeping dogs on leash in public.
Understanding dogs have different temperaments.
Licesnsing and having your pet spayed or neutered.
- Providing a safe hone, healthy food and taking care of all medical needs, exercising and responsible ownership for picking up waste and keeping dogs in control
- Taking responsibility of your animals whether it's one or ten. Feeding, exercising and protecting properly
- Picking up dog feces everywhere, backyards, or while on walks, ensuring dogs that are anti social or that bite are on a leash at all times and NOT at the dog parks. Ensuring dogs are Not in any type of endangering situation. Ensuring dogs are kept up to date with vaccinations.
- Licensed dogs and cats. Appropriate vet management - health, shots, etc. No more than two animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- To me, a responsible cleans up after their pets no matter if the pet is within homeowners property or in public. They watch their pet and take precautions so their pets don't escape. They abide by and know bylaws.
- Look after your pets to keep them healthy and happy, and don't let them bother your neighbours.
- It is to be a good pet citizen. Pets have lots of value for their owners, but that should not be at the expense of other citizens, their pets or the natural environment. These factors have to be balanced by policy.
- Caring for the needs of the pet and trying to keep them happy and healthy, and cleaning up after them, and ensuring they are trained well enough to interact appropriately with those they come into contact with.
- Cleaning up after your pet, providing exercise and training, socializing, and offering positive animal experiences to non pet owners.
- Do NOT let your animal loose outside of your property.
Only exception is off leash dog parks when you know your dog will come when called.
- Well trained pets, caring owners - spayed/neutered, up to date on vaccines, and are able to afford the animal through its entire life.
- It means assuring your pet has appropriate care; food, water, shelter, and care. It means assuring you clean up after your pet, have access to both on and off leash areas, and provide adequate transport (not in the back of a flat bed)
- Not allowing your dog off-leash unless in a designated off-leash area.
Not leaving your dog outside unattended.
Being reactive to excessive barking.
Picking up after your dog.
Registering your dog with the city.
Annual wellness exams and being compliant with vaccination schedules.
- Owners need to remove all pet poop from any public area. The city needs to enforce their existing bylaws. Some of our city parks are ruined with dog poop, especially when the snow melts. I should not have to clean someone's pet poop off my lawn.
- It means looking after the animals properly and keeping animals and people safe, happy and healthy
- Someone who understands the responsibilities of what come with owning a pet. This includes knowing the costs, time commitments, respectful treat and providing it a loving and safe environment free from abuse. Some who is being respectful of the community and their pets behaviour.
- Respectful ownership and management of any pets 24x7. Licensing any/all pets with COC and complying with all bylaws and regulations. Provide all pets with sanitation diligence exactly as the general population abides by. Keeping all pets under constant present control. Increase penalties.
- Caring for your pet, ensuring safe interactions with those around you and the natural environment.
- Understand and meeting the needs of your pets. This means that proper care be given by means of food, water, shelter and enrichment. In environments where pets congregate with other pets and humans, ensure all can take advantage of safely without fear of negative and harmful interactions.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Having a pet(s) as part of the family. Being treated with respect and dignity even though they are animals. Not letting cats roam and making sure dogs are a appreciated part of the community.
- Keeping a dog in control and properly trained when outdoors in green spaces and multi use parks and pathways
- Being able to care for the pets you have, and knowing the resources to help you out when you can't.
- Someone who focuses on the outmost care for their pets. Ensuring they are well cared for physically and emotionally.
- Having leashed dogs, unless in an off leash dog park. Which includes driveways of homes, sidewalks and open spaces.
- Caring for and ensuring the needs of the animals you are a custodian of are being met.
- Caring for your animals in a kind and humane way.
- Responsible pet ownership is being respectful of your neighbors, care of your pets with excellent nutrition, shelter, veterinary care when appropriate, proper socialization. Being a responsible pet owner also means proper and regular clean up of your own yard all year long!
- The owner is responsible for the care and health of their pet. Should not infringe on others with undue noise, unpleasant smells or pet poop. Always clean up immediately. Provide a safe, stimulating environment for the pet. Provide health care for their pet.
- a person who knows that if their dog is barking they control and teach their dog, a person who owns a dog knows that they have to educate their dog with other dogs when their dog show aggressive behavior, someone who will vaccinate their dog, register their dog, feed, walk regularly their dog
- Means no barnyard animals in backyards. No chickens allowed please!
- Responsible pet owners do not leave their dogs outside to bark. Ownership does not include bees, pigs, chickens, sheep or any other farm animals.
- Fully being responsible for said pet, veterinary needs, training, proper disposal of waste and providing a loving home. Knowing your pet enough to know if it's in a danger situation weather it's the danger or it's in danger.
Being able to enjoy the furry, scaley or feathered critters on earth.
- Someone who has empathy for and provides proper food, exercise, housing, training, medical care (vaccinations) and necessary groomingfor their animal while ensuring it and their home is not a nuisance.
- Not dumping yOur pet, taking care of them like you would your child
- Keeping in mind the temperaments and needs of other dogs. This is a huge thing we struggle with when we have dogs with certain temperaments and other people assume interactions will be "fine" because their dog is "friendly"
- Responsible pet ownership to me, means that the pet owner is capable of taking care of the animal. This means not neglecting the pet, regular vet check ups, grooming, and proper obedience training. If I pet owner knows they can be unfriendly, it is on the own to properly train and care for that pet
- Reasonable number of animals, not overly loud or disease causing.
- CALGARY NEEDS TO ALLOW URBAN CHICKENS LIKE MANY OTHER MODERN CITIES DO!!!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

NOT ALLOWING URBAN CHICKENS ONLY LEADS TO ""SECRET"" OWNERSHIP AND MAKES NO SENSE. CHICKENS ARE QUIETER AND MUCH CLEANER THAN DOGS (DON'T POOP ON STREETS ON OTHER PEOPLES PROPERTY. WE HAD THEM FOR 8 YEARS, NO SMELL, NO COMPLAINT

- Ensuring that your pet is healthy, happy, cared for, and not a problem or danger for others.
- Feeding, spaying, loving and taking care of your pet. If an outdoor cat then ensure its let out and brought in quickly especially during cold weather. Let it do its business, then right back in the house.
- How many letters have been written to mayor Nenshi about selling animals in pet stores like [removed] & it has fallen on deaf ears! Then he lied for re-election! BAN SELLING PETS in pet stores & BAN BACKYARD BREEDERS! Also ALL dogs on harnesses when walked or dog park & no chokers-they KILL dogs!
- Clean, well cared for animals. If you limit the number I can have I will leave the city.
- That animals have proper housing, food, water, medical care and comforts.
- Providing pets with proper care while respecting other people and animals in your community.
- Adhering to the community rules like the Community Standards Act and Pet By Laws, including providing ones pet with appropriate care (all pets have unique needs so not overly prescribed), abiding by criminal laws around cruelty, and not allowing ones pets to injure humans or other pets.
- Not letting your pet infringe on the rights of others ie, your barking dog shouldn't bother the neighbours or make your kids fee unsafe. And clean up pet feces. Everyone has the right to fee safe.
- It means that a person's choice to have a pet should not impact any other person. Thus, your dog's barking should not keep the neighbours awake, your cat should not be running all over the neighbourhood, your chicken poop should not cause stink or cause mice infestation in my yard, etc.
- Treating animals under your responsibility with love and compassion while making sure all of their needs (physically, emotionally and mentally) are met and will continue to be met for the duration of their lives.
- Providing food, water shelter and love to an animal that you adopt. Also making sure that your animal(s) brings no harm to itself, you, others, or other animals.
- It means caring for an animals needs and also not affecting people around you negatively.
- People with animals mind their own business and are aware of any behavioural issues their animals may have
- Responsible pet ownership to mean is making sincere efforts to minimize pet ownership on those who are not owners, while allowing for inclusiveness for what who considers what a pet. Mostly I think of people needing to pick up their dog poop and keeping dogs on leash in on leash areas.
- Taking responsibility for your pet's health and well-being, and ensuring your pet does not intrude on, impact / affect any one outside your household.
- Caring about you dog and it's impact on the environment and society
- Someone who has the proper means and space to care for the physical and emotional wellbeing of a pet(s). Also taking care to train and socialize dogs so that they can be positive members of our communities. This includes eliminating things like excessive barking and aggression.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It means the pet is healthy and well adjusted to living in an urban environment. It is not aggressive, obeys its owner and has no negative impacts on humans or the environment. The owner follows all laws and respects the rights of other people
- Providing adequate housing, food, and veterinary care including vaccinations. Walking dogs daily. Not allowing your pets to be a nuisance to people around you, eg. stray cats and barking dogs.
- That pets are well treated, up to date on vaccinations, cared for, not left outdoors unattended, and where the owners have the best interest of the pet in mind.
- Consideration of others
- Being a responsible owner
- The animals health and wellbeing comes first, which includes cleaning, feeding, and love in general. It is also important to be conscious and respectful of your neighbours and community.
- Pet ownership means having pets that are properly trained. Pet owners should keep pets in control and clean up after them. Dog walkers should be allowed to walk not more than 3 dogs at one time. How can they possibly keep more than that under control. Pets are pets- not people.
- Living in a inter-species household (human-pet species household). It means providing proper care for the animal. The animal provide emotional comfort and support to the humans. In turn the humans provide emotional comfort and support to the animal. Also, the animal should not bother neighbours.
- Ensuring domestic animals are safe, well cared for medically, emotionally and behaviourally. Ensuring communities are safe and clean as well. Ie. leash laws, waste pickup
- Cleaning up after a pet defecates
- Pets are properly licensed, owners provide appropriate training for their pet(s), provide proper care, nutrition, health care and exercise, they pick up after their animals, they have FULL control of their dogs at off leash parks, they do not leave dogs outside to bark and annoy neighbors.
- Having a pet or livestock that do not interfere with the ability of others to enjoy their property or shared common spaces. It means dogs don't bark at night and cats don't wander onto my property and eat the birds I am feeding. Both happen in my neighbourhood.
- Making sure animals are healthy, clean and happy. Housed indoors. Waste picked up when you take your pets for a walk. Do your best to stop constant barking etc. Basically making sure your animal is well take care of and not a nuisance to others.
- The ability to properly house and care for an animal and exceed care requirements whenever possible
- Responsible pt ownership means you provide the basics of life ,food shelter,walk your animal regularly, pick up their poop, and able to control them at all times . Besides being a part of our family.
- It means I should be able to keep a hen, bees and even a goat or something on my property as long as it is properly taken care of and doesn't disturbe the neighbours. Let's make sustainable living a reality in Calgary and put ourselves on the map!!!!
- Having your dog on lease and under control at all times. Some people in Christie Park walk their dogs off lease in the park. There are no signs posted to indicate that dogs must be on a leash. The City needs to post signs in all leash parks that clearly indicates that all dogs must be on a leash.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Freedom to exercise your pet. Ensuring your pet doesn't hurt anyone or other animal. Ensuring that pet waste doesn't impact the environment.
- providing care to the pets that results in a high quality of life for them. Making sure that the choice to have pets does not diminish the quality of life of any other people in the community (cleaning up after them, noise control, walking control). a
- I make it my business as a responsible dog owner to no the bylaw rules. In my opinion most people don't no the laws about off leash area so we must have signs too educate owners and signs people are more likely to obey. I can't walk on path ways because off ignorance as my dog is difficult I'm alert
- The ability to provide good care for the pet whilst not adversely affecting neighbors with respect to noise and odour.
- Means having the freedom to have a companion that fits one's needs as long as it doesn't compromise others.
- Taking care of the animal, and being responsible to the community.
- Pets are treated well, kept healthy, and properly trained and socialized. Responsible owners should also clean up after their pets in public and keep a clean house.
- Being a positive and my pets being a positive part of our community. That they-we are controlled, respectful on leash and in public spaces and picking up after ourselves. Twice in the last week my small dog has been attacked, ticketing for unruly dogs and owners who disregard it would be good.
- No pets should be running at large. Offleash should ONLY be allowed if the animal is under control and has perfect recall. I know it's hard to police, but people should be fined for not picking up after their pet. Pets should not be allowed on soccer and baseball fields, again policing is an issue.
- It means fully providing for a pet's medical, social, behavioural, & physical needs. It also means being socially responsible to the community the pet lives in in making sure the pet's presence has a positive or neutral impact upon the community.
- Safe and respectful treatment of all pets, keeping all pets contained, cleaning up after your pet on public or private property.
- Considering the needs of their neighbours, being able to live in my house without their dog non-stop barking!
- Firstly, that pets' needs for health, nutrition and psychology are being met. Also, that pets, their owners and non-pet owners can share public space peacefully and respectfully (which I also expect of groups humans with or without pets).
- Having a well trained and cared for animal that can interact with the community.
- taking full responsibility for your pets behavior instead of blaming the pet and/or people who complain about the pet
- Cats licensed and not permitted to run free. Stiffer penalties & monitoring for not picking up poop. Penalties for people with out of control dogs at off leash parks. More fenced off leash parks. No sale of dogs or cats at pet stores. Purchase direct from ethical breeders & rescue only.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- This means caring for one's pet(s) in all manners to ensure they are healthy and happy, but also making sure that they are neither nuisances or threats to the rest of society. If at any time the owner is unable to manage or care for their pet(s), they ought to seek out services to help get on track.
- Taking the animals needs and putting them as a family priority. Health, food, shelter, water, LOVE, humane treatment.
- Owners are responsible for the wellbeing of their pets and the wellbeing of their neighbors. This means noise and feces are non-existent outside the pet owners home.
- Using leash except in off leash areas and then only if the dog is in control. Pick up pet waste. Manage barking.
- Safe and Caring home. NO riding in back of trucks, No leaving them outside in freezing weather. Licensed Breeders (NO puppy mills) Huge fines for dog arenas. Investigations into Animal abuse. Stricter rules for those that do not pick up after there pets. Cats at large. Funding help for Rescue site
- Keeping pets under your control. Ensuring there is no impact on the local parks, gardens, playgrounds and pathways from pet defecation. Being responsible for keeping pets healthy so they cannot spread disease.
- It means taking good care of my pet and not allowing the pet to bother reasonable neighbours with behaviour. I would like the "keep cats indoors" part of the bylaw dropped, as cats are naturally predatory. Our cats have always been allowed outside, keep the rodent greatly reduced in our 'hood!
- People respect their neighbors and follow bylaws regarding whatever pet they have.
- Paying for the yearly licensing, picking up after your pet. Not allowing your pets to run free and all over everyones property
- Responsible pet ownership means having pets under command and control and pets that are not dangerous or bothersome to others. For example excessive parking, excessive odor due to poor maintenance of yard
- Pets are the responsibility of their owners, but also deserve respect from others to the same degree as one would respect their owners. Being neighbourly includes pets in both regards.
- You take the best care of your pet (vet care annually, vaccines, well mannered pet, picking up after, grooming) anything you need to do for a pet you do. If your dog isn't nice don't take it to a off leash park.
- Having responsibility for the care, feeding, exercise of your pet. Ability to provide food, medical, take outside, clean up after, train to be safe around others, spay or neuter.
- Looking after your pet's safety and health while obeying our bylaws.
- To do no harm, keep up preventive care provide enrichment and basically ensure they're happy and healthy.
- Ensuring a dog is taken care of from various aspects (medical, food, exercise) while still being a good member of the community.
- I have two bunnies, they are litter trained, well behaved, and do not cause any damage to any property. I would love it if the bylaw could allow for responsible pet owners of small mammals to be



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

represented a bit more. We have had so many troubles renting apartments despite our great track record.

- Ensuring you have the means to provide appropriate resources for your pet in terms of veterinary care/health care, appropriate socialization for species that require it, meeting proper nutritional requirements and exercise requirements along with following city bylaws in regards to owning pets
- We need more off leash parks. Calgary is growing exponentially and the lack of off leash parks is evidenced by how busy Sue Higgins dog park is all the time. Licensing is a questionable and continued endeavor and should be instituted only for owners of dogs who have aggressed toward people.
- Pets are animals kept in close proximity for the enjoyment of people. Pets should be fed, watered, sheltered, and protected. In addition, pets should receive basic veterinary care to ensure health and pain-free existence. A responsible owner ensures these things occur.
- It means providing Ensuring pet owners provide medical care to their pets when needed. Just as you'd be responsible leaving your child suffering you should also be responsible for leaving your pets suffering. Also pick up your dog poop
- Being wise in controlling population and ensuring that pets live in peace with others, both harmony and wildlife.
- Ensuring pets in the community are able to enjoy the spaces available to them, and advocating for behaviours that benefit the community as a whole.
- It means having animals that contribute to healthy eating and healthy earth. Please add bees and chickens to the list.
- Responsible pet ownership is understanding the needs of your pets and the pets of others. Pet owners and non-pet owners should be accountable for their actions. Care and respect for the animals well-being should be of the utmost importance when considering responsible pet ownership.
- Everything that is alive and is possible in roaming the street, and owners making sure their pets are safe and do not cause harm to others or other animals.
- Providing care and a safe home for an animal; including safety from overpopulation by sterilizing all animals not specifically planned/licences for breeding.
- understanding the responsibility it takes to properly care for a pet, for the entirety of it's life. costs, proper medical care, respecting our off leash parks and removing feces. Having more protocol in place for adoption to avoid rehoming.
- Caring for both my dog and the city. I feed my dog high quality food and take him to the vet for vaccines and check ups. I care for the city paying my taxes and picking up after my dog. Also, being kind to other dogs and dog owners.
- It means providing a safe, comfortable environment for your animal. Cleaning up after them is huge and something not enough people do.
- Proper animal husbandry, the right, species specific food and shelter, taking care of your animals and regular veterinary check ups. And lots of love.
- following applicable by-laws, following guidelines from applicable/related organizations (CDBA)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Pass a quick test on licensing: Human behaviour is the problem - On leash in on leash areas, keep the dog on your right (outside), no flexi-leads, ask permission to greet, pick up after your pet.
- Having pet that do not bother others
- responsible pet ownership means have there dog licensed and shots up to date. carry poop bags with them and clean up there dogs poop. have there dog socialized so it gets a long with the other dogs. if the dog is aggressive keep them on lease or leave the dog park.
- Excercising your dogs appropriately. This doesn't just mean sending him to doggy daycare, but spending an hour a day walking, playing. Picking up after your dog's on your walks. Keeping your yard tidy regardless of how many dogs you have. Your dog is trained/socialized to be a good example.
- Clean, quiet, contained,and no odors. All with in your yard with no outdoor chicken coops, snake dens, rabbit cages, etc. No eyesores. All in back yard only
- Taking good care of your pets by keeping them and the community safe with training
- Don't bring aggressive dogs to the dog parks.
Do pick up dog feces.
- Cats that cannot wonder in the neighborhood and Bylaw does nothing
- Licensed animals, clean property maintained, animals trained to be quiet & under control
- Ensuring pets are looked after and kept safe for their own health as well as others.
- Licensed pets, spay/neuter dogs only in off leash, dog walker permits similar to Toronto, limit dog walkers to how many they're allowed off leash to help with park cleanliness and their responsibility for the dogs themselves. Properly behaved dogs, trained, in off leash areas
- Taking care of the pets that you have, ensuring that you are cleaning up after them in and out of your yard and higher fines for people not cleaning up after them. Let cats roam. 100% for urban agriculture. I would own chickens if I could!!!
- I'm a pet owner, and my idea of responsible pet ownership means when you choose to own a pet, you take 100% of the responsibilities of that pet -cleaning up after them, feeding, vet visits, ensuring their safety.
- Providing food and shelter appropriate for your pet. Providing caring home. Ensuring your pet is safe and that you provide essentials to their quality of life.
- Keeping your dog on a leash unless otherwise indicated, cleaning up after them, regular vet attention for any and all pets, keeping them licensed.
- Bylaws around leash length should be more strict and actually enforced. Flexi leads extend past the legal length and are a risk to runners, bikers, rollerbladers & other dogs. Fenced dog parks should NOT allow people to bike, scooter, sled, skateboard etc. Because it is dangerous to dogs & people
- Training/socializing, cleaning up after them, licensing, caring for them
- Pet owners being respectful of wildlife, humans, and other pets. Not self centred on what their pet needs. Choosing the right space for interaction and having a well trained and responsive pet. Picking up waste. Choosing wildlife first in wild spaces.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A person or persons that care for an animal or animals needs. Medical, physical, behavioral and all needs to keep them healthy and happy.
Clean up after pets, keep them under control when in public.
- Looking after basic needs of that animal (vet care; exercise, enrichment, training, licensing, food, water, shelter).
- Have control over your animal. Do not let it inconvenience others
- A name tag on my dog with his name and my telephone number. A city dog tag is an unnecessary tax.
- Pets have secure food and shelter, free from abuse and neglect.
- Responsible pet ownership means treating the animal in your care with respect, love and prompt and appropriate veterinary care when needed. Pets should receive proper care, nutrition, water and shelter and exercised as needed and appropriate to the breed. Pets should never be abandoned.
- respecting the rules with leash and behaviour in public areas. dont let your animals roam onto other peoples private property.
- Everytime a new dog owner registers a dog they must take basic obedience and dog etiquette classes.
- Specifically at off leash parks. Dog must come when called otherwise pet is not allowed off!
Number of dogs one person is allowed to take to off leashe park. I have seen dog walkers with 8-12 dogs with one person. There should be a maximum number of dogs a person can handle at one time! Maybe 7
- Pets should not be left outside all day during winter
- Responsible as in their dog takes at least basic training or is able to show basic obedience. Allowing fir overweight dogs should be considered abuse, especially if the dog can hardly walk or breathe.
- Responsible owners should be allowed to use whatever training tools best suit their dog, as long as they are used properly. Proper training or research should be done before use. Would love to see only trainers sell all training tools instead of stores.
- People that clean up after their pets. People that humanely treat their and other's animals.
People keep their animals under control in public.
- In some other provinces there's a law that states landlords may refuse to rent to someone with a pet, but they can not evict them for getting one during the duration of the lease. I wish they had this law in Alberta.
- Caring for my animals, ensuring they are safe and healthy. Protecting them from anything outdoors.
- The ability to pick up their dog's poop and throw it out. Would love to see more garbage in the city and the City of Calgary actually maintain these garbages
- Being able to adequately care for one or more pets, emotionally, financially and physically. Treating pets as members of the family. Obeying all regulations and bylaws regarding your pets.
- Well trained animal that will not harm others, cleaning up after your pet, you have the right animal that fits your lifestyle
- Chickens please!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Humans managing their pets in a safe way for all - including the owner, pet & all other human/animals. The animal must. Be cared for appropriately & others humans/animals not be at risk. Pet owners need to be committed to the care of their pet - healthy living environment, food, water, shelter & safe
- Licensed, well trained, well behaved dog. Making sure your dog has good behaviour in public and in your home/yard. Able to easily control your dog in off leash parks. Providing shelter, food and water if dog is outside and making sure it doesn't bark a lot and annoy neighbours.
- Not being a dick and teaching your pet not to be a dick.
- Ensuring your pets aren't a nuisance to others
- If people are going to have a companion in their life spay/neuter is relevant. Minimizing breeding as shelters are full, low cost spaying etc helps. exotic animals should be banned, pet stores need to be responsible. Micro chipping should be mandatory where possible. Licensing cats is ridiculous.
- Keeping a pet under control, teaching them appropriate behaviours/ training them, being responsible for their behaviour at all times, and picking up after them.
- Pet in control, pick up after pet joyful enjoyment of spaces available
- register your pet (micro-chip)/ picking up dog poop/ if purchasing a dog, give information on finding responsible and registered breeders certified by CKC or AKC, and discourage pet-shop style pet sales/ enforce vaccination requirements for all pets
- 1) Ensure appropriate care/food/shelter
- 2) For dogs to be leashed in public
- 3) for cats to be licensed and not freely roaming streets or yards and should be fined similarly to that of dogs for doing so.
- 4) More supervision by owners at off leash areas/parks
- 1) maintaining the health and safety of your pet (spay/neuter, health treatments, safe space to live, no neglect)
- 2) providing an enriching or acceptable environment for your pet
- 3) cleaning up your pets poop in private or public spaces
- 4) ensure the safety of others
- Being a responsible human being / parent to your pet just like uyour child making sure their needs are met
- MORE OFF LEASH SPACES
- It means being truly able to care for your animal as you should. Clean up after your pet. If your dog is grouchy, or more aggressive leash him up at dog park. Caring for animal and community.
- Clean, healthy, fed & watered, sheltered.
- Providing the basic needs to the pets. Most regulations in regards to pets are unnecessary.
- Taking good care of your pet so that it is healthy and content, and so that you and your pet interact with your neighborhood in a way that is not harmful or a nuisance to other people, pets, or wildlife.
- Caring for and making responsible decisions around the treatment and training of your pet. Taking ownership if your pet causes damage or hurts a person or another animal.
- -pets are family and should be treated as such



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

-it should be illegal for landlords to deny pets. If we are rescuing animals, It is RESPONSIBLE that owners are able to find a decent place to live...

- Responsible pet ownership does not involve more rules - it involves ensuring people train their pets properly and therefore don't need more rules. Regulating people and animals to death is no use. When we lived in Europe we could bring our well trained animal everywhere something yyc is missing
- Pets should have mandatory neutering. There is a huge problem with homeless animals and the average joe breeding dogs for profit without giving proper care. Animal abuse NEEDS harsher penalties.
- As a dog lover I believe responsible pet owner provides: Nurturing, socializing, training, picking up after your animal and disposing in the numerous garbage cans. Having areas where our dogs can run leash free in the parks. Dog training is a must. Health testing before purebred breeding is ideal.
- Licensing
 - Keeping indoor pets indoors, not letting them wander into neighbours yards
 - Keeping your pet healthy and well cared for, including physically active
 - Not having a pet if you can't financially take care of it or you don't have the time
- Providing a safe and happy environment for any animal in your home.
- Pets should be spayed and neutered, identified with a microchip, provided with not only food, water and shelter, but loving care and human companionship and all necessary veterinary care for their entire life.
- It mean having proper care and control of your pet. Keeping them healthy and picking up after them. I also believe pets should be on leash unless in a designated off leash area. There should not be more than 3 pets per home unless on an acreage. Dog Walkers packs should only be a maximum of 4 to 6.
- No cats roaming outdoors, no off leash dogs except in fenced (have yet to meet a dog under owner control), poor owner judgment: if your dog jumps at pedestrians when walking on the sidewalk; move away when you are coming up to and passing a pedestrian. Cleanup your dog (and cat!) excrement
- Providing the best life possible to any animal in your ownership. Meeting all the animal's needs - physical, emotional, social. Using force free methods only.
- No use unless you have enough bylaw officers boots on the ground, to many dog owners have respect for private property
- Caring for an animal in a way that enriches their lives, and is respectful to your neighbours
- Keep dog on leash in public spaces, clean up in public spaces, keep dog quiet in backyard, have animal neutered
- Responsible pet ownership means you are able to provide financially and emotionally for this new or existing member of your family. It means providing shelter, food, and necessary veterinarian care within your financial means and committing to that animal.
- Being in control of your pet. Also not allowing dog walking companies fo have MULTIPLE dogs off leash at one time. Restricting that number down significantly for the safety of everyone.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- When taking on a pet you are now responsible for the health and safety of that pet. Responsible pet owners should LOVE them, feed their pet, pick up after their pet, keep their pet safe from other pets, keep their pets healthy with vaccinations and keep them safe, warm and comfortable in their home!
- Held accountable for your pets actions and behavior. It is not the animals fault of it is defending itself you as an owner need to teach him the correct behavior. If you as an owner fail you will be put down just as recent animals have had to die because of your irresponsible actions as a pet owner
- Caring for your animal in a manner that keeps it healthy and safe while not allowing it to infringe on the rights and enjoyment of neighbours and others who may not love your pet like you do.
- As per chickens, I don't think new backyards are big enough for chickens not to bother neighbours who don't want chickens. Smell and noise alone would be a nuisance to home owners that don't want chickens around their house.
- It means nothing because police can come in and kill my dog anytime for any reason. We need responsible policing first. Where we dont have cowards afraid of dogs carrying guns.
- Get rid of the offleash on pathways. Literally zero percent of people control their dogs when off leash. For a Cory of a over a million people it's a ridiculous by law to have.
- Taking responsibility for your pet and its behavior.
- I believe taking care of your animals Where they are supported, fed, and health and wellness is taken account for consistently while providing for the owners is essential.
- - the pet is provided with adequate food, water and shelter.
- - the owner provides daily exercise, socializing and continuous control over the pet such that other pets or persons are not impacted by the pets behaviour.
- Dog owners must pick up dog poop, no off lease in the community-which happens often in Sunalta
- Calgary does pretty good, but we need to get rid of the [personal information removed]. It encourages backyard breeders, and sells to uninformed people at exorbitant prices. It literally makes calgary worse.
- cat owners should be held to the same standard as dog owners- my flower beds have now been destroyed because the neighbors cat uses them as a toilet. Why are they allowed to roam free?? It means doing something about the coyotes so my dog and kids can play without fear. Fines for leaving dog poop
- It means loving and caring for pets that live IN your home. This means feeding and providing a warm and safe place for animals to reside. It also means affording to pay for vet bills, food, housing and care of the animals. It means providing pets with the exercise and attention they require for life
- Keeping animal healthy and happy (mentally and physically), taking to vet when needed, providing mental stimulation, healthy diet, FOLLOWING LEASH LAWS!!!, keeping them contained, licensing them
- Owners of pets should be responsible for the actions of their pets, including ensuring that their pets do not negatively interfere with others and their property.
- Not having your dog bark or whining as early as 4:30am for several hours, disturbing & waking up the neighborhood. Not Leaving the dog outside in winter for hours. Picking up their dog's poop on sidewalks and parks. Not taking the dog out for walks or letting it outside in back yard ever or rarely.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- taking care of your pet so it is safe, content and healthy. Controlling your pet so that the citizens of the city and other pets are safe, content, healthy and able to go about their daily lives without your pet causing problems for them or extra work for the city.
- Everything!
- Taking care of a pet requires us to provide for its needs and keep it safe from harm. We also understand not everyone enjoys pets, and we need to respect their property and needs as well. Communities are for everyone, and it takes everyone to make it a safe and pleasant place to live.
- First, consider your future plans and then do research on the animal to consider if this is the right time and type of pet to get. Realize having a pet requires lifelong commitment, time and money to provide proper food, shelter, care, training, and attention.
An animal is never to be abandoned.
- On leash pick up after. Signs in open areas indicating not an off leash park, ie Riverstone of Cranston where dogs run free always.
- Having a dog on a leash when not in an off leash area. I Live in Cranston Riverstone and people are constantly letting their dogs off leash and ignoring the feces their dogs leave behind. It would be nice if there was some sort of officer patrolled that would come out and actually ticket.
- Keep your dog on leash in areas that are not off leash areas , also picking up after them
- Basic needs, proper health care and adequate training to ensure a happy, healthy pet.
- No one is asking the tire industry to revisit the possibility of making them square instead of round so why does the city need to waste all kinds of money revising laws that do not need revision just because they are twelve years old. Leave it alone.
- Ensuring the pets have access to sufficient space and their needs are met. Well fed, clean grated with respect. Not noisy
- Spade and neutered, licensed, cleaning up after your dogs, breeding restrictions
- Cleaning up after your pet, respectful behaviour in off leash parks, keeping your dog on leash in designated areas
- Being responsible in cleaning up after your pet, as well as keeping them under control.
- Owners that keep their pets in good health and follow all bylaws.
- Where pet ownership doesn't impact others, where one takes care of all of the pets' needs
- Taking 100 % care of your dog and it's needs. This includes up to date vaccines and proper training. Teaching your dog to be respectful to other dogs and people. Anyone who does not have complete control over their dog should not be at the Calgary Dog parks . Microchip in case your dog gets los.
- Dog owners need to train their dogs better, people with no dogs should not have to endure barking dogs. We should be able to enjoy our backyards without dogs from neighbors barking at us. The City needs to implement better rules regarding barking.
- Picking up poop! The city needs to do a better job of policing off leash parks.
Professional dog walkers need to be held accountable for not picking up after the dogs in their care.
The city needs to monitor and penalize these people; they are damaging off leash areas.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Having--and fully utilizing--the physical, financial and emotional capacities to fully provide for an animal's complete wellness.
- Making sure you understand your dog, understand his signs and his body language he's giving out. Also not putting an aggressive dog on a retractable leash and don't bring an aggressive dog to off leash dog parks. Picking up your dogs poop and not leaving it in the middle of the path MORE GARBAGECANS
- take responsibility for your pet & don't have them annoy or worse other people. There is a black cat that is in Montgomery who is supposed to be kept inside but isn't. Dogs that bark constantly in my apt building & the management get complaints constantly about them. City laws have to be stricter.
- Cleaning your own animal poop and disposing of it properly. Teaching and educating other pet owners. Stopping back yard and un needed breeders. STOP BRINGING IN STRAY ANIMALS FROM OTHER COUNTRIES
- It means to have an animal you're able to financially and emotionally support throughout its life.
- I think this definition will vary greatly but I am the owner of a hunting dog (springer spaniel) and my definition would be a person who cares for and trains their dog and can anticipate and correct actions before they occur.
- I have a pet and appreciate having a say in how they are treated and how they should be handled
- I have two cats, so it means keeping them inside and licensing them. I think for dogs it means cleaning up after them, keeping them on leash unless in an off-leash area, and providing training for them.
- This means being able to control your animal. This means understanding that I may be able to control my dog with voice commands and other may need a leash. It also means all pets and people are not the same. It also means we shouldn't all be lumped into the same basket. Don't punish good pet owners.
- Knowing your dogs limits and stressors and acting accordingly.
- Provide shelter, food, training, exercise and mental stimulation for our pets. Cleaning after your pet waste is important, at home and in public places. Dog Parks in each community to socialize.
- To me it means a community that values animal care and welfare issues. These issues are important enough to the community to advocate for responsible behaviors for members of the community who own or care for animals, providing guidance and in some cases regulations.
- Keeps their dog under control.
Does not take their dog off leash in an on leash only area.
Does not let their dog bark at all hours.
Picks up after their dog.
- The City's Killarney Aquatic Centre sits across the street in a park on 30 St and 17 Ave SW. Dog defecation and urine is so great that the park reeks when the snow melts.
- Clean up after your pet, leash dog when when in community, learn to manage and care for pet
- Putting your pet first in vulnerable situations and providing more than just the necessities of life. It also means knowing the requirements of pet ownership, such as picking up feces on private and public property.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A pet/homeowner who owns pets/livestock that do not infringe on neighbors quality of life. A responsible pet/livestock owner keeps their pets activities to their property and does not allow said pet to defecate on neighbors property nor cause unwanted intrusion.
- Responsible pet owner is someone who realizes that they took on an animal and are responsible for it like a child. Which means regular vet visits, proper food, showing it love and taking care of it. Cleaning up after it and giving it a comfortable living environment for the length of its life.
- Looking after your pet whether that is for the safety of them or people around you.
- It means that my dogs vaccines are 100% up to date. It means that I can reasonably expect my dog to always be in my control in public. It means that my dogs have access to warm shelter 24/7. It means that neighbours do not have to hear my dog bark nonstop
- Having complete control of your pet at all times and picking up after them ALWAYS . Also ensuring that your pet is always safe, secure and fed.
- Canadian statistics are extremely incorrect on pet ownership since pet owners don't accurately report the number of pets they have and vets don't report regularly to the Canadian Veterinary Assoc. In the U.S., 67% of households have pets. The number is higher in Canada, especially in Calgary.
- It means keeping your dogs healthy (good walks), being a good neighbour (picking up after your dog, not allowing excessive barking), respecting on leash rules (avoid those very long leashes as well). Just considering the comfort and needs of those around you.
- Responsible pet ownership is taking care of your pet and following rules and bylaws so your pet does not disturb or bother anyone around you
- You are a guardian for your pet. Same rules apply should it have been a child. Proper and adequate shelter food water. Taking care of needs etc.
- Clean up after your pets. Pay attention to them, not your phone or someone you're walking with. Control them, think about what you are doing
- It means immunizing and spaying or neutering pets. licencing fee's are high and should be reduced. City of Calgary should offer preferred vets and insurance companies that are reasonably priced for these services. animal waste pick up should be enforced in a more visible manor to deter waste.
- providing the necessaries for your pet to be happy, healthy, safe around others- people and other pets alike. Giving that pet training, attention, love, exercise and stimulation to be a well behaved member of your home and community.
- Keeping your pets safe and providing for their needs
Keeping them safe means keeping them on leash
We really need to work on off leash issue it is becoming a nightmare with people in private property and in green spaces around Calgary
The cost to private property and wild life is out of contro
- It means that you take all and every measure to ensure that your pet is comfortable and safe. There needs to be stronger "consequences for people who do not take care of animals. This includes not walking your pet daily, as well as leaving animals outside in freezing weather.
- Being responsible for a sentient individual that needs care and love for their entire life.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Providing the animal's needs as far as food, shelter and caring but also being responsible that their animal does not impact neighbours in a negative way. Excessive noise or being loose on others property is the responsibility of the owner. Having a well-trained animal.
 - Only owning pets that you want to care for their whole life, and are able to and can afford to care for their whole life.
 - Taking care of the animals that take care of us.
 - Ensuring safe environments for people, pets, owners and wildlife.
 - Pets up to date on shots and tags. Also people in off leash areas who know their dogs could pose a problem to take precautions .
- Also I think cat licensing is not exactly fair if you have pets that never go out.
- Providing care and love to your animal to enrich their life while being considerate of neighbours. Picking up after then off property. Not allowing dogs to bark outdoors as to disrupt neighbours.
 - Cleaning up after yourself. Knowing and controlling your pet if need be
 - It means taking care of your pet with regards to good health, vaccinations and socialization.
 - Ensuring your pet is up to date on shots, ensuring your pet can handle both being on leash and off leash, and being respectful that the animals don't behave like humans. What we think is aggression in an animal is the animal dominance and just being loud; also small animal owners being respectful
 - Someone who is capable of providing the needs specific to their pet. Feeds them, walks them, grooms them, if they're out in public they're trained or on a leash. The owner picks up after their pet weather in their own yard or not.
 - People licensing their pets, keeping their cats indoors (big issue in new Brighton.), people keeping their pets on a leash on the streets ect But mostly the cat issue is the big one I see. One terrorizes my dog every summer.
 - Caring for your pets and providing them with a healthy full life without infringing on others.
 - Cleaning up after your pet, keeping your pet in your own yard, using a leash where instructed or if being off-leash isn't safe for your dog, other dogs, yourself, and other people.
 - Picking up after your pets. As well, keeping your dogs on a leash at all times unless in an off leash area.
 - Responsible pet ownership means caring for a pet with love and respect. It means ensuring that it is fed, watered, medically cared for, licensed and neutered, and ideally trained in some manner.
 - Cats should no longer be allowed to roam outside. They are toppling the ecosystem by decimating the bird population and are destructive to personal property. There are no direct benefits to allowing cats outside. A law should be implemented that prevents cat owners from letting their pets roam free
 - I want dog owners to obey ALL leash laws ALL the time. I would like the City to take more responsibility enforcing leash laws.. I want dog owners responsible for picking up their dog's waste everywhere!
 - Having a pet that you treat like part of the family and not having them and, by association you, treated like a criminal when you are out and about, if you are not following, to the letter, all the laws owners have to follow. People should be responsible for their pets and should be to do so.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It means taking care of the animals you own and respecting nature.
- Picking up after your pets and keeping them on leash! Bylaw is basically inept at enforcing any complaints. Need better mechanism for reporting (i.e. photo evidence is sufficient) and harsher fines. I hate feeling my children and I are unsafe because of irresponsible dog owners.
- Ensuring your pet is provided a safe, stable environment, given the proper love, housing and diet. That the owner takes every reasonable step to ensure their pet is properly trained and socialized. The owner will take all measure to clean up after and control their pet.
- Providing love and care to an animal you choose as a pet, while keeping other people and animals safe from potential disease and injury from your animal.
- That pets are treated and cared for correctly
- Keeping an eye on your pet and adhering to the laws.
- Not letting your dog off leash in on leash area just because your dog is nice to everyone. Pet owners are idiots and need to start being he's accountable for their own stupidity. Dogs aren't the problem.
- Not bringing aggressive dogs to off leash areas.
- Making sure your pets are healthy, loved and not affecting anyone else
- The owners of the pets have the resources to provide for basic needs such as food and veterinary care. The animals need training and human interaction that supports a pet that is not problematic to the neighbours including regular exercise and mental stimulation for dogs and containment for cats.
- We need more funding to follow up on animal welfare complaints. We also need more funding to amend laws that are out of date with respect to animal cruelty, so that prosecution can occur more reliably and more in line with the public's views.
- Cleaning up dog feces. Woodbine and Fish Creek Park are covered in dig crap.
- Loving, caring and maintaining the health and wellbeing of the animals we take under our care. Being aware of their limits and providing exercise and stimulation based on the capacity they exhibit in friendliness and coexistence. Ownership means being responsible for all aspects of pet behavior etc
- Responsible pet ownership starts with following the by-laws that are in place. This presently does not happen There are no way to identify those who are not following the by-laws and thus no way to enforce them.
Even if the offenders could be identified, the city has a very small by-law team.
- Well-cared for pets that are exercised and waste picked up after. Dog friendly trails and parks
- Providing your pet with medical care, daily exercise, grooming, a clean and warm home, and assuring they are trained so they can be calm and balanced. Be sure to follow the common sense laws so my pet is kept safe. Example being keeping cats indoors and lashing your dogs when in off leash areas.
- Making sure your pet is happy, well-trained and well-cared for. Not allowing your pets to negatively impact other people or pets, and not allowing other people or pets to negatively impact your pet.
- not letting your dog bark outside for ANY length of time after 11:00pm



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Getting an animal to care for it long term. Feeding, exercising and grooming it properly and only getting it if you have the time to properly care for it.
- Ensuring that all the physical, psychological, and mental needs of your pet are met. Maintaining a reasonable amount of control dependent on the age, breed, and species of your pet in public, and taking responsibility for the actions of your pet (ie. cleaning up after your pet defecates).
- It means having control of your animal and treating it well. This includes not leaving them alone for long periods of time.
- My pets are my children. They are family. I love them. To be a responsible pet owner, you must clean up after them, feed them, care for them, take them to the vet for there health, and most importantly love them and teach them manners. Never hurting them or abusing them. Also never neglecting them.
- To me it means that your pet is licensed properly, and that you are following city by laws. You are able to provide the necessities of life for your pet(s) including food, and proper shelter. And that your pet has adequate training that it needs.
- Keep my pets healthy, happy, and not a nuisance to others. Licence and register your furry's. Need more strict guidelines for people who don't licence and register, I have neighbours with a mean unregistered dog who has (unproven) Killed neighbourhood stray cats and we can't do anything about it.
- Understanding a pets needs and what you are capable of providing for them. If you can't afford food and or provide enough care then limit your number of pets or reconsider the type of pet.
- To be able to provide adequate care for any animal as their guardian.
- This means taking care of your pet and ensuring that it doesn't impact other people, pets (on leash unless in a designated area for all pets), or property (clean up after them)
- I think responsible ownership is having cats licenses for those whose cat roam outside. Cats can cause a lot of trouble like a dog and actually can cause quite abit of ecological damages because they are unsupervised outside.
Also I'm all for bee keeping and chicken keeping as long as its clean.
- Making sure my pet is in a safe place for themselves and other it may come into contact with.
- Aging choices for your pet so they are always set up to succeed.
- Taking care of my pets. Ensuring that they are kept safe and not jeopardizing themselves or others. Cats should be indoors or outdoors in spaces where they are supervised. Dogs should be on a lease and in control. Unless they are in a designated off leash area.
- Cats should be treated the same as dogs. A loose "house cat" came into my yard multiple times last year and attacked my dog on my own property. For everyone's safety, including the cats, the bylaw stating cats should remain on their own property should be more strictly enforced.
- Training and paying attention to your pet and respecting the rules and other people.
- I would like to set dogs on leash. I have 2 small children and I am really annoyed by dogs running around off leash and using public spaces as their toilets. It's disgusting enough to have them pee everywhere. In addition most people don't pick up poop either
- Following local rules and regulations



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animal welfare first, less regulation.
- Looking after your pets and respecting your neighbours and neighbourhood. Keeping pets under control and not allowing them to bother others while keeping your pets active and cared for
- Take care of your pet and do not be a problems for others
- making sure you animal is provided for, kept safe and contolled
- Taking care of your pet and not infringing on those who do not have pets.
- Housing happy, healthy, socially appropriate dogs and cats.
- It means taking care of your animal and training it properly.
- Pet owners following current bylaws and rules.
- Making sure your pet does not affect others, ie excessive barking, not cleaning up after your dog
- Housing happy, healthy, socially appropriate dogs and cats. I live in a multi dwelling condo complex with large dogs. The new bylaw should limit the size of dogs allowed in apartment complexes. Almost all the large dogs are reactive and have the tendency to be aggressive to both people and other dog
- Follow City Bylaws and provide ness
Follow Cit Bylaws and provide care and food like you would to any of family member. Only have pets you can afford and give time, affection and attention. Be able to own Hens, small goat and pony's. Vicious breeds of dogs should be banned and stay outside city
- Not only providing the minimum level of care to our pets but providing what they need to live meaningful healthy happy lives
- Most important is to have pets under control at all times. Obey the existing leash laws for both dogs and cats. Many neighbors are not considerate allowing their dogs to bark loudly in the yards for often hours. Responsible pet owners should quiet them down.
- Taking responsibility for your animal such the safety of your pet and the communities you visit with your pet. Also the community you live within is comfortable with your pet and not bothered by your pet. It means cleaning up after your pet, and managing interactions with other animals.
- Picking up after your pet. Having your pet on leash at ALL times unless in a designated dog park. As a dog owner I am tired of asking other pet owners to put their dogs on leash and pick up after them. Penalties should be stiffer and more staff to enforce it.
- Providing the best care and environment for your pets are raising them responsibly to coexist with others.
- cleaning up for pet. making sure it is well looked after and cared for. making sure it isnt a problem for neighbours
- Abiding by the rules set out for ownership of an animal, as well as the care and well being of the animal.
- Framework to ensure the right owners, have the right animals (and number of animals), In the right places (mastiff in a studio apartment not great) and that behaviours of pet and owner do not negatively effect those around them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Knowing your own dogs limits. Is the dog park right for your dog. Do you have a recall before taking off leash? Does your dog like other people and dogs ? Haveing respect for other people and there dogs. Do you have poo bags. Having good communication with other dog owners
- It means that people don't have a zoo at home that runs into everybody's backyard. Because not all people have same common sense , amount pets per household should be restricted and for sure , no birds or such allowed.
- It means being responsible for making sure my dog is under control (does not mean on a leash) when other people or animals are around. It means picking up and disposing of dog poop. I strongly believe there should be more tolerance for dogs being allowed off-leash in all parks for dogs in control
- Exercising pets (dogs) with their safety in mind, which ideally ensures safety of others. Off-leash areas with trails to explore. Plenty of garbage cans throughout a dog-friendly area, not just at entrances. City knowing the usage of an area before putting up restricting signage.
- Care and compassion and proper education on breed responsibility. It also means having accessible spaces for dogs to be off leash all over the city. Also, more pet friendly options and mandates in apartments and bylaws. This city is crazy anti-dog.
- Providing a suitable home for pets with adequate basic needs which does not infringe on others property.
- well behaved licensed healthy safe dogs should be granted access to more places so owners can take with them, i really appreciate that dogs are allowed on public transit! maybe can work towards more type of places/business allowing dogs while making public more comfortable with dogs around
- A happy, healthy and safe pet. I'm responsible for all of the before mentioned.
- Being responsible means not letting your cats roam free to poop in my yard,kill the birds that feed in my yard,and torment my dogs.it means licensing your pet,chipping or tattooing your pet and not letting your dog roam free if your not in an unleashed area.
- Being able to command your dog and have it respond. Picking up after your dog. Making sure your pet is healthy. Having space in ur home for them. Afford them too.
- Providing a loving, safe and enriched environment for your animal.
- To me it means that people have been screened for pet ownership and educated properly on proper and more ethical ownership. For ex. pet stores not just selling to anyone but making sure they have proper education for the pet they are selling. Especially for dogs and the issues with backyard breeding
- People with animals are responsible to control them in public at all times. I don't like dogs coming up to me in stores/ people putting them in shopping carts & then I happen to use the same cart with all their fur in it because I am very allergic to animals with hair/fur.No animals in public stores
- First of all, PETS! NOT livestock, not camels, not coyotes, nor elk, pigs or humpback whales.
- Person that respects other people's property & space when having a pet. What you do with your pet on your property is up to you, but get off mine. Take your animal to the park, and obey leash laws on the way! Too many dogs running free around the owners. Control your animals people!
- Giving your furbabies yearly vaccines



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Exercise daily by going to dog parks

Proper tagging and updated info

- Enjoying your pet but not annoying the neighbors excessively.
- Dogs on leash when walking, pickup poop, and control your pet. No chickens or farm animals in city!
- Responsible Pet Ownership to me means, providing an animal with food, shelter, veterinary care, and love.
- Spay and neutering your pet, training and caring for it for its whole life. Picking up after it on walks, under control. Being quick to report if it's lost and trying to find it.
animals not left unattended or tied and if it has been aggressive, seek a behaviourist or use a muzzle when away
- Drug dealers don't get to train dogs to be violent anymore. That's a life sentence for that animal.
Dog owners do a better job of cleaning up their feces.
Not trying to pass pets off as support animals.
Lower fines and fees for pet and lost pet issues from the City / Humane Society.
- You pick up the pets poop, you bring them in when it's cold outside, you make sure that you are providing the animal with what they need. You make sure the pet feels happy, comfortable and loved.
- Taking care of your pet(s) in every aspect
- It means providing for the health and safety of the pet in your care and ensuring your pet does not cause damage or distress to any other person or property.
- You have a conditions to treat nice your pets and provide what they need and most important understanding that a pet is not a toy so we can not let behind.
- People who look after and clean up after their animals in public spaces, and train them sufficiently to not cause problems for others.
- Training, leading and living with animals respectfully for everyone.
- WeNeedToChangeTheLegalLanguageRegardingDomesticPetsFromAn"Ownership"OrientationToA"Guardianship"Relationship.PetsShouldNotBeIdentifiedAsProperty;RatherTheyShouldBeLegallyRecognizedAsSentientBeingsAndTreatedUnderTheLawAsSuchToImproveHowSocietyInteractsWithThemInBothPositiveAndNegativeSituations.
- Having pets does not disrupt neighbors' lives i.e. number of dogs should be limited, cats not running loose, picking up after dogs, keeping dogs on leash except in designated areas - not park/playground areas, not letting pets chase wildlife..
- as a dog owner, it means having a well-behaved, under-control dog in your own yard, when on walks either on or off leash. This includes picking up waste and understanding bad dog behaviour. I find too many owners downplay aggressive and dominant behaviours.
- Pets are like furry, four-legged children. If everyone who has pets looked at themselves as "Pet Parents" instead of just owners, their fur babies would have all the love & attention they need.
- A healthy and happy animal that is getting the care it requires as well as respectful of public places
- Knowing the rules, bylaws and holding those that break them responsible (owner not pet)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The pet is happy healthy and the family/person can provide for it
- Responsible pet ownership means that inam responsible for the health and welfare of my pets.
- providing proper care for a pet (proper diet, medical care, exercise, training); making sure your pet does not disturb others (minimize barking, keep dog onleash and under control at all times); know and respect the bylaw (keep pets away from prohibited areas - schools, sports fields, playgrounds..)
- To own a pet (one or two or more) and to be responsible for their needs and their interaction with other pets, humans and the environment with no need for fees or regulations. Anything besides that means that we are politicians' pets under government vision.
- Responsible pet ownership means understanding and adhering to the rules set out in the by-laws. It means being respectful that others may be afraid of your pet even if it is "friendly". Understanding that wildlife in the city takes precedence over your need to let your pet wander or be off-leash.
- responsible pet ownership, is not letting your cat roam the neighbourhood leaving presents for your neighbours. ensuring your animals are taken care of and not bothering the neighbours barking or feces from all animals is cleaned up, reducing smells. I am not a robot 4 times so far
- Understanding the rules, and following them.
- Ensuring that Pets, Owners and the public are all represented and treated fairly
- Obeying the laws and bylaws surrounding pets. Like have them on leash in off leash areas. Cleaning up after them on walks and when off leash. Making sure they are not put in harm or anyone else's pet or any person is ever put in harm's way either.
- Just like being a parent. Need to always be res[ponsible
- Keeping your pet safe from others. Keeping others safe from your pet. Cleaning up after your pet. Catering for your pet.
- Reducing stray and homeless animals and having all animals be vaccinated to prevent the spread of disease.
- Taking good care of the physical and emotional needs of your pet while being considerate of the people and other animals in your vicinity.
- PROBLEM: Dog walkers not in control of their charges. Maybe up to 8 dogs but chatting on cell phone and not picking up (or not seeing it). Licensing - permit - bonding - taxes paid....not in many cases! Also some larger breeds should not be off leash period.
- Pets are provided adequate nutrition, kept on owner's property and don't make excessive noise (dogs in a yard barking at everyone who walks by is excessive, or that regularly make loud noises in offense of noise bylaw are a problem)
- Responsible pet ownership means that I take responsibility for my pet/s health and well being as well as their behaviour toward/affecting others, their pets (if they have them), and people's property or space. (e.g. no wandering pets)
- When you take on adopting an animal, he/she is now part of your family and must be taken care of and loved as your own flesh and blood. Too many irresponsible persons are adopting and surrendering at the first chance when behaviour training or spaying/neutering or house breaking becomes inconvenient



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Rules that are enforced, with fines that are actually given to pet owners who do not follow the laws. If not enforced, people will continue to do what they want knowing there is no consequence. Roaming cats, not cleaning up after their dogs and barking dogs.
- 1. Caring for the physical and emotional well-being of your pet (training, environment, food, medical attention, enrichment, exercise, attention).
2. Being responsible for your pet (picking up poop, training to ensure pet is safe to be around if you are taking them into public spaces).
- Keeping out pets under control while respecting our neighbors and property when we are out and about.
- Everyone is responsible for his/her own pets i.e. cleaning up after them, making sure they are always under control. And not ignoring the animal who needs company e.g. turning dog loose in off-leash park and then sticking nose into cell phone!!!
- In addition to all my responses, I believe all Off-Leash dog areas should be fenced.
- That I take good care of my pet - see that it goes to the vet regularly, is up to date on vaccinations and, make the difficult choice when the time comes to have it euthanized rather than suffer.
- Loving and caring for your pet as though it is a family member. Providing all the necessities of life for your pet & abiding by the City regulations.
- Licensing our dogs, cleaning up after them and keeping them under control and leashed
- Caring for your pet, ensuring they have proper health, diet, exercise, love and support. Ensure you do what is right for them instead of what the norm is, we shouldn't be sheep and just follow the pack. Be smart, and make good choices for both you and your pet.
- Pets - incl cats on leashes
People clean up after their pet
Barking animals are to be controlled
Maximum number of dogs/cats per household
- Engaged ownership considerate of all citizens of Calgary while providing the best experience for your pet and others enjoying our outdoor spaces.
- Your animal is always under your control, not wandering loose, and part of the family.
- Pets on leashes in all areas except dog parks. Fines for those that allow pets off leash and do not pick up after them
- Treating your pet like a family member. Ensuring the impact on your neighbors and community is positive and never intrudes on their rights.
- It means caring for my pet while following all bylaws about on leash areas, picking up his poop, etc, and also understanding that there are people who do not wish to be greeted by my dog.
- Owners owning their pet actions.
- Owning a pet is a privilege. Pet owners must ensure ALL pets are licensed, under control at all times and not be allowed to negatively impact other people, animals and the environment.
- A pet owner who looks after their pet inside and outside of the residence.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Spaying and neutering your pets, only owning as many as are within your means. I have multiple pets and care for them extremely well, yet someone can have just one and be a terrible, irresponsible owner. Responsible is seeking medical care when required. It's not letting your indoor cat outside.
- Keeping animals that do no harm to other people or their property.
- Controlling the pet so that it does not negatively impact other Calgarians or our City wildlife and botany. e.g. Clean up dog feces, keep dogs under control when outside the home, keep cats on property.
- Owners have personal control over their pet, pick up after their pet (including cats), animals are leashed in all areas (except off-leash areas). It also means that a person is mentally and physically equipped to care for the animal, and perhaps even trained to handle a difficult breed (dog)
- Having the right to take my dog to city of Calgary facilities like soccer centers. The city shouldnt punish people for having dogs by banning them from publicly funded spaces.
- Making sure that your pet has a valid licence, regular vet check ups, and is kept in a fenced back yard. Picking up after your dog when it messes in someone's front yard. If you have a particularly loud dog, not letting them stay outside and bark if you're not home. Not letting cats roam!
- Taking care of your pets. Giving them a good quality of life. Respecting your neighbours in regards to your pets.
- Leashing your pup in all areas that are not "offleash". Picking up after your pets. More garbages in our cities parks and fish creek park would help with this issue.
- 1. picking up your dogs poop. 2. having control of your dog 3. well trained 4. listening to other owners about their dog personalities (ex: my dog is nervous around people. Please don't pet my dog. response: it's okay, all dogs love me)
- Being able to provide a safe and healthy environment for pets, owners and others who might have interactions. Pets in public need to be under control at all times, either through proper training, leash control or containment. Cleaning up after the pets and noise control is a requirement.
- Someone that takes care of the mental and physical needs of their pet while adhering to applicable legislation.
- Properly taking care of your animals by licensing them, providing care , being able to financially take care of them and ensuring they have space
- Taking care of my dog to the best of my abilities as well as giving her the best experience she can have
- I think responsible pet ownership is tending to the behavior and health needs of your dog at all times. Making sure you follow the bi-laws, keeping your dog on a leash where applicable, getting your dog licensed, up to date on vaccines and vet visits. You should treat your dog like a family member.
- It means taking care to be thoughtful, to plan, to commit to training good citizen behaviour (canines) and respecting others property (canines and felines), to follow all norms and bylaws in good faith and above all to care for and nurture the pets who cannot speak for themselves.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Being aware of your pets health, behaviour and social-emotional-physical well being. As a pet owner it is imperative that I know what my dog is capable of and the environment she is in - I am trusting fellow pet owners are doing the same and never putting my dog at any risk.
- Being accountable and aware of your pet at all times. Caring for your pet to the best of your abilities and seeking supports if needed. Always acting in the best interest of your pet.
- It means understanding that we all live together in this city and that both my pet and me can impact others as others and their pets impact me
- An animal is being taken care of in a loving home. Fully licensed and vetted. Functioning as respectful citizens.
- To me it means total care. Licensing, exercise, affection, training, grooming, socialization.
- Trained, well-controlled pets sharing public environments. Always being proactive in cleaning up after pets and being aware of hazards for your pet and others.
- People taking care of their pet and following rules. There is no need to implement licensing as it will add to administrative cost without much benefit. I see most pet owners follow rules. There should be tickets for those who violate rules. Bad vicious breeds.
- Providing food, shelter, exercise, companionship and training so my pet is well mannered and social
- Taking responsibility when your pet does something they shouldn't- biting, destroying property, etc. Also picking up after your pet, and keeping them on a leash when outside.
- Looking after your pet and not allowing it to be roaming around the neighborhood
- Pet ownership means everything to me/us. Our two little dogs are our babies and we love them ever so much and don't know what we'd do without them. Being responsible means raising healthy pets and cleaning up after them, like we were never there.
- I am a dog owner. To me, dog ownership means give my dog proper training, and register my dog (should be mandatory). Clean up after my dog public, keep my dog away from dogs that appear aggressive.
- "pick up poop.
- Ask if it's ok for a dog to approach you or your dog when in leash areas.
- Keep off leash areas they are the best.
- Make sure people have a basic knowledge of how dogs tell Other dogs they don't like Something. E.g growling. Growling is ok - it's a warning for them to stop."
- not letting your dog defecate on your neighbors lawn to kill the grass they work hard to keep looking nice. Also dispose of your dogs feces in your own garbage bin, not your neighbors to smell when they open it
- Rich people think they don't need to pick up dog poop.
- dogs should not be allowed to pee on neighbors grass
- Proper shelter food exercise socialization Affordable Veterinary bills. No licensing for responsible owners who microchip spay and neuter. Living with Wildlife, as Calgary Council continues to not listen to build up but to expand and take away the wildlife habitats. Limit number of pets per househo



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Caring for your pet humanely.
- It means having a trained and socialized dog who is licensed and free of communicable diseases. It means owners who take ownership seriously by having full control of their dog; leashing; and picking up after their pet. It means that I wouldn't see so many cats illegally running around.
- Keeping you pet healthy and friendly. And picking up your dog shit.
- Ability to adequately feed, care, exercise, provide shelter & seek appropriate vet advice for the animals in your care
- Ensuring the animal is well cared for, all medical needs & sustenance needs are met and the animal is not encroaching on others space.
- Adequate care for the physical and emotional well-being of pets. Keeping a clean and safe environment for the pet and community. Keeping pets reasonably quiet, well-socialized, on-leash where needed.
- Ensuring the welfare and safety of a an inclusive list of animal species and the community that encounters them.
- It means that a pet owner should control their pet at all times. Also aggressive dogs at an off leash dog park should be not allowed and a phone number to report them easily visible .Also I think that there should be doggie poop bags available at the parks and disposal sites along sidewalks .
- That the person/people who own the pet can 1. Afford it 2. Mature enough to ensure proper training is provided 3. Ensure that the well being of the animal is met 4. Clean up after them
- I would LOVE to have a law that one person cannot walk more than 4 dogs at one time. It is dangerous to both the dogs and people. There are many, many reasons why this would be a logical and important law. Please consider
- Responsible pet owner ship means that you take proper care of your animals with food, affection and veterinary care. It also means your pet does no harm to others. Responsible pet ownership also means cleaning up after your pet and controlling your pet. No overbreeding.
- " - Taking responsibility for the actions of your pet i.e. pick up poop
- - Ensuring that your pet is provided with proper health care, i.e. food, water, shelter, appropriate level of exercise, regular visits to the veterinarian, vaccinations (or titers)"
- Being allowed to own one or more of a variety of animals while providing them with adequate food, shelter and care. It also goes hand in hand with being a responsible neighbor and ensuring there is limited impact to neighbors for having that animal.
- Pet of your choice and raise it ethically & responsibly. Dog, cat, hamster, hen... stop discriminating against pets.
- Keeping your pet on a leash and under your control. Pick up after your pet
- Dog and owner able to follow the ten skills of the canine good citizen as outlined by the American kennel association
- Putting the interests of your animal ahead of your own. Taking care to ensure you act responsibly with your animal so that they have the best life and health possible. Accepting them in public spaces and knowing animals will leave a mark but that the positive benefits far outweigh the small cost.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responsible pet ownership is taking responsibility for your pet because they depend on you for everything. It is making sure you don't put them in compromising situations and doing all that you can to keep them safe and healthy
- Dog that is trained and listens well to owner.
- Responsible pet ownership to me means people being in control and aware of their pets at all times, on leash, off leash, at home or anywhere you take your pet, as if they were your own children, which they basically are.
- Take care of your pet, clean up after your pet, train
- Urban bee keeping
- People who take proper care of their animals, including how their animal impacts others (picking up waste, limiting unnecessary noise, and ensuring safety of others).
- Pets live with people who care and love them. They have manners and enhance family harmony.
- Spay/neuter your pets, ability to care and provide high quality of life, taking care and responsibility for pet and their actions, training pets, picking up after them
- Ensuring my dog is up to date on vaccinations, neutering/spaying my dog, picking up after my dog. Walking my dog on leash for his safety and others.
- People taking responsibility for their pets welfare and wild life being looked after as well.
- Ensuring the health, wellness, and safety of pets, and those who come in contact with them.
- It doesn't matter how many you own as long as they are kept healthy and in an environment safe for their needs.
- Making sure the needs of the pet are met, physically and emotionally. Being caring and unharmed towards a pet/any animal
- "knowing yr pets instinctual behaviour, breed behaviour., Then personality behaviour.
- water food love, not left for too long. not left outside. taking time to teach yr dog good behavior."
- Not letting your cat roam free through your neighborhood. Keeping your dog on a leash, cleaning up after both your cat and your dog, not tossing your dog waste in other people's black bins (unless it's getting picked up that day)
- "expect pet owners to take a three hour online course covering the basics On community parks etiquette
- Responsibility for your animal
- Continue to offer a spay and neuter program to low income families
- Having a pet is awesome however they must be social and securely monitored"
- Having pets taking care of them picking up after them making sure they are not a nuisance to neighbors. Keeping them from excessive barking or howling (cats). I am fine with dogs outside as long as they have appropriate shelter and water. Some dogs do not like being in house. Licensing fees fair
- I think this means when pets and people live together and we are respectful of all of our needs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- being an active participant with your pet, that includes walking, jogging, biking, skijoring, sledding, rollerblading, carting. We all try to live a more active healthy lifestyle and having our best friends (pets) being part of that is not only a healthy alternate but can build a stronger bond.
- Better Mental Health, Meeting people and neighbours, exercise, living outside
- The city needs to deal with cats and rabbits throughout the city. Also 311 needs better training
- Cleaning up after your pet and being aware of your surroundings while out with your pet. And providing unconditional love :)
- Other than the providing love, attention and the necessities for life, it means cleaning up after your pet, keeping control of your pet and respecting those around you.
- Being a responsible pet owner means setting your pet up for success. This includes providing structure, training and food for your pets.
- Taking responsibility for the well being of the animal. Providing the animal with the proper necessities at all times.
- Farm animals do not belong in calgary and number of dogs and cats should be limited
- It involves educating non pet owners about the importance of ensuring the needs and requirements for pets to exercise, and have social interactions with other pets and the important role that parks, and open spaces throughout the city plays in the physical and mental well being of urban pets.
- Being a responsible pet owner while making sure that pet does not infringe on neighbours standard of living.
- People need to keep their dogs are under control at off leash parks, and they should be walking their dogs on leash when outside of off leash areas. Owners should pick up after their pets; the city NEEDS to enforce this better! I often have to clean up dog poop on my lawn due to lazy pet owners.
- It means financially, mentally and physically taking care of your pet. Providing a good safe home, giving them love and attention, food/water and medical care if needed.
- Taking care of the animals needs first and being able to provide a safe, healthy, and loving home.
- "clean up behind your pets -even in dog parks
- be in control of your dog at all times even in dog parks - dogs must not jump against other users of park and dogs certainly should not bite or nip other users- got bitten the other day. Improve surveillance of off-leash parks and issue fines."
- "Responsible pet ownership means:
 - - dogs are trained and follow obedience commands in real life scenarios
 - - pets are kept in good health and show no signs of abuse
 - - pets are cleaned up after including at home/yards
 - - pets will not harm humans
 - - pets are not a threat to other pets and wildlife"
- Means pet owners respect others in the way they do not leave their dog(s) in the yard barking all hours of the day. And letting their felines roam around the neighbour in people's backyard, into flowers bed, chasing birds etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Providing a safe and happy environment for a pet to live in- adequate socialization, medical care & being responsible for the actions of your pet. This means cleaning up after your pet & ensuring it is safe around people & other animals. I think bylaw officers need more presence at off leash parks.
- Keeping your animal safe and cared for - regardless of behaviour and where you live
- Taking good care of any animal, providing food & warm accommodation on your own property. This includes picking up feces on your own property & when out walking in public areas.
- I prefer to use guardian and companion over the word "PET". i am my dogs guardian, ownership implies we can do whatever we want to the animal including mistreatment. I am responsible for giving my dog the best care and medical and live in my home as part of the family.
- Providing for the welfare of the animal. Minimizing the animal's impact on those around you (noise, smell, hygiene, etc.)
- "It means :
- -picking up after your pet
- -not leaving your pet unsupervised for long periods of time outside
- - only socializing your pet should they have received training for proper behaviour (I.e don't take an aggressive dog to the dog park).
- -staying up to date with all vaccinations"
- Taking care of your pet, and being a good neighbour
- Pickup the poops of the dogs even in winter time.
- I 100% agree with the 5 principles of the responsible pet ownership bylaws. To me it comes down to how well the animals are cared for physically, mentally, and legally. A responsible owner does not leave poop everywhere, let their animals kill wildlife, produce unwanted babies, etc.
- Being responsible in caring for your pet. Keeping cats indoors, spay/neutering your animals. Having well behaved dogs under your control at all times.
- Picking up after your pet to keep public areas clean. Making sure your pet is as well cared for as the rest of your family, if not better because they can't speak for themselves. Keeping pets leashed at all times unless in an off leash area. Being accountable for your pets actions towards others.
- It means: cleaning up after your dog while walking them. It means keeping them under control in the yard or on walks, so short leash if they want to dart out to another dog, or they go uts when they see another dog. Keeping the barking outside to a minimum. Not locked in a hot or freezing car.
- Pet owners that respect Animal Rights, follows the City of Calgary Bylaws and takes ownership of the animals actions.
- Cleaning up after them. Making sure my pet is fed and exercised and has a good life
- "It would be nice to see people getting a fine for not picking up their pets waste.
- My neighborhood is covered in feces"
- It means that owners assume social and financial responsibility for their pet in public locations the same way they would be responsible for a minor child's behaviour.
- Giving pets the same care and consideration you would give to any valued part of the family. Doing as much as possible to ensuring that your pet is not a negative impact on others.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- " -Citizens acting as stewards of the lives in our care.
- -Supporting pet owners so that they can provide for the physical and emotional needs of animals in urban spaces
- -Supporting healthy pet ownership for renters, unhoused populations and low SES groups not just homeowners"
- It means following the animal by-laws, respecting other's property when out with your pet in the community, and in general being accountable for the behavior and health and well being of your pet.
- "Keeping your pets safe and following the bylaws in place by the city.
- Dogs have to remain in the house or yard at all times and are not to roam free. If the city picks them up there is a significant fine. The same should be followed for cat owners. There are way more cats running free than dogs."
- Responsible ownership is three fold, what is good for the owner, the community and the dog. Unfortunately, many people think responsible has to do with the number of animals or the breed of animal. Responsible ownership starts with education
- Providing a safe and loving home. Responsible pet parents
- Looking after care, health and nourishment.
- it means taking good care of the pet, including feeding it properly, taking it to veterinary if it is sick or injured and not bothering other people.
- Treatment of animals and your community.
- I believe apartments should allow tenants to have pet cats as they are important for the well being of many people particularly seniors . Cats should be spayed or neutered regardless or the type of home they live in.
- Keeping your pets safe and properly cared for.
- Maintaining and promoting healthy and well balanced companion animals that integrate well into the community
- "Train dogs to not bark, not jump on people, keep dogs away from others as not everyone likes your pet even if it is friendly. Pick up your pets waste. Keep dogs on a leash.
- Barking dogs are the biggest annoyance."
- Not the government's business
- Common sense and courtesy! I see owner leave their dogs off leash all the time, thinking they are above the rules and they have the best trained dogs. Keep your dogs on leashes unless otherwise posted. The other obvious problem is not picking up after your dog in public parks.
- Taking care of any pet, providing them with love, food, shelter. Making sure they don't hurt/bite anyone, keeping them on a leash when not in an off leash area. Also picking up their feces and keeping a valid city license.
- I do not want to see pigeons and chickens all over the place. Bees ok, but only if they are well cared for and not affected with any type of hive diseases. I don't mind coyotes and bobcats being around. I wish Rottweilers and other dangerous dogs were not allowed in the city.
- Ensuring your pet is safe as well as other animals and people are kept safe.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A responsible pet owner is someone who ensures that the health, feeding and adequate shelter of their pet is provided. They will not abuse or hoards pets. They will respect others. in regards to managing pet behaviour such as soiling in other yards, running loose, barking or threatening behaviour.
- A). Heavy fines for people NOT picking up after their dogs. In the off leash in Woodbine it is disgusting and it is not little dogs- more like elephants! You cannot miss big dog poop! NO bicycles through off leash- they won't go slow and are so rude and abusive
- Ensuring my pet does not interfere with other people or their animals. Cats should not be allowed to roam freely outside and aggressive dogs should be tethered and completely under control
- Ensure the pet does not run free except in designated pet areas. Owner cleans up after the animal & pets do not allow pets to deficate on private property. Ensure animals are licensed, inoculated & trained to interact with other animals. Owners need to be educated on appropriate animal ownership.
- If you are a pet owner, you need to be as physically fit as your pet breed requires. It's not ok to let your dog run beside the car while you drive on the outskirts of the city or beside a park!
- Keeping animals in a way that doesn't cause harm to them, people, other creatures, or the spaces they use.
- Responsible pet ownership to me means that individuals are able to ensure that they are able to care and have control of their animal in a manner that does not cause others concern or issues. This is in their residence as well as open areas.
- Taking responsibility for their behavior and their mess.
- Caring for an animal in a responsible and respectful way within the community
- I WOULD LIKE TO SEE CAT OWNERS HELD MORE RESPONSIBLE WHEN THIER PETS ROAM OUT OF THIER YARD. THEY DEFICATE IN FLOWER BEDS AND VEGTABLE GARDENS, AS WELL AS COME INTO MY YARD AND DISTURB MY DOGS CAUSING THEM TO BARK AND BE STRESSED. I WOULD LIKE OPTIONS TO DEAL WITH A WANDERING CAT ON MY PROPERTY.
- "pets contained on owners property securely and safely or leashed in public
- owners should be responsible for the waste their pets produce, Damage done properties RE: repay/fix. No owner should have more than two pets at a time to prevent hording. Neutering/,spaying adoptions should not be so costly"
- Providing adequate housing and food. Fixing or preventing accidental babies. Making sure the pet is safe and safe to others. Providing love and affection for the pet
- Enjoying and caring for another sentient being as part of ones family. Ensuring that all needs of the pet are looked after, nourishment attention, training and doing so with attention and care for our neighbours.
- Not allowing their cats to roam around the neighbourhood and poop in my yard.
- Caring for pets, to keep them healthy asks safe, while also keeping people and other animals that come into contact with my pets safe.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No tethering. Mandatory microchipping and licensing of dogs and cat. The city to provide filled doggie waste bag dispensers and garbage cans at all dog parks. Extremely tough fines or jail for animal abuse. Investigate and enforce prolonged or excessive barking.
- Providing a safe and caring environment to a pet where it can thrive in all manners. To ensure that your pet is also not a nuisance to others in any way - noise, cleaning up after it etc...
- Keep dogs on leash at all times, except in designated off leash areas. This will ensure the safety of you, your dog, and others nearby.
- Not chaining pet up but keeping on the property. Have hours within dogs can bark without owners worrying about the city coming.
- Boyh animal and human having their needs met while being able to peacefully co-exist with neighbours. Cleaning up after pets is essential.
- Off leash areas should not be directly beside playgrounds. Dog feces on bike paths, side walks, and off leash areas should be picked up. Dogs that run up to children and challenge them should not be allowed in the park.
- It means that when irresponsible pet owners break laws...we do not need MORE laws. Those same people will not obey the new laws that every one that is responsible now have follow. Responsible pet owner means look after your animal and all that it does outside of your house.
- Being responsible for your pet's behavior; i.e., making sure your pet is not disturbing others, such as excessive barking, meowing, jumping on other people. Ensure you clean up your pet's waste and that they are on a leash in areas that are not designated off leash.
- Providing food, shelter, and medical care for your pet. Keeping your animals safe and keeping others safe from your animals
- Adequate food, water, bedding, toilet area obedience training, exercise, (1-2 daily walks) indoor play & handling, minimal barking (5 - 10 min. max) indoors or outdoors
- Caring for their needs and keeping them healthy and safe, spay/neuter, ensuring they are not causing problems for others.
- I do not agree with "outdoor cats". If they are your pet, they live in your home. If you let them out to do as they please, they are a strange animal that you have befriended and you might as well domesticate a skunk, beaver or coyote since there is such an increase in the wild population.
- Licensing pets is good. Continue with accessible training and focus on educating PEOPLE. Calgary should be MORE pet friendly. Pets are some considered children to some and they should have more opportunities to bring them out. More public areas should allow dogs.
- All I am going to say is this province is a scam allowing renters to charge fees because someone owns a pet. Disgusting.
- "Keeps their pet in their house if it makes noise - ie. does not leave it outside to bark, wail, screech..."
- Keeps their pet secured IN their yard (cats are the number one reason many natural and important wild birds are becoming endangered) (Vicious attack dogs in cages in yard) All dogs on leash."
- Care and commitment to your animals



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Knowing that just because your dog is "friendly", doesn't mean it can be off-leash in a leashed area. This causes a problem for other responsible owners. Owners need to be responsible for abiding by the laws.
- Responsibility and care for your animals. Making them part of your life.
- Not allowing your dog to hurt others. To protect your dog, cat, etc. from danger, knowing your surroundings. Not allowing pets to chase, attack, kill wildlife. Not dumping them, abandoning them and picking up after them. Know your surroundings and respect the natural areas by having them on-leash.
- Choosing the right animal for your lifestyle. Providing for all your pet's needs. Respecting other animals and people in public places (e.g. on-leash, in control, clean up after,)
- It means keeping off-leash areas clean and safe. Dog walkers should not be allowed to bring more than FOUR dogs off-leash unless licensed to do so. Individual citizens pay taxes AND keep parks clean and safe. Dog walking services do neither.
- That all pets in a household are looked after, have clean bedding and fed a healthy diet in addition to regular vet checks to ensure health.
- First than anything being responsible with my pet!
- A commitment to care for the needs of the pet for the length of its natural life. Ensuring your pet does not interfere with the normal enjoyment of life of others.
- I'd like to see fines enforced for people who purposely let their cats outside. My neighbour doesn't care. I told her we have a bylaw. So her cat goes all over my flower bed and around the outside. Also I'd like to see more from the city to enforce owners to get pet license for cats.
- Providing a good quality of life and care to your pet while taking reasonable actions to minimize their impact on others.
- Taking responsibility for my animals that they are well cared for and not a nuisance to my neighbors.
- Proper and responsible care of your pet while obeying city bylaws.
- It means I can access on-leash parks and off-leash areas, following the rules, and there is infrastructure to support these activities. For example, in both types of areas, the City would provide garbage cans to make it easy to dispose of dog poop.
- understanding the behaviour patterns that dogs have and learning to live with your dog. Sharing space with others that do or don't have dogs.
- Ensuring my pet has food, water, shelter and love as well as following current city bylaws, respecting fellow pet owners and those who are not fond of animals.
- Don't see anywhere else to put this, but dogs off-leash in non off-leash areas needs to be addressed. I have a dog that was attacked while on-leash in an on-leash area by a dog that was off-leash. This has changed her and now she is fearful reactive which is different than aggressive/vicious
- It means treat your pets like family. Take care of both their physical and mental health. It means a lot of time outdoors on walks, keeping them under control and away from any circumstances where they could be harmed or cause harm. And most importantly, pick up the poop!
- "Keeping pets under control at all times.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cleaning up after your pet
- Keeping your pet healthy with access to food, water and shelter
- Not allowing dogs to be kept outside, barking and disturbing others. Not matter the time of day."
- The owner of three dogs off-leash attacked me in Edworthy Park, which is connected to an off-leash area. Dogs should not be allowed in City parks to defecate and urinate where kids play. Owners are NOT cleaning up after their dogs.
- Owner behaviour: keeping dogs on leash, picking up droppings and PROPERLY disposing of them, eliminate ALL off-leash areas in public parks (owners don't obey signage) especially in Nose Hill Park. I have not visited that park in two years due to free-running dogs and dog crap on the walkways.
- Pet ownership to me means taking every available step to ensure the pet is happy and healthy. That means taking into serious consideration whether you are financially and logistically prepared for a pet, and extends to everything including behavior classes if necessary, good food, and vet care
- It means that I don't have to listen to others dogs barking all night and I am free from the smell of a kennel or run. It also means that the owners of pets control the numbers involved. Maintaining a good understanding of their neighbours feelings
- That your dog is under control at all times. You always pick up after your dog. you train your dog to be friendly. you respect the environment in which you walk your dog, you keep your dog inoculated against the common diseases.
- Caring for your pet; meeting veterinary, dietary and mental enrichment needs. Reducing human and pet negative interactions. Having pet under your control.
- Taking care of your pet to make sure their needs are met while also leaving your environment the way you found it.
- Family, responsibility, happiness, pride, and environmental stewardship.
- Doing what is good for your animals health and well being while being considerate of others
- Responsible pet ownership is someone who does activities with their dogs in a responsible way, ensuring their dog gets enough mental and physical enrichment, picking up after their dogs, taking them for continued education, and keeping them safe and not loose.
- You are "Liable", rather than guidance
- Providing a safe, nurturing home for your pet. Up to date vaccinations. Clean up after them when on a walk or in the dog park. Fenced yard if you let them out.
- Ensuring that the pet is well taken care of, and that the pet doesn't negatively impact anyone
- We do not believe that retail establishments should sell pets that have been bred for re-sale. Pet-related stores should partner with registered not-for-profit organizations to host rescued animals currently up for adoption. This would benefit the business and the organization.
- Having a companion and ensuring proper care for them
- This means that the pet is part of your family and enjoys all the benefits that entails. Warmth, love, food, medical needs, stability, old age care and responsible life decisions. It is a commitment and a privilege to have a pet.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 3
- Taking care of your pet and ensuring the health, comfort, and happiness of your pet as well as safety of the public.
- Animals, not matter the number, are well looked after, loved, provided clean and safe environment. All animals be registered with the city.
- Being a proper parent is expected, whether animal or human. Understandably, not every parent is competent, and such bylaws need to be in place, but bylaw officers need to exercise greater tolerance for responsible owners who are not causing anyone issues, aka, chasing someone down for petty ticket
- Making sure your animal has proper living conditions and following the bylaws set in place. (also picking up after your dog whenever walking)
- Love, care, security. Groomed, fed, trained. Shelter, exercise, socialized.
- It means NOT!!!! Putting a cap on responsible dog owners that is just stupid don't do it
- Providing food, water, safety, shelter and LOVE.
- "Leashing your dog when appropriate. Picking up and disposing of dog waste no matter where you are (off leash and on leash areas). Announcing to on comers with dogs if your dog is friendly or not, especially in off leash areas.
- Having more off leash areas in NW ."
- Picking up after your pet, not abandoning your pet, not letting it roam the neighbourhood.
- Responsible pet ownership means caring for my animals, keeping them safe on a leash out in public and completely under control at dog parks.
- Having a loving and safe home for the animal(s)
- Someone who has control or their pets and is able to provide for them all that they need. Proper food shelter and the ability to cover vet bills
- The same as having children, be it one or 12. No 2 owner is the same and the good pet owners should not be penalized for the bad ones.
- That pet behavior is controlled by the pet owner such that they are not dangerous or disruptive to the quality of life of their neighbours or fellow Calgarians.
- Always cleaning up after your pet, and not letting them jump up on or bother others. Essentially having no negative impact on your community.
- Feeding and caring for the pet to ensure it's health and happiness and to control the pet from disturbing others as much as possible.
- Meaning kept in good health,annual checkups,well exercised and registered with the city!
- "-pick up after your pet, unless the pet has a diarrhea, but don't punish the owner if it's impossible to clean it all.
- -it is ok for a dog to bark if someone approaches your property.
- -If kids can scream for hours playing in the backyard (YES, it happens), why can't a dog bark occasionally?"



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Having the financial, physical and emotional stability to safely care for animals on a day to day basis . Providing them with all of the basic necessities and more, while not being intrusive or bothersome to neighbors and the community.
- It's means not buying pets from retail shops or breeders. There's so many animals at the humane society/ AARCS that you can rescue. Breeders should be shut down and made illegal. Let's adopt the animals that need a home first.
- Walking your dogs on a leash. A lot of people walk their dogs off leash in Dover making an excuses that it's okay because their dog is friendly. My dog is reactive and i have a hard time taking her for a walk because of this. Also, picking up your dogs poop.
- When walking pets on-leash or off, they must be controlled. Responsible pet owners remove their pets' waste and dispose of it properly.
- Having friendly animals that are well behaved. I'm good with a dog being off leash as it is well behaved.
- Taking care of the animal and making sure your pet doesn't disturb people or other animals (including wildlife)
- "Retail establishments should not be allowed to sell pets that have been bred for re-sale.
- Rabbits, Cats, and dogs should not be allowed to roam around without supervision."
- Providing an animal with the best care possible, free from harm and pain as well as keeping those interacting with the animal safe.
- preventative actions and care to animals in the owners care that provides safety and health for the animals, owners and general public.
- To me responsible pet ownership means providing a safe and happy home for your pet, taking nessecary measures to ensure their health and safety. For dogs, having a properly maintained fence so the dog can't escape, proper training so they don't jump up on strangers. For cats, keeping them indoors.
- Owners that provide all basic needs for their pets (Food, Shelter, Water, emotional support/training/wellbeing), and ensure their pets are good pet-citizens.
- "Meeting the 5 freedoms:
- Freedom from hunger and thirst (food and water) All animals deserve access to clean water and a well-balanced, nutritious diet. ...
- Freedom from discomfort (shelter) ...
- Freedom from pain, injury and disease (medical care) ...
- Freedom to express normal behaviour (exercise) ."
- I agree with the way it is currently worded in the bylaw.
- "Picking up after your dog, not letting cats roam off your property.
- Not letting dogs bark all day/ night.
- Keeping dogs on a leash in areas that are not designated off leash."



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Be careful putting too many rules in place because of a vocal minority. Would you rather have animals sitting at home lonely all day without interaction, because you have put too many rules on dog walkers and their business.
- Meeting the five freedoms for your pets
- Being a responsible pet owner means one has done their research into the animal, understands their needs, and has made a time and financial commitment. Commitment to providing the best home environment, structure and discipline, and overall health and well-being. Discipline, exercise, and love.
- Feral cats should be acknowledged. We should support T-N-R (trap-neuter-return) initiatives to humanely manage feral cat populations. Also do not believe that retail establishments should sell pets that have been bred for re-sale. Also should be options for low income to get animals fixed.
- Providing for all of your pets needs and safety for the duration. If it's life.
- Taking proper care of your pets. Take to vets and do everything required to ensure their well being.
- Educating yourself on how to best care for and train your animal, interact appropriately and respectfully with fellow owners
- Ensuring your pets are properly looked after and are loved, and that you are also mindful of other's around you. Cleaning up after your pet always, not just on walks. Your neighbors don't like seeing or smelling yards full of poop. Not allowing your dogs to bark constantly and indoor cats only.
- "License and register your pets
- Permanent identification
- Encourage spay and neuter for all dogs who are not involved in an ethical/reputable and responsible breeding program.
- Savings plans, or pet insurance as a backup plan for pet emergencies
- Train dogs using humane methods"
- Owners who take responsibility for the physical and mental wellbeing for both their pets and other people's pets who might interact with them
- I want stiffer penalties for not picking up dog poop. If you're too lazy to do that, I think you shouldn't own a dog. But removing dogs from lazy owners aside, something needs to be done about all the dog crap I am forced to deal with. (I work outdoors)
- Responsible pet ownership means taking care that your animals do not interfere with other's enjoyment of life, including picking up their poo, not letting them bark too much, etc. Also keeping your pet safe for their own enjoyment of life, ie keeping them safe within your yard or on leash.
- Responsible pet ownership to me means treating your animals as family. As you would for your children, you care for them in all aspects from feeding, to exercising, to cleaning up after them, to loving them and providing them with a safe and secure home life. Registering them and respecting the law.
- People that care for their animals financially, and those who recognize which pets are good with others and provide safe environment for their pet as well as others
- having safe, respectful animals who can co-exist with humans in an urban setting.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Providing the best possible living conditions for your animals, and be attentive to their physical and emotional needs.
- I think responsible pet ownership means all animals on the property are properly fed, cleaned up after and free from illness, or the illness is being treated.
- "It means caring for your pet emotionally and financially.
- I can have 1 pet and not provide the above. Or I can have 10 and do it."
- Ensuring your pet has food, clean water and a happy healthy environment. Picking up after them and disposing of waste properly. Proper training so that there are no unnecessary accidents, ie; getting out of the yard/running away, friendly encounters with others while out for walks, etc.
- It means making sure that we humanely treat animals, provide clean enclosures/yards, access to high-quality food and water, and that they have shelter, shade, or heat in different weather conditions.
- Good training, respecting others, picking up after your pet
- A person who genuinely cares for their animals. Provides food, shelter, exercise, a clean comfortable living environment, medical care and does not allow animals to be a nuisance to the neighbors with noise or smell.
- A responsible pet owner is someone who treats their pets humanely and lovingly and provides them with proper care. They also ensure that their pets are not a disturbance or a danger to other people.
- Two things. Acting responsibly towards your pet and providing for its physical and emotional needs including getting it fixed and vaccinated and ensuring it cannot leave your property unless on a leash. Secondly, not causing a nuisance to neighbours such as having a barking or aggressive dog.
- Owning a pet that is licensed or microchipped, up to date on shots, well trained and taking responsibility for the pet's behaviour and cleaning up after it.
- Nuisance barking rules should be vastly strengthened similar to other jurisdictions. Our neighbourhood is being ruined by an owner whose dogs bark frequently throughout the day. When politely asked to quiet the dogs the owner said "What are you going to do about it? Huh? What?".
- Taking responsibility for all care and training of your pets
- Nuisance barking rules should be based on unambiguous testable criteria. This lets owners clearly know what's expected of them, and lets annoyed neighbours know their rights. This would prevent conflicts before they occur and make our residential areas more livable.
- Nuisance barking should be defined as more than 10 minutes continuously, or 15 minutes cumulatively within a one hour period, anytime, affecting multiple neighbours. And any barking between 10 PM and 7 AM, even for a few seconds, is an unacceptable nuisance (same as a lawnmower at 2:30 AM!).
- People caring for their animals providing food, water, shelter, training. Cleaning up after their dogs and ensuring good recall in all situations. Not allowing dogs to harass people or wildlife.
- Providing our companions with the care and support needed to have healthy happy lives
- It means that pet owners understand bylaws and adhere to them. That they maintain all yearly vaccinations, sterilize their pets, provide parasitic medication, use positive reinforcement force free trainers and walks and use equipment that doesn't hurt their animals!

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Making sure that the pets, and all the people and property they come into contact with are safe, happy, and healthy.
- Owners that look after their dogs by exercising them everyday, picking up their dogs waste when walking them, and making sure if their dog is aggressive they muzzle the dog when on walks or at dog parks
- No pet or pet owner should negatively impact any other person. This means through noise (barking dogs, roosters), safety (dogs off lease running towards you), annoyance (pigeons next door) or any other impact. An owner can have a pet, but only if it doesn't affect anyone else.
- Providing a caring home for a pet. Ensuring a safe environment for a pet. Cleaning up after pets (dogs on walks etc)
- Cleaning up after all pets. Keeping them safe. Cats stay inside.
- Providing a caring home for the pet. Ensuring a safe environment for the pet. Cleaning up after the pet (dogs on walks etc).
- Responsible pet ownership means that a person takes on the responsibility to meet the needs of the dogs they have just as you would for children. They need to be properly fed, bathed, trained and socialized.
- Always have good shelter, food and water available. Not acquire a pet if you can't afford basic spay/neuter and vet care, emergent care if needed. Have enough time to spend with the pet. Not leaving it alone for long periods of time. Protect the pet and other people from each other.
- That pets are for life and should not be treated as disposable.
- "Non dog owners do not feel threatened by off leash dogs. An off leash dog running up to someone and making contact with them should not be allowed.
- There needs to be a limit to the number of dogs allowed off leash at any time (2)
- There are too many off leash areas in the city."
- Cleaning up after your animals, not letting them free roam, providing proper care (food and vet)
- Caring for the needs of my animal, food, water, shelter, medical, spay or neuter, walk on leash for public safety and clean up after it for public health.
- Picking up feces. Ensuring my dogs recall is good so he doesn't chase bikes or wildlife Yearly vaccinations Walks daily.
- Respect for both the household pet and the guardians of the same. Household pets require a guardian and never an owner!
- Dogs who behave that is owner's have them PROPERLY trained...no jumping, growling,etc to strangers. Pet dogs should not be permitted to be the alpha dog in a household. Pet owners MUST clean up after their pets... even in their own yards... max 1 dog per household...we have too many animals
- Not owning a pitbull
- Cleaning up after your pets, cleaning up after your pets, and cleaning up after your pets! Not leaving messes in the middle of sidewalks. Not allowing them to destroy others' property. Not buying a pet "because they're cute" and then failing to train and care for them properly.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Caring, responsible, understanding towards pets
- Loving and taking care of your pets, which includes feeding, exercising and cleaning up after them.
- Having the time and financial ability to care for animals that provides them a safe, loving and healthy home. Having a pet that does not negatively affect others who live near the pet either by animals vocalizing, excrement or unleashed behavior.
- We have a dog walker, and that service is essential to having a happy relaxed pet. She walks around 8 dogs and always is responsible with them. If the city decreases the number of dogs that can be walked by one person, she will not be able to afford providing this service. I support dog walkers!
- Care of pet proper feeding, water, vet care, walking, picking up after pet. Taking care the pet does not adversely affect others by barking, urinating (cat) on others property. Having control of pet, if prone to jump or bite (muzzle).
- Making sure your pets are licensed and well taken care of
- It is not a term that can be applied to many pet owners. Seeing and experiencing more dogs and cats running free, excrement in parks and private property and way more people owning dogs. Without enforcement or deterrents problems will keep getting worse.
- Providing an appropriate level of care, which includes not only food and shelter, but mental fulfillment and companionship, where applicable, to any and all non-human beings under one's care. Consideration for the community and nearby residents should also be taken into account.
- What it means to me to be a responsible pet owner is providing food, love and any/ all medical needs for your pet. They need a loving home that provides all these things but not only these things. They need walks, car rides, vet visits, family bonding, cozy beds, toys and much much more.
- It means someone who licenses, loves, walks and takes care of their animals. Someone who teaches them patience and calm and knows what their pet needs
- Not allowing your cat to roam the neighborhood. Domestic cats are responsible for decimating our bird populations. City needs to enforce the rules on this.
- Having your dog licences fixed trained and well cared for
- Having safe space for my dog to run around and exercise. However this city has no off leash parks in the south which makes it very impossible to properly exercise your dog when you don't have car access. I do drive and find it very difficult, expensive, & time consuming to have to drive to Southland
- Love and family
- Properly caring for your animals/meeting their needs and respecting your neighbours/neighbourhood
- Cleaning up after your dog. Auburn Bay dog park is bad. I've watched owners watch their dogs poop and just walk away. Street Lights would also be nice in dog parks due to winter darkness. Licensing for animals should be the same no matter animals age,sex or reproduction status. Licensing for sellers
- keep dogs on leash when off your property and keep cats on your property
- As long as the owner/guardian of the pets is capable of feeding, grooming, walking and being responsible for their healthcare it shouldn't matter how many pets are in the home.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- "If the two neighbours on each side of permission in writing, any Calgarian should be allowed 2 chickens, within 500 feet - 4 chickens, within 1000 feet - 6 chickens but no roosters. A volunteer committee that has chickens should handle complaints from others.
- Kill all magpies by any means."
- Ensuring your pets are loved and cared for. Meeting their needs and providing them with positive interactions. Ensuring pets who interact with other pets or frequent public areas are spayed and neutered.
- Attending to the care of your animals, not neglecting your commitment to keep them safe, healthy, and thriving, for the ultimate benefit of animals and others in the community.
- Not having your pet interfere with my space. I don't enjoy hearing dogs barking at any time continuously, nor letting your dog crap and you not picking up after it. Pet ownership should not mean that my quality of life is negatively effected. Sorry very disheartening , I love animals not the owners.
- The complete care of a pet that you choose to bring into your family. Food, water, love, care, attention, proper licensing, adequate living areas, grooming, training, and more.
- That you are responsible for your dogs actions.
- A person who licenses their dogs and cats, and has enough resources to give those and any other pets adequate food, shelter, attention and basic health care.
- A responsible pet owner cares for their pet at every stage. Food, shelter, basic vet care (shots, annuals, preventative medications) and emergency care as is affordable for the owner. It means providing the best life and ending for your pet. It means ensuring the safety for your pet and others.
- No free roaming, as it is unsafe. Not supporting breeders. Providing the best care, no matter the cost. Never abandoning a pet. Not taking on a pet if you cannot afford quality food, vet checkups, spaying/neutering, & medical costs if they arise. No abuse or neglect. Loving/treating them like family
- Pets who are licensed, exercised, well taken care of, sociable, and healthy.
- Providing care and love to our pets. Making sure they have everything they need and treat them with respect and love
- "Having your animal fixed before the age of 2.5. Cleaning up
- It's messes in public spaces. Showing respect to other animal owners who may have a different opinion than you."
- The bylaw needs to be more strict. The fines need to be higher for everyone, especially for barking dogs. All need to be spayed and neutered except for breeding purposes. If a dog or cat attacks & causes irreparable harm, they should be put down.
- safety of the animal and other people. Vaccinate you petr and keep them healthy. Make sure they don't invade other people's property.
- Getting dogs trained, not lwavng poop on the side of the trails. Take good care of your pets.
- "Shots, licensed, neutered, food water. It depends. Take them to the vet, mandatory checkups.
- Price of licensing shots, vets is a big barrier.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be a law about people that abuse their animals - there should be more of a punishment."
- Common sense. With the bylaw, try taking tagged dogs home if they are caught in their community.
- It took a long time to get in the building. I'm in and they don't allow pets.
- Taking care of pets. Owners should know what their responsibilities are so others are safe.
- Good life for people and pets. If you have a pet, you have to be more alert.
- You should know how to take care of the animal, and to love it. If you have it. Also, cats are the dangerous animal, it can kill the man. It can eat birds, snakes, etc.
- Like it when authorities rescue mistreated animals. Good to educate people about taking care of animals.
- Were not allowed to have pets in harm reduction housing. I think it might help people deal with their addictions to have pets. But it might be tough for some people to take care of them.
- When businesses or people dispose of dog food, make sure it's not done in a public space that would encourage lots of dogs to congregate in the area as this is intimidating
- Follow the rules of the city. Pick up after your dog. It was good that they helped me license my cat through affordable housing, Sometimes it's too expensive.
- "- Taking care of the health and well being of your pet
 - - shots/physical activity/fed & watered/exercise
 - - responsible for poop
 - - knowledge of rules and bylaws"
- "Dogs.
 - - picking up after dogs. Give out tickets.
 - - Some dogs need muzzles, pitbulls.
 - - children are in danger from this type of dog"
 - - only have birds in registered bird feeders. So you know where they are, and where other animals may be attracted
- Walking & feeding them. To watch them. Give them attention & train them.
- "- All dogs should be supervised even in the backyard
 - - not let dogs bark constantly in the backyard for no reason or state the length, time of day
 - - dogs should not charge people from behind the fence
 - - Dog that didn't bite but is vicious should be muzzled"
- I think of a person that treats their pet well and lets their pet out instead of it being inside watching TV. Respecting its space. Take the dog outside so it doesn't pee in the house because it's not the dog's fault
- "Duties - Take care of pet, teach it to not attack, pick up after pets
- Love your pet - don't treat bad
- Get tag (license) - microchip tattoo - if lost try to find"
- cleaning after your pet. making sure your pet is on leash in required areas. being aware of the bylaws regarding pet ownership.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I honestly think that there should be a limit on how many dogs one person can have in the city as are they getting the proper care? Exercise or coupled up because one person can't physically have the time and money to properly care for a bunch of dogs, just my opinion
- Providing appropriate food, shelter, medical care and love. It shouldn't matter how many pets in household as long as they are well cared for. Having pets microchipped and registered, making sure any lost pet can be easily returned.
- The current "Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw" needs to have added how to safely transport your pet as per Canadian Veterinary Association policy as well as how to safely use off-leash parks.
- Being responsible for all aspects of pet care and safety. This includes both inside and outside the home.
- Clean, well kept yards and houses. No animals left outside to fend for themselves. No barking dogs at 3am because you think they should be left out.
- Responsible pet ownership means no animals are allowed to wander at random (must be in a fenced yard or on a leash if outside). Your animal's feces should be picked up (even a cat's) and if an animal is outside and yowling constantly and the owner isn't home then if complaints received a fine issued.
- Caring for, and loving whatever animals you choose to have.
- Providing a safe, healthy environment for a pet to thrive with quality of life.
- Taking care of the health and welfare of your animal, and ensuring you abide by city bylaws (i.e. not allowing your animals to run loose).
- Providing a loving safe home for my pets. Training my pet so that he/she can be around others safely and educate people on proper ways to approach pets.
- Being able to humanly care for and love the animals you own while having minimal or no negative impact on others
- Being educated on the animal you own. Respecting other pet owners. following the rules.
- Responsible pet ownership is about providing appropriate care, love, compassion and supervision for our beloved companion animals. One person could be an irresponsible pet owner with a single pet and another person could be a responsible owner with 5+ pets. !! ☐ An animal limit bylaw won't prev
- Taking care of an animal's needs - physically, mentally - and being a considerate neighbor and community member.
- Pets are cared for and are impact neighbours as little as realistically possible (ie: it is not realistic that a dog will never bark but constant barking when left alone is not responsible). The same rules should go for urban beekeeping and small scale operations of chickens.
- Responsible pet ownership means living in harmony with nature and your neighbors. However, there should still be off-leash areas (dogs must have a space to run) and opportunities for raising one or two female only chickens.
- Cleaning up poo in the parks and keeping your dogs away from leashed animals



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I look after and control my pet so that it is not a danger to itself or other animals or people. I always pick up after my pet and dispose of the waste. I use dog parks to walk my pet off leash when in the city. I provide a safe and secure yard and house where my pet can live.
- Pick up after your animal, keep on leash except in off leash areas. No wandering cats. Acceptable minimum behavior in off leash areas, no attacks, promiscuity, wandering out of touch with owner.
- Respect the animals in public spaces. Provide a safe environment to care for them. Pet Owners need to respect other pet owners.
- That animals are fed, watered, have a clean, safe home and are loved and cared for. In the case where animals require exercise, to ensure they receive same. Licensing and medical care include vaccines and other shots, as well as spay/neuter when required.
- Responsible pet ownership means your pet is family for their life, and should be treated as such. Taken care of, fed, not left outside, not allowed to get sick and not treated or old and abandoned. Loved and treated as you would any other members of your family.
- Ensuring dogs are always on a leash when in public areas, animals are always cleaned up after and cats are not allowed to roam free. Ensuring your animals vaccinations are always up to date and dealing with any known behaviour issues either through training or avoiding problem situations.
- Enjoying your pet, keeping it healthy and safe, and not imposing on other people.
- "Pick up & dispose of poop
- Keep on leash even in their own yard if it is not fenced
- Ensure your dog will not bite/injure/threaten/attack anyone/animal anywhere including in their own unfenced property
- Ensure your dog does not bark/disturb anyone"
- Being responsible for the care, wellbeing and safety of your animal (and others) for the duration of its life and abiding by all related bylaws/rules related to the ownership of that animal.
- It means meeting all of the needs of your pet such as food, water, exercise, love, respect, feeling safe and having a comfortable sleeping spot. It also means training and socializing your pet so they are great around people, other animals and a joy to be in the neighborhood.
- Having a dog on leash on residential sidewalks, cleaning up after your dog, and knowing your dog well enough if you should cross the street if another dog or small child is walking towards you on the same side.
- "Pet owners taking good care of their pets without causing problems for their neighbors. A reasonably sized city department to catch and work with lost / abandoned animals.
- What does it not mean? The city charging more fees - i.e. licencing cats that are exclusively indoor cats."
- Let pet lead a human & quality life & access medical care when needed. Don't leave pet alone at home for very long period of time for causing stress & anxiety and doing something unpredictable. Understand the ownership is the pet's whole world. Without owner, the pet losses all, even his/her life.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Providing a healthy and safe environment for your pet. Making sure you tend to your pets health and nutrition needs. Having a way to identify your pet if it goes missing so that it can be returned. Making sure you have control of your pet when it goes outdoors for exercise - does not harm anyone.
- Responsible pet ownership means dedication towards those animals, accountability, ensuring you put the effort in to train the animal, cleaning up after your pet and respecting bylaws
- Taking care of your pet by keeping it indoors, leashed or monitored if it is outdoors. Cats should not be outside unattended.
- "Taking care of the animal first-vaccinations, check-ups with vets, proper nutrition.
- Being good neighbours and not letting your pet wander, bark too much, etc."
- Providing a physical and mentally good lifestyle for dogs. Making choices to care for them, they are my property but also part of my family. I am responsible for keeping them healthy, working on their behaviors to be safe canines interacting with society.
- They should pick up feces when the pet is let out in the back yard immediately and not just once a day. Also they should take dogs for walks or to a off lease area so that they get exercise not kept in the house. There should be a limit of one dog per house and not used for breeding in residence.
- Picking up after your dog & not leaving bags on the ground(bikers) .keeping control of your dogs ,especially little yappers . I feel the dog waste is from people who just drive up in their cars (silver springs)
- It means providing a safe, secure, happy home to animals that are legally allowed in Calgary. It means providing mental stimulation as well as physical stimulation/exercise to your pet, in order to fulfill their needs, based on what type of pet they are.
- Respecting others so your pet doesn't impact them - clean up after your pet and don't let them jump up on, or otherwise interfere with others.
- Being responsible for the mental and physical wellbeing of your pet.
- Someone who feeds, loves, exercises and provides all the basic needs a pet needs
- People cleaning up after their dogs. Dogs on leash. In Silverado, a lot of people leave them off-leash on the walkway beside the environmental reserve
- Looking after pets in humane manner with safety to public, owner and pets (in this order) of utmost consideration
- "Caring for your pet inc.
- Including food, housing, vet visiting"
- Like one of your family members
- Being the best and most loving parent to my fur baby. Taking care of them to the best of my abilities and affordability. Making sure they have a good life by taking them to dog parks and ensure they are safe there. Treating them as an integral part of the family. All the love and cuddles!
- Not be allowed to let pets urinate on front steps in both summer & winter. The yellow snow at my front steps looks disgusting & in the summer do not want to be walking on it & bringing it into my house. Not be allowed to dump poop bags in my garbage bin or left on my steps or thrown over fence.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- providing adequate nutritional, medical and emotional care to the pet while obeying laws and respecting the varied feelings toward animals by neighbours and the general public
- taking measures and owning responsibility for ensuring pets are managed, however there needs to be appropriate dialogue allowed and sharing of information so the owner can address issues appropriately
- I believe it means to care and provide for your pets properly, to give them a great quality of life, keep them safe, and prevent them from causing problems for other people and animals
- Good neighbors, not leaving a dog outside barking, cleaning up after pooping, respecting non-dog parks, recreational fields
- Providing a safe and happy life for a domesticated animal while not inconveniencing your neighbours.
- Ensuring your pet does not infringe on another persons life. Keeping your animal away from others, keeping your animal quiet and clean.
- Cats and dogs ONLY
- Responsible pet ownership to me looks similar to having children, you would need to provide all the necessities of life as well as be responsible for their actions. I don't understand how I would get a ticket walking my well behaved dog off leash under supervision but people can have their cats run
- Providing all the necessities of life (and some) such as food, water, shelter, vet care, grooming, etc. Fixing at an appropriate age. Not allowing pets to become obese.
- Pet owners are not policing their pets or following the bylaws ie. many times dogs are out unleashed, cats are spraying in my yard, and dog poop is still left on my lawn and in the kiddie park!! Owners need to realize not everyone likes dogs and cats. And bylaws are LAWS, not suggestions.
- owner understands the care needed to to keep their pets healthy and happy. Included vaccination, walks, toys, whatever is needed. It is also understanding the nature of their pets and ensuring they are keeping people and other pets safe. Large or small.
- It means taking care of my pet. Someone who wants and cares what happens to then. It means not locking them up because some people complain. Allowing them to be what they are with in reason. Responsible people license their pets.
- Someone taking responsibility or an act of ownership over there own dog e.i fed, taken care of, health wise and physical wise.
- "Do not live in multi level dwellings with furry pets when the laundry is shared. Keep all pet food in sealed containers and litter boxes cleaned and disposed properly in sealed bags in large garbage bins.
- Do not use your neighbors yard as a litter box. Walk all dogs daily and twice daily"
- Being considerate of the impact of your pet onto others in the community and their property. Not imposing fear into those who's path you cross, noise from barking, and pet waste (including urine) onto private property.
- Being accountable for your pet's actions and behaviors. Having your pet under control at all times (on a leash when not in an off-leash park), cleaning up after your pet, ensuring dogs are not threatening to people (growling, even when on the owners property; barking).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- You should allow cats to roam free to cut down the over population of mice voles and other vermin. As spring arrives the mice come out and there,s lots of them. So use commonsense and allow cats to roam, in London Englind it is against the law not to allow cats to roam as they keep the vermin down!!
- Providing, food, shelter and healthcare for pets. Providing love, gentleness and understanding of who and what felines are and what their purpose is for. We all know that felines catch vermin, they are plague preventers therefore common sense dictates that they should be unencumbered and outside.
- Dog owners knowing the Dog Owner Bylaws and needing to sign affidavit to agreement before new dog licence granted!
- This means not letting your cat run at large, cleaning up after your dog on public or private property, training your animal and making sure they are neutered or spayed.
- ensuring that your pets are properly cared for/looked after. This includes proper training and making sure they are safe. They should not be allowed to roam freely to cause damage to property or people. Dogs can not be required to be silent, but they should not be allowed to bark for long periods
- Making sure your pets are cared for and that they don't negatively impact people, other animals or the environment.
- Both taking care of your pet by practising common sense and by treating the areas you walk your pet with respect. Unfortunately too many Calgarians do not pick up after their dogs.
- Providing adequate food, water, shelter, human companionship, exercise, medical/dental care and keeping one's pet safe from harm by not putting them in situations that put them in jeopardy of getting injured/killed or under stress that may cause them to inflict injury/death.
- "Caring for your animal's needs. Preventing damage or other problems on neighbours' properties.
- Protecting people and wildlife from your pets. Cleaning up after your pet. Responding to concerns about noise complaints (e.g. barking)."
- Responsible pet ownership to me means keeping dogs on leashes especially near playgrounds, schools and pathways. It also means cleaning up after your animals, pet off leash does not mean you don't clean up. If you have a dangerous or aggressive breed then it should always be on a leash.
- Holding dog owners responsible for their own dogs. Stop punishing the responsible law abiding dog owners to appease the minority. The only input you need or require is from not dog owners, not citizens who do not own them!
- Doing everything to ensure that animals and humans coexist in a positive way that is equally beneficial to people and the animals.
- All your activities as a pet owner should be focused on the health and well being of your pet.
- Treating ALL your pets as if they are part of your family, and not allowing them to be unsupervised out of your yard/property, and to not allow them to be a nuisance or their waste a nuisance.
- Being legally responsible to provide pets needs and safety. Ensuring all pets are leashed when not on your property. Protecting feral cats but making sure cat owners do not let their cats roam free. Increasing fines to 'irresponsible' owners. Easier to call in stray cats (by name, not address).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- "Spat or neuter your pet.
- Pets on leash in leash zone, and under control.
- Tags for pets"
- License for all pets,Picking up after your pets in your yard and else where.
- NOT LEAVING THEM OUT IN THE COLD ALL WINTER . AND CLEANING UP AFTER DAMN DOGS . Respecting animals like people becaus epeople keel abuseing them and putting then in dumpsters . And the poulce DO NOTHING. REALSE THESE NAMES OF ABUSERS TO THE PUBLIC.
- Loving your pet and providing them with food, exercise and support. Picking up their poop and NOT allowing cats to roam outside.
- Taking care of your pet according to the law
- Taking excellent care of the animals that are dependent on you, as if they were your children.
- "Being responsible for the pets.
- Ensure: people pick up after theor dog. dog don't bite/ run at large/chase people or other things.
- Being responsible for their care, food, shelter, medical care etc.
- Being responsible and know how many dogs can be affordable, financially and house space and medical."
- Owning and raising animals responsibly
- It means looking after the health and well being of the animals in your care and ensuring they are not a nuisance to anyone.
- ensuring that your pet is safe at all times. This means that you are not walking a dog off-leash that could be reactive or does not have proper recall. It also means that you are picking up after them and making sure they have a chip or tattoo and also is registered with the city
- I think there needs a limit on how many dogs a person can have. For example our neighbor has 8 dogs in a tiny 2 bedroom apartment. I think somebody with the bylaw should always be present at off and on leash parks, that way we can limit dog fights and/or negligent owners.
- Providing essentials for pets and following bylaws.
- having your dog or dogs licensed, loved,well taken care of.
- Taking steps to make sure that pets and owners are safe.
- Ensuring that your pet is compliment and not a burden to the community.
- "Loving your animals with all your heart.
- Giving them a home, food, exercise and medical needs.
- If you have the space, money and time for your pets there SHOULD NOT be a limit of amount you can have.
- If I had an acreage and money I would have plenty!! I should be allowed to!!"
- Caring for their well being, providing food and shelter and a safe environment for them and being considerate of others when out of the home with them.
- Having your pet registered. Having a safe environment at dog parks. And cleaning up after your dogs in public



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Caring for your pet & ensuing you're a considerate neighbour.
- It means to care for an animal(s) in the right manner . To take care of your animal , and have the proper necessities to care for it. To give that animal all the love that you can give it and make sure you can accommodate the needs of said animal(s). To make sure they are always well fed and cared
- When outside, Keeping your dog/s under control and Cleaning up poop. The pet owner must ensure each pet gets love and individual attention, and sanitary living conditions I.e. no hoarding of pets. Pets are sterilized. Cats are kept indoors or allowed in outdoor catios, not free roaming.
- Caring for my pet in a way that positively impacts the community.
- As a non-pet owner living in Garrison Woods, I have about 40-60 dogs a day doing their business on my lawn. I spend on average \$100/year reseeding my lawn. My wish would be that dog owners are not allowed to use other people's lawns/yards to do their business.
- When you adopt a pet, you commit to loving, caring and being responsible for it's health and welfare for it's entire natural life.
- Tending to all the needs of your pets in a safe and secure manner
- Respecting the animals life and health, respecting other's pets, knowing, following and abiding by the bylaws, respecting neighbors' areas and public areas, reporting mistreated animals, reporting people who are not following bylaws
- To not allow a dog to be off-lease in an on-lease area. Many times I have seen people go to school grounds & allow their dogs to run free. Not fair to us who abide by the law and never allow a dog to go off lease in an on-lease area.
- A responsible pet owner is some whom exercises their dog and follows the rules of off leash and on leash areas. A responsible dog owner loves their dog like it's family, because they are.
- Responsible Pet Ownership is providing at a minimum the appropriate level of care for that particular animal. This includes food, shelter, veterinary care as well as not allowing the animal to be a nuisance to the neighbourhood and wild areas/wildlife.
- Ensuring the health and safety of your pet, and also cleaning up after it
- Getting the poop cleaned up in your yard and making sure your dogs don't bark as much outside and making sure your dogs are feed and loved
- "license pet
- train pet
- pick up after pet
- take care of pets needs responsibly (food, health & medical, grooming, etc.)
- socialise pet
- ensure safety of pet & of people and other animals exposed to pet
- city/province fine & jail people and confiscate animals who are abused
- limit # of animals in the home"



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Spay/Neuter, licensed, microchipped, not a nuisance to people in public areas, not at large (people let their cats out to roam neighborhoods), dogs under handler control at all times whether on leash or off leash, picking up after one's dog/dogs.
- I agree with the City's responsible pet ownership 5 principles. I believe we should be allowed some farm type animals such as Pot Belly Pigs, and chickens - max 12. Dogs should be limited to 4 or 6 with no tolerance for barking. Cats same 4-6 and not free roaming although that is hard to do!
- Having your animal happy and healthy. Not being a nuisance to others.
- Investment in my mental health
- Ensuring the safety of my pets and the community when we are out around the city
- Why is there no focus area on city dwellers having livestock in their back yard such as chickens? The last three international viruses started with livestock (pigs), birds (SARS), MERS and now COVID19. No livestock (pigs, chickens, horses, "pets" or egg production where large populations exist
- Providing food, shelter and love to your pet. Making sure your pet is not aggressive and harm others.
- meet your pets medial needs, keep them safe by keeping them in their yards not running the streets, have them chipped and feed good wholesome food, get pets neutered and spayed, and have a city license.
- It means having "control" of your animal at all times. I have had unfortunate encounters in "Off leash" zones being harassed by larger off leash dogs and the owners are so far away or are just unable to control it. "Off Leash" should only be allowed in designated off leash parks, and no where else.
- Taking good care of pets while also respecting neighbours and property
- Taking full accountability for your dog and anything associated with your dog. Disposing of waste, training, being considerate neighbours, feeding properly, caring properly, not allowing the dog to be unattended outside all day long.
- Dogs are intrusive, messy, and come breeds can be dangerous if not controlled. Cats I have no issue with. They are unobtrusive when let outside on their own and can help to keep rodent populations in check.
- Keeping your pet and the public safe
- Exactly what it says - the owner being responsible. Some owners spend more time on their cell phones than they do watching their dog pooping on my front lawn.
- A pet owner who is taking well care of it's pets and their pets are not problem for others around.
- Being aware of where your animals are, keeping them healthy and fed
- working in the best interests of the animal and the humans among whom it lives
- Ensuring pet owners have appropriate and active licenses for their animals. Ensuring pet owners are capable (proof of appropriate living/property standards) for the species as well as the number of species on within a person's possession and property at any given time. Courtesy to neighbours.
- When you take an animal into your household, you have to take care of - feed, house, vet, exercise - and value the animal. Since we live in a city, the animal should be a good citizen.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- personal accountability for training and controlling your animal regardless of breed and size. picking up after your pet and not placing your waste in other peoples bins. prioritizing your pets health and safety at home and in public.
- 1) taking care of physical needs: food, shelter, exercise. 2) taking care of exercise needs as well as picking up poo after them, 3) controlling behaviour...so if you have a dangerous breed dog...muzzling them when out in public, keeping all dogs on leash, not letting your cats wander etc.
- Following bylaws and ensuring a happy, health pet
- It means that you are responsible to feed and care for the animal. To clean up after it. If it is sick you take it to the vet. Keep its shots up to date. To keep its licence up to date in case it happens to get out.
- "NOT these things:
- We are distressed daily by barking dogs from across the street. Requests for consideration are ignored.
- When I am out walking and am rushed at, barked at and attacked by dogs, while their owners call uselessly or say ""he is friendly, he won't hurt you"" I am deeply disturbed."
- Means being responsible just like you would for a child. A roof over their head, food, love, training to ensure the are the best pet they can be. Pick up after them, don't let them run loose and be all round good pet citizens. If you limit , yiu need to grandfather pets that are already well cared f
- Properly taking care of the basic needs of a pet including food, shelter and veterinary care. Also, respecting public and private spaces with regards to your pet. Cleaning up after them in public, keeping dogs on leash in wildlife sensitive areas, not letting your cat roam or kill wildlife.
- That those who take on pet ownership accept the responsibility to care for, feed, exercise and socialize their pet(s).
- Ensuring the City of Calgary is actually enforcing the responsible pet ownership bylaw.
- Keeping my animal within my yard/home, and not allowed to roam free. Training animal where possible for good behaviors.
- Responsible pet ownership to me, means the ability to care for domesticated pets, safely and in a loving home with their owners and in harmony with neighbors. Responsible pet ownership means the ability to licence your pet, spay & neuter, prevent your pets from running at large or being a nuisance
- Licensed pet, always on a leash, always picked up after, never allowed in play parks or near schools, owner knows the laws for where pets can be, take into consideration that many of us do not like dogs or are afraid of dogs and do not like to have them near us in stores.
- Have loving kind animals on your family
- Keeping pets heathy, safe, happy and fulfilled.
- People are responsible for proper care and understanding your pets needs. To ensure they are met to the best of your ability. To be respectful of others who may not feel the same passion for animals by cleaning up after your pet; ensuring that your pet is not disturbing anyone.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That all animals in a persons care are provided with adequate food, water and INDOOR shelter. Animals should not be forced to live outside. Pets should be provided with adequate exercise and mental stimulation as well as regular veterinary care.
- Keeping control of your pet at all times. Providing safe and warm/ cool space in the home as a part of the family. Providing proper food and medical attention for the pet and not allowing the pet to disturb neighbours.
- Caring for your pet properly. Making sure your pet is properly trained & socialized so it doesn't become a nuisance. Making sure your pet is safe and healthy with regular vet visits and adequate exercise. Licensing & microchipping your pet. Spay & neuter.
- Taking care of all your pets needs, food, exercise, healthcare. Proper stimulation, keeping them safe. They must have access to food and shelter at all times and keep the area they play in clean. Provide them with love and attention.
- To care for your animal(s) with proper nutrition, Training to be a Good Neighbor to People and Dogs and to clean up after them.
- Responsible pet ownership means control. Whether that's controlling the animals verbal behaviors, roaming, or sexual behaviors. Its all about the person having control over their pet. Numbers don't matter if control, and of course proper care are taken care of.
- Tax pet owners. \$400 a year, per pet dog. \$100 year per pet cat. The dog urine in my local public park is disgusting! You can't walk 10 ft, without piss everywhere! People do not need pets. It's a city luxury.
- Properly caring for your pet and cleaning up after them, particularly in public spaces. Not allowing them to bark for hours, at any time of day. Calgarians have become very inconsiderate of their neighbors.
- That you have the sufficient time and resources to take care of your animal so their health and standard of life is secured. All pets have different needs and it's the owners obligation to research if the pet is a good fit for its family BEFORE buying it!
- Providing care for your pet while respecting others
- Ensuring that your pet is happy, healthy and safe at all times. I also believe that all owners need to pass a basic training before owning an animal and then proceed to special training WITH their animal. I recognize that the majority of "incidents" are caused by ignorant pet owners.
- Ensuring that pets are well taken care of, and that they are a welcome part of the community.
- Always taking care of your pet(s) and making them a priority
- Picking up after dog's poop, keeping dog/cat out of neighbors' yards. Keeping dog on leash around others who don't have pets.
- Responsible pet ownership is the oversight and healthy care (ie physical, emotional, etc) for an animal(s) in an individual'a care.
- managing pets in the city, including cats and dogs
- It means being respectful of your neighbour in terms of noise and smell. It means if you are in public spaces you pick up after your dog. It means that your pet is under control at all times, it is well trained and has "good manners".



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responsible pet ownership means following the rules outside of the home. Keep you dog on a leash in leashed areas, clean up the poop (especially on sidewalks), when you let the dog outside the house, do not let it bark incessantly! (This is a big pet peeve), let people know if you can pet them.
- Making sure pet owners keep their pets safe as well as others. Respecting non pet owners and city parks
- Not impinging on the rights, quiet, peace and privacy of neighbors. Also owners must pick up and clean up the feces of their pets instead of leaving it laying on the boulevards, sidewalks and trails with better enforcement and greater penalties for those who do not clean up after their pets.
- Being responsible for what your pet does, controlling their behavior and picking up their POOP!!
- Being aware and responsible to your pet, your neighbours, and the environment.
- Caring for dog or cat family members. Ensuring safety of pet as well as health needs. Save home for them.
- Responsible pet owners take their own means and capabilities (time, financial, future plans etc.) into consideration before ever taking on an animal. After that, they ensure their pet is vaccinated, chipped and fixed. They will do all they can to give them a happy, healthy and secure life.
- Provide fully for the animals in your care while being a responsible neighbor, citizen, etc. Meaning cleaning up after the pet, limited barking and nuisance behaviors, controlling odors and pests, not allowing them to run at large, providing proper vet care, etc
- Providing the necessary care to a pet's health and well-being ie neutering, vaccinations and caring for them when they are sick. Providing a safe and proper environment for an animal taking into consideration the specific and natural needs of an animal & not modifying a pet to suit human needs.
- It means to be responsible and preserving nature. I like people who cares for bees and putting their time and money towards all wellbeing of neighbors and nature around. They making our planet healthy and beautiful.
- I am a pet owner and animal lover. Responsible pet ownership means taking care of the animals and also respecting your neighbours right not to be negatively impacted by my choices to keep animals.
- It means keeping pets safe, happy, and from disturbing others. Dog owners need to keep dogs under control so they don't threaten pedestrians. There should be a mandatory course on obedience training for dog owners so they can control their pets.
- Caring for your pet in a way that doesn't interfere with other people.
- Having your pet licensed, tattooed and if it is a cat, keep them indoors where they are safe.
- Taking great care of the animals in your home.
- Creating a safe, healthy, and stimulating environment for your pet.
- "Responsible Pet ownership means a pet owner who is committed to three things.
 - 1. the care and well being of their pet,
 - 2. the consideration of our neighbours, both pet and non pet owners



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 3. civic responsibility to respect and care take the facilities provided for the enjoyment of pet ownership."
- I don't currently have a cat, but a cat license for an indoor cat is just a cash grab. The odds of my indoor cat imposing itself on anyone is near zero, and I shouldn't have to pay a fee just to have a cat. Responsible ownership is indoor/leashed, neutered, well fed, vet care, and loved.
- Keeping your cat in it's own yard. Keeping your dog in control on a leash everywhere unless posted as off leash. Not allowing your dog to bark for more than 5 minutes when outside.
- taking good care of your pet and making sure your dog is well behaved with people and other animals.
- Providing food, shelter, training, exercise and love
- Providing a safe and healthy environment that provides your pet the love and care of your pets.
- Licensing, vetting and assuming responsibility for your pet including respecting the off leash and on leash rules. If you have an aggressive dog take necessary precautions to monitor the dog, provide a safe environment where the dog can't escape.
- Cleaning up after your dog in public places, not letting your dog rush up to other dogs, respecting leash-only areas. Keeping cats on your own property, not putting poison out for rodents. Also, not letting your dog bark and bark and bark. Understanding pet bylaws such as leash laws on pathways.
- Owners should keep their pets under control. Even in off-leash areas, owners are responsible for the actions of their pets.
- Being a responsible pet owner means your providing a loving, healthy home. Up to date on vaccines, registered, fed, exercised, trained
- A pet is any animals a person chooses to own. Responsible is being knowledgeable and providing the necessary requirement for the pet/s to live a long, full, happy, healthy life with their human.
- It means not leaving your dog outside to bark yap and howl to its hearts content at anything that moves. Dog disturbance is the number one noise pollutant on this city. But we seem more concerned about cats having licences.
- "Providing safe loving homes for dogs and cats and other companion animals. Affordable veterinary care (spay and neuter) Lost animals (strays) given a chance to reunite with owners.
- Suitable homes for rescues..trap and neuter programs"
- It means proper care and training of one's pet. Obligation of pet owner to educate themselves and understand "control". It does NOT mean dogs can't bark and act like dogs. Care includes proper grooming and veterinary care as to not incur pain or suffering on the pet.
- # 1 on my list would have to be spay or neuter your animals .
- Pets are taken care of. People clean up after them. People protect others from their dogs.
- Means providing care for pets of my choice.
- Your pet will not bother other residents near by. Things like barking etc will be controlled and trained. If you own a dog you will train it properly to respond to commands etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Have those using the off leash parks pay a fee to do so. The parks are disgusting. The fee can cover cleanup costs etc. Build it into the dog licensing fee.
- Keeping your pet safe and well cared for as well as happy and well loved. I do not think it is responsible to crate an animal unless it is a VERY minimal amount of time and for good reason such as travel. Also not allowing the pet to disturb or harm neighbours.
- Providing the basic essentials necessary for life including access to ample fresh food and water, shelter and exercise on a daily basis. It means a minimum standard of training to allow for safe, controlled interactions with other people/animals in outdoor spaces. No pets roaming unsupervised.
- Providing a loving home, appropriate exercise (i.e. taking a dog out for walks and not just leaving them in a backyard), socialization training for good behaviour, and ensuring your dog(s) are not a noise nuisance. Keeping your dogs healthy and regularly vaccinated, dewormed, etc.
- As pet owners our responsibilities are twofold: to provide a safe, enriching life to our animals and to respect and keep safe our neighbours.
- "Dogs on leash when off property.
- Constant continuous barking controlled by owner or LARGE fine.
- Dogs not left out all night"
- I just want to say I understand why people said not to bother with this and they were right. It is only a way to see how to increase revenue and that's it. Maybe changing some by-laws like cats can save money compared to complaints and hours wasted. I know you will just increase things instead.
- Stop lying. Your 'so-called' experts that testified backyard chickens cause Avian Flu were WRONG. The WHO said there has never been one case of the virus from backyard chickens, only factory farm chickens. Can send the response from WHO if the facts are needed.
- Keeping your pet healthy, safe and loved as well as being mindful of the health and safety of other people and pets.
- Do not allow your pet to disturb your neighbours or neighbourhood. Do not leave droppings behind in public places. Control your pet's noise and aggression. Do not let pets wander while unattended. Have pets neutered. If you can't manage these simple things, you should not have a pet in the City.
- It means caring for your dogs, as if it were your own child, such as feeding, grooming, exercising. making sure your dog is healthy and cared for physically and emotionally, that they are vet checked and, making sure their vaccines are up to date. As well as licensing your dog with the city.
- Pet owners that love their animal in all aspects including providing food, water, shelter, healthcare. Owners that clean up after their dogs and abide by Calgary's bylaws.
- I feel that Responsible pet ownership means to have the homes pets licensed, well fed, safe environment, humans being able to understand body language, and not in danger. I also feel that there should not be a limitation on how many (dogs) owned, but some regulations like home checks done by city.
- It means the animal is properly cared for meaning health care, grooming, not neglected, loved, fed, housed. Just like a responsible parent would care for a child.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A person who provides a safe and loving home for a pet. The pet relies on you 100% for food, water and a safe and comfortable place to live, and you must provide all of that without question. Without your support that pet will not survive.
- In my opinion, responsible pet ownership means following city by-laws regarding pets and providing them with all the necessities like food, water, shelter, medical care and ensuring their wellbeing and safety.
- Taking care of my pets so that they have food and shelter along with attention, exercise and regular vet care.
- providing proper love, food, water, shelter, enrichment and quality of life for any creature in your care
- Taking care of pet and making sure it is safe.
- The City of Calgary enforcing it's own by-laws and not having their 311 operators go off a phone script. It's a shame the people pay for this service through licensing fees, yet Animals Services and phone operators pass the buck to other agencies. Please train your staff accordingly.
- "Taking ownership and responsibility for the actions of your pet.
- Before acquiring a pet, realize the life span of the pet and be committed and capable of financially responsible for that pet for its life time."
- It's means taking care of them, keeping track of them and cleaning up after them at all times. Just like having a child.
- Providing for the physical, mental & medical needs of our companions, with as little negative impact to our neighbours & their pets as possible.
- looking after the dog , so the dog is enjoying a good life and behaves very well.
- Including your pet in a happy and healthy lifestyle that provides physical and emotional benefits to both owners and pets. Providing the necessities for healthy life of the pet.
- Follow bylaws and care for your pet
- Have your dog decently trained, ensure your dog is well socialise, ALWAYS pick up after your dog, have your dog on a leash at all times (except in officially designated offleash areas), treat your dog with respect , keep him well, healthy and loved.
- Providing pets with the means to meet their needs and thrive.
- number of large dogs in a tiny yard and never cleaning the yard or stopping the constant whining and barking. The owners consider the dogs well looked after but leave dogs out and then go to work for the day. Discussed with owner and get nowhere as they are "allowed" to have dogs.
- Responsible pet ownership means to me- picking up after your pet, Obeying on leash park and playground rules for pets. Would love to have small off leash dog parks as well. (under 30 pounds).
- Dogs on leash unless in dog park, scoop it everywhere, increase fines for infractions, cats inside only
- It means being responsible, and being an adult. It means taking the best possible care of the creatures you have. And if you can't take proper care of them, then you need to take the necessary measures to ensure they are well taken care of - even if it's not by you.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stiffer fines for dog attacks, and owners who don't pick up their pets' shit. The registration fees are ridiculously high and because of that I refuse to register my dog. Not paying 70 dollars a year, and thus I haven't paid a single penny in 7 years. If it was 10-15 dollars I would pay.
- Keeping dogs quiet, clean and indoors, well fed and taken care of
- It means following the city's bylaws when caring for your animals. Also ensuring that before getting any animals you fully understand what is required to care for them well (walks, food, following bylaws, pick up poop, vaccines, grooming etc).
- To me, it means: taking care of the physical & mental wellbeing of the pet, ensuring the pet is trained, well exercised & healthy. When out in public, the properly tagged pet is under the control of the owner (on/off leash) & the owner picks up after their pets. S/he is fully responsible for the pet.
- All of Calgary's off-leash parks make it incredibly easy to follow and abide by the Pet Ownership Bylaw. It is fantastic how many off-leash parks the city has.
- Responsible pet ownership - take responsibility for your pet; including behaviour, socialization, leashed at all times when not at off-leash parks, clean up after your pet - even in laneways and particularly on other persons' lawns, lastly - proper edict and behaviour of pets at off-leash parks.
- It means having a limited number of pets in your home (perhaps max of 3 or 4) unless you are a licensed breeder. Our neighbour has 13 dogs in a small home/yard & ALSO illegally breeds puppies. Court twice and no change! Impacts everyone who has to smell & listen to these poor dogs bark & cry.
- There are people in my vicinity that leave their dog out most days and into the late evening. The dog barks at every car or passer by. This noise impacts hundreds if not thousands of homes in the area. I believe you should not be able to leave your dog outside barking in this manner.
- Keeping pets and people safe.
- It means that pet owners actually know and follow the bylaws concerning pet ownership. I would like to see pet owners keep their animals within their own yards and not allow or put them out to roam neighbourhoods. I find it abhorrent that owners allow their pets to use my yard as their toilets.
- cleaning up after your dog makes a mess, keeping animals on leashes.
- Responsible pet ownership means that in addition to meeting a pet's basic needs the pets are also well socialized and have basic obedience skills.
- Not leaving your dog outside to bark at every moving thing for hours during the day - 10 to twelve barks every few minutes every hour as someone or a vehicle passes AND NOT TELLING THE DOG TO BE QUIET.
- Responsible pet ownership means that a person is in control of their animal at all times. Provides proper training when needed. Cleans up after their animal. Provides proper care and attention for their animal's well-being.
- It means picking up after your dog on walks and in the dog parks. It means controlling your dog at all times and if you know it is aggressive either keeping it on a leash or muzzling it.
- Of the five principles listed 1, 3, and 4 are important. Forcing people to spay or neuter pets is cruel and barbaric; this needs to be the owner's decision and not be the basis for increased or decreased licence fees. Cats roaming at large creating a nuisance need to have far stiffer penalties!!!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- To love and protect pets. When it is very hot or cold, allow us to bring our pets into stores, buildings and restaurant patios so we can do errands -otherwise we can't because we can't leave pets in cars. Allowing pets more access gives people more enjoyment & they can be our companions more.
- Take your neighbours into account. They have a right to the quiet enjoyment of their property too. Ownership of any farm animals should require a process similar to a development permit, with adjacent neighbours needing to be consulted (What if there are allergies or fears of specific animals)
- "Keeping a pet in a manner that keeps the pet healthy and safe while respecting the rights of both pet owners and non pet people.
- I expect owners to license their animals and clean up after them. If their animals are aggressive, they should not be allowed into an off leash area. Limit dogs to 6."
- The ability to provide a pet with a good life, where they are cared for and provided all the necessities of life including food, shelter, medical attention and appropriate exercise.
- kjshfkjshfkjdsfjk
- Being a responsible pet owner means that you need to provide things for your pets, like neuter or spay, giving your pets animal tags or keeping them up to date on their vet visits. You should also make sure that if you have a vicious or unfriendly dog, you shouldn't take them to social areas.
- Taking care of animals. Making a connection with them and giving them a home
- It means that you care for your pet, Feed, Let outside, give attention, etc.
- Responsible pet ownership mean to me. It means to me that you care for your pets. You give them food. Pick up after them and give them tages.
- on how to treat you pets
- Im Not Really a pet fan but if i got one, where would it go if it got lost
- walks the dog,picks up there STINKY WET TASTY poop.
- taking good care of them and make sure that they are happy and healthy
- That you care for your pet, Love your pet and would care if they ran away, it means that you take full ownership if your pet does something bad.
- do not let ur dogs out with out a leash unless in a backyard with tall fence.
- Responsible ownership means to me that we all need to keep our dogs and pets on their leash, and pick up after their pets.
- ensuring the health and wellbeing of animals in your care while enjoying the benefits of animal ownership on your property, ensuring animals in my care do not negatively impact the wellbeing of others (cleaning up waste/mitigate odour), not limit others' ability to enjoy public spaces we all share.
- I think it means to me that people should unleash there pets sometimes to let them roam around far to tun around more then just going around there owner
- It means the utmost consideration for the health and safety of your pet. I'm particularly passionate about keeping cats indoors. It's already bylaw but more people need to understand how irresponsible it is to allow their cats to free roam.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Always keeping your pet in control when walking your dog, so if your dog should be on leash and if at a off leash park you should know you dog is safe to be off leash and able to control with commands.
- It means creating a life for your pet that fulfills them mentally and physically with high quality food and proper training to promote a calm and balanced animal while being respectful of other pet owners and their varying needs.
- Addition to family.
- - picking up after your dog, walking your dog. if you have a dog walking company- 8-10 dog max per walk. I have seen dog walkers have 14 dogs in one walk with a baby in a stroller, no problem. what happens if 1/14 dogs get in a fight. How are you going to control 13 other dogs w/ a stroller & baby?
- Cleaning up after your animal and taking care of their needs - not leaving them in a yard/tied up all the time. Behaviour/manners training if you're letting them in off leash parks. Using the color coded leashes if they do have behaviour problems. Keeping shots up to date.
- it means you dont go out and get a pitbull type dog and bring it to a residential neighborhood.
- License, training, taking responsibility for the pet's behaviour and getting training/help before and after issues arise
- Caring for a pet in a manner that has the best interests of that animal at heart. This would incl diet, housing etc. Also involves respecting other people and their safety and themselves and their pets as well.
- Taking proper care of your animals and with due consideration of your neighbors
- Not leaving your dogs out barking for hours on end.
- "Ensuring your pets are spayed or neutered and vaccinated and licensed.
- Ensuring your pets are properly socialized and trained.
- Ensuring you only keep pets that you can actually afford to care for with food, water and vet care etc. People are adopting pets and not able to pay their vet bills."
- Dogs don't lunge onto strangers. Some dont train big dogs and then these big dogs lunge ansmd scare the passerbys. That is very scary for others nearby and could result in injury for elderly and children.
- Treating animals with dignity and respect. Doing all one can to make sure they are taken care of to the best of their ability.
- Never allowing your pets to infringe on your neighbours rights to peace and quiet. No barking dogs in particular. Penalties for barking or biting should be more significant
- Ensuring your pet is healthy, safe and cared for.
- Responsible pet ownership means caring about your pets, feeding them, walking them, not letting them out during -30C and not letting them pee or poo on (and damage) your neighbours' (private) lawn.
- Responsible pet ownership means a lot of things to me. Such as: Being able to financially afford the pet including insurance and additional pet care if needed, having the time to spend with a pet, having the space for a pet, having a safe environment, loving the pet and taking the pet to the vet.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Providing my pet with a safe and happy environment, ensuring that I have the means to provide my pet with love
- I am a citizen of Thunder Bay Ontario. This also came up in our city. Our Mayors opinion was that animals are some people's family and we do not limit how many children you have.
- Having your pet vaccinated. Cared for. Licensed.
- Caring for them. Training them. Cleaning up after them.
- Someone who has a pet, and provides the basic necessities to keep the pet healthy and taken care of.
- Keeping pets healthy which includes not having too many, having them sterilized, taking them to the vet for regular check ups, and keeping them indoors or under the control of the owner/handler (ie: dog walker). Training from an early age.
- No dogs in green spaces. They pee through my chain link fence and poop 1 foot away. Cochrane limits distance to property to 5 meters. I want to feel comfortable in my back yard and house and not look out my window, while eating, and see a dog turn his butt around and poop. Birds are chased away.
- Training your pet well. Meeting it's every needs. Taking care of that pet even if it has special needs. Ensuring you do not abandon it somewhere. Ensuring the pet could never get lost. Ensuring a space in which the pet cannot be harmed. Ensuring the pet has the necessary space. Etc.
- We have a bike path running between the backyards of houses. Children use this path to get to school buses, seniors from the home for exercise and many people use the path for walking (including dogs). There are 4 yards with dogs that charge and bark at everyone. This is not responsible ownership.
- "Not allowing your cat to roam the neighbourhood. Like dogs, cats need to be leashed and with their owners.
- Cats or dogs, owners need to clean up after their pets. While out on walks, but also in their own yards. Don't leave poop sitting for days/weeks/months. Clean it up!"
- Responsible pet owners live with their animals. They enjoy the interaction and company all the time not just when it is convenient. They feed them well clean up after them at home in the yard and out in public. they enjoy them to the limit
- Paying licensing, yearly vet checks and immunizations, extra visits if required.
- mostly the 5 areas you have already got. I live in Riverbend where there are multiple dogs (I have 4) I am amazed of how many people walk the streets and the parks with their dogs and don't pick up their mess. I also have a good relationship with my neighbours to ensure mine are not annoying them.
- Keeping pets from disturbing others. That means keeping cats out of others gardens, keeping dogs from barking (excessively - we have a neighbour with a non-stop barker). I means keeping pets under control when walking and cleaning up after them, And zero tolerance for running loose.
- Keeping our pets healthy and working with the behavior so they can co-exist with other pets and people in our neighborhood. Obtaining pets from local rescues who need homes rather than purchasing pets from unsanctioned pet breeding businesses.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responsible pet ownership means protecting and maintaining the physical and psychological well-being of your pet. This means ensuring your pet is safe, under your control, registered if necessary and not at risk of harming itself or harming/disturbing other people and their property.
- to provide a healthy happy environment for all your pets.
- Finished the questionnaire but no place for input???? Off leashes are fine but do not need more policies. One thing that can be done if there is an incident (exchange pet licence tag numbers and call the city and the city can evaluate the incident)
- Maintaining control over your animal while out in public, looking after their wellbeing and cleaning up after them.
- meeting the needs of your pet. no pets should be allowed to be left outside for extended amounts of time.
- To care for the pets needs while not impacting the natural environment. Cats should not be allowed to roam free.
- Following the Bylaws and training your pet to listen and obey your commands
- Responsible pet ownership to me means: 1) picking up after your dog, 2) don't let your dog chase other people, cyclists and wildlife, 3) not walking more than 2 dogs, (I've been chased a cyclist, harassed by dogs as a pedestrian. I am terrified that I will get hurt one of these days.) senior citizen
- Owning and appropriately caring for a pet that is suited to my lifestyle and living environment. Providing quality food, shelter, training, attention and exercise in safe and stimulating spaces.
- Obeying bylaw regarding leashes. Having respect for your neighbours in regard to barking dogs.the shoreline along the bow river is not off leash everywhere. Off leash areas should be outlined when purchasing license
- Doing the right thing so pets, people and wildlife are safe.
- Not letting the purple elephant and the awful city counsel go on a POWER TRIP and try to limit how many dogs people can have.
- Responsible pet ownership means that I take full responsibility for the actions of my dog and how they effect others..
- Keeping ALL dogs on leashes unless in an off-leash park, pick up after your dog, and please, please please, do something about barking dogs...This is one area that dog owners have little regard for, when their dogs bark all day when left alone, or early in the morning and late at night.
- It means taking the responsibility for the life of a living, breathing creature. You need to provide the best possible life for an animal in your care.
- "The Laws as they stand are not ensuring pets are taken care of responsibly. Instead, they seem to seek to punish animals for their natural behaviour. I have emailed the city about this previously and I expect to see more moral laws.
- Language such as nuisance animals is barbaric!"
- Taking the time to educate yourself on animal behaviour and pet owner responsibilities before getting a pet (or immediately after).
- Ensuring your pet is in good health and has a safe environment to live in.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ensure that the pet is provided with a safe, prosocial, and happy home
- Responsible pet owners license their dogs. Vet checks, exercise, grooming, nutrition are all important.
- Pick up after your pet. Having your pet on a leash at all times unless in a designated off-leash area. Have your pet under control when in public areas. Dogs should not be allowed in playground areas or school fields. Pets should be licensed, socialized, spayed/neutered & receive appropriate care.
- To not have loud barking dogs left unattended outside
- keeping your animal under control, within your property limits if unaccompanied, all shots, pick-up after your pet (dog or cat).
- Spay/neuter should be mandatory for registered pets! Retail establishments should not be able to sell animals! They should partner with shelters and rescues to host adoptable animals. Feral cats should be acknowledged and protected - The City should support Trap Neuter Release initiatives.
- The commitment and accountability to take good care of one's pet, including provision of shelter, food, healthcare, training, exercise, and love.
- "Common sense and courtesy.
- Spay / neuter
- Regular vet visits for health
- ID tags, obedience training
- Make your home pet proof to keep pets safe and feed them properly (weight control)
- Regular exercise, but pick up after your pooch
- Socialize them so they don't scare people/other pets"
- "1. Owners of all dogs should be required to take them on a 12 hour socialization course at a registered humane society (or similar). This should be recorded as a part of their licence process.
- 2. There should be a way of uploading photographs of dogs who are not on leash to report their owners"
- It means enjoying your pet and caring for its health without causing harm to other people or pets or to the natural environment
- Cleaning up after your pet; not letting pets roam freely (including cats); train pets; regular vet visits to ensure health.
- Owners being responsible for their pet, but also communities taking collective responsibility for our animals and our public spaces (for example, off leash areas) and interactions with wildlife. I appreciate the city has a strong reputation for responsible pet ownership.
- Understand all municipal bylaws BEFORE owning a pet then following the bylaws, cleaning up after the pet in public areas, researching the right pet before purchasing, being mature enough to understand when they are unable to care properly for the pet and to turn it over so no harm is done.
- Following the bylaws. Too many times I witness irresponsible pet owners leaving dog feces behind. Dogs in parks, dogs on pathways. Enforce the damn bylaws already
- I think it's well past time that cats be licenced and not allowed to roam freely. I think cats should be governed exactly the same as dogs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- protecting your pet and also protecting people from your pet - if it's aggressive. Also - being responsible to clean up after your dog and not bother others with your pet
- Sticking up for your family members when their city places unfair and bias restrictions based on other's dislike of our chosen family.
- Picking up after your dog on your property and when taking it for a walk. Keep cats in your yard and not letting it roam everywhere. Bring your pets indoors during the winter and at night. Limit barking. Press charges for those that cause animal cruelty of any kind including keeping the pets outside
- It means that pet owners ensure their pets are cared for in the best possible way. It also means that they obey all city bylaws relating to pet ownership.
- Ensure you animals are in good mental and body health or are being treated for any issues . Pets are out of harms ways, exercised , loved , cared for and is treated as the dogs wish to.. so run if they want to run sleep if they want to . but always in a safe caring environment.
- Caring for the pets you have, keeping them healthy and safe.
- Making sure your pet is under control and that you are picking up after it.
- As a responsible dog owner I have noticed a huge increase in the number of people NOT picking up after their pet. Often times pet owners will bag their dogs poop and leave it off the path. We have had to stop walking in many off leash areas because of this. I think more enforcement is needed.
- To me, responsible pet ownership means having your dog under control, especially on the walking and bike pathways. There is nothing worse than dogs jumping on you, running in front of you, or nipping at you while walking, running, or cycling. Dog owners need to understand dogs need to be in control
- Clean up after your pet; keep dogs on leash when walking on bike paths; dogs with any history of aggressive behaviour toward other dogs or people must be kept on leash
- We have seen over the last decades that animals in China that live in residents backyards and market have transported deadly diseases to humans. Therefore we should only allow pets in Calgary to be dogs and cats. I moved to the city to get away from other animals. Don't allow other pets. Also Noise
- "Keeping control of your dog. I have been attacked 3 times while riding my bike on Nose Hill Park over the last few years, totally unacceptable.
- Owners still not picking up dog waste."
- It means the onus of the pet, and its behaviour, is ultimately on the owner.
- Let us have chickens and bees within the city limits, please!
- It means that pets are trained and not taken advantage of. People should be required to train their dogs if they are going to own one and shouldn't be allowed to leave their cats outside due to the amount of birds and other wildlife they kill.
- I am a foster parent at the Calgary Humane Society. All animals should be registered at the day they are purchased, force to be chipped or tattooed. This way when the animal (f.ex.bunny) gets abandoned/ lost it is easy to find the owner and either penalize or safely return. PENALTIES and FEES!!!
- of neighbors and fellow residents.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- "Licensing your pets and ensuring proper vaccines are maintained.
- I also think the City should not mix offleash parks with bicycle paths. It's dangerous for everyone. Bikes often go too fast and animals can't get out of the way in time"
- picking up your dog's poop. There is too much dog poop on the empty lot directly across from my residence of 4315-75 St. NW, Calgary, AB (Bowness) left by people littering, thinking the lot is owned by City of Calgary and these people are negligent and hazardous.
- " -caring for the emotional and physical needs of an animal in your care
- - making sure your pet is not interfering with others freedom to move around the community/not interfering with others
- - ensuring you have the resources to care for the animal
- - cleaning up behind your pet"
- It means ensuring safety for your dog and other dogs as well as making sure people around your pet are safe.
- It means meeting the social, emotional, and physical needs of my pet while ensuring that they are not creating problems for anyone else.
- Taking care of the animal(s) in your care and being held responsible/accountable for the impact the animal(s) have on other people, animals, and the environment.
- Keeping your pet healthy and physically active (off leash dog parks are great for this) while ensuring every person and domesticated animal is safe with my pet's interactions with them.
- It means that if you exercise your right to owning a pet that you will also exercise all of the responsibilities. Failure to be responsible must be treated as abuse."
- "Following the rules and regulations, having control of my pet at all times, picking up after it
- Responsible pet ownership is a stewardship by ALL residents in a city of more dependent species. Though some may choose to take on this stewardship personally (the pet owners), all contribute to creating a healthy & peaceful environment (re cleanliness and designation of parks, interaction).
- Keeping the number of pets in a household to a manageable level (2 max); keeping pets under control - no barking, always on a leash, and adhering to bylaws that prohibit dogs from school yards, sports fields, playgrounds, etc. in order to keep those spaces safe for children.
- Taking care of your pet by providing necessities of life, comfort and respect while respecting those around you by allowing neighbours/ strangers/ visitors to live and move about unaffected by your pet.
- Monitoring and recognizing when animals are having behavior issues. In off-leash dog parks, I see owners let their dogs be aggressive towards other dogs and do not remove them from the situation. Or if the dog is nervous, the owners get upset at other owners when the other dogs are simply playing.
- A responsible pet owner is one that looks after the welfare of the pet(s) providing a comfortable quality of life, while also respecting neighbors, public population and property. This respect includes pet noise, smell, waste, trespassing, and use on public/private property.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I took the time to read the "responsible pet ownership bylaw", it sound pretty good to me. The only thing I wish is that more of the "off leash" areas were totally fence. Dogs are like little children when they are playing. I get it, with the economy the way it is, put it on a list for the future
- Doing what is required to give you pet a happy, healthy life, while limiting impacts to fellow Calgarians.
- People with pets enjoy them and people without pets don't need to deal with them; ie no need to clean up after them or chase them out of my yard.
- Caring for your pets, ensuring your pets are fully vetted, ensuring your pets are licensed, and sharing your pets are happy
- People properly caring for and providing for their pets
- Any noise or smell that my pet makes will not leave my space (rented or owned) & create a nuisance for my neighbors. My pet will never run at large. I will not keep a pet that shows aggression towards people or other pets. I will license, micro-chip, & vaccinate my pet, & produce evidence of same
- As I understand, pets should be owned by individuals who are engaged and fully committed to train their pets to be an asset to pet ownership and and not reflect negative influences and/ or hostile attitudes instilled by pet owners on their pets. Often, pets take the blame for pet owners' motives.
- Keeping my animals healthy and happy
- To me, it's holding one self accountable for the care and wellbeing of pet, providing enrichment/positive quality of life for pet, proper training for positive behaviors and preventing any disturbances/damages pet may cause. And to be respectful as a person in general, clean up after pet.
- Providing for the needs of the pet (food, love, vet, training) and proper socialization. Respectful of people and other animals in public spaces and parks, by picking up after your dog and good recall.
- It means everything as a pet owner myself.
- Allow chickens!
- "If you dog shows ANY signs of running up to people or aggression to other dogs they should not be allowed off leash in any park/pathway, whether is on leash or off.
- I have a dog and don't go to specific locations because of a few inconsiderate dog owners."
- "Providing adequate food, water, shelter for the pet. As well as providing health care (vet visits etc...) and grooming to make sure pets are clean and healthy.
- When letting pets stay outside, making sure there is appropriate shelter provided."
- Provide animal with good quality of life and health standards.
- My pets are licensed, vaccinated and always under my care and control. This keeps my pets, others' pets, and the community safe.
- "A responsible owner must understand that animals are not accessories and sentient beings.
- That giving up your companion is not ok under any circumstances cause they made a commitment to them."



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Caring for pets by giving them all the necessities of life: food, appropriate shelter, protection from extreme weather, water, love. In addition. "responsible" means being accountable for your pet when you're in the community: cleaning up after your dog, keeping them on leash where appropriate, etc.
- "Housed
- Fed
- Loved - walks, family
- Not chained outside
- Clean"
- Accountability, safety of pets and the public, responsibility
- Pets are fully cared for, including food, shelter, veterinary care, training. Pets are not left outdoors or confined for extended periods of time, especially in extreme weather. Pets are picked up after ALWAYS. Owners understand their pets limits, especially at off leash parks regarding recall.
- It means you treat and care for you pet like it is your child, including taking responsibility for its actions and behaviours.
- Keeping your pet(s) safe healthy and we'll loved.
- Spayed/neuter animals that have recieved postive rienforcement training and can afford food, shelter and vet care on a regular basis and familiar with all city animal bylaws
- It means doing the right thing to ensure your pet's safety and happiness. It means cleaning up after your pet and making sure it behaves properly, receives mandatory shots, and be trained sufficiently. It is making sure they have what they need including food, water, shelter etc. for survival.
- Addressing and being responsible for your pets and all aspects of their care and wellbeing, while still being a good neighbor and citizen
- Well cared for, safe animals and people.
- Accountability for the overall well-being and safety of an animal in my care.
- taking care of any animals we may own humanly and in a way so they dont cause excessive disruption to neighbours
- Proving a safe, loving, nurturing home that meets all of the dogs basic needs such as food, water and shelter.
- An owner is provide the necessities including food and water, and also mental stimulation, protection from harm, warmth, security, care at all stages of life and at all times (24 hr care), indoor living, provide medical care in all stages of life
- Onus to provide a reasonable level of care and control of owned animals, regardless of species, for the welfare of the animals and the safety of the community.
- Financial means to care for your pet, vetting, grooming, feeding, vaccinations, spay/neuter, licensing, abiding by animal bylaws, training, and cleaning up dog poop in your yard.
- Being respectful of other people regardless if they have a dog or not and being responsible for the pets you have its not my responsibility to keep an unleashed dog in a leashed area away from me no matter how many times the owner says its ok
- "A responsible pet owner picks up after their pet.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Also, I would like to see cat on a leash or at home rather than roaming through people's yards."
- RPO will not be achieved until all levels of government work together. Animals should be considered sentient beings & not property & subjected to cruelty such as abandonment leading to the overpopulation. Need to work with rescues & use all pet license revenue strictly for cat spay/neuter programs.
- Making sure all of your animals needs are meet
- Loving, caring for and being able to provide the necessities for your pet, including regular vet visits. Training and socializing your pet. Not leaving your pet in the car. Picking up after your pet and disposing in the garbage. Making sure your pet is safe and secure in the car, backyard etc.
- "Responsible pet ownership means:
- -providing the appropriate health care, vaccinations, food, water, shelter
- -spay/neuter
- -having control of dogs, carrying poop bags, cleaning up poop at off leash areas
- -being educated before you add a pet to your family
- -following laws created to protect pets"
- Responsible pet ownership means to me..making sure you pick a breed that is suited to you. Such as amount of exercise , stimulation required. Also spaying and neutering your pet. Exercising your pet regularly, picking up any poop , in your yard or in public, dog park. Providing proper food .
- respecting the pet , your neighbours and the community . This means pet on leash- dogs and cats alike. Training your pet responsibly. Picking up waste after your pet in compostable bags and depositing it into appropriate waste bins. Caring for pet, not leaving barking dogs outside.
- It means being in control of my pet and my's interactions with the city, but it's my responsibility to ensure the wellbeing and proper interaction of my pet. We are responsible pet owners with high levels of training for our pets, our pets can have more leeway accessing public spaces(eg.restaurants)
- I believe responsible pet ownership means treating your animal with respect. Also, having the dog on a leash at a public park. If a dog is on the grass at a public park, are you required to have it on a leash? Are there any pet bylaws regarding dogs and wildlife? (Such as chasing ducks or geese.)
- Healthy and safe environments for all pets. Keeping your animals under control and cleaning up after them on your own and public property. Having an appropriate number of Pets per household.
- I think of pet owners who respect city bylaws designed to protect people, natural spaces and wildlife. Unfortunately, I have encountered an increasing number of dog owners in recent years who do not respect posted regulations and seem unconcerned when aggressive dogs threaten people and animals.
- Pet owners need to have 100% control over their pets at all times. ie, no dogs off leash except in one of Calgary's 150 designated off leash areas. And cats shouldn't be allowed to roam around, pooping in people yards or digging in gardens.
- Pet ownership means lifelong care of pet. This means committing to the relationship for your pet's entire life. It also mean that recognizing that owning a pet requires an investment of time and money.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I've already completed your online survey. I'm hoping someone sees this. Your process is flawed. [personal information removed] Your March 2020 - Phase 2 Research focus group discussions never happened. 311 had little if any knowledge about this.
- I think more focus on spay and neutering and mandatory training of dogs. No more back yard breeders who lie about vaccinations and volunteer rescues have to donate millions of their own time and money to clean up the mess no government takes seriously.
- To me it means, once you adopt a pet, it's yours for the rest of that pet's life. Not dumping it off because your lifestyle outgrew it. Also choosing the pet that best suits your household and educate yourself on the animal's needs before making the commitment.
- Safety for both the community and the pets we own.
- Respecting your neighbors. No dogs barking even 1 time in the mornings! That's all it takes to wake us up, which is usually around 5:00am, ridiculous. We don't all have your schedule, some of us need to sleep till 9:00 or whatever. Quick killing our shrubs, our city is now a dog urinal!
- There needs to be added responsibility to dog owners when their backyard backs onto a public space, soccer fields, bike paths, walking paths, etc. People using/walking in these public spaces should be able to do so without being harassed by barking or aggressive animals.
- Being respectful and showing empathy to individuals who are out for a walk or run by putting your dog on a leash! Especially when you have been attacked recently. Some dog owners just defend their dog vs people. Bad neighborhoods - Valley Ridge, NW Valley Ridge Golf Course and Cresmont!
- Pets are taken care of. A suggestion: please make the ID smaller/ create a licence card that we can carry in case we left the pet ID at home. The metal is heavy for my teacup puppy and most of the time I don't put it on her.
- Providing a reasonable amount of care and companionship to animals, regardless of species.
- Owners that take care of their pets, i.e. train them, provide food, shelter, exercise, pick up their feces and don't let them be a bother to neighbors, example left alone in the yard to bark. Either the owners leave them in the yard when they are gone or don't bother to quiet them.
- Providing your pet with the 5 freedoms, ensuring they are safe as well as the public is safe as well.
- I really want people to control their dogs at the park and pick up their poo
- Having your dogs not urinate or defecate on community facilities such as skating rinks, picnic tables and park benches
- You need to provide a stricter framework for dogs barking and being left outside alone. Streamline the complaint process and tackle the issue quicker. Noise is an issue and vicious dogs too.
- Responsible pet ownership is being able to learn and train your pet to compliment neighborhoods by
- Following all bylaws while in leashed and off-leash areas. Caring properly for your animals with all vaccinations up to date. Regularly exercising to keep them healthy, and social interaction with other animals to develop social skills to avoid aggression.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Being aware of local laws. Appropriately managing interactions between your pet and humans, other pets and wild animals. Picking up dog poop and ensuring your dog doesn't destroy or damage personal property.
- Treating animals with respect, following the laws, cleaning up after them, treating aggression.
- The onus to provide a reasonable level of care & control of owned animals, regardless of species, for the welfare of the animals & the safety of the community.
- "Ensuring that the pet is well socialized, for example one's dog should be ""good"" with other people and other dogs (off-leash dog parks are a great help with this).
- Picking up and properly disposing of poop.
- Keeping the pet under control. (Easier said than done!)"
- The biggest issue I see with non-responsible pet ownership is dog owners not picking up dog poo. It is disgusting and a pet and human safety issue.
- Being able to provide a healthy, safe, home for an animal that neither bothers or is bothered by other animals/wildlife. Importantly (to me) this includes safe areas to exercise/socialize them which offers small dog (eg.
- "Pets should be under the control of owners at all times.
- Specifically, a dog that is not on its own property & that bites a person on that person's property or on public property should be seized by the City & quarantined & returned to the owner only if identified as vicious & kept muzzled."
- Understanding that animals, especially dogs, may not always behave perfectly, especially if they have been rescued and had a traumatic life. Understanding that, although your big dog may seem playful to you, it should not chase smaller dogs out of the park. owning as many animals as can be cared for
- Ensuring your pets are well cared for, and have plenty of freedom
- It includes making sure that your pets are not a nuisance to other animals and people. For dogs, it means being in control so that they don't jump up on other people when out for a walk. For cats, it means that they stay on your own property and don't disturb other cats who are indoors.
- Everyone should be able to enjoy their home whether they want to plant a garden, have a dog or have a beehive. Their enjoyment of their property with a pet or bees should not impact the enjoyment of your property. Ie: my neighbour's dog never shuts up and uses my front lawn as a toilet.
- Caring for your pet or pets and making sure you are considerate of your neighbours. People before pets.
- As long as the pet is treated as a being and the neighbors with the same respect you are expecting to be treated I think that is responsible enough.
- I believe it means creating an environment for your pet where they are fed, mentally satisfied and safe from abuse or irresponsible breeding. I also believe owners should be accountable for providing medical care and behavioural training when needed.
- "Having your pets licensed, whether cats or dogs. Not having animals running through neighbourhoods unsupervised.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- For dog owners, whether runners, walkers, or people cycling with their dogs, they pick up waste. For dogs that have a history of aggression, muzzled in off-leash zones."
- Providing a reasonable level of care and control over pets, regardless of species, for the welfare of the animals and the safety of the community
- Spay, neuter your pets. Ensure roaming cats don't create a nuisance. I consider letting you cat go outside to be responsible pet ownership. No other major city in Canada requires you to keep your cat inside or only on your property. Let's get in line with other Canadian communities.
- Pets should not impact other people in any negative way. Live and let live is important too, people should be allowed to have pets that don't cause other people grief or frustration.
- As someone who likes animals, but has no pets, the essence of responsible pet ownership is understanding that your pets are precious to you, but not necessarily to others. This means enjoying your pets while keeping them close and quiet, respecting on-leash areas and cleaning up after them.
- Control of barking dogs inside properties. This is a major disruption for young and growing families with children who sleep during the day, for shift workers who sleep during the day, for people who work from home, and for peace of mind for residents in proximity to households with barking dogs.
- "Responsible pet owner", as "Calgary bylaw enforcement", means to me mostly a contradiction in terms. Dogs still attacking children, parks & streets glisten with excrement, unleashed dogs in restricted areas, barking dogs abound. You would know this if you investigated complaints & did your job.
- For me, responsible pet ownership is two things: 1) your pets are not disruptive, burdensome, problematic or pose any risk whatsoever to others, and 2) your pet is safe and cared for.
- Responsible pet ownership means being considerate of your community while caring for an animal in a respectful manner. Leaving your dog(s) tied up in your yard all day for it to bark at everything that moves is a disservice to both parties.
- Responsible pet ownership is the ability of an owner to maintain a good environment for the pet, monitor the pet and limit disruptive behaviours of such pets.
- Take care if it's sick; pick up waste; correct food; have someone take care of dog if you leave; leash; don't hurt; don't forget; clean litter box; daily exercise; keep healthy and happy; clean cage; don't scare; give attention; vaccines; good environment (dog needs to run)

Cats

Roaming Cats

- My indoor cat is a ninja at getting outside despite my best efforts. Consider selling "cat-ios" at cost to the public to help owners contain the roaming.
- I don't believe cats should roam free unless they are in a rural area. Cats are a leading cause in bird population declines and if they are to be left outside it should be mandatory to have a bell.
- Stray cats could be taken care of (i.e., fed and provided veterinary care) at stations around the city and fixed. Alternatively, a comprehensive system of foster care w/ an adoption program should be implemented. Implement an education program to have 'owned' cats remain indoors.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cats should not be allowed to roam free. Feral ones should at least be caught and spayed, stray but domesticated should be rehomed.
- There are people who feel it would be ok to poison them. Cats should not be forced to stay inside all their lives - perhaps providing incentives for cat owners to build/buy catios - allows cats to be outside but in a protected environment
- 1st of all you should adopt programs as in some US cities where they recognize the value of feral cats to control vermin and thus catch the females and spay them and release them again. Fines for those who let their cats roam free.
- Humans should not let their cats roam free. Stray cats must be rescued and placed in shelters or foster homes until they are adopted, and should be spayed or neutered.
- Owned cats should not be roaming within city limits. Stray cats should be taken in and adopted.
- The safety of these cats. Too many pet owners allow their indoor/outdoor cats to roam their neighbourhoods unsupervised. Putting them at risk of being hit by cars or injured by other animals or wildlife. There should be greater emphasis on allowing controlled outdoor access only.
- I have no problems with roaming cats, and judging by the number I see in my neighbourhood, few of my neighbours do either. The current by-law seems very difficult to enforce. Perhaps the focus should be shifted to specific cats that cause problems.
- I think cats should not be allowed to roam free - they get hit by cars, get into neighbour's gardens and sandboxes, and kill far too many birds. They should be allowed to enjoy the outdoors, but not unsupervised.
- If they are owned the owners should be fined. If they are feral, initiative to TNR and create community feeding programs should be implemented.
- Responsible cat ownership means making cats indoor animals. Feral cats should be rehomed as well as strays.
- My main concern is the safety of the cat. If it roams in a relatively quiet area and has a home it can return to when it wants that's ok. Cats roaming around busy streets can easily be run over by cars and hence should be humanely caught and taken to safety.
- At first people followed ruling, but last 2 years I have seen cats wandering regularly and have my front door regularly fouled by someone's cat. Tougher fines and more advertising cat bylaws are needed.
- I agree that cats should not be allowed to roam free, however I understand that it can be extremely difficult to keep a cat confined and that doesn't contribute to their quality of life. I think 'catios' or cat proofing a yard might be a good way to combat this.
- They kill the bird population, ruin landscaping and I have seen cases of attack. They need to be managed better.
- None really but I suppose I don't see it often so it doesn't occur to me to be concerned. As long as cats have bells on so they don't massacre birds, I think it's not a huge deal.
- As a modern society & a compassionate city, we should strive to have NO homeless animals on our streets. We should be a No Kill city. They are sentient creatures & we as a society should be actively working to have them cared for. Minimally a TNR program in place.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- "1.Garden digging,we use garden soil that is harmful to cats
- 2.People who own them take no responsibility for them
- 3.Getting harmed by dogs in their own yard,if they(cat) gets hurt or killed,why should the dog owners be responsible for vet bills etc"
- Cats must be treated the same as dogs from a guardianship point of view. Cat guardians must have the same responsibilities (care, management, costs) as dog guardians. Cat fees must be brought level with dog fees. End the cat subsidization for guardians who are less responsible than dog guardians.
- Feral or lost cats should be picked up and handled by the humane society.
- The danger is that they will suffer incredibly. As previously mentioned pets should be licensed tattooed and or microchipped. The owner who then released them are fined. The animals are put up again for re-adoption.
- Pet cats should be kept indoors for their own safety. Healthy stray cats should be sheltered and adopted out. Cats that are too ill or injured for adoption should be treated or euthanized if rehab is not possible.
- most people don't know the calgary bylaws in regards to outdoor cats, and they often get hit by cars, or eaten by coyotes. I've personally known many people who were completely unaware that it is against calgary bylaws to have an outdoor cat. Perhaps a reduced spay/neuter cost will help, and a PSA
- They should be sterilized, vaccinated, treated for parasites, provided with permanent ID and released back to where they came from provided they are provided with necessities and monitored. It's inevitable that there will be feral cats and maintaining a healthy stable population should be a goal.
- Cats destroy property, leave feces In yards that are not their own, ruin flower beds, bother other people when allowed to roam free.
- I have 0 issues with it unless they are not fixed. I actually think the city should just accept that some owners let their cats out and sell a specific license for a roaming cat that costs more and can't be obtained unless the cat is fixed and vaccinated. If owners submit yearly vaccinations
- "- Shouldn't be allowed to roam free.
- - Same rules as dogs.
- - Stay on a leash.
- - Should be allowed outside on own property. "
- "- Dog eating it
- - Feces all over property
- - Same rule as dogs, needs to be enforced
- - Cats should be allowed to go out, but needs proper fencing"
- "- Shouldn't be allowed
- -Dog eating it
- -Feces



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- -Same rules as dogs
- -Cold weather
- -Allowed to go out, but not roam
- -Fence"
- Yes, they wreck gardens. They poop in gardens and dig up plants. It's a concern for pregnant women. They should have the same rules as dogs. You can walk your cat on a leash. You can have a cat offleash area (like a caged in kids play area). What I really worry about is a cat coming into my yard, and my dog attacking it or even killing it.
- We are very concerned about the health & safety of roaming cats. We would like more education of the public to how detrimental it is for the cats. Cat traps should be easier & cheaper to rent.
- What concerns me is I have neighbours that like to shoot these poor animals. I believe they deserve better, we need a free of charge spay and neuter program provided and to push adoption programs. We have so many cats/ animals that need homes to be off the streets. A catch spay neuter adoption/teac
- The human who lets them roam free is irresponsible. Cats do not need to be outside unless they are restrained (leash or cat run)
- There needs to be lost cost spay neuter clinics to reduce litters. More needs to be done to tell the public how many cats even dogs are euthanized so people understand the problem. The city could build a large cat shelter and allow rescues to use it to help their cats find homes manned by volunteers
- Crapping in flower beds. Home owner is responsible for picking up trap to catch roaming cats and taking to pound. Bylaw should provide this service.
- I foster dogs and some have reactive tendencies with cats. When on walks I can control them but can't control cats in my yard or on my front deck or digging in my flower beds or under the deck etc. I would receive a fine for a dog off leash cats should be the same
- They will be eaten by our wild life. They will freeze to death in the winter. Why can't people take them to the humane society instead of letting them go free.
- The damage they cause to our gardens, they can be aggressive which prevents my children from being able to enjoy our backyard when one gets in. People should not be allowed to let their cats roam - the same rules should apply to cats that apply to other pets.
- I prefer people to look after their cats but I know as a. At owner it is sometimes difficult to keep them in. Our one escapes no matter what we have done to stop it. It's not ideal but respect from individuals is needed towards the roaming cats. They do help to keep mouse populations down.
- Use all pet license revenue to alter & reduce cats that will lower animal control costs. Work with all levels of gov't for stronger legislation; as abandonment leads to overpopulation. The cat crisis causes anguish amongst those at rescues, kill shelters & vet clinics who destroy healthy cats.
- Mainly their propensity to "litter" at the neighbors. Unclear how to stop them. Also concerned about their impact on the bird populations. Require them to be "belled"?
- The biggest concern with outdoor cats is that they kill billions of birds every year. Bird numbers are in steep decline due to cats, habitat destruction and a host of other problems. Cats are not native



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

species; they have been introduced. The City of Calgary needs stiff fines for people allowing their cats to run free and it should not be up to neighbours to trap their neighbour's cats in order to have something done about them. There are options for allowing cats outside, such as having an enclosed space outside for the cat so it isn't roaming around. More education about this would be helpful.

Feral Cats

- They are dangerous. I don't know that I've encountered a feral cat. But I believe they should be contained and relocated or euthanized.
- That old ideas such as cats are a pet to be dumped, non neutered or homed properly, can lead to domestic cats having babies. Humans are the issue. Natural wild cats evolved because of the environment and serve a purpose, catch rats and pests.
- That they might not get enough to eat
- That the cats may be hit by vehicles, which is hard for everyone involved. There may be cat fights, which can seriously hurt cats. There may be spread of disease. Also, I worry about feral cats' health, ability to find enough food and water, and a good shelter - their quality of life.
- Disease
- How quickly cats reproduce ie the fact that they're probably not fixed.
- see number 1
- I think there should be a program to capture and rehome them to get them off the streets.
- Breeding mostly and their lack of needs being met
- Try to rehome or foster whenever possible!
- Not much personal concern though I recognize it may be a concern for others.
- Only concern is breeding. Animal rescue groups, or the city, can catch/spay or neuter/and release.
- Feral cats may enter a private yard and harm pets.
- I have seen literally zero feral cats in the city. There are so few, it is not a current concern, so whatever is being done is working in my opinion. Keep doing that.
- They should be relocated with the aid of barn cat programs. Feral cats have no place in the city and are not a native species to Alberta. They were at one point owned cats that have been abandoned and left to reproduce in huge numbers.
- Risk to domestic cats, cost to city, risk to birds and other wildlife, proliferation of cats and kittens in shelters.
- I don't have any concerns except if they are sick and start acting weird. As long as the public is informed on what to do in such situations, I am ok with feral cats.
- Further reproducing. Not sure how that can be handled.
- they can be hit by vehicles and attacked by animals. they crap everywhere
- none
- deceases
- Unvaccinated but otherwise no issue
- Same as above



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not enough resources to make sure they are properly vaccinated and spay and neutered.
- Disease and quality of life.
- Because they are not vaccinated they spread disease. Toxoplasmosis spread by cats feces is dangerous to babies, immunocompromised people, or pregnant women. Cats dedicating in gardens and around homes could potentially spread this parasite and other diseases.
- Starving freezing having kittens
- I don't see them much, but I know they are a big problem in rural areas and shelters are over full. I think TNR is the only way that makes sense.
- diseases they may be carrying
- none, they are wildlife in my opinion
- We have a couple that come around and they're really mean and fight with other cats. There is one that if you get too close it starts hissing at you. 311 had no suggestions other than trapping and calling a foundation. Meow Foundation suggested I feed them and help them out. Brutal advice.
- detriment to wildlife, death and injury to domestic cats, injury to self
- Same as above.
- Destruction of native species such as birds. They attract predators such as coyotes and are also vulnerable to being hit by a car as well as death and disease from malnutrition, illness or due to being exposed to elements.
- As responsible citizens we should help to get them to shelters
- Feral cats may have diseases that will spread to stray cats.
- Just being a general pest, pooping in garden, yard etc.
- That they are well taken care of. Spay and neuter and return keeps the population from growing. They also need access to shelter and food water.
- None.
- Feces. Wild birds are killed. Draw coyotes in to urban areas as a good source.
- As mentioned above, plus uncontrolled reproduction.
- None
- People doing harm to them.
- Still destructive to the environment.
- No specific concerns
- Same as for cats roaming free.
- Feral cats also draw in larger predators like Bobcats and Coyotes, putting the animal and small children at risk.
- Population control, spreading disease (public/animal health), conflicts with public/other animals, animal welfare, negative impact on native wildlife
- They urinate and spread feces around my property.
- Numbers getting out of hand



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animal messes that are left for someone else to clean up; uncontrolled breeding; disease spreading; risk of emotional damage caused by accidentally running over an animal that shouldn't be on the road.
- No concerns but they should be observed for disease.
- They are a risk to struggling bird populations, and some other animals as well (endangered squirrels etc.). Not to mention we get cats wandering into our yard with dogs who are unfriendly with them. It should not be on us if our dogs kill or severely injure a cat that we did not want in our yard.
- Above noted.
- It's sad. But they aren't aggressive.
- Adding to the feral population & living a hard life subject to sickness & injury. No vaccinations perhaps spreading illness.
- N/A
- I like the TNR (trap neuter release) programs provided by MEOW and others. It would be good for the City to provide a program like this to reduce the feral cat population.
- my concern is for their welfare and the trouble they have in obtaining food and shelter
- Chances are they have not been spayed or neutered so will keep procreating and causing a greater issue with their Feral babies.
- Disease and injury.
- Same as above, there should be more emphasis on getting them off the streets for all
- Feral cats can be left alone.
- They might carry diseases.
- I have never seen a feral cat.
- Just too many babies, a cruel existence. In Istanbul, they used to (maybe still do) round up feral dogs and cats who the people fed, would spay or neuter, then return to the neighbourhood that took care of them.
- Constantly breeding increasing numbers. Spreading disease.
- None
- Nothing. They probably clean the mice pop
- Disease vector, loss of indigenous species
- The same concern re: stray cats. I'm not worried about human:feral cat interaction, but domestic cat:feral cat issues. Our cats should be able to enjoy OUR backyard.
- poop.
- Don't want them crapping in my garden
- that they are starving and being abused because they have no owner
- In addition to the problems with stray cats, feral cats are more likely to spread disease and act more aggressively to other wildlife and humans.
- Disease
- There are none in my area and I do not have a cat that roams at large so for me I do not have any concerns. However any animal that is not vaccinated can pose certain risks others.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Have not been an issue for me.
- Feral cats are there due to human stupidity largely. They lead a miserable short life scrounging for food, freezing in winter, females always pregnant. It is cruel and every year hundreds more spread and fight and suffer.
- The fact that some are not neutered and that feral cat populations are reaching spikes and causing an unnecessary strain on resources that Calgary provides, as well the damage they cause to property-the accidents they're involved in. It's all so unnecessary and ignored.
- fighting with house cats. attracting coyotes to an area
- The people who keep dumping cats causing this to be a challenge.
- should be fixed
- Have not encountered feral cats, have all belonged to neighbours.
- The issue with feral (and stray) cats is mainly toward impacts to pets and small children in yards, playgrounds etc.
- None
- Feral cats add to the population of animals requiring homes in the city, and have the potential to harm other animals which is worrisome.
- feral cats must be trapped if they're a neighborhood issue..spay/neuter/euthanize should be options..HIGH STIFF for people who feed or leave out food for them...they can catch mice/gophers for foods...
- See above
- Cats hurting themselves or other animals - uncontrolled reproducing. We don't need anymore animals. Too many in shelters.
- Zero. They're wild. Let them live how they are living and surviving. I've also never seen one personally in 35 years, or know anyone that has ever, in Calgary
- Feral cats have the same concerns as free roaming cats, except in the case of free roaming cat the cats owner is allowing such behavior. Feral cat populations should be properly managed and controlled.
- Feral cats are just as bad as a sick raccoon. They have a high birthing rate, are more dangerous to humans due to their aggressive nature and contact with bacteria and disease. They should be culled from cities.
- In barns, shops or acreages they have a place otherwise I think they should be caught and brought to the city or humane society.
- They need to be neutered!
- That they are contributing to the stray/homeless pet population, and they they are suffering/cold/hungry/ect.
- Huge loss of songbirds
- Not an issue in my area.
- They can be aggressive and who knows what diseases they may carry.
- They're great.

- Concerns: Feral cats may have rabies, worms, or other diseases that can be transmitted to other animals or humans; they can reproduce without limits leading to overpopulation; they are not socialized and may attack other animals or children.
- Disease, Potential for roaming cats to injure other animals that may not be loose, potential for human injury, out of control population.
- Their reproduction. Disease.
- For the most part, I don't think this is an issue, at least not that I see.
- So long as they don't attack people or pets, I have no concerns.
- They need to be spayed and neutered to manage the population.
- Their health
- Not a large concern that I know of in my area. Most are owned cats.
- They are impacting the environment by killing native species.
- Not sure I have seen feral cats within my area, see roaming cats, can't say for sure if they are feral or not, but do know not all I see are feral as some appear to be too friendly.
- Their damage to small wild animals as well as damage to people's property and belongings. Incredibly frustrating to deal with.
- Feral cats can carry communicable diseases and pose a threat to the stray cats. They can also be aggressive and a nuisance. They are also not likely to be neutered/spayed so can contribute to a higher than necessary population.
- "1. Lack of adequate food shelter and safety for the animal.
- 2. Birds become a main staple food source for feral cats. Song birds have plummeting numbers and as a result we see implications in our urban ecosystems.
- 3. Reproducing in mass number of kittens due to not being spayed/neutered."
- they should be caught and fixed
- These also crap in my yard and need to be rounded up.
- They multiply
- Feral cats should be taken to farms.
- Harrassing my indoor pets, spraying and pooping on my property, parasites.
- Feral cats if caught should be spayed or neutered and then set free. They are wild treat them like a wild animal. They do not adapt to home life after being feral.
- Numerous litters increasing the feral population.
- They should be captured and put to sleep. Feral cats are strays and offspring of strays. They would not be there is original owners kept their cats or took them to shelters instead of leaving them to run.
- Mostly the possibility of diseases they could spread. They are also another source of food for wildlife.
- Their well being. They need care too. Extra shelters outside in the winter
- No concerns unless they are aggressive or spread disease. They control mice and other rodents in areas naturally. If they become too numerous trapping and relocating or killing the animal would be acceptable.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None . Cats should be outside and happy.
- They may carry disease. They may attack if cornered. A nuisance if they are digging up gardens, killing birds, going through garbage.
- None
- Breeding, pooping and peeing in my flower beds and yard
- Simply put I feel sorry for them. They are NOT protected, safe nor do they feel constant Love and support from a human. They may contain disease due to non routine vaccinations but ultimately they NEED to be respected and protected by mean people. Citizens should be able to call for pick up
- Should be relocated, if possible to farm land.
- None
- Some one needs to feed and do catch and release to colony sterilization maybe paid for by city . Never have I noticed feral cats in Calgary though
- That they dont get enough to eat .
- The same as stray cats
- Disease, sickness. Potential for contact with humans.
- Spread of disease and Contamination of Gardens with faecal material.
- They need to be caught. They make coyotes stay in the area
- None.
- Reproduction and health in general.
- Feral cats can spread disease to people and pets, resulting in their own demise as they often need to be euthanized if disease is found.
- Feral cats do not have maintained health and well-being and can be the carrier of disease such as toxoplasmosis and feline leukemia, which can be passed to other animals and in some cases humans.
- Being killed by people who don't care for them or see them as pests
- None in terms of them living on their own terms. Help them with feed and illness. And monitor. I agree with TNR.
- They can be a danger to humans and other animals.
- Same.
- Same as above, plus they climb on porch railings, jump/climb onto the roof chasing squirrel's, birds (which I love) dig up flowers, grass to urinate/spray, scat which allows other cats to do the same. I've tried every thing from auto sprinklers to wire barrier fencing to little or no avail.
- I have no experience with feral cats to speak of
- Similar to concerns above. They kill native wild life, can carry diseases, and can mess in gardens.
- Attacking domestic cats
- none
- They are hard to catch or know where the owners live. My neighbor saved a feral cat that roams free. How do I catch it as it's feral.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They multiply and no where to go.
- Cats roam, kill wildlife (birds and small animals), treat gardens as toilets, reproduce
- Implement and trap neuter release programs to control the numbers and disease outbreaks
- Feces in my yard.
- cease all feral cats when possible ... they make a mess all cats should be on a leash on your property or inside only....I am a cat owner BTW
- A concern for their safety as well as concern with their speedy population increase. Spay and Neuter task forces are great and need more support.
- Same as above
- None
- No concerns, only sympathy that they probably originated from abandoned animals.
- carrying disease
- Catch and spay/neuter
- They shouldn't be in urban areas where their population can drastically increase.
- Picked up where possible
- Feral and at large house cats kill millions of song birds a year.
- KEEP ANY AND ALL CATS OFF THE STREETS PERIOD.
- I think the number of stray cats should be controlled
- They are not usually spayed or neutered and increase the feral population.
- That they don't have a home especially in the winter.
- No comment as have no experience with them
- Unsanitary, unsafe, messy and noisy.
- They carry horrific disease!! Cat feces is very dangerous to children and pregnant women, we need to destroy feral cats, it would be terrible to end up like Florida where a person cannot even use the grass on lawns ect because of feral cat feces, never mind rabbis, worms, etc. etc.
- Same as above....that they are not hurt...hungry or cold
- They could carry disease. They can be aggressive and harm small children or small pets.
- I have welfare concerns with feral cats and exploding population problems. I'm not sure what the city does now but should consider trap-neuter-return programs to manage feral populations.
- " -It may be difficult to know for sure that a cat is feral and not stray
- -feral cats should be left in the wild unless In danger or unhealthy / or trained to be comfortable around people, other cats, and with being indoors before being adopted/ or spayed or neutered before returning outdoors"
- Diseases, feral cat fights, shelter
- Feral cats reproduce rapidly and are not native predators. They are an unnatural introduced species that should be eliminated.
- Should do our best to trap them and reduce the feral population.
- I haven't seen any.
- As above -- disease transmission from feces and songbird.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I haven't seen any feral cats in Calgary.
- Their lack of medical attention and no spay or neutering.
- Same as above.
- Diseases
- A catch and sterilization program would be good to prevent rampant reproduction, otherwise they should be treated humanely, and considered as part of urban wildlife.
- Disease that could be passed along to other wildlife or roaming pet cats. Over population.
- Unsafe to other pets and spread diseases to other people or animals
- None really. We don't have any feral cats around my neighbourhood
- "They will breed and eventually cause a lot of headaches around other animals and people.
- No Feral cats should be allowed in the city. On a farm is different and they tend to stick around the farm. Would the city of Calgary allow Feral dogs? look at the issue of Feral cats in Hawaii. Oh my god!"
- They should be spayed or neutered and allowed to live their lives.
- They kill song birds by the millions.
- Injuries and disease
- Again the safety of these animals. Their impact on overall health in cats in the area.
- As above
- Uncontrolled breeding, making them more difficult to manage.
- Disease
- Their predation on birds.
- Disease, reproducing, defecating
- As above
- Disease and population control.
- Not much, they dig in my garden, but keep down rodent population.
- Spread of disease, preying on birds
- Peeing and pooping in my yard where my kids play (sandbox/garden.)
- " -spread of disease (to animals and people)
- -overpopulation
- -lack of proper care"
- None. Not an issue in my area.
- The city dumps cat control on affected homeowners who have to deal with cats hunting wildlife/nests and crapping in flower beds and under decks.
- None as well. Just make sure they not carrying rabies.
- Feral Animal safety and health.
- Disease, unpredictability and unchecked propagation.
- More should be done to curb the population of feral cats. A spay and neuter program should be put in place.
- Same as above



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- These cats should be captured and spayed or neutered
- They can spread disease and reduce bird populations.
- None
- Cats frequently defecate in my yard. I'm also allergic to cats, yet have over 5 different cats frequenting my yard.
- None
- No help in ensuring their safety; lack of aid in trapping and general consideration and care of the feral cats
- Disease's, parasites and attacking domesticated animals.
- My only worry is abuse and harassment from people.
- They have had no shots, they may carry disease and may be aggressive and they go into back yards and areas that they should not be.
- None. If unadoptable they should be neutered/spayed and released to reduce the feral population
- None they have a right to live
- "Over population
- Ecosystem shifts in both predator species on cats and prey species of cats (native birds and rodents)
- Issues with walking a cat reactive dog around the neighbourhood"
- Their owners should be fined and held accountable for why they abandoned them.
- None
- Have not encountered feral cats personally in my neighbourhood however would see them as a threat to other small animals and children
- I don't know - do they pose a danger to humans or other animals? If not I think the main concern would be that they don't over populate.
- Nothing..they avoid human contact so there should be no problems
- I have no concerns, feral cats stay away from humans, they are not a threat and if one is seen then I would keep my distance.
- I haven't seen any feral cats. They probably make good coyote/fox food.
- They are a nuisance and detrimental to the surrounding environment
- Havent seen many but I have concerns for their safety
- Feral cats pose the same risks to bird populations and they also spread disease or worms to otherwise sheltered, safe back yards. They should at the very least be spayed and neutered.
- As long as the animal poses no threat to is, leave it be.
- There they carried diseases
- People who feed them irresponsibly.
- abuse to them, poor health, uncontrolled breeding
- A spay and neuter program in place so they don't have kittens all over the place. Also cat boxes to keep them warm they help keep the mice population down. A vaccination program for them also so less disease is spread around.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Disease.
- "I actually adopted a captured feral cat - and have no regrets in that regard, though definitely not an experience that appeals to everyone - and NOT an experience for the first time cat owner.
- Mostly shitting in play areas/gardens, and the whole ""quality of life"" ethics concern."
- Population control. Catch, spay and release opportunities for cat rescuers should be encouraged and promoted. Those deemed adoptable, can and should be re-established for domestication.
- That feral cats are just the result of humans who let their cats out unfixed/unspayed to get pregnant and have kittens. Education to the public is necessary to get away from the old cat culture of cats should be roaming. these situations would be better reported + helped if everyone knew it's not ok
- That they are not vaccinated or spayed /neutered and could multiply very quickly leaving little to no food to sustain a colony or transmit worms and disease.
- They could harm children and leave their poop in kids sandbox. They are at risk of being hit by cars, killed by wildlife.
- Have not encountered any that are truly feral, with the exception at animals shelters. Stray cats brought into CHS that are feral or than often euthanized due to lack of socialization and non adopt ability. Can these animals rather be fixed and then released back into the city?
- Cat feces are dangerous to children and can often be found places where children play such as sandboxes, backyards and playgrounds. Feral cats also have not had veterinary care so they may carry and spread disease.
- I think TNR should be undertaken and medical care offered when needed. And they should be in safe place with access to food, water, and shelter and left to live their life.
- The city is doing nothing about them
- I think there should be a spay/neuter and release. I hate to see them out there but they don't do well in care b
- Rabies or other diseases. Also many are frostbitten and starving which is cruel.
- Feral cats are just 'doing their thing' - humans don't value animals (cats especially). It is unfair to them. My concerns are for their safety and well-being.
- That the city does not make spay and neutering free or near free. Too high of costs in vet community causes a direct affect on those who cannot afford it. Thus a population explosion. Poor people do better with a pet. Not enough programs. Needs to be city wide @ the cheapest cost possible!!!
- Same as point 1, and they are also a little more unpredictable
- Quick rise in MORE feral cats with no spaying/neutering; getting into garbage.
- Same as above
- Same as above, over population, spreading disease.
- Safety of the cat
- Diseases, procreating
- Mainly disease/ injured/not spayed, neutered, foraging to survive, subject to predators, colonies exploding.
- See previous note.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They need to be treated with kindness or they will continue to be feral.
- Disease spreading
- As for owned cats, my main concern is the killing of birds.
- "DO NOT KILL THEM IT DOESN'T WORK
- The neuter spay release program is the only effective solution invest more in those programs"
- Cats could significantly reduce bird populations, add claw marks to wooden fences and could mate en mass. Maybe only spayed and neutered cats should get a special collar and tag to identify them as being permitted outdoors?
- Sad to see them without shelter but cats are incredibly saavy
- That they a spayed/neutered. Cats shouldn't start life feral.
- Potential for attacking children not all feral cats react same I have dealt with feral cats where they were friendly and eventually able to house and than their ones who can be way more dangerous than adult tigers or lions approaching with individual basis to identify where new animals apply
- Feral cats, and rabbits, should be eradicated.
- My concern is for the cats rather than for the community. These cats must have a very hard life in Calgary and should be helped if possible.
- Need to be caught n spayed
- Same as above
- Unfortunately, they should be caught and neutered or put down.
- Haven't come across feral cats
- Again, preying on wild song birds
- Same as above
- Don't see many in our neighborhood.
- None
- They should be humanely caught and removed from the City
- Wasn't aware we had many of those in Calgary.
- Feral cats should be trapped and euthanized.
- Very frustration when they use your garden, side of the house, plants for litter boxes
- I don't see any
- The same as above.
- Potentially unsterilized, unvaccinated, FeLV/FIV positive. Cat fights. Hit by car. People abusing free roaming cats. Coyote attacks, bird attacks.
- Feral cats are a major problem from a humane perspective. They often live short, malnourished, difficult lives and have the capacity to breed rapidly and spike the population far beyond what is sustainable.
- Unsafe for themselves
- I have never seen one
- I have not really encountered this before.
- Same as above mass breeding and too many feral cats.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I just feel bad for them honestly.
- carry disease, destroy gardens. should not be allowed
- The city should make it illegal to in any way sell or adopt an animal that isn't not fixed without a breeding licence. Do not leave it up to individual owners to decide if animals are spayed or neutered.
- The same as above, but also the fact that they do not survive long. They also continue to bred which adds to the problem.
- None. i have never encountered one.
- They Increase the population
- If a feral cat is bothersome, it should be caught and put down.
- None
- They carry disease and it's an unhealthy life. Populations can sky rocket so they must be controlled even if that means euthanasia.
- They provide prey for predators which can cause predators to come into contact with humans.
- Mainly the health of the cats. they didn't ask to be feral or to have to live outside in our winter conditions. More often than not they have been dumped, then reproduce, and have no choice.
- I am concerned about their health and ability to spread disease. That said, they keep down the population of many nuisance species.
- Breeding. How do we control having more feral cats.
- Same as above and the fact that they can cause harm to reproduce with other cats. No control of the cat population.
- Safety issue
- Danger to small children and other small pets within ones own property.
- feral cats should be dealt with by a trap, neuter, return program
- They can be aggressive
- they can die from hunger, disease or hit by a vehicle and end up dead somewhere
- Should they not be trapped & dealt with ?
- They will always exist but I think better cat bylaws will help
- Safety of other animals and people. Feral cats should be rescued and fostered/adopted.
- Feral cats can be a threat to domesticated cats and spread disease.
- Unintentional breedings and disease. Also harm to birds.
- Diseases, killing birds, making a mess.
- Health issues passed on to other stray animals, or possibly children.
- Worried about their well-being, plus damage to the eco-system and property damage
- I don't think there are feral. I think the cat is owned but by someone who doesn't care for the animal or others. Any cat roaming should be removed. Cats are becoming a huge issue as owners say cats need to roam or they destroy. Wrong they still destroy our roaming, just other people's stuff
- Cat feces and wildlife predation - especially birds.
- None really within city limits.
- You don't know which ones are feral and which aren't.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same as for domestic cats - You don't know what contaminants they leave in garden beds.
- Disease mostly, and over population
- These cats are more likely to find themselves in a difficult situation, whether it be facing harsh weather conditions or injured/killed.
- I never see them but if they're roaming too I'd be worried they may hurt my cats (who are tied up when outside). Perhaps diseases too but I know most can be dealt with.
- Only that they should be neutered and released to help ensure a limited population. How are feral cats different than bobcats?
- None - I've not seen any in Calgary, and most strays would be picked up by animal rescues.
- No concern, I will be only concerned when the city gets involved between neighbours..it makes it more complicated
- The potential for population increase, and attracting wildlife that prey on cats (like, coyotes).
- Carry disease.
- Impact on wildlife, ie. birds and injuries to the cats themselves from vehicle impact and abuse.
- None, except for how owned-cats being let loose when they are not spayed or neutered may contribute to the feral population. But really, I'd rather cats than mice or other small, invasive, critters.
- Feral cats should be collected, neutered and released in a wilderness park.
- Rabies and procreation.
- I feel that feral cats need to be supported through proper comprehensive spay /neuter ID release and care programs. There are many reputable organizations in the province that would be willing to support the city with such initiatives.
- None. All of the ones in my area are owned.
- No concerns; not aware this is an issue in Calgary?
- Concerned for wildlife such as birds and squirrels. Population control is also an issue
- They are not being cared for.
- the safety of the cat is primary, that the cats don't have medical and safe support and food as needed.
- All of the above issues (spread of disease, property damage, harm local bird population, dangerous for cat due to cars and urban wildlife). Cats also rapidly reproduce so feral populations can grow quickly.
- Re home if able to fix if not
- I haven't seen any in my area and don't have concerns about the existing population of feral cats, but I believe all domestic cats should have to be spayed/neutered to reduce future populations of feral animals.
- Harder to manage than cats owned by people who are allowed to roam free, but I think the TNR programs already in place are the best option we have, but possibly with more funding to be able to do more
- They should be controlled.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None other than population control. They are essentially a wild animal too and so the same rules should apply to these cats as they do to mice/pigeons/coyotes etc.
- None as I never see any.
- Removal is paramount.
- Disease
- None
- Disease transmission, property damage.
- Feral cats are frustrating but are more hazardous to my compost bin than to humans - generally. Again I'd be mostly concerned about other animals - like hens and ducks becoming prey.
- None, any more than lynx or bob cats. They avoid me and mine
- Danger on roads- attract wildlife closer to homes
- None
- They can contract diseases that can spread to the pet population and to humans. They can also be a danger to the public due to their lack of socialization as well as to the wildlife population as they need to hunt for food. Populations can become out of control if there is no sterilization.
- None. How can they be domestic if they are not owned? They're wild. Let them be, they control the mouse, rat and vole populations. Believe what you want, there's no way alberta is 'rat' free, just go watch a council meeting!
- Attacking pets, children and caring disease that can be spread to pet cats. Life of feral cats are hard in Calgary.
- cars running them over or wildlife getting to them
- Again, haven't seen any stray cats in years.
- None really... never encountered one. Potentially the same problem as roaming cats i.e. upsetting our cats.
- Zero
- The only concern I have is for reproduction. Ideally it would be great to spay and/or neuter feral cats to help control the population.
- We don't have a feral cat problem. We have a coyote problem. A skunk problem.
- diseases and reproducing
- spreading disease, uncontrolled population, enticing predators into urban areas.
- Same as above, disease
- Unpayed/neutered and breeding which aggravates the cat overpopulation. They may be sick or hurt with no medical attention. They can be aggressive.
- Their health and safety and possibility that their population can greatly increase without veterinary care or intervention.
- Over population
- None. I doubt there are many, not a concern.
- No concerns, just humans being stupid.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Feral cats should not be removed from their environment unless injured, sick, or otherwise unhealthy. Feral cats who are brought into the animal shelter should be spayed or neutered before returning outside. Cat's who are determined unfit to live in the wild should be domesticated and adopted.
- Need to consider spay and neuter
- Feral cats are a threat to birds, a nuisance to homeowners, and are in danger from dogs and vehicles.
- I am concerned about population control with feral cats. While their health and safety is important to me realistically these cats aren't ideally suited for domestic life. I'd like to see trap and release programs implemented or barn cat rehoming programs
- I don't see many of these in my community so do not have concerns. If any are reported the City should try to pick them up and adopt them out if possible.
- Ditto above, minus the whiners. Untagged cats should be captured, and adopted out, or destroyed if not possible. An invasive species is an invasive species, regardless of whether they were once domestic.
- Trap them.
- Threat to wildlife
- Feral cats destroy property - flower beds, fences, grass - they should not be allowed to roam whatsoever within urban centers. They also can cause dogs (on leashes) to try to chase them into traffic, so it causes a real danger.
- Don't have any because we never saw one in our neighbourhood in the 10 years since we moved in bridlewood.
- TNR program support
- Continued spread of FIV & FeLV, parasites, and fleas to domestic cats, preying on native birds and other wildlife, cat waste hazardous to humans and pets.
- Their vaccine status, specifically Rabies, and if they are breeding.
- They can be unhealthy and spread disease to other animals and possibly humans who are unwise enough to approach them.
- Further prevention needs to be in place to prevent cats from getting into this situation.
- As long as they are altered and in reasonable health, none. I would love to see more support for feral cats including feeding stations, shelters, etc.
- I don't believe we have many in our community (evergreen) as the majority we have seen roaming have collars.
- City should trap and spay neuter..release or adopt to barn cat. Rescue
- rabies, typhus, and toxoplasmosis
- Pee, poo, unchecked breeding. Feral cats should be trapped.
- They can be unhealthy and can transmit diseases/pests to other animals and humans.
- Attacks on other animals or people, disruption caused by hunting
- None

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None that are specific to feral rather than strays or roaming.
- Overpopulation and uncontrolled reproduction.
- The lack of resources/help when trying to remove feral cat populations from residential areas
- They live shorter more painful lives due to predators, cars, and the elements. They cause destruction to native animal populations and are harming the environment.
- Life as a feral cat is “nasty, brutish, and short”. I have seen evidence of feral, stray, or roaming cats killed by vehicles. I have heard of feral, stray, or roaming cats being taken by urban wildlife.
- The suffering of those animals.
- General Health concerns, going through garbage and upsetting my dog when he’s “safe” in my backyard.
- safety of those cats is paramount and their ability to survive, unrestricted reproduction, safety of wildlife they may encounter, destruction of property
- have never seen a feral cat. Big concern regarding birds - they need to eat and birds are easy/delicious prey! Feral cats should euthanized - there are SO many unwanted cats already - sad but true and it is the fault of irresponsible humans :(
- No real problem with feral cats as the often are part of the solution to increased population of rats, mice, pigeons etc.
- Would like to see them helped
- They are mean and do the same annoying things that free roaming cats do.
- How are residents supposed to distinguish between feral, stray and roaming cats? Problems with all are the same
- None
- Are they not wild cats? I have no concerns with them if they're wild. They cause no issues and keep the rodent and hare population in check!
- They keep mice and vermin populations down and population can be managed by extreme cold and predators. Leave them alone or find a job for them (ie relocate to high vermin areas)
- We do not have this issue in our area on Beddington, I don't think. All of the cats I see have tags. We do have Bobcats though...
- Feral cats can be unpredictable if they feel threatened. If they can't be taken off the street and domesticated they should be caught, fixed and vaccinated, and released. This way they can't make more cats or get any others sick.
- Spreading disease, breeding uncontrolled. Get into fights.
- Disease and reproduction
- none
- Same as above. Feral cats kill wildlife, damage property and it is a horrible, dangerous life for the cats.
- These animals needs systems to help them live and be safe. Spay and neuter programs are essential. Community health of these animals needs to be addressed to.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There are lots of feral cats in calgary and not enough resources for people who want to help with catch and release programs.
- Feral cats create the same type of issues that stray cats create but also spread more disease.
- They can have health issues and cause concern for pets. They prey on songbirds. They should be either trapped, neutered and released, adopted into homes if possible, or have a "safe haven" colony established.
- There should be a trap/neuter/release program in place for feral cats.
- Same as above
- increase in numbers
- Are they over breeding? Maybe i have not seen evidence. There are places that to catch neuter and release for feral if population gets out of control
- Same as above
- Their quality of life being out in the cold
- Same as above, however increased chance of wildlife impact via hunting and transmitting preventable diseases to owned cats
- Same as above, but with nobody to bring them back to if they're caught. Also, do they tend to roam/escape if they get adopted?
- Harsh winters.
- Over population. If they're sterilized and have a primary caregiver, put them back into the neighborhood!!!
- Passing infections or diseases to healthy cats with owners. I'm also sad that they don't have a home.
- Population control.
- The lack of support for TNR programs for these types of cats in the City. I believe this is the best way to get control of these populations and there is a huge cat crisis across the province as we don't seem to value cats as much as dogs.
- None as long as they are not rabid.
- They should be removed, there are enough cats everywhere already.
- Overpopulation. They need to be spayed and neutered, eventually moved to acreages or elsewhere.
- Just need to be able to recognize which cats are feral vs. roaming cats that are owned by someone.
- I don't have concerns except that there could be a TNR program in place to manage identified colonies. See the success at tinykittens.com. They can sometimes be rehomed. It would be very unique for a municipality to have a program like this.
- That feral cats are misunderstood, should be TNR'd and returned to their colony, not attempted to be adopted.
- Feral cats should be fixed and put up for adoption to avoid their spread. There should be a rule that if a cat has a collar / tag / license they should be left alone. There needs to be a hard and fast definition of "feral" so that the city isn't abducting cats that are minding their own business.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't see feral cats in my neighbourhood. To be honest I think they are less of a problem because of their wild side they stay away from people. I only have a problem with roaming cats that are people's pets in the neighbourhood
- Cats not getting vet care, breeding freely and not getting proper food and attention. Cats outdoors are always in danger from wildlife and cars. They are also dangerous to local wildlife
- We need to put in efforts to have them spayed or neutered to keep the population under control and minimize their impact on other wildlife.
- No concerns, if they are found they should be spayed/neutered, if young enough for adoption that is great.
- Not spayed, disease, attraction for bigger carnivores and allergic reactions, outdoor litter box challenges.
- Feral cats tend to be better hunters, making them more dangerous to wildlife, and they do not have any vaccinations, making them more dangerous to cats with homes.
- That they will not be safe or they will be taken from their environments and euthanized.
- Same as above
- short life span and their presence can draw in wildlife ie: bobcats
- Significant concerns particularly the impact on native wildlife (#1 cause of death for birds in North America). Risk also to human health and safety. Waste in gardens - disease for people.
- I don't really except if we could increase the spay/neuter release program in order to help the numbers be reduced.
- The cats are still at grave danger for getting hit by cars, eaten by wildlife, harassed by people, or injured and left disabled due to lack of care and veterinary contact.
- None
- carrying diseases, them pooping in my yard, multiplying in numbers, killing birds
- They poop in our gardens, and our animals get very upset when a stranger is on our property.
- They can become aggressive and carry diseases.
- they are an invasive species and can harm local native species
- None.
- none.
- Same as for free roaming cats (environmental destruction, road hazard) plus the added component of disease spreading.
- Same as above.
- They are a potential hazard to drivers; they are a potential hazard to other pets or people if they get in to someone's yard or if they have contact with other people's pets
- They do not have adequate food or shelter
- I haven't experienced any issues with them.
- I have no concerns regarding feral cats, they should be able to live their best life out on the streets instead of being euthanized for not being friendly enough. People should care for them and provide food and water and shelter.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- they are likely to die prematurely, they need to be cared for and spayed/neutered
- I've never had an issue with a feral cat in Calgary.
- They will likely not be vaccinated and overly aggressive cats attacking could cause transfer of disease.
- Same as above
- That they won't be spayed/neutered and will be making more cats that won't have a good quality of life.
- Accidents on the road, un-spayed or neutered cats reproducing, cats preying on local bird populations.
- They should be euthanized
- Not much
- Not really. Not sure i would know the difference between a feral cat and a lost pet
- " -unaltered cats breed indiscriminately
- -spread disease by using gardens and playgrounds as litter boxes
- -decimate the songbird population"
- They could be dangerous
- That they are not spayed or neutered. That they are exposed to the elements and do not have necessary food, water or vet care
- In addition to possible danger to children these animals could be carrying diseases that could pose health problems to people.
- Breeding more. Feral cats are fine but they should be spayed/neutered then let loose again
- Could be carriers of disease for domestic or stray cats, kill a lot of migratory nesting birds
- Killing/safety of birds and kids. Destruction to flowerbeds and gardens
- That they are unchecked. They go unspayed, spread illness and impact wildlife. That said, the burden of care is difficult. Perhaps spay/neuter programs and medical treatments for feral cats could be offered without needing to rehome them. Vancouver has similar programs.
- They should be spayed and neutered and rehomed or given to rescues to be rehomed as barn cats or to monitored colonies.
- Over population. Injuries and accidents. Weather
- We need to rescue these cats and try to rehabilitate them to be adopted
- Disease
- None
- Potential to spread disease is the main concern, followed by risk of overpopulation. Feral cats tend to avoid populated areas and instinctively curb their own pops; but, a trap-neuter-release program that includes vaccines could provide great benefit to both human and feral populations.
- That there is funding to support them when it's cold.
- They may prey on song birds, may carry diseases
- They can get rabies
- Injury to other animals



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Feral cats are dangerous to other animals (cats, dogs, kids) and should be eliminated
- None
- Possible disease, with transference to domestic cats. Damage to property. Exploding feral populations
- They predate on birds that bring joy to our garden.
- never encountered any
- All the same as above except no I did responsible for them. As much as I love animals and own cats of my own the best course of action is trapping and humane euthanasia.
- N/A
- Feral cats may help keep mice, voles, etc. under control. Is there a possibility of spreading disease???
- I wasn't aware that there were lots in the city. I suppose they should be rehomed as barn cats as they most likely would not enjoy being a house pet.
- Feral cats have more feral cats. At what point is the feral population too much? Will they end up like feral rabbits when all of a sudden something has to be done to reduce the population?
- Disease
- they can potentially be dangerous if you encounter them by accident, someone might get hurt or get infected by it.
- They need space and freedom to roam without the fear of people
- "Harming other animals that might be in the backyard.
- When calling 311 to report strays, you should be able to provide a PHONE NUMBER OR address. I only had owners phone number and 311 wouldn't do anything! So no consequences for owners who don't register AND let their cats roam freely! Ridiculous!"
- Their health. Their ability to transmit diseases to pet cats. Will they try attacking my pet bunny rabbit if she is out in our yard? Will a feral cat attack my kids if they go to pet it?
- None.
- That they are not getting the support they truly need, some cats need vet care and they are left to fend for themselves.
- Hard to tell which are Feral and which are lost- thus using up volunteers to attempt to catch and reunite to owners. Also they would be attracting bigger wildlife like coyotes
- None
- Despoiling my garden with excrement
- Their safety and health. Small children being exposed to their feces in backyards
- They are fine but it would be nice to make sure they get fixed.
- If they are truly un-owned cats I would like to see the city collect them.
- Damage to bird populations. I worry about animals being cold and hungry or sick. Also, unaltered cats produce more kittens.
- Safety concerns or poop in the sandbox
- Collect these cats and eratacat.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think all the cats in my yard are owned not feral so don't have an issue with feral cats.
- Reproduction, impacts on ecosystem, pathogen transmission
- Same as above
- How does a domestic cat live outdoors? They just didn't drop from the sky, we are responsible in putting them there
- Potential for them to injure people who frequent areas they live.
- Same as above.
- Spreading of disease to non-feral roaming cats. Wild bird population in decline.
- I have not seen this in our community. There need to be a city initiative to have a spay/neuter clinic for feral colonies. As long as these cats are fed and ALTERED they are great at keeping rodents away.
- Same as roaming cats. And they get hurt when it's cold and they don't have homes.
- "Increased breeding.
- Cat fights.
- Disease."
- The city should have a TNR program in place and a Barn buddy program as well.
- To keep the population under control, all cats should be spayed or neutered, including feral colonies.
- We need to adopt a "fix and free" program. Some rescues already do this. Trap feral cats, neuter/spay them, and return them back to their area. This will help prevent breeding which just leads to more feral cats.
- Efforts to cull would be supported
- none unless they show aggressive behaviour and then they should be captured and put down
- None, there are no bother in our neighbourhood
- Annoying for neighbourhood should be taken in by city.
- None, never seen one in Calgary
- That they will breed and young kittens pay the price of fighting the elements
- Negative effects on native wildlife (birds, etc).
- Unneutered cats roaming free can cause more, they can be a nuisance, they can be exposed to disease and then spread it. I haven't had experience with feral cats outside of a farm, just owners who allow their pets to roam and those who have abandoned their pets leaving the city to deal with them.
- The same as above plus overpopulation and the needless suffering it causes
- Feeding stations around the city and a capture/release program to fix them and prevent overpopulation.
- These need to be caught and fixed and rehomed. I think there needs to be more of a push to catch all these loose cats.
- can't say I have ever come across any!
- They tend to be a food source for the local predators. What feral cats
- None, never come across any



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Feral kids need to be managed through rescue efforts and spay and neuter programs.
- None
- I believe that having colonies of some feral cats that have been trapped, neutered and released does in fact help the control of the overall feral cat population.
- Disease, aggression
- Feral cats should be caught and sterilized to limit their breeding. Ones that seem fit for domesticating should be caught and adopted. Population of feral cats allows for the flux of predators in the urban space.
- Dying kitten
- Just animal feces in my gardens and excessive breeding.
- Disease but they are actually no different than squirrels and other wildlife.
- They should be caught and spayed and neutered and if possible either socialized to become adopted or given to farmers for their barn cat population.
- They should be gathered and put up for adoption.
- Any Feral cats who are not in a home at some point during the week should be taken to the shelter offered to farmers for dirt cheap after they are fixed
- Unwanted kittens, lack of: food water shelter compassionate care
- That they may hurt other people's pets
- No help is available. People expect rescues to handle ferals, which they're willing to do but are under-resourced. Put some money into TNR programs and more into SNAP! Spay and neuter should be free.
- These cats are going to suffer, they need shelter and food as well as neuter/ spaying. TNR is not enough in our climate.
- It is unsafe and unhealthy for them and others. They should be caught and, of possible, be adjusted to humans and adopted out.
- Spread of disease and un neutered cats having litters
- Eat songbirds. Diseased. Hard and terrible life for an animal to be outdoors in minus thirty weather.
- A concern I have is that they can create many more cats because they breed and procreate at very high rates.
- We feed and water neighbourhood feral cats by agreement with the Meow Foundation. I would not like to see indiscriminate euthanizing of otherwise healthy cats which are unadoptable.
- It's cruel and could be prevented if every cat was spayed nurtured. We could put much more effort into control by compulsory l'd. chips. I think our officers will never catch up to their work load.
- Their health and wellness. Spaying/neutering as well.
- Their health and well being.
- unless they have disease, i'd just leave them be.
- Disease spread, overpopulation of cats leading to strain on animal rescue organizations
- Again my concern is safety especially when they are not receiving any vet care.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Current bylaws do not allow for responsible TNR communities, which makes it difficult to care for this population.
- They cause issues in neighborhoods such as fights, reproducing, etc in addition to end up ring killed by cars and wildlife
- None in the city.
- Disease and mess making
- The same as above but they are possibly more aggressive than domesticated cats
- Feral cats spread disease and unbalance the local ecosystem. They need to be trapped and euthanized or rehomed.
- That they be handled appropriately with trap, alter, & release and not left to endlessly reproduce. Ideally, they would also have a community guardian(s) keeping watch.
- Limited ability to sterilize and control population
- Get rid of them
- Never see a feral cat. Wondering if they can survive the extreme cold weather.
- They should be safely neutered or spayed and Released or put into the adoption program.
- I believe that people should be able to leave out food and fresh water for them and even set up warm spots for them to sleep. The city should also make sure some warm spots are set up for them.
- I don't come into contact with feral cats but imagine Calgary would be a tough place for them. Considering their impact on the bird population. I believe there should be a catch and neuter or spade program with the goal of refund the population of feral cats down to zero.
- Disease. Food for bobcats or coyotes, so they stay in the area. Spraying urine near homes and areas where children play.
- We should work with rescue organizations to TNR any feral cats so that the population doesn't grow out of control.
- None
- Finding them safe shelters to survive the weather.
- Danger to wildlife, uncontrolled breeding
- Start a spay and neuter program where they are trapped and released back after. They will continue to live the life they know, but cannot expand the populations. Sadly there is no demand for feral cats, so they will remain the neglected, but there is hope that they can live the life they have.
- Cats are mean. Often swatting, taking ownership of neighbouring property
- Disease, predation birds, injury and harm, stressing indoor animals, population control
- Disease
- Just that they could get hurt mostly at the hands of humans
- Trap Spay neuter release. No kill. They are loose / born due to humans being irresponsible.
- I have not seen any in my area
- "Disease transfer
- Impregnating other cats"
- none



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same as the above.
- They kill birds, dedicate in flower beds, and will multiply with kittens if not nurtured or spade. They can carry diseases. and could make meowed in the night.
- Not many. As long as there's access to trap neuter return programs.
- It's unfortunate for them, and the concerns I have are mostly things such as safety (cars, salt on roads, etc), resources (food, water, shelter from elements, etc), and being unfixed and breeding. But, feral is feral, and at some point they're no different than any wild animal.
- None - I have never seen one and I am third generation Calgarian. I'm sure there are some in the downtown core, in Ward 1 we have coyotes
- Again, I don't want our city to be overrun with cats...
- No concerns. I do not know of any feral cat in the neighbourhood
- Diseases and they threaten our cats safety. He is very afraid and anxious when there are cats outside. (He is always indoors)
- My biggest concern is for the safety & well being of the ferral cat, & I don't want their population multiplying. They need to be fixed, but NOT euthanized! I don't think they pose much danger to people, like bats & wasps do!
- I don't.
- Concern-Killing birds. Solution-eliminate feral, stray and roaming cats.
- Possible property damage
- None
- Cats decimate local bird populations. Feral colonies breed rapidly, leading to strain on both the environment as well as animal shelters, which then have to either euthanize or turn away found animals.
- Animal care and welfare.
- Poop in my garden.
- Health and safety of feral cat.
- No concerns. TNR and leave them be.
- None. They keep the rodent population down.
- Feral cats should not be in a city setting just because of overpopulation concerns, but are very useful in rural areas like farms, however there population is kept down because of predators in these areas.
- risk to wildlife, human health risk and concern for the health of the animals
- None
- The only adequate way to deal with feral cats is to catch, sterilize and release. Their numbers will then eventually go down. Instead of relying on non-profits, I'd like to see the City take an active role in this process.
- They kill birds
- I'm sure there are some but in my neighborhood (mount pleasant) I recognize most of the cats and they are domestic cats with homes. Feral cats can cause a lot of damage too so also a concern.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Wild bird populations are already under tremendous pressure and their numbers are declining. Nature Canada has great information: <https://catsandbirds.ca/about/>
- Health and disease
- Feral cat population should be monitored so that the population doesn't become out of control. I didn't know Calgary had a feral cat population. Perhaps a program to spay/neuter feral cats would be helpful.
- They should be trapped
- Feral cats concern: overpopulation, being targeted by cruel persons and diseases like distemper and rabies.
- Concerns about diseases and nuisance.
- I am concern for their safety from predators and people. I am also concerned about their impact on birds.
- feces, spraying, mating & fighting noises, constantly going into peoples yards, gardens, flower beds etc. Also concerns with children outside coming across these cats. Diseases from these cats that you could get. Killing of birds & leaving them where children could get them. etc.
- Killing local wildlife
- The lack of coordinated plans to control the population. The municipal government doesn't have a plan or partnership with a rescue to provide SNR in the City to minimize damage and population.
- They should be captured spayed or neutered and if possible adopted. Otherwise send them back to the colony. Also find people who abandon their cats and fine them heavily.
- Very few.
- People find them "cute" and leave for food them. They might wander into yards for food and water and attack those who try to approach.
- They can be aggressive.
- same as above
- Feral cats are not spayed or neutered and can lead to a population explosion. This is bad for the cats and others alike.
- Damage to wild life and gardens.
- Just that the city is working to reduce the feral cat population
- Are they spayed/neutered? Controlling the population in a humane way is the best method to caring for the feral cat population. Additionally, I believe it can help reduce song bird predation.
- None, don't think I've ever seen one here in the SE.
- They leave feces in food gardens and cause damage to outdoor furniture, and they kill birds.
- They're often not sterilized, which tends to result in more feral cats.
- Same as roaming, though feral cats have more street smarts that a house tabby.
- None, I don't see them
- feral cats can carry disease and kill birds, create issues for dogs in back yards and their population cannot be easily controlled.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They reproduce at a very quick rate and populations could explode. As they are feral they cannot be easily caught and converted into pets. Feral cats need to be trapped and spayed/neutered before being released back into the wild.
- Free-roaming house cats can behave like feral cats due to fear, so I do believe they should still be trapped and assessed. CHS has a great barn/shop cat program for these cats.
- None
- Some feral can never be rehabilitated or captures for sterilization.
- The well being of the cats, I have seen one hit by a car in the road of our residential street and see them digging in Garbage's
- My concerns for these cats are the weather conditions in winter and the risk of being killed by the wildlife in our area.
- As above.
- Disease, cats fighting.
- Same as above, as well as attacking people or other animals.
- Not being spade or neutered
- Feral cats can be quite mean so they could be caught and given a chance to be domesticated
- I have no experience with them
- See above. It shouldn't be on small charities to take care of the problem. The city should have a solid TNR program like many other cities do and expand their low in income pay and neuter assistance program.
- Feral cats can become aggressive, especially if they have kittens, and can attack small dogs, children and sometimes even adults. They need to be caught and removed.
- Feral cats should be trapped, spayed/neutered and returned to their colony. It's a no brainer. Talk to or partner with AARCS or ASNTF to get a program up and running.
- Feral cats spread disease and over populate quickly.
- Really don't have an answer other than they can't be allowed to roam free. And thus creating a bigger problem as they reproduce.
- They need to be captured and put down. Having been to other country that have allowed feral cats populations, the populations have soars and the city is inundated with cats
- That they bite someone, start reproducing, cause any damages to houses and be Disease carrier
- The feral cats get into my beautiful gardens and wreck the plants. They will spray on walls fences also. The smell is very hard to remove. I love cats but this is a big problem in my neighbourhood.
- The high volume of feral cats that end up in local animal shelters that are very hard to domesticate and place into homes.
- Same as for domestic cats, plus they should be spayed and neutered so feral populations don't increaae
- They don't seem to bother me. Maybe allow people to kill them if they are a nuisance.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Again, human beings are the worst. I like feral cats, their colonies do need to be managed - spay/neuter, for illness, and food provided - but they provide a service in that even if there is food they keep vermin down - mice, voles, etc.
- Feral cats are not native to Calgary and compete for food and habitat resources with natural wildlife.
- Feral cats should be euthanized sad but true.
- Same concerns as with roaming pet cats.
- That they are continuing to breed/reproduce and lead to similar problems as with roaming cats. Sterilization programs would be a positive way of mitigating this
- None
- Bird predation.
- They need to be removed from the landscape humanely. There are a number of Calgary based rescues that can be involved in this process!
- The inevitable need to capture and euthanize cats who have been left to breed unchecked, and who suffer due to our inclement winter weather.
- attacks or diseases
- Feral cats can have adverse affects on their local ecosystem. A predator species, they quickly overwhelm the prey species, throwing the ecosystem out of balance. They are also a prey species to other predators higher up the chain such as Coyotes who hunt farther into our communities to find them.
- Should be trapped/caught and contained or put up for adoption/rescue.
- Same as above.
- Sadness that they don't have a loving home.
- I don't ever see any feral ones
- disease, other animal deaths, their population being unchecked.
- Spread of disease
- They kill too many birds and defecate in gardens.
- None
- None
- they have no one look after them if they get sick or hurt. More food shelters and shelters to help protect from weather should be provided
- Provide support for organizations like the Meow Foundation handle it. The city cannot or will not do it.
- Feeling sorry for cold and hungry animal
- In our area, not an issue, just the domestic ones.
- I have never seen any within the city. I see far more feral bunnies.
- same as free-roaming cats, poop, fights, noise.
- I think feral cats have a difficult life trying to survive.
- Not sure if cats become rabid but issues should be dealt with on a case by case basis.
- If their health is not an issue they're not an issue



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Feral cats should be trapped and spayed/neutered so we can reduce the feral cat population over time. Then released back to the colony to live out their existence. Otherwise they should be left alone
- N/A never saw one
- None. The bobcats are in our area sometimes, and they generally stay away.
- spay/neuter, kittens can be rehomed through rescue
- Same as above
- Territorial disputes between toms and impregnating more domesticated cats
- -Same as above
- Populations generally stay low without intervention, in my 15 years in my neighborhood the strays come and go but never an over abundance. Helps keep rodent population down where Coyotes are not present.
- The cats could be spreading disease and impregnating other cats.
- *Your definition doesn't include what you mean by stray cat. Feral cats can be vicious and kill birds.
- As said, catch females, spay and release again. In cities in the Us they see the value of feral cats to keep down vermin.
- Same as above but also including attacks on domestic animals and spread of rabies.
- The biggest concern with feral cats is overpopulation. I'd support a program where feral cats are trapped, neutered, then released.
- They are often sick, hurt and suffering.
- These feral cats have an impact on wildlife health and population.
- Spread of disease.
- They kill native birds and raid nests. They also urinate in the same spots over and over and poop in gardens.
- they spray outside the houses, are aggressive or spread illness to leashed pets.
- Feral cats should be caught and euthanized.
- Breeding and a general problem
- I have no concerns about feral cats. Live and let live.
- Impact on urban wildlife, especially birds; transfer of disease to owned cats. Horrible life for these animals.
- Could carry disease
- Attracts wildlife ie: coyotes. Potential Disease issues to all other city wide pets.
- Health and safety, spay/neuter status.tra
- These will populate with other cats and produce more unwanted cats.
- Their proliferation
- breeding, carrying disease
- None at all. They avoid others mostly.
- My concerns are because of how many domesticated cats are roaming free in our community, further adding to the feral cat population.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I feel sorry for them and have taken a few to the Vet.
- "bird loss - cats kill approximating 2.4 billion per year.
- Outdoor cats can be hosts to fleas, ticks, ear mites, tapeworms, roundworms, hookworms, and heart-worms. While rare, fleas can infect your cat (public) with tapeworms. Ticks often carry Lyme Disease and Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever."
- Poor dears
- I support a capture, spay, and release program
- The same as with roaming cats. But if no one owns them, the population isn't being managed. Un-fixed cats just create more cats.
- Weren't these cats homeowners cats at one time that they just ignored and let go their way I'd say any pet owner meet reminders every year of the rules put in place when you decided to have a pet and make the fines harsh
- Same concerns as above
- reproducing, attracting coyotes (predatory animals) to the community
- it is sad that we have this situations and it puts other animal at risk of possible diseases.
- Their living conditions, we should follow the best policy to ensure that we are treating them as humanely as possible
- None.
- Wildlife sustainability and vehicle hazards
- The animal needs to be Spayed or Neutered.
- Improper human interaction with feral cats. eg Bobcats/Lynx. We invaded their home. Educate the public for safety and co-existence.
- It has not been a big problem, but the things about roaming cats that bugs me are: crap in my vegetable garden, hunting at my bird feeder.
- They should be put down
- Safety for the feral cats, shelter, food. It is a brutal world out there.
- Health and Safety of the cats and the people living around them. Cold weather care and coyotes etc
- I do not see feral cats in my neighbourhood.
- I can't actually say that I've encountered a feral cat. The ones I see are well taken care of. They just like to get outside and explore, it's their nature.
- No concerns as long as they avoid contact ...
- Same as roaming cats (see #1), but these animals are at a higher risk of acquiring diseases and spreading them to pets and humans.
- I have no concerns as they keep the rodent population down.
- We should be reducing feral cats by spaying/neutering them and stopping the dumping of cats into the wild.
- None, as they are avoiding human contact as much as possible. We have a good size yard but I have never seen a feral cat on our property.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A certain number of feral cats are good to help control the population of mice and other vermin. I prefer a "neuter and release" policy.
- I just worry that they are cold
- Reproduction again. I was recently in Istanbul and feral and stray cats are captured, spayed/neutered and vaccinated before being released again. The top of one ear was docked to show that this had happened.
- None
- I have concerns about cat feces, and them digging in my garden or child's sandbox
- Feral cats can be dangerous and can carry disease - they need to be humanely captured and taken out of our neighborhoods.
- Same as in 1) above with the added safety risk for interactions with persons and domesticated animals as feral cats are not socialized to manage these encounters.
- Let them roam, coyotes will keep them in check
- Non sterilized animals causing the population to explode (similar to the bunny problem near the 39th Ave CTrain Station)
- Their health and well being (preventing zoonotic disease transmissions) and keeping their populations under control through trapping, vaccinating and spaying or neutering.
- " - Roaming cats kills birds
- - They are traffic hazards.
- - They spread disease and parasites.
- - They provide no benefit to society."
- zero concerns. they keep mice and vole populations down
- My primary concern is their safety. Secondly exposure to extreme winter conditions, and last their unfettered reproduction rates.
- Their safety, they avoid human contact for a reason
- I do not feel the city of Calgary has a feral cat issue
- They make a huge amount of noise with their fighting and they leave fecal matter on my property where my children play.
- As above
- Reducing the amount of feral cats by continuing to support spay/neuter programs is the best way.
- Feral cats kill song birds. They should be caught, neutered, and re-homed.
- Same as cats roaming free
- No concerns except for their wellbeing.
- Trap and kill
- Disease
- Health safety welfare of animal.
- Songbird hunting.
- See #1
- That they become targets for sick and cruel people



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Over breeding as is not in the cats interest or the humans.
- My concern with feral cats is that they are not neutered. Calgary is a very hostile environment for these cats who live short sad lives and breed more kittens to have the same type of life.
- My concern is that they are uncared for and suffer unnecessarily from disease and climate.
- If we don't want to have a cat explosion in the city the feral cats should be taken care of!
- They do not have consistent access to water, food, housing, warmth or protection from other animals. They deserve a better life. They also are not spayed or neutered or vaccinated.
- Diseases, killing birds, breeding.
- I think these animals should not be left free on the neighborhoods.
- As above also disease
- They use people's property for a washroom, they dig up people's property, they chase and kill wild birds (I have no issue with them chasing and killing mice or squirrels), they fight with other cats, they have unwanted kittens, they may be sick,
- Eating birds and other wildlifes. Destroying my garden.
- none controlled cat population leading to unhealthy cats and impact to local wildlife such as birds.
- They can multiply quickly and live much shorter lives
- Spread of disease.
- Feral cats can be useful in keeping rodent populations down. Perhaps tagged and fixed feral cats can be left for vermin control
- " - Uncontrolled population growth
- - Welfare of the cats
- - All the issues from #1"
- Cats are not a native species and shouldn't be in the environment.
- 1. My concern is their health and safety.
- My concerns are for the cats. They were originally pets whose owners abandoned. Again, they are not a problem in my neighborhood.
- That they could be carrying diseases that could be transmitted to other roaming cats.
- As above.
- Sadly these cats have no proper care and should be humanely euthanized. I understand the logistics are difficult. Who will catch them and pay to euthanize? Perhaps they are a food source for hawks and eagles ? I do not know, but if their numbers are a problem, then it needs to be addressed.
- I don't believe in TNR in residential areas as it causes conflict with neighbours. Stray cats need to be trapped.
- These poor cats were someones pet at one time and were abandoned. They should be treated decently, microchipped if possible and given a proper home to live their years.
- Rabies. Eating garbage.
- I don't know of any in Calgary. I am sure they exist but I am unaware.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They suffer as are not intended to live in our climate, they can spread disease to pets and harm wildlife.
- As above
- Potentially more dangerous & aggressive - impact on native wildlife - should be captured & destroyed
- Same as above. Concern for their health.
- Before the climate crisis, I worried about winter kill but now I mostly worry that they are sick or injured and might be suffering.
- possible attacks
- They do what they gotta do to survive . Hard to control them once they are feral.
- "Feral cat populations are known to get out of control fast due to the number of litters an animal can have annually.
- These cats can be a nuisance to society, spread parasites and diseases. Affect the balance of wild species."
- They stalk my yard and aggravate my dog and no-one is responsible for them.
- Not many. They are unlikely to approach people & while I don't want them in my yard, there may be areas in which they help keep rodent populations down
- Revolting cat droppings
- My concern again is for the animal. But so many people have farm cats out of the city and on reserves that they don't spay/neuter I believe that's were they come from. But if they're within the city, the should be helped!
- None
- Same as above . They MUST be culled or you will have a similar problem to the bunnies in Canmore or all the feral cats in some european countries. Also very unsanitary
- TNR programs do good work. Keep supporting them.
- The animals safwty. Especially in the cold winter months
- None - I'm unaware of any in the neighbourhood where I live.
- They can pose a danger to people and pets especially when they have offspring and when they are hungry.
- None other than they also deserve to receive the Five Freedoms. The city of Calgary has been recognized as a leader in their companion animal programs. There is a opportunity to continue this in developing a sustainable, compassionate feral cat program.
- Doesn't bother me.
- Refer to #1
- Most feral cats came from a domestic cat that was abandoned but survived and gave birth. There should be a greater push to spay/neuter all pets. The feral cats ive encountered arent dangerous and can be co-habitated with.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Nothing. They are important members of the community that control the mice population and cause no harm. They all need to be spayed or neutered to control the population though, and vaccinated which can be done through the MEOW foundation.
- I am concerned about them attacking other animals
- Disease, clean up of garden beds. Will animal services take them when I trap them? They can eat the mice but they will get the birds!
- I don't really have any concerns as they rarely come into contact with humans
- Need spay neuter and release programs.
- I do not see feral cats in my area.
- I have never see feral cats.
- Same as roaming but more public safety issue. Overpopulation and infestation are a big concern.
- Feral cats spread disease and should be rehabed if possible and rehomed.
- They pee on my door mat as they smell my indoor cats, they crap in my flower beds and try to eat & catch the wild birds I feed
- City should spay and neuter then if possible. Realisw there are budget issues here though.
- The transfer of disease to pets
- No issues really, just dont want them to get hurt.
- They should be caught, spayed/ neutered and released.
- My concern is that the city does not have a Trap neuter release program. Studies show that feral cat numbers will never decrease unless we are using sterilization to limit them. These cats should be managed, not ignored or euthanized as you are currently doing.
- They reproduce uncontrollably and are not well cared for, often have injuries or diseases and low quality of life.
- That they might have corona virus
- That they are not spayed or neutered and have not had their shots.
- Feral cats should be caught and spayed or neutered to help control populations.
- Safety. All animals in the wild should be able to stay safe.
- No concerns with true feral cats (not cats that were dumped), but believe the city needs a better trap and spay/neutered program. This is the only way to control the population.
- I have not experienced a feral cat problem in my area
- My main concern is that these cats are safe and have access to food, water, and shelter in cold weather. If they do not they might be better off caught and taken to shelter.
- Getting into fights with domestic cats and potentially spreading disease
- Not enough focus on TNR programs or domestication.
- I only hope they are being taken care of by local TRN groups. And given support in colder months with food and shelter .
- None
- Get rescues more involved and help fund spay and neuter programs to prevent overpopulation in a humane manner



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Over population would be my only concern. Cats really are professionals at pest control
- Feces on my property.
- Never seen any so not concerned
- I have not encountered a feral cat in this city.
- They fight with resulting wounds that get infected, breed indiscriminently, are noisy when mating or fighting.
- noone
- These cats should have a safe place to go, regardless if they don't want human contact. I think they should be brought to a facility where they are safe from the cold and predators outside.
- if they are feral they may be not neutered or spayed resulting in more off spring on the loose
- Same as free roaming cats
- No feral cats.
- Feral cats should be left alone or offered to farmers. The city would have to ensure the feral cat is going to a legitimate farmer and not someone who will abuse or torture or use as bait!
- Diseases
- Similar concerns, but I also feel population control would be beneficial
- Killong native birds. Spreading pests. Noisy when fighting others for territory and in heat. Defecate in gardens and foodsources in gardens.
- I think that cats have the ability to multiply very quickly, and if the city does not support spay/neuter programs then feral cat populations can get out of hand. This can have significant impacts on bird populations.
- They can become a huge and potentially dangerous issue. When I was in Europe, some cities were overrun with feral cats. It was very nerve-wracking. Let's not allow this to happen here.
- I worry about the feral cats finding enough to eat in the winter. I think that feral cats could be a factor in the wildlife predators spending more time in the city, due to the abundant, easier to catch prey.
- Again none, except for their contribution to bird population decline
- All cats that are on the loose whether owned or not should be collected in live traps and the owners fined. The Derek ones either adopted or euthanized.
- Also none
- None
- Not spayed or neutered. Possible population problems. They have a high probability of survival after birth.
- Hard to control the population. They aren't neutered or spayed.
- Same as above - bylaw enforcement officers should be regularly catching these cats. Both pet and feral cats also have an extremely negative impact on wildlife, specifically birds. Theh have no place wandering loose.
- None
- None
- As above. Safety.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Safety of the cats and overpopulation
- None
- None
- as above
- None. They're more likely to avoid humans than house cats being let out. Just the fact they're not getting the care they deserve.
- The safety of the cat and imoact it has an on the ecological balance
- I wasn't aware that it was a problem but I would be concerned that they could spread disease to domestic cats
- They dominant the ecosystem.
- No feral cats at this time in my neighbourhood. We have coyotes - feral and 'roaming' cats are a food source!
- As above
- Reproduction, disease and aggression.
- Aggression towards other pets.
- I fear for their safety. I think if people spayed and neutered their animals we wouldn't have a problem.
- Feral cats contribute to the problem of unwanted kittens and affect the local bird population negatively.
- Feral cats can reproduce exponentially in a short time, which means they could be perpetuating problems.
- None, let em roam.
- "cat feces can spread toxoplasmosis when they poop in other peoples gardens. this is an unreasonable threat for pregnant women.
- they can spread disease to domesticated cats
- they also kill song birds whose numbers are currently in decline worldwide."
- It is through no fault of the feral cat that they are left to their own devices. Where possible these cats should be captured and rehabilitated.
- Feral cats should be trapped, spayed/neutered and re-released if they can not be rehabilitated to become domesticated.
- Breeding and making more cats
- If children try to pet them they potentially could be badly hirt
- I don't see many feral cats but my concerns are similar to free-roaming cats. They are detrimental to local bird populations.
- As above.
- Their safety.
- Feral cats can also be dangerous to songbird populations, they are also potential carriers of disease that can be passed onto pet cats since they are not typically up to date on vaccines. I also have concerns about population if they are not fixed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Over population in an area which could result in suffering of the cats due to lack of space and food.
- No comment.
- Spread of disease to stray cats (eventually returning to households).
- None. I don't see any in my neighbourhood.
- Not alerted
- Population control. Feral/community cats can assist with nuisance wildlife control. But they must be controlled with a TNR program.
- Feral cats should be captured and either domesticated or placed in cat shelters. Feral cats suffer in our winter climate.
- If we are to protect song bird populations, feral cat communities need to be culled. TNR programs are misguided at best.
- That they don't have a home or family to love them.
- That they are not taken care of, are not fixed and reproduce and enlarge the feral population. I feel bad for them.
- I worry about impact on local wildlife, and risk of them interacting with indoor/outdoor pets. I would also love to see a spay/neuter program to manage this population and prevent growth.
- None
- As sentient creatures, they should be cared for or at least a TNR (Trap and Release) program in place. As a modern society & a compassionate city, we should strive to have NO homeless animals on our streets. None
- These should be rounded up and put up for adoption if possible. If not, they should be put down.
- Population control and injuries to cats from cars or fighting with other cats
- I do not think that there are any feral cats in my neighborhood. I understand a lot of cities (or agencies that look out for animals) have decided years ago that the best thing to do with feral cats was to have them spayed/neutered and returned to hold their territory and keep down the vermin pop.
- I feel like they are extremely rare in Calgary but should be collected and probably put down humanely.
- The spread of disease to regular cats and overpopulation.
- Their health and that they may be abused.
- They are in everyones yard causing a nuisance.
- Concerned feral cats are not spayed or neutered and allowed to breed.
- Predatory to local bird life. Concerns about disease. Destructive to flower beds.
- Hurting owned cats on the streets.
- Spay and neuter before letting your cat out.
- Feral cats prey on native birds that are already hindered by shrinking habitat.
- Their temper.
- I don't see many within the city (at least where I am), so nothing besides what I wrote above and below.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Capturing wild birds and other animals and killing them.
- Same as above
- No concerns
- Dangers to their well being plus same concerns as for roaming cats.
- None
- Disease. Uncontrolled breeding. Competition with natural habitats. Breaking into waste containers for food. Generally nuisances. Pooping.
- should have a clipped ear so we know they have been spayed/neutered
- Killing and damaging bird habitat, spreading disease and bugs.
- That they can become overpopulated and kill songbirds and other pollinating birds. They also live sad lives being outdoors, subject to being killed by predators and harsh weather
- I don't know much about the issue, to be honest. I don't consider Calgary to have a feral cat problem.
- Spreading disease, pooping/peeing in my gardens.
- Pretty sure most of the nuisance cats in the area are owned
- We need a strong trap, neuter return program, with strong community cat reporting. Try to control reproduction and adopt out kittens when possible
- just that they be spayed/neutered and receive appropriate food/water/shelter and medical care as needed
- Similar: they can potentially wipe out native bird or animal species because they are such proficient hunters.
- i never see in the my community
- Population control and destruction of natural animals.
- Viciousness, biting, scratching.
- The cats are unlikely to receive veterinary care and may be suffering, may also spread disease. They also may be killing birds.
- These cats can create significant issues in neighborhoods. These cats need to be captured and potentially rehomed.
- Reproductive mayhem.
- Not sure
- Adopt kittens of feral cats. There are many kind animal lovers who will feed these feral cats and dogs. They should not be penalized.
- Same as for non-feral cats plus greater risk of rabies.
- No concerns, as long as feral cats are part of a TRap Neuter Return (TNR) program and are spayed or neutered to stop the population growth and have a caregiver in the neighbourhood, they should be allowed to live out their natural life.
- Trespassing, harassment, physical attacks on domestic animals in their own yards by feral cats trespassing. Diseases brought around by feral cats.
- Disease and



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Concerned for their welfare.
- I don't know anything about this but again maybe they would help to get rid of the high rodent populations we have city-wide.
- I don't have concerns, feral cats have coexisted in cities forever. People may be more willing to adopt a feral cat if they would be legally aloud outdoors. We for one would adopt a cat if the bilaw changed.
- Disease and death
- Diseases, over population
- The population problem with unneutered animals
- None except I believe there should be mobile vet services that will round up strays and feral cats to spay and neuter
- Attacks, fighting and spreading disease.
- - increasing population
- Pretty much all the same concerns about cats roaming free.
- Do not really have any issues where I live. If they keep rodents under control then fine.
- Not being spayed/neutered and producing more feral cats. Being hit by cars, wandering onto properties with non cat friendly dogs and even humans
- They are likely helping to control mouse populations. So no concerns.
- Bird deaths, diseases, and feces
- Breeding, disease
- my concern is with the growth of the population more than their existence. If they were neutered and self sufficient, I would not be really concerned. They help control things like mice.
- Haven't really dealt with ferral cats. Buy would be concerned about the animals and kids being around or what they have picked up and could be passed on to our pets.
- Keeping them safe and warm in winter. I don't see many feral cats in the city.
- Poor living conditions, disease, suffering, extreme temperatures, reproduction, animal cruelty.
- They attack other animals, other dogs, other cats. Unsupervised vicious animals roaming at large
- Injury to the cat, lack of shelter and food, predation on birds, spraying on items. They can be good for reducing rodent population.
- That they have diseases that could be transmitted to roaming cats.
- Spread of disease. They also attract predators.
- Getting a transferring diseases to humans or other animals like dogs
- That we have no TNR program to help them and to keep their populations under control.
- Same as #1. In addition, starvation and freezing.
- Simply numbers. Assuming they're previously domestic cats that have "gone feral", they're a non-native invasive species.
- None,not really much you can do,they are not usually the nuisance like cat owners who let them run free!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- as above. Have to contain them same as supposedly domestic cats. He doesn't avoid human contact.
- NA
- The City should have a feral cat program where attempts can be made to socialize the kittens and relocated the adults as barn cats if possible.
- Feral cats breed unwanted litters. Can cause danger to other animals and children. Cause unwanted defecation and odor. Feral cats need to be trapped and either domesticated or euthanized.
- All feral cats should be caught and adopted or euthanized.
- Same as the above re their killing of birds and animals, plus disease since they're unlikely to have been vaccinated if they're truly feral.
- None
- Same as above.
- None except the fact that I feel sorry for them
- Spreading disease, digging in garbage. Killing songbirds.
- Spread of disease
- As above. If no owners identified euthanized 48 hours
- Illness, dead felines, cats getting into garbage and therefore attracting other things
- They need to be helped
- Reproduction
- That they could disease or injure humans and pets.
- That they will freeze, starve and reproduce kittens who will freeze or starve
- None but population control
- Spaying and neutering must be funded municipally.
- I do not notice an issue with this
- More funding should be provided by the city to help trap-neuter-release programs and rescue shelters control feral populations.
- The unlikeliness of vaccination status in regards to if a owned cat got out or is a roaming cat and they get into a cat fight. They are increasing that risk of disease and illness. Not enough awareness of the MEOW foundation in regards to doing TNR for the extremely Feral cats.
- Overpopulation due to unmonitored breeding, health of the cats, cats passing disease onto domestic/ pet health
- I have not seen feral cats in our neighborhood.
- Only if they are intact
- That they will freeze and not have enough safe foods.
- These cats should be spayed/neutered through trap and release programs, as well as vet checked, vaccinated and provided with shelter and food.
- That they're safe and not getting hurt if hurting other things
- I am concerned for the health of the cat
- That they will be hit by a car or eaten by a coyote.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- These cats may become emaciated and struggle to survive throughout the winter months. Members of the public may look down on them, associating them with disease, and thus they may not be treated humanely.
- They should have loving homes too. Also they tend to fight with other cats and have higher risk of transmitting diseases to house cats.
- Not many. They hide, stay away, and remove the mouse population. They stay away from my yard as I have a dog.
- They are like stray dogs, both shouldn't be out on thier own because they are technically an invasive species and they can cause trouble.
- None, leave them alone unless they need medical attention
- None
- animals have no protection in the weather and no food
- That they will injure roaming cats
- No experience with them
- Over population, illness, lack of food
- Nothing. They tend to leave people alone.
- no Concerns, part of life I guess.
- We should control their numbers
- None. I have never seen one to my knowledge.
- Should aim to have less of them, but in my eyes no different than a bobcat, as long as avoiding human interaction our only concern should be preventing further breeding.
- Coming on to my property and using it as a litter box. Breeding
- Aggressive cats, cats carrying disease, or cat that aren't spade or neutered.
- I have never seen a feral cat in my community and don't see an issue with them in the city.
- The idea that they can increase their population quickly. The risk of spreading disease amongst their population.
- Feral cats, unless they are under the care of a responsible person, who is feeding and providing shelter, should be trapped and euthanized. They, like the bunnies, attract larger predators.
- Concerns are with the diseases they carry. They tend to use garden beds as they litter and that can be bad
- Not all being spayed and neutered, even with the programs in place
- They will, if they survive, find their place in the food chain.
- I have never seen a feral cat is Calgary and I have lived here over 30 years. If they avoid humans I don't think they are a problem
- The City could advise Calgarians that there are TNR programs to help feral cats, live out their natural lives outdoors. TNR programs, neuter/spay, vet check, provide winter housing, and have a responsible person to feed them. ie MEOW Foundation
- None
- That they aren't being trapped and fixed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- My concern is about their safety, I have never experienced any or seen them as a nuisance.
- I don't see that Calgary has a feral cat problem; I think probably our winters help to manage that
- n/a
- Same as above.
- Not much we can do cost-effectively to help feral cats. Leave them be; they typically avoid human contact and help to manage vermin in the environment.
- same as the above, also the risk of disease transmission to domestic animals
- city should get more involved in spay/neuter, trap and adopt out kittens.
- Aggressive
- not sure
- Same as above
- only that they are not vaccinated most feral cats can be tamed and at the very least neutered to prevent over population
- They kill wildlife. They are introduced into this environment and wouldn't be here without humans.
- contact with young kids
- Animal services likely has a role in controlling the feral cat population.
- Mostly that they will be killed by my dogs or hurt someone that comes across them
- Safety of the cat
- These poor animals were abandoned and had to fend for themselves. If possible they should be caught, neutered and released but in a safe location.
- none at all
- Reduce them. Nueter and release
- that they have a horrible life
- Provided they aren't behaving in a manner that affects my ability to use outdoor spaces I have no concerns
- diseases they carry worry me the most.
- Over-population from breeding, source of food for drawing wild predators into the city, possible disease transmission to household cats/animals.
- Roaming cats are a problem period, feral or not. Spaying/neutering programs are key. Perhaps stricter rules around purchasing a cat would help.
- I struggle with the City of Calgary's mandate not to allow trap and release in our city. If we could move to a system of trap and release it would help lessen the amount of feral and stray cats over time. This has been a successful initiative in many cities.
- Same, along with spreading disease.
- Not a problem in my area, but sadly I think they should be captured and euthenized (as it it my opinion that cats are a dime a dozen and we do not need to overwhelm cat shelters)
- N/A. Feral cats tend to avoid humans, and I don't have any concerns.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I support the catch-neuter-release approach to feral cats. I support the Humane Society neutering all cats before they are adopted. I believe that we need to monitor the feral populations - provide food, shelter in harsh climate conditions. I know they cannot be adopted easily.
- I have been a TNR caregiver for about 10 years (near Chinook). I do this because I cannot bear to see feral cats suffering. I am constantly shocked by how irresponsible & cruel Calgarians are towards animals.
- I don't notice a lot of feral cats, but would support a trap/neuter/return program.
- We have no feral cats in the neighborhood.
- Same as #1.
- I never see these in my community.
- Feral cats can be caught and euthanized.
- Not many. I don't see many in the city
- None. Doesn't seem to be a problem where we are.
- Should have a program to catch, spay/neuter and release (ottawa has done it).
- Potential for disease, killing local wildlife, aggressive towards smaller pets
- Defecating and spraying on my property. Are we able to catch, spay/neuter, and release so that the population doesn't increase?
- Violence towards other animals. Breeding and exploding population.
- It is not a problem in yyc
- No concern
- Cats that I have come across have all had collars so I can't speak to that in my neighbourhood
- None
- Haven't seen any in my neighbourhood
- See above
- uncontrolled population, transfer of diseases to domesticated cats.
- They cause so much damage to personal property, fighting, spraying and digging up flower beds!! They cause issues with indoor cats by teasing them. The back lane cat fights are ridiculous and very annoying!!!
- Feral cats can cause nuisance issues with spraying and digging on property and could be a health issue to other pets or people if they come in contact with anyone as they are unvaccinated and possibly carrying disease.
- I think that will become a bigger problem if left unchecked. I had seen a program where feral cats are caught, spayed and neutered and released to live out their lives, or adopted out if adoptable.
- None
- Breeding. Capture spay or neuter release. If they're super feral adult cats they're probably fine living on their own for the most part and kill nasty ass mice
- I believe the humans created the problem in the City by abandoning them, not having affordable spaying and neutering. People have the right to pets but most can't afford the vet fees in this city. The Pharaohs that are here should definitely stay but the situation does have to get under control



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None
- None
- I am concerned for the same reason as free-roam, as they kill wildlife BUT overall I'm less concerned because then they are part of the wildlife, as opposed to cats being fed at home then going to kill animals to fulfill their instincts. If these cats are actually eating to survive, I don't care.
- None. My cats have all of their shots.
- Feral cats can hurt humans and domestic pets if there's a conflict, and don't have a human to be responsible for their actions if they're being aggressive or causing property damage in the community. Feral cats in Calgary need to be eliminated and people who release their cats should be fined.
- Feral cats are vulnerable and at risk of passing diseases; attracting wildlife like coyotes; becoming vicious or starving. I understand the barrier to remove feral cats requires more resources and
- Same as above.
- There should be a capture, spay and neuter, and release program to keep their numbers down
- That they can negatively impact bird and other native wildlife in the city, and potentially impact the natural migration of birds and other wildlife through the city.
- No concerns, if I was aware of any I would probably phone the city to have them picked up if I thought they were in danger.
- Disease, aggression
- I believe it should be illegal for people to trap them. The city should work with spay and neuter clinics to spay and release them back to control population and they should be humanely trapped by professionals only when needed
- I have no concerns with feral cats. If a cat is hanging around our place, we trap it and take it to Animal Services. The feral cats do not return, the cats living in the community do return as the owners just allow them to roam free again and again. Stiffer fines are probably needed.
- None, see no feral cars downtown ever.
- The killing of song birds and small mammals. Also, of course winters are a concern as I don't wish the cats to experience the low winter temperatures.
- Breeding and kittens being born in unclean and unsafe conditions.
- Out of control breeding. In turn the colonies are out of control and most of these poor animals starve or die of illness.
- They may spread infections to other pets.
- I've never seen any so I have no comment.
- Constant exposure to untreated injuries, diseases and weather. Access to food, water and shelter. Increase population if not spayed or neutered.
- No concerns other than their safety, getting hit by cars etc. Want them to be safe.
- More education... I suspect they are not safe, they are not healthy, they are not built to live free. They kill birds.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I've never seen any (that I know of) in Calgary. I don't think a feral cat population should be allowed to established, both for human health and safety and for the sake of local wildlife and other pets
- "Breeding & fights
- Lack of vet care
- Injuries"
- That they started as abandoned animals and are now trying to survive. Stop them having litters
- They are a 'wild' animal, as a mom with young kids I do not one of these animals close to my children and even though they 'avoid' human contact - living within city limits this is not an easy task. Also these small animals also attack coyotes.
- Again, I think we need to control the population. I do not mind feral cats so long as they not harming or destroying people or property.
- Coming onto my property and pooping and peeing on my porch and in my gardens
- Same as above
- Same as above: getting in my yard, opening compost bags, attacking my cat through the screen door, cat poop in my garden, attracting predators to the area
- I didn't really even know we had a feral cat problem. But I am guessing it exists because people let their unfixed cats roam. This also means that the problem will continue to increase because feral cats are not fixed.
- That are not spayed or neutered which causes an over populated community. That don't have their vaccinations which can spread disease and feline HIV. They don't have regular meals or a warm shelter.
- The fact that none are spayed or neutered and the population keeps increasing.
- They may not be spayed or neutered
- "reproducing at rapid rates creating imbalance
- - bird and other wildlife safety"
- Do not see in my neighbourhood. If there are any controlled by coyotes.
- All of the same points I've made above, as well as the spreading of feline illnesses to pet cats.
- Mostly concerned about diseases and negative interactions with people, particularly children.
- Disease, upsetting my indoor cat (I live main floor of an apartment complex so she sits in the patio window a lot and sees all of the cats outside), injury to other animals or children.
- Too much random procreation and spreading of trash in the search for food as well as damage to domesticated animals.
- I don't have any concerns I haven't seen any
- I am concerned about the potential spread of disease and pests (fleas, ticks) if they come in contact with domesticated pets.
- The well-being of the cats themselves. Access to food, warmth, water. Bites
- Same as above
- Feral cats spreading illness to domesticated cats. However, I do not feel that this is a significant concern.

- A community may have a need to control a feral cat population if over-run.
- Rabies.
- Them harming other animals
- They can be carriers of disease and can cause injuries to other animals
- None I have never had a problem with any feral cat
- They can be a danger for young children especially if they are in heat.
- None
- Same as other cats roaming free above but would add that I would have concerns about feral cats having a litter of kittens in my yard.
- Absolutely none. Let me run until every block has 1 or 2. Hopefully they'll get poached or picked up by crazy cat ladies.
- Feral cats have to make a living just like the rest of us. Unfortunately they are known to kill songbirds to do this.
- I don't have a concern with feral cats.
- none
- Haven't seen any, not sure what could be done about them.
- Concerned for their lives & ALL the hazards they face on the street .
- I've never encountered these type of cats....most cats are owned in my neighbourhood. Cats keep the mouse and vermin population in check. My cats have a bell on their collar to alert birds.
- My concern is still the animal's safety, for the same reasons as above, but with feral cats, very cold weather is also a danger.
- Transfer of disease. Increasing population. Altercations with other pets
- I haven't encountered any where I live.
- Round them up to spay/neuter then release them again
- are they collected and humanely housed, health checked and re-adopted
- We should endeavour to have them picked up spayed or neutered, recognizing that cost is a problem. As much as we love cats a great many fall by the wayside and are not adoptable, we know that many are euthanized.
- Capture and euthanize them.
- Trap, neuter, release is what I prefer. Trapping and removing them to Animal Services just guarantees they'll be killed. The MEOW Foundation's TNR program to community caregivers makes sure they are fed, sheltered, and can't reproduce. Ferals are a result of irresponsible humans.
- Feral cats are wild animals. If they lose a threat to people, they should be moved.
- Feral cats are in danger from the elements. They should be rounded up sterilized tattooed or microchipped immediately after they are put up for adoption. It is the only solution to controlling the numbers.
- Theyre an invasive species and damage local ecosystems, also they poop in my yard and kill birds. I'm concerned about disease/parasites that have the potential to spread to humans or domesticated cats the escape



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- defecating in gardens, killing birds, getting into garbage, aggressive contact with humans, unwanted litters
- Spread of disease, as they are not vaccinated, nor spayed or neutered.
- None if they are not outwardly viscous.
- Disease and parasites. Uncontrollable breeding, it doesn't take long for it to become a problem. Killing songbirds
- Their safety & health
- Multiplying and spreading disease.
- They infringe on native wildlife, and have pretty short, horrible lives.
- I have never seen any.
- the same as above
- None
- No concerns .. let them be or try and adapt them to a home life
- These cats should be rehabbed if possible. If not they should should be spay/neutered and released.
- I have no issues with feral cats. They're born outside with no human contact and it's all they know. For the most part they're wild and self sufficient. I believe that human intervention should only occur if truly required.
- They should be rehome to acreages/ farms outside of the city where they may be safer and provided consistent food, water and shelter
- I'm not aware of any feral cats on my area.
- Spread of disease and the welfare of the animals.
- No current concerns
- Not sure where there is a problem but trap, spay, neuter and microchip needs to be implemented.
- I think they keep the mouse/rat etc population down.. I think great to have them.
- same as above.
- We need a well-structured Trap-Neuter-Return program that is conducive to volunteer assistance.
- Impact on birds
- General health and welfare of the cat balanced with factors such as property damage, fecal/urination issues, garden contamination, etc.
- My concern would be the potential for them to carry disease and spreading it to other animals including domestic
- Control only when overpopulated or diseased
- None, they are great, help control nuisance wildlife like mice and skunks
- Killing local wildlife
- The same concerns as above but these can also become wild and vicious and they breed indiscriminately
- I would like to see them spayed and neutered and released.
- They need to be spayed or neutered where possible



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Feral cats should be acknowledged as a reality in our community and need protection. We believe our City should support T-N-R (trap-neuter-return) initiatives to humanely manage feral cat populations.
- Safety and disease.
- No concerns
- None
- Mostly just their safety.
- Uncontrolled reproduction leading to overpopulation
- None. I understand their place in the ecosystem and how they bring down mouse populations.
- Their safety. Multiplying (not fixed).
- They poop in my garden.
- My concern for feral cats is the same for roaming cats. They can be hit by a vehicle, hurt by other animals, freeze or overheat in Calgary's ever changing weather conditions.
- Same issues as roaming cats.
- No experience
- Population expanding. Impacts on prey animals populations
- Cats destroying property, harassing & severely stressing indoor cats. Pissing and shitting everywhere, killing wildlife.
- Unhealthy looking feral cats should be reported!
- Round them up!!
- Uncontrolled breeding
- None, I haven't seen one myself within the city limits.
- The same over population and disease spreading without vaccinations and fixing them
- nothing
- I do agree with the City or the Humane Society trapping feral cats to try and save them and find them safe homes.
- Not too much.
- I have concerns about feral cats reproducing and increasing in numbers. I am also concerned about them defecating on my property.
- poor living conditions, carrier for disease
- eliminate them
- They mate and make more feral cats. Population can get out of control
- Mostly them just attacking my dog when I see them. But it's very low on my list of worries when walking.
- No concerns other than their well being. Our city needs to do more to institute a TNR program. If they are unable to breed, their numbers will naturally decrease.
- I have no concern with feral cats, just part of the wildlife.
- Can transmit disease and kill birds.
- "There is nothing wrong with feral cats. They are misunderstood and need a little more time



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Proud owner of 4 once feral cats."
- Since feral cats have little to no chance of being domesticated, they should be almost treated like wildlife. More Spay/neuter and release programs should be initiated to help keep populations down. Feral kittens and young cats will adapt to the idea of being a pet.
- That they are not sterilized or vaccinated.
- I feel feral cats should be put down right away
- I want to see them have good long lives.
- that populations are controlled.
- They kill wildlife, they multiply, they are often fearful of people
- I do not have concerns with feral cats in the city.
- None, I've never seen any in Calgary
- Feral cats cause animal populations to increase and kittens then have to be picked up by the SPCA etc. Cat overpopulation isn't a problem here but in other countries it is a problem. TNR programs would help cat populations while still allowing them to live outdoors.
- My primary concern is that they should all be spayed/neutered, especially the feral cats! Rescue shelters like AARCS have extensive spay/neuter/return programs that can help curb the feral cat population. They are perfectly capable of surviving on their own, and great for keeping mice at bay.
- Disease..
- I do not have a concern with feral cats unless they are physically harming someone.
- They could have rabies
- Only concerned if they are a nuisance. If there are one or two in an alley and they don't bother anyone then maybe it's not of concern.
- How they survive through the winter without adequate housing and food. If they are fixed and not adding to the growing population. The way they are treated as vermin and disposable by some humans.
- Again, for the safety, health, and quality of life for the feral cats.
- It's a rotten life for a feral cat in this climate, and a poor outlook for their kittens.
- None
- Feral cats spread disease and continue to breed
- Safety of people or animals that encounter them
- Health and safety of the cats, sanitation issues, exposure to toxoplasmosis and reproductive harm, safety of children and other pets who want to play, damage to personal property (gardens, scratching things) traffic inconveniences
- Getting into my yard with my dogs and overpopulation.
- Don't have those in my area.
- They can become aggressive
- Again, mostly concern for the cats safely and wellbeing.
- May get into fights with more docile domestic cats
- They are not indigenous wild animals. No need to have them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They should be sterilized
- Most of the reasons above: cat feces in my kid's sandbox; bird kills in my yard; cat spray/markings on my property; cats in heat making noise and disturbing me while I'm trying to sleep with my windows open.
- Disease. Population control. Attracting predators to city.
- Uncontrolled population increase by intact roaming cats.
- The only thing that bothers me is the humans that try to kill or hurt these innocent creatures just trying to survive.
- That they may come to harm through human cruelty and ignorance. They may also negatively impact native wildlife when they are allowed to breed unchecked. When there are feral colonies I would hope there would be TNR & education programs among the community members indicating modern means of helping.
- I think feral cats need to be trapped, fixed and relocated. I don't think having colonies of feral cats is ok in city limits at all. They can carry disease and cause overpopulations and usually suffer from injuries and illness.
- Never seen any in my neighbourhood.
- Same as above, however the ones destroying my gardens are our neighbours. They don't care!
- None; having lived in our neighbourhood for eight years, we have only encountered one once.
- Only concern is if they have food and shelter when cold and if they are fixed. Information about how neighborhoods can provide support to coexist
- None
- Feral cats should be caught and put in a shelter
- None, they would be extremely stressed to transition to living in a house.
- Disease
- That they don't have access to food, and they are not usually spayed/neutered
- Constant breeding leading to more cats
- That these animals aren't harmed
- A cat's purpose in our society is to be a mouser or a companion. If they are doing neither, they should be put down. It sounds cruel, but I think our money should be spent on people not cats.
- No one is taking care of them.
- I have not seen any feral cats in my area of Tuxedo.
- Feral cats, knock on wood, are not a problem. The cats that roam in our area, live in the area and have homes with irresponsible owners that let them roam free.
- The city of Calgary needs to support neuter-trap-return programs to keep the cat population down. The cycle of feral cats needs to end.
- Overpopulation
- Getting sick or injured and repopulating to over max use of resources, not having their needs attended to with proper shelter, food, or medical attention, lack of knowledge for public on engagement of how to address ferals



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It's unsafe for them outside and horrible what they have to go through. If people would be responsible & have their cats fixed, keep them inside, & not buy from breeders, there wouldn't be millions of cats killed every day. I do not see ferals as a nuisance, but animals that need help and love.
- "Do we have a feral cat problem?"
- Coyotes should take care of them."
- "Disease
- Vicious
- Cleanliness - pick up after them
- Bird population"
- "- Disease
- - Vicous
- - Cleanliness
- - Dog will eat"
- Don't have any in neighbourhood. See only 2-3 running at large. Might be more of an issue on city outskirts.
- That they will attack humans and pets.
- The population can quickly get out of hand if cats remain unaltered, increasing the risk of diseases (ie rabies). These cats are often mistreated, as people don't feel they have many options to reduce the populations.
- Would say the same....however don't believe there are many in my area
- Require a neuter/spay program to keep population reasonable
- Same as above.
- They suffer and can become injured or ill and suffer. Usually developed from being abandoned
- None. They are wild and generally keep their distance in residential neighborhoods unless someone decides to provide food for them.
- Don't want them to suffer so would like people to help care fore them. Would like spay neuter programs
- My pets being hurt by them and killing wildlife.
- Hit by cars
- We support animal organizations that trap & spay or neuter feral cats.
- Breeding
- Disease and safety for the cats
- No concerns -- they avoid human contact and provide natural pest management.
- They kill a lot of wildlife and are not a natural part of the ecosystem.
- None, Ive never seen it
- Frostbite, being preyed on, traffic collisions, humans deliberately targeting them as annoyances, not enough trap/neuter/release programs
- "Diseases



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Plus all other concerns regarding cats roaming free"
- " -Potentially aggressive
- -using other than the owner's land as a litterbox.
- -reproducing with other cats.
- -malnutrition
- -cold weather"
- Other than them being injured, nothing.
- didn't know Calgary had them
- Impregnating non-feral stray or owned cats and creating more kittens that will need homes. Disease. Otherwise I don't think I've ever seen one.
- They kill birds.
- My concerns are people hurting them. Or that there are so many that need to find homes.
- no concerns.
- Same as above. As well as disease and breeding.
- Same as above. How safe are they around small children and small animals. ?
- Them suffering from lack of medical, starvation, succumbing to elements, overbreeding.
- I have never seen a feral cat so have no concerns.
- I am concerned about health of the feral cats and reproduction. The animal foundations are doing great work with their spay and neuter programs.
- Round them up and spay/neuter them so they don't reproduce
- No exposure to this.
- Over population; at the very least they need to be trapped, neutered and released. Feral cats exist due to strays/wandering cats that have procreated and their owners have not been able to take on that responsibility.
- Over-population. Work with local rescues to support organized TNR programs within the city. Control the population.
- That no one/org is monitoring them- reproduction, disease etc. Community cat programs could be implemented to ensure these cats are fixed, have had one round of shots , are being fed- look up cat colonies (loads of successful projects in Asia)
- I am concerned for the health and safety of these animals. A spay ,neuter, release program could be implemented by the city in conjunction with rescue associations.
- That they are not healthy, and are over populating an area
- Disease, reproduction and destruction of property
- disease
- Concern for the cats' health and welfare and the fact that they are reproducing.
- I think feral cats provide a rodent reduction service but also concerned for birds. I think we should be able to provide a warm shelter and food for a feral cat and not have it considered part of household count for animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't believe we have a lot of feral cats in the city, I know there are few colonies that are well-managed, but I haven't heard of many other issues
- Do not have experience with feral cats. They should be trapped and adopted out if possible if not euthanized.
- Could be dangerous to our dogs if in our yard.
- "-disease
- -risk to the wild bird population"
- None leave them alone
- Can cause issues and scratch/harm dogs. I dont think we have a feral cat problem in my neighborhood though just problems with people letting their cats outside
- Can cause issues and scratch/harm dogs. I dont think we have a feral cat problem in my neighborhood though just problems with people letting their cats outside
- I feel sorry for them, but not a problem, where I live.
- If they ended up sick and then had interaction with one of my children. At least owned cats usually go home regularly for food and their owners would be able to recognize if they were acting strange or needed help.
- Have not experienced this.
- part of the problem is people don't register their cats not just to save money but if they get caught they don't have to acknowledge that they own them and pay fines. If people could register them and have a way to get pets fixed for a reasonable price may help.
- They can carry and spread disease. Probably should be eliminated to prevent such.
- They need to be spayed or neutered to control populations and the barn cat program needs to continue.
- They kill birds and squirrels, and spread disease.
- We do not have a feral cat problem in our area but we do have a domestic cat problem which are owned by our irresponsible neighbours.
- They can spread disease to other cats bite small children and be eaten by predators.
- Their survival rate is low and they need protection.
- They need to be picked up to prevent further breeding and prevent any issues with people. They cause damage and can be aggressive.
- I have concerns about feral cats being able to survive severe winter conditions. what supports are put into place to help them.
- Never see them
- That they can transmit disease, and that they are, in most cases, living desperate lives.
- No experience with feral cats as they are typically skittish. The concerns include injury to other pets, nuisance in yard but the likelihood is very small.
- That we do not have a TNR program for feral cats - trap, spay/neuter and re-release would not be a terrible idea in areas that have a high population of feral cats that would not interact well with humans. I believe Ottawa has/had a program like this (parliament cats).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I would like to see them rescued and if possible rehabilitated. I understand this can be difficult so I would hope a happy medium can be reached. Maybe a spay and neuter program to stop them from breeding.
- Why are they allowed when the bylaw says they are breaking the law
- No problem with truly feral "community" cats that are TNRed and hopefully have someone looking out for them, augmenting food, providing shelter. These cats very rarely make good candidates for adoption and it's only fair to let them live out their lives in their own environment.
- Not many, I just hope to see these cats get their shots and get neutered/spayed in a humane manner to be re-released in their neighbourhood as it is stressful for cats to be taken away from their homelands.
- I don't find there is many
- Same as above, but no suggestions as to how to control the existing population other than capture, sterilization, and release.
- None
- They have enough to eat.
- I always have concerns in the winter time. These cats end up with major frostbite injuries or death
- They should be treated like stray dogs.
- I worry about the spread of disease by these cats as well as their impact on the environment as they are not a native species of Calgary.
- Education, trapping assistance with spay/neuter being paramount. Ferals are usually in clusters or colonies, they need to be cared for and kept healthy.
- Their safety and the safety of other cats
- "build a spay/neuter program - vets in training could do as a learning tool and help cut down the feral numbers. Think of incentives for vets to take on the program to give back to the city.
- <https://www.alleycat.org/resources/why-trap-neuter-return-feral-cats-the-case-for-tnr/>
- I am concerned for their welfare but don't have other issues with them.
- Breeding, health of the animals. Why does Calgary not have TNR programs. Cats should not be killed just because people abandon cats, do not spay/neuter and allow cat colonies to begin.,
- Feral cats are destroying natural songbird populations. They need to be eliminated as they are not part of the natural environment and are threatening native species of birds and mammals.
- None
- Safety, shelter, food, potential for disease transmission
- see above. Also, anything that may affect children and vulnerable people who don't realise it's important to leave a feral cat alone rather than chasing it. A fearful cat can cause a lot of damage.
- Disease, unwanted litters, rooting through garbages
- Their welfare concerns me, but I have no problem with TNRs and think nature will take its course as long as they are fixed.
- Only that they may not be neutered.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Feral cats can be a nuisance as, ultimately, they have nowhere to call home. Also, they may not be 'fixed', adding to feral cat population issues.
- I don't know of any in the community
- I have no concern as I have not had any exposure to these in my neighbourhood. I feel they should be captured if not licensed - as they probably carry disease that could be passed onto domestic cats
- No concerns in urban areas
- none
- Illness and disease, kittens
- Not sure about the size of the problem - is there one? Need more information to respond. I haven't run into any feral cats on my many walks in our neighborhood and Nose Hill. Most stray cats seem friendly so wouldn't be feral.
- I have concerns for our wildlife (songbirds) but also the health & welfare of the cat itself (cars, coyotes, etc.). I'm also not fond of having to clean cat poop out of my flowerbeds. These animals often lead a short hard life. They could be managed with a spay/neuter release program to limit
- I would hope that we could work with the rescues in Calgary to have feral feeding stations, TNR projects. Help fund current people looking after feral colonies.
- Mostly kittens, and more feral cats.
- They are a danger to wild bird populations, and their populations can grow pretty quickly if they aren't neutered.
- Luckily I have seen more feral domesticated rabbits than cats. Both are a bit scary.
- The unchecked population boom that can potentially occur. Disease transmission within the feral cat population and any cats roaming outside
- There are great non-profit organizations working to spay/neuter to help reduce their populations while providing health care and food for them. The city as far as I know doesn't do any of this. The city could provide support to monitor these populations.
- Pooping in my yard and garden
- Concern the City of Calgary has no plan in place to deal with them.
- As long as they are spayed or neutered, they keep mice and vermin populations down but they get loud when fighting and aggravate our dogs
- None
- I wish there was a way to sterilize them and put them back out it is the only way to control the population.
- My kids getting attacked
- they need to be dealt with. they are a huge pain
- They should be trapped and neutered then either put up for adoption or released back to their territory.
- Feral cats are not spayed or neutered so could repopulate very quickly. They have no protection from wildlife, disease or the cold and could potentially suffer.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I've not encountered a feral cat in my neighbourhood.
- This is something that animal control should deal with though I've never had any problems with this.
- Carrying disease, attack, will come into my yard and wreck my garden.
- Would be worried they may not be living a safe life.
- Not a problem
- None
- None.
- None
- Mostly the same, just more risk of harm or diseases.
- No concerns.
- Spread of Disease (health of cat)
- they pose a safety risk to people and other animals
- They can be vicious and harm other animals and people. But they do help with mice control!
- The existence of feral cats and the amount of birds they kill at a time when many songbird species are in decline. I think feral cats should be removed.
- "Disease.
- Population control"
- Damage and nuisance they cause, destruction of local bird stocks
- Their safety
- Relocate outside of city limits.
- Exposure to dangers such as harsh elements and traffic can be detrimental if there are not members of the community looking out for them. Public ignorance can also lead them to harm these animals. By educating members of the public, we can reinforce the idea that these animals are not a nuisance.
- I haven't experienced any obviously feral cats in Calgary and support programs to get them into safer habitats like Barn Buddies
- Growing population, if that is the case. Would like more information to better understand where the problems exist currently , options and costs to address the problem.
- As above.
- maybe disease and aggression from them in the wrong situation?
- It's more the neighbours' cats who we know are owned and cared for but migrate all over the neighbourhood eating birds and using other yards as toilets. It feels wrong that as responsible pet owners (cat indoors, fixed, licensed) that this isn't enforced or perhaps the education piece is missing...
- Feral cats damage bird populations and should be controlled within the city.
- Over population and diseases they can carry. They cause concerns for bringing in the coyotes.
- Disease, that they will become victims of abuse / torture , and that they are an easy food source for wildlife. They can easily pass disease onto other pets. There are some very sick individuals in our society and my worry is that they might trap them and torture them for personal satisfaction

- Same as above, also killing birds hunting. Spreading disease, fighting domestic cats causing possible injury.
- people being cruel to them.
- None really..they are a risk of being killed by predators or contracting disease
- none
- None.
- we are feeding the cats as agreed to with the memow foundation
- Same as previous answer.
- That they are not neutered and so they create more homeless cats. Also that they are not well and suffering.
- There should be a city-wide feral cat neutering program established where residents can bring in feral cats to be neutered for free, given shots and released.
- These are a health and safety issue and should be removed.
- Feral cats are not spayed and neutered, which means increased amounts of kitties. This is over running a lot of rescue foundations and can be costly on society.
- None. As long as they aren't starting up fight clubs, I have no problem with them. Hoping spay and neuter task forces will help control the population by sterilization.
- No concerns
- I have not encountered feral cats, but I hope that there is a Trap, Spay, Neuter program for them.
- Feral cats need to have safe TNR sites that provide food and shelter. Rescue organizations that support these programs should receive funding from the City to help safeguard these cats.
- Birds being killed, spraying, perhaps spread of disease should there be an outbreak of something.
- They can spread disease and produce too many more.
- I am concerned about them becoming aggressive, possibly spreading disease, and the amount of offspring they can have.
- I'm not impacted by feral cats and never have been living in Calgary so far so I feel the same way about them as I do about stray cats.
- rabies, preying on wild birds
- same as above but cannot be adopted
- Over population and disease
- Getting killed, being on people's property or vuggun their animals, spreading disease and over population
- pooping and bothering other animals
- none.
- Disease, pop explosion, impact of quality of life
- They can be vicious and carry disease. And, it's sad.
- We do not seem to have a problem with this in our neighbourhood, but I would be concerned about overpopulation. I loved it so we have to leave it on fire
- Population growth amongst these cats affecting the urban wildlife - particularly birds



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- My concern is with their well-being but that goes for all cats. A neuter spay program would be good.
- I believe feral cats should be trapped and, if possible, rehabilitated.
- Catch and euthanize only when presenting a problem.
- If they are on a rural property, they don't bother me. But they should not be allowed within city limits as they can carry diseases and parasites.
- I am concerned about their health and safety. I am also concerned that without ownership they will not have their vaccinations.
- making sure they are spayed/neutered to prevent more feral cats
- None.
- same answer as above but they can also carry disease as they are not seen by a vet for a check up.
- I am concerned that they will damage native bird populations
- None
- They prey on wildlife impacting normal population levels. Untreated feral cats can carry issues that can be passed onto other animals.
- That eventually they could go crazy if they stay out long enough and could end up injuring other pets or even humans.
- they can wreck property
- They are a danger to pedestrians(attack, vicious)
- Aggressive, Not Spayed.
- Feral cats can attack people, which is bad, I believe someone should go around capturing the cats to find them a home, or to find their owner (if they have one) if they attack people I believe they should somehow be trained not to attack people.
- waste in yards/public spaces uncontrolled leading to unpleasant odours and health concerns for children and the public, feral cat health and wellbeing
- They should be euthanized if they can't be rehabbed to be a house cat. I know that's an unpopular opinion, but they're a destructive invasive species.
- I don't know much difference other than these are more likely to fight with other pets.
- Also health. They are also hungry and unpredictable.
- Hum, I just don't know. Put out food, water and bedding for them - - entice them to shelter.
- None
- Endangering wild birds, transmitting illness between cats and other animals, providing a food source to wildlife
- My concerns with feral cats are that they aren't spayed, neutered and vaccinated.
- Reproduction and disease
- Disease, dangerous if accidentally cornered or spooked
- Great keeps rodents down, move them all to abandoned areas of town.
- Their safety. Frostbite. Reproduction.
- The cats wellbeing given that it's unowned. Who is looking after it, who ensures its vaccinations and checkups. What if someone is bit by it etc



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Known ferals should be tagged in some way so they aren't picked up by accident and waste Animal Service's time/resources
- Multiplying!
- Same as above
- Being mean to children
- Cats not getting medical attention. Human's being abusive to them.
- Same as pets. They cause property damage and are a nuisance, plus can spread filth and disease.
- Poop in flower beds
- Disease
- Same as above
- Exactly the same concerns with stray cats. They aren't a natural part of the ecosystem & are destructive, all due to irresponsible pet owners.
- I have not had an issue with feral cats.
- none. if they can survive they will otherwise the coyotes/bobcats have an easy meal. problem solved.
- Breeding multiple generations of strays that cause a hazard on the road, to wildlife, and spread disease. They also help our coyote and bobcat population be a bit too healthy.
- Attacking other pets and being a nuisance.
- none
- they are hit by cars or killed by coyotes
- Uncontrolled breeding can easily get out of hand. Spread of diseases.
- i have not seen any feral cats in Calgary. the concern, if there were feral cats, would be breeding.
- All feral animal populations require some level eternal population mitigation. This includes feral rabbits.
- Killing birds
- They fit in the ecosystem with the wildlife - predators prey on them and they prey on small rodents like mice.
- Feral cats should be trapped and relocated by the city if reported.
- That despicable idiots will try to harm or poison them (or even the possibility of the animal inadvertently encountering these circumstances accidentally - i.e. getting into chemicals that were note stored properly or getting struck by a car).
- I am not really familiar with this issue - mostly only see collared cats outside.
- Feral cats nedd trapping and fixing TNR
- Unowned by anyone they can pose a threat to owned cats by passing on disease. They can breed and become a nuisance. Impact on birds and other wildlife.
- That they are in even more danger than roaming cats. I am concerned that people may hurt them or not take them to a safe place when found.
- They are living in the cold, without food, subject to disease and injury and suffering.
- Feral cats may kill other domestic pets. The welfare of the animal may also be low.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The potential for feral cats to spread illness or disease. Certainly the population control as Gerald are unlikely to be spayed or neutered
- Feral cats can be difficult to deal with but they should also be treated with compassion. They should be taken in and they should be rehabilitated by an animal behaviourist. These animals can be rehabilitated and adopted with kindness, compassion, and education.
- "Impact on wildlife
- Overbreeding
- Human safety"
- Health. Safety. Danger to species other than cats (bird murder - cats can kill all the rodents they want!)
- Same as above.
- Overpopulation, plus all of the above. However, they would help with the mice, voles and moles.
- See above.
- attract wildlife into residential areas who prey on them, some carry sickness, hard to remove if they settle in
- I've never really considered feral cats, but I would still have concerns about birds falling prey to cats.
- Population management. Ensuring the population does not get too large and unmanageable. I worry these cats end up being brought in to shelter and euthanized (or shelter-lifers) because they cannot be domesticated. Quality of life.
- I think we should care for them if they are truly feral. I volunteer for the meow foundation and help to domesticate feral kittens.
- I believe our city should have a Community Cat program. These Trap-Neuter-Return programs work to help reduce the population of feral cats. They are out there, they didn't ask for this life and we must help them where we can.
- Haven't come across so not an issue.
- reproduction and health should they not be vaccinated or get injured
- Diseases, breeding
- Uncontrollable breeding and the spread of diseases together with those of "roaming free" domestic cats mentioned in (1) above
- I never see feral cats in my neighbourhood, is this a big problem in the City of Calgary as I am unaware of it?
- Disease and infection from bites on humans
- I worry about them reproducing and making more feral cats....
- Their impact on birds.
- Also the amount of birds they kill, but also that they could become fearful and dangerous to people and reproduce if not fixed.
- disease, multiplying, bringing large wildlife to the community
- there are too many of them in Bowness.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They are neglected, without food and basic care and treated terribly by some. There is a place for a feral cat such as a barn buddy program for rodent control etc to allow them to live (vaccinated, spayed/neutered and sheltered). I have also seen feral cats do just fine after some time in a home.
- They need to be caught and altered so they don't create a bigger problem
- I have not seen many feral cats.
- Propagation. I would like to see a humane catch, neuter/spay, and release program such as the one they have in Toronto.
- Not concerned. They are not causing trouble to humans. I like animals. It enriches neighbourhood life. The neighbourhood is boring without animals.
- We should catch wild cats and put them in the zoo. The show outside the people, you will get money. People will be get happy. How to taking care of you should know animal. It doesn't matter wild or non-wild.
- They might spread disease if they aren't healthy
- Usually they're in particular area of the city. Maybe there should be some areas of the city allocated to them to fundraise, bring food and volunteer. They're not huge disease spreaders.
- Cost of the problem ie. Agencies and services that exist to manage
- I don't really see any
- I think feral cats should be left alone. It would be nice if food could be left for them There is a solution like "the pile" for cats which should be implemented
- Infections spreading diseases/sickness viruses. Attacks on cats
- "- Attacking people
- - Diseases
- - I'm afraid of cats so I don't want cats wondering around my property
- - hurt your animals
- - over population"
- "They could attack you if you approach them
- Make a mess in your yard
- They can attack your cats & dogs
- Breeding problem (over population)"
- Could attack children, could have rabbies, fight other cats or other animals, dogs or other pets, have more babies, need to reduce population
- Population control. Feral cats are very unlikely to be spayed or neutered unless they are part of the trap and release programs. This will increase the population of feral cats. However, feral cats likely help control the population of rodents.
- None
- they are dirty and carry disease. They poop and pee in the flowerbeds and under my deck in the back yard. They are noisy and procreate at night
- They should all be spay, neutered and vaccinated and released
- None.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Defecating on my garden and flower beds. Howling/fighting at night.
- People seeing them as nuisances and harming them or killing them.
- Feral cats should be spay netured and vaccinations given. Colony's should have warm dry places provided so they can live out thier lives.
- Reproduction, killing native species and livestock.
- none as long as they are neutered/spayed
- I just hope they are being looked after properly (feeding, emergency vet care when needed etc.
- Quality of life, health of the cats. Presence of predator (coyotes). Risk of being ran over by cars.
- Same as #1
- Feral cats are a concern for birds, and because many of them are not spayed/neutered, they contribute to the overpopulation/feral cat problem. Also, feral cats may mark on people's lawns or sides of houses, and they may taunt indoor cats, which can cause anxiety and indoor marking.
- reproduction, safety of cats, other pets and people
- None. Once past the socialization period its next to impossible to rehab a feral cat. Catch, spay/neuter and release is the best solution to this problem.
- "If picked up not released
- No domestic animal should live uncared for. If unadoptable then euthanasia is best for animal NOT release!"
- That they will be one injured or ill and are not being cared for.
- Attacks on ourselves or our dog. Not really a problem in our area
- Same as roaming cats.
- None if TNR was around to control the population. They are not a safety risk to people as they are very fearful.
- Their quality of life and safety. Safety risk to the public: cat scratches/bites can be extremely dangerous
- No concerns, feral cats are afraid of people and they stay away. They also control the mouse population.
- We are not aware of feral cats in our neighbourhood of Sunnyside.
- My wish for them is to be cared for by humans. Whether in a shelter or adoption.
- Risk of injury/disease, exposure to elements/extreme weather, access to food/water/shelter
- I am concerned for the safety of the feral cats: being hit by a vehicle, being poisoned, being mistreated, carrying diseases
- we don't have that issue in our community but feel they should be captured .
- "Their well being
- Procreation"
- Impact on wildlife (primarily birds).
- Pooping in yards, digging in gardens, killing birds. A Nature of things CBC show documented how feral and roaming cats are decimating the population of North American songbirds.
- They will be killed by annoyed citizens and they kill a billion song birds a year.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- "risk to welfare of cats, heightened concern for quality of life
- safety risk to public"
- The public needs to know there is a cat overpopulation crisis & be made aware of the number of cats in shelters & the number euthanized in kill shelters. Killing is ineffective & costly and the city needs to support TNR Programs.
- The safety of the cats, access to medical care, food, water, and shelter, and their overpopulation.
- Need to be spay/neutered to mitigate population explosions. Could make good barn cats.
- None
- Spay and release program.
- I can't say that we have feral cats in our community. Those I've seen are well fed and seem to belong to someone.
- Living in Calgary I have not seen them.
- Feral cats exercise their survival instincts which unfortunately create challenges to other species. A balance needs to be struck between a true feral cat and a stray that has gone rogue.
- Feral cats reproduce unchecked, harbour disease and spread disease.
- Disease, population control, public safety risk.
- I don't have any concerns around feral cats.
- They may be breeding and increasing the problem.
- How to manage the health of feral cats
- Population growth
- That they are also not spayed or neutered so the population of feral cats increases and impacts the populations of wild birds. Unvaccinated cats can also spread diseases to pets.
- Risk to welfare of feral cats - concerns over their quality of life; safety risk to public
- Same as domestic free-ranging cats: they kill birds.
- That they haven't been spayed or neutered and producing offspring.
- Mainly their propensity to "litter" at the neighbors and also their impact on bird populations. I am not sure if they are carriers of certain pathogens for people? If yes, trap and euthanize them.
- Feral Cats are technically invasive pests that live their lives consuming species that have no natural protection against them. Although many are supported by an ad-hoc community of carers in the community, along with the local strays, it is avoiding the solution to continued environmental impact.
- Safety of small children and other small pets
- Shit, disease, parasites, bird depletion, aggravation
- I don't have a lot of experience with feral cats.
- We don't seem to have a problem with feral cats.
- The only concern I would have is if there became a notable problem with vicious cats that attacked other animals and/or instigated the spread of diseases. No one wants to pay for a vet visit.
- As these cats are afraid of humans, generally not an issue unless they are ill or in distress.
- The biggest concern with outdoor cats of any kind is that they kill billions of birds every year. Bird numbers are in steep decline due to outdoor cats, habitat destruction and a host of other problems.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Cats are not native species; they have been introduced. I know it is the current thinking to trap and neuter stray cats and put them back where they came from but this, to me, is not a solution and does nothing to save birds.

Expectations of City

- That I can report one to the city if I encounter one and that the city will capture it and handle it accordingly, with heavy fines for owners to deter them from this practice.
- To bring education and ideas in to 2020. We are far behind. I'm part Brit and the UK surge ahead with kindness to species, research and ideas. I enjoy evolutionary biology and Calgary must strive if it's to do better.
- I would like to see that license cats are ok to be outside. I have a cat and lots of kids sometimes my cat sneaks out threw a door or window then I have a neighbor pounding on my door threatening to call bylaw cause my cat happened to escape . City shouldn't give out 150 dollar tickets cause a cat.
- Capture and locating owners or re-homing, or homing on a farm if feral. Perhaps feral cat colonies, if there are any in Calgary, should be spayed/neutered, vaccinated and released. Education about the dangers of roaming, and fines for offences.
- Kill them all, just like they do in Australia
- Harsher punishments for cat owners who let their cats roam free.
- respond to calls, capture the animals rather than the present practice of making it the responsibility of the tax payes to trap and transport the animals to the appropriate shelter.
- If The City is not able to help get the feral/stray cats off the streets then it would be good to do a capture/sterilize program to reduce the ongoing number of unwanted kittens which contribute to continuing the population.
- Capture and find who let them free and fine the hell out of them
- I would imagine that stray and roaming cats should be treated the same as dogs, though I can imagine they would be much more difficult to catch. In terms of feral cats, I would imagine that these could be treated the same as wildlife.
- I feel the City has more pressing issues (animal hoarding, neglect and abuse, vicious animals) than feral, stray and roaming cats, especially with licensed cats.
- Bigger penalties/fines for cat owners that let their cats run free outdoors.
- Expect them to be caught. Owners should face large fines.
- Try to find their owners. Keep track of cats that are being brought to you multiple times. Adopt out friendly strays when possible.
- I expect that they act like they do for roaming dogs. They should come out and capture, hold and manage the cat problem in this city. I am shocked that as a home owner I have to pay to rent a trap and trap other people's pets myself to bring to the city.
- "Charging fines to citizens who do not have their cats licensed and allow their cat to roam.
- Collaboration with local agencies to spay/neuter, treat and adopt feral and stray cats.
- Assistance for owners and neighbours when a cat is hit by a car."



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Educate the public about the benefits of outdoor cats to avoid panic and negative sentiment. Cats are awesome and people should be able to enjoy them, regardless if they own one or not.
- Cats who are outdoors should have a licence but not all do
- trap and fine owners where possible, control population of feral colonies with Spay/neuter and move out of city into farms where possible
- none
- bring them in get there vet check & shots and try to re-home them if possible
- Responsible pet owners should not be allowed to have their animal roam free for the safety of people AND the cat
- Control
- That they provide funding for properly taking care of feral cats and give strict fines for roaming cats and help teach the public that domestic cats should remain indoors.
- Continue to actively to work with teh Meow Foundation to capture, spay and neuter, socialize and rehome to consciencious cat owners, while educating the general public about responsible ownership and the benifits of spaying and neutering cats (but all pets).
- I think that the bylaws surrounding cat trapping can be clearer and more streamlined. As it is, it is a long and difficult process to trap and bring a nuisance cat to animal control. I would also like the city to give more fines and more strictly enforce the bylaws against having roaming cats.
- Fine owners ,deal with owners properly feral and strays should be put down way too many cats wandering around
- More funding for TNR programs. In an ideal world there would be fines for letting un-neutered cats roam as well.
- that they are placed in an adoption program and are spayed/neutered
- Fine cat owners who let their cats roam, catch stray cats. educated people on responsible cat ownership.
- If I know who that cats belong to and they don't comply with letter warnings, it should not be a neighbor problem. They are violating the bylaw and it should be enforced. All of the warnings instead of fines when trapped are ridiculous. These are not my pets and I don't want them in my gated yard.
- euthanasia program for feral colonies, indoor cat laws for domestics (no "outdoor cats" allowed)
- They need to capture and euthanize. Currently, nothing is done with regard to roaming.
- Each cat needs to be licensed with the City, and these rules need to be strictly enforced. More education of the public, and stiffer fines for owners who are caught letting their cats roam. Maybe hire a bylaw officer or a team who would deal exclusively with trapping feral, stray and roaming cats.
- Spay them when they are caught work closely with organizations that take in stray cats.
- No change from current policy, which is to capture them when people complain.
- Pick them up, bring them to a shelter, rehome them.
- Frankly, I think you should follow the methodology aarcs and meow use
- Provide traps to citizens to trap. Divert cats to Humane Society if possible. Euthanize when necessary.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Capture them for distribution to new homes or euthanatia.
- As I indicated above, cat owners need to be more responsible. They need to license their cats and those fees pay for collars with transmitters that sound alarms when the cats leave their properties and only stop when they return home. Steep fines should be placed on owners of roaming cats.
- None
- Programs for trap and spay and neuter of feral cats, fines and education for owners who let their cats roam.
- Reduce the destruction of natural habitats by taking these cats off the streets.
- No specific concerns
- Set and enforce policy and regulations.
- I expect higher fines for those that have 'outside cats' as the current fines are not a deterrent, and i expect those fines to be levied against the owners so that it drives the message home that free roaming cats are a violation of the bylaw.
- Cats should not be allowed to be outdoors unless leashed and supervised by the owner at all times. Owners should be fined whenever possible. Encourage public to report stray/feral cats for pickup/trapping by city bylaw.
- I expect that they catch the cats and fine any of the owners that allow their cats to roam off of their property.
- Catch stray and ferel cats. Leave roaming cats alone.
- Removal of animals. An inexpensive/free program so people can spay/neuter their cats and prevent uncontrolled breeding.
- If they are not in danger or dangerous, let them be.
- I expect the fine to be the same as with dogs, as well as registration. Education for cat owners!
- More education on how roaming cats is not responsible pet ownership.
- I would love the City to be able to capture the ferals & strays and make sure they are spayed/neutered and safe. Roaming cats that are licensed and returned to owners should be fined
- As a tax payer, I expect the bylaw dept to enforce the bylaws. When a cat owner is a chronic offender & ignores the bylaws, the city should deal with it. ...i.e. remove the cat, issue a fine each time the animal is caught roaming, etc.... There seems to be no consequences so bylaws aren't followed
- "The city doesn't seem to put any effort into enforcing the cat bylaws. Cats free roam and owners have no fear of being caught or fined.
- It would be great to capture stray cats and put them up for adoption through the city if the owners can't be found. See above question re: feral cats."
- Deal with them humanely and try to obtain homes for the feral cats. Leave the roaming cats (cats that go outdoors) alone. They help to clear up the mice
- If contacted the City Bylaw dept should give traps to concerned people..and not have it weather dependent. We had a feral here this winter and we could not get a trap because it was too cold!! Call back in the spring they said. Be proactive..set a trap and come back to check it :)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Feral and stray cats need eradicated from the city by whatever means the city deems humane (which could include adoption)
- TS&N where possible. Treat them with respect.
- i expect them to be treated the same as a stray dog
- I expect cats to be trapped and returned to owners if they have them.
- Feral: Trap, neuter, and release. Stray and roaming: Trapped and if no owner can be found, put up for adoption.
- I don't know... more reminders to pet owners to keep their cats on a leash or indoors. Higher fines for roaming cats? Everyone seems to ignore it because they know that no one is going to do anything about it, and their cat's need to go outside is more of a demand on them than the city's bylaw.
- as above
- Owners of roaming cats should be subjected to fines
- To make sure there are not problem cats multiplying, lets get them into the spay or neuter clinic at the university.
- Trap, spay/neuter, and rehome or humanely euthanize ALL cats that are taken in. Including free-roaming. Leniency if cat is reported missing by owners (it's just a lost cat, not free-roaming, so strict repercussions seem unnecessary)
- They should be left alone unless causing a safety issue with people or domestic, properly managed pets.
- Stepping in to control if the city becomes over-run with cats.
- To remove them when asked and put them to sleep if they are unclaimed. In general too many people become owners of pets and give up on them or just let them go because they realize they are expensive and a nuisance or a lot of work. If we keep allowing just anyone to own pets it'll keep happening
- I would hope the city would do a quarterly round up of any "roaming cat" and those who have licenses get fined
- Ratchet up the fines for subsequent offenders. Refuse licenses to repeat offenders. And, as unfortunate as it is, provide a system where neighbours can report ownership (of all pets) by address and report poor owner behaviour.
- Pick-up and destroy feral cats, look for owners of strays and roamers and fine the owners for letting them run loose.
- None, other than perhaps providing a humane trap for a citizen that is concerned to capture the offending feline.
- Enforce licensing and bylaw against letting your cat run loose.
- I think the City of Calgary should expect neutering and spaying, every intact animal they acquire must be fixed and that for their own protection regular trapping of roaming animals should take place. Better euthanized than neutered/ spayed and be left out to suffer.. mandatory spay/Neu



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- To pick them up upon any inquiry made by a Calgarian. I know that it will probably never happen but to be at least more adamant and on top of things. Maybe start issuing out fines to those who choose not to comply and risk everyone else's safety. There have been 15 accidents on my block. It's ridiculous.
- minimize the numbers best as they can. no key measure to follow. as long as there is no mass concentration in one quadrant or Neighbourhood.
- That bylaw enforces the law that owners cats must stay in their own yards.
- If The City of Calgary receives a call, I believe they instruct the caller to capture or trap the cat in order to be picked up by animal control? If The City could instead call or send a notice to the offender which ensures the caller's identity is kept anonymous.
- I don't honestly know what could or should be done about feral and stray cats other than capture and euthanization. For roaming cats - why can't I take a picture of the offending cat on my property and report it and have the city require the owners to keep their cat at home. Big fines for repeats.
- None
- "When it comes to feral cats, attempt to rehome at barns or within a rescue that is willing to train the animal if possible
- For roaming cats, I feel like there needs to be stricter laws. Higher fines/ animal being taken away from the owner."
- we are not so much concerned about roaming cats as feral cats..people can always humanely trap them & bring into the pound..owners must be fined a large amount to deter owners..the pocket book is always where it stings for the owners...
- Feral, stray and roaming cats should be impounded.
- As long as they aren't doing any harm (and as long as they are fixed), I don't really see them as too big of a problem. It would be a shame if one was hit by car because they weren't kept inside like they should be.
- If they are destructive take it up. If roaming, make neighbours be grown ups. Maybe a three strikes rule. But you have to show N to N attempt at resolution first.
- Disallow cat owners to knowingly free roam their cats. Cats allowed outside should be kept on the owner's property at all times unless leashed, similar to dogs.
- Outdoor cats are a major issue for most Canadian cities (I used to manage the the City Pound of Nova Scotia). They source only issues to cities, with no benefit. They should be culled by DNR or Animal Services.
- If they are being a nuisance call 311 and a cat trap should be placed to humanely capture. Most cats have a home, bigger fines for repeat offenders?
- Neuter them and put them up for adoption
- collect the cats, increase the fines for cat owners.
- I would support the City to trap, neuter and release, or engage pet rescues that can accommodate feral cat. For strays, I would want the City to work with humane society and other pet rescues to help find homes.
- The City should be capturing and euthanizing to keep them from getting out of control.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Charge owners if found.
- Unfortunately I think spaying or neutering is out of the question because who's going to pay for that? Possibly euthanize them to get the population under control.
- Re-unification of cats with tags yes please. Collect approachable strays for possible rescue and/or re-unification. Ignore feral cats, and encourage coyote populations by unilaterally allowing unrestricted backyard chickens. Coyotes will solve any feral cat problems in a heartbeat.
- Trap & assess any reported problem cats that are roaming. For feral: spay/neuter & release if possible or euthanize if necessary. For stray: attempt to contact owner & return pet, or spay/neuter & re-home. Returning strays: provide info for first 2 instances, then increasing fines, up to losing pet.
- That they are captured and when there is an owner, that the owner is fined.
- Trap/release programs. Disease monitoring.
- I would like the City to pick them up, the same way that they pick up dogs that are roaming freely.
- Please let cats roam free, it reduces the time, money, and energy I have to spend when dealing with rodents
- Added resources, personnel, facilities.... These animals are not meant to live in such harsh climates and its sad to see them struggling, fighting for territory and food, and battling injury and disease alone.
- Support our shelters and free licences for senior to encourage older people to adopt more cats. Cats are less maintenance than dogs and will improve health in older people. Win win for both let's not put \$\$ above love.
- Consider offering free neutering for cats a couple of times a year!
- For feral not much you can do except try to catch them if known to be problematic in some areas. Spay and neuter. Stray and roaming cats: would like more initiative or deterrent for individuals to not let their cats roam free in the city.
- Culling would be appropriate. TNR at the very least.
- All cats licensed and microchipped, all cats contained (kennels, leash etc.) no exceptions.
- Catch them (then adopt or euthanize them), heavily fine the owners that let their cats outside. Provide people with resources to catch and or deter nuisance cats that are damaging their property.
- There needs to be stronger enforcement of the current bylaws. Especially for those who leave food out for their cats who roam. It is attracting nuisance animals (magpies, skunks, nice..etc)
- "How would you treat a feral dog? How would treat a roaming dog?"
- Why is the responsibility of pet owners minimized only when you have a cat? If my dog continually defecated in your back garden, threatened the safety of your baby and elderly in your home? How would you want it dealt with? Do that."
- they should all be caught fixed and rehomed
- Reminder notices in Enmax bills first...then trap them.
- The city should support trap, neuter, return programs with pet license fees
- Cats should also be licensed just like dogs



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- To be more strict about roaming cats. The bylaw should be enforced more. I abide by the rules and lazy owners' cats harrass me and mine on my property (I am a cat lover by the way).
- Feral cats need to be spayed or neutered if caught stray or roaming cats should be sent to the pound and the owners contacted if they can be found.
- Fines for owners, ensure they are cared for and for feral cats having them spayed/neutered and adopted out as barn cats.
- Clean them up. Fine owners.
- Trap, rehabilitation if possible.
- I would like to see outdoor shelters in the city. Maybe even on private properties to those who are willing.
- As long as private property rights are maintained the next issue would be destructive behaviour of stray or feral cats. I expect the city to deal with the issue through licensing and enforcement issues. Officers can deal with aggressive cats on an as needed basis.
- If a cat is aggressive the City should come out or if someone feels the cat is a stray and in danger. Otherwise cats usually find their way home. They love to roam and hunt.
- Trap, catch and take them to shelters like the Meow Foundation.
- They need to be catching feral and stray and spay or neuter them to prevent the population from exploding, also mandatory chips in domestic cats so they can be reunited with owners.
- To trap and access whether can can be adopted or is best sited today live as a mouser on a farm or humanely euthenized. The feral/stray cat has done NOTHING wrong as ultimately it was a human who was irresponsible in letting these feral/stray cats and it is them who suffer not the human
- Unsure at this time exactly what should be done. But new rules possibly? For roaming cats.
- The City should provide education and fines for roaming cats.
- Feed and sterilize and release feral cats to colony. Stray roaming cats leave them alone
- Trying to catch the feral cats and obviously stay cats . Let the licensed cats with tags micro chip be aloud outside
- To trap, sterilize, and home as many as possible, and assist people attempting to do so as much as possible.
- Bylaws should be enforced and these animals need to be picked up and dealt with appropriately.
- To pick them
- They be neutered.
- Feral and stray cats should be de sexed. Roaming cats are a challenge as people let their cats...be cats...and that infringes on other people and causes distress. Keep them on your property or leash them like we have to do with dogs. So fines I guess.
- Hmmm, I'm not sure about feral cats, but The City should manage stray and roaming cats through education and ultimately fines.
- City of Calgary should respond to complaints when feral, stray and roaming cats are made. Staff should attempt to capture, quarantine and identify the cats as appropriate and contact pet owners if possible.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Set up a sanctuary for all stray, feral cats so they can be cared for.
- All cats must be licensed. Period, end of conversation.
- I'm very happy that Calgary got rid of its kill policy. Perhaps more education on raising a cat or kitten? Perhaps teaching how to take a walk with your cat. Cat parks? Understanding cat behaviour has come a long way. Yet, still not enough when I watch cute cat videos and so many cats are stressed
- "Feral cat should be treated like a coyote
- Stray cat should be treated like a rescues"
- "Roaming cats should incur a small fine on return of animal to owner.
- That's about it"
- Felines are ABUSED by owners that do not maintain care of their pets. Humanely put them down /or charge owners with abuse, not to own any more; when they pick up their pet the FIRST TIME, only to be re-released back to start the same cycle over again. It's a shame cats need to suffer neglect abuse.
- I expect that stray and roaming cats will be picked up and dealt with accordingly. Owners should be fined if they are repeat offenders.
- Feral stray cats should be put down, licensed roaming cats should be returned to owners.
- Increase fines for cats caught outside and more public information ads in the media informing people about the by-law.
- Take a bigger role in catching them. Don't leave it up to neighbors of offending animal and owner
- To make sur they can keep the strays and all cats have a licence.
- Catching, returning to owner, depopulation
- Stricter fines for dumping cats or allowing them to roam
- That the cat be collected and the owner given a large fine.
- do a licence blitz and issue fines... all have a anonymous call in line to report roaming cats an actually have bylaw do something... LOL this will never happen stop with the so called education of owners and start fining people and large enough so people wont take the risk of ignoring the bylaws!!
- Cats should be required to be either strictly indoor or confined to ones property, perhaps via leash or similar. Stray and feral should be treated by the task forces and adopted when suitable
- To offer free traps and collection of the cats
- Better response time
- Follow through with trapping and fining like you do with dogs totally a double standard.
- My only expectation is that the city consistently fines pet owners who let their cats roam, which will hopefully encourage the mentality that it's unacceptable to allow their animals to be outside their control.
- Roaming cats should be trapped and impounded if not wearing collars, identification, immunization tags and city registration. Outdoor cats should be spayed/neutered.
- Catch feral and stray. Spay/neuter and release and no kill humane society



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That they are captured and dealt with (either rehoming or else).
- I expect the city to assist with feral cats. Leave roaming or stray alone and do not fine! I have a cat that escapes on us no matter what. It's hard to keep tracking her down and picking her up when she's been picked up; and the expense! Harder for people to keep animals.
- Trap, spay or neuter and adopt.
- KEEP ANY AND ALL CATS OFF THE STREETS PERIOD.
- I think the city should be able to control the number of strays.
- The city collects stray cats and I think it would be awesome if they spayed or neutered and vaccinated all cats before their owners could collect them at the owners expense.
- "Try to find them a home. If they are feral take to humane society
- Contact owners if a complaint is made
- Demand chips on all pets large and small...charge ALL costs related to management, rescue, administrative, and vets, etc back to owner. ABSOLUTELY NO COST TO taxes residents!!
- I do not feel cat owners are fined for their cats roaming and these animals should be destroyed if they cannot be re-homed. Same rules as dogs!!
- If feral or stray to be caught and if possible be put up for adoption. Roaming cats if caught to be micro chipped and returned to owner with a small fee
- To remove them from the area. If feral maybe euthanize. Maybe try to have them adopted. Relocate wild animals to the country.
- I expect the City of Calgary to have a no-kill policy at the shelter, educate Calgarians on what it means to be a responsible pet owner, and prioritize being exceptionally humane in its handling of the cats.
- Staff to set traps through 311 complaints, educate Calgarians regarding the harm that can lead to the feral cats. Over population of cats, not being spayed or neutered.
- To capture, rehome or euthanize them.
- Not much.
- Fine people who consistently let their cats roam free.
- Easier and quicker availability of humane traps. In our case, we purchased a trap, but had to drive a long distance to have it registered at Animal Services.
- "Stray and roaming.....impound and fine the owner.
- Feral cats, catch, spay/neuter and release to control vermin."
- Most citizens do Not understand that Cats are NOT supposed to roam. More information about that with ads and adverts about education.
- It would be best if the city was involved in these cases. Many people still allow cats to roam. Significant fines or removal of pets from irresponsible pets should be in place.
- Pick them up and enforce the rules, fines for owners who allow their cats to get out.
- If we could rescue strays to reunite them with their owners or adopt them to new loving homes that would be good. Owners of roaming cats posing an issue in the neighbourhood should be penalized. Trap, sterilize and release the feral colonies, it is unlikely these cats will ever be happy in a home.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I would hope they would trap, sterilize and rehome or release the feral strays.
- More enforcement and capture of roaming cats in parks and other areas
- None should be allowed. Does the City allow Feral, stray roaming dogs? NO!
- Feral cats should be TNR'd. My hope is that stray cats are brought to the city where they will be reunited with their people. If they don't have people, then I hope they will be adopted out. If scared/shy, I hope that volunteers will work with them to become more comfortable/confident.
- For the safety of the cat and to ensure coyote activity is not encouraged cats should remain indoors at all times
- They should be euthanized.
- To make it easy for citizens to log complaints with the City and not be subject to harassment from neighbours for doing so. I don't know if the City would even come out for a cat roaming.
- An active TNR program to keep these cats from continuing to breed.
- Make the penalties stiffer for roaming cats that are caught and brought to Animal Services...repeat offenders should be fined more.
- Act on complaints immediately, rehabilitating if possible then putting up for adoption
- "Feral cats-to be captured & "fixed" & homed, if possible.
- Stray cats-to be captured & returned to their owners through having the cats registered
- Roaming cats - that they are registered"
- "Stray or owned cats (if owners are found, should be ticketed they should not be allowed to roam free, dog owners are ticketed when ""at large"" same should go for cats.
- Feral cats should be caught and adopted out for barn cats, also mandatory spay/neuter."
- None
- I would expect the city to manage the population of feral cats and take stray and roaming cats for rehoming or to a shelter.
- Do something that doesn't put all the responsibility on home owners. Require all pets to be tagged or chipped . Frequent violators should be fined and have not allow to get another pet for a certain time
- Capture and rehome
- "Roaming cats- owners warned, then fined and possibly cat seized if non compliance.
- Stray- pick up, check for identifications today find previous owners, if unsuccessful the. spay/neuter, microchip, and rehome.
- Feral- unsure, large scale spay/neuters but probably unrealistic. Monitoring of knowns?"
- Catch stray and roaming cats. Possibly adopt them out to recoup some of the costs of catching them, and to ensure lax owners who repeatedly allow their cats to wander to rethink their "outdoor" cat ways.
- Support more spay and neuter programs.
- Responsive to complaints, educate pet owners (city staff were very good when we contacted them a few years ago)
- Fine owners, make licensing cheaper



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- " -more vigorous population control of feral cats
- -better efforts in finding owners of strays
- -actually follow through on fines and penalties for people who actively allow their cats to roam"
- I would hope there would be some assistance to concerned citizens when feral/stray cats are an issue.
- Conduct targeted problem area catches/collections where there are colonies of cats, and unfortunately quickly and humanely euthanize.
- To monitor and neuter the population.
- Capture.
- Take a stand. It's called Animal Control for a reason. I want the choice of not living among the beasts. That's one of the reasons I live in an urban centre.
- I expect the city to do more. Too many cats are euthanized in Calgary each year. We should aim to have the same rate as dogs. Start a spay and neuter program. And petition the Provincial Government to do more. Create tougher penalties for animal abusers.
- If they are a nuisance to get rid of them
- The city should do whatever is needed to have owners adhere to the rules. Feral cats should be caught and domesticated
- They should be captured and killed.
- Let them be unless they have become a bother
- The city told me they would not help me deal with the cats in my yard in any way, and being allergic, I can't trap them myself and bring them to a shelter. I want the city to deal with these cats and pass the actual costs plus penalties on to the irresponsible owners.
- None
- Care and concern for starters. I've called the city for help for catching stray cats and the individuals made it clear that the city won't help. The city could aid in providing humane traps for civilians to set, the city could also provide lessons in setting the traps, pick up animals too.
- Enforce the bylaws. Start ramping up patrols to catch cats and start fining owners. Cats owners seem to get a free pass on having what they call "outdoor cats". Fine them the first time and make them license them. 3-4 time Repeat offenders should get charged with neglect and forbidden to have pets
- Support groups that support and tend to feral colonies. Support catch, spay, re-release programs. Cheap spay programs for pets to help curtail unwanted litters
- They should be caught and given to a humane service who can determine the best course of action. If they are not controlled they will populate to larger numbers.
- Trap and try and adopt them out. If not spay/neuter and release.
- Feral should be left alone, stray and roaming should be picked up by animal services and brought to a shelter if they are being a nuisance in the neighborhood
- "A website to report feral and stray cat populations so that an entity (city of Calgary or third party animal rescue) can come a deal with it



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not allow roaming cats at all"
- Pick them up like you do dogs.
- If captured they are cared for
- Ticketing owners who do not look after or care for their pets. As a multiple dog owner, the expectations for cats should be the same (licensing, picking up after them, etc).
- If these cats pose danger to humans or other animals then the City should have a policy to prevent that. But as far as I know they pose no danger. Although a cat pooping in another's yard is an inconvenience, many dog owners allow the same thing to happen. I think cats should be allowed to roam.
- "Roaming cats are returned to their owner along with a fine for allowing it to roam.
- Feral - relocate if possible, outside city limits
- Stray- if no microchip or tattoo, have vet checked and sheltered for adoption."
- I don't see cats as a problem and I wouldn't waste a phone call to report it, therefore I have no expectations on the city dealing with feral or roaming cats.
- They should be trapped when possible and the owners fined for roaming. More food for the coyotes.
- Capture and euthanize
- I expect the city to smarten up and understand that cats are different from dogs! I HAVE TONS OF DOG CRAP IN MY YARD ALL YEAR, BUT NO CAT POOP! Stop being racist against cats!
- Keep the program to provide traps
- Coordinate with rescues and vet clinics to do capture and release spay and neuter operations on feral cats and enforce a no roaming policy on pet cats. Property bound felines are fine, but if they're left to wander neighborhoods they should be treated like anyone would a stray dog.
- Leave em alone, preferably.
- To limit the number
- Make it easier for anonymous complaints. Like through dming.
- catch and release altering, feeding stations, medical care
- You can't always get every cat, cat boxes (these are little insulated ins or boxes to sleep in) for those you miss would be amazing.
- If they are left to be feral, the population of cats would obviously dramatically increase numbers which increases disease and strain on shelters and finances to house them. Catch and spay/neuter release all roaming, stray and feral cats. Owners should be heavily fined for roaming nuisance cats.
- Continue to fine/educate for roaming, attempt to trap/adopt strays & ferals - work with and support the existing non-profit orgs (MEOW Foundation, ARF etc.) - improve support for, even.
- Common sense with Roamers as is with dogs....educate, investigate potential abuse or neglectful homes and act on those suspicions. Ensure ALL pets have licenses, fine those who dont. Should be treated no different than loose dogs...bring them in and if not reunited after X days sent to a shelter.
- people need to be EDUCATED. See a cat outdoors? pick it up + bring to the vet. never assume a cat is a stray, they're either lost or abandoned. better ads/info from CAS on



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

licensing/chipping/neutering deals to the public. Cat owners need to start keeping cats indoors. Dogs are helped, Y not cats here

- To have plans put in place to vaccinate, neuter/spay feral or stray cats as well as microchip them all and to allow temporary winter cat houses to keep them safe in the winter. I also feel every owner of any animal should have them microchipped so making microchipping mandatory.
- The roaming and feral cats should be caught. The owner should be fined. The feral cats should be domesticated and homed. All cats should be tattooed.
- My expectation is on the owner to spay/neuter their pet. Would be great to see the city have a capture/fix/release program to help manage cat populations.
- This bylaw is currently widely disregarded and not well enforced. I expect the city of calgary to enforce this law with stiffer penalties and trapping policies.
- I expect the City of Calgary to TNR feral cats and make sure if a colony is found, that they have access to food, water, and shelter. Stray and roaming cats should be taken in and adopted out, if owners cannot be found.
- city should deal with exact same as it does dogs
- I think owners who let their cats run free should be ticketed.
- Catch and rehome if possible
- I expect the animals to be treated humanely and fairly. I expect the humans who allow their cats to roam and/or become feral to be help accountable for their actions. Providing inexpensive options to keeping cats on their property would also be beneficial.
- Unless they are causing a problem, or are to numerous. Nothing
- I want them to TNR!!! Cats will die out naturally in any given group! It's been proven and it works! And it will be cheaper for Calgarians in the long term. This is the absolute best thing for all cats - feral and domestic!!
- Education of public, address appropriate citizen complaints.
- Something needs to be done about roaming cats. In both neighborhoods I have lived in roaming cats have been a problem. I have been told that we have to lay out traps to catch any cats. I think the city should be the ones responsible for this, you collect the license fees.
- Animal control should be picking them up. Heavy fines for roaming cat owners to offset costs for putting down feral and stray cats (whose owners can't be found)
- "I dont see the.city doing anything about them
- The only resource or response I have seem is a rental program for cant traps"
- Capture as many as possible, and put down.
- Controlling fertility cat population. Heavier fines, more rules for domestic cat owners.
- "Ideally there should be a trap/neuter/release program in conjunction with feral cat colonies to address feral cat populations
- Roaming cats, if owned, should be reunited with their owners if possible."
- Not sure. Euthanization seems extreme, perhaps vet school vasectomies if they are feral/stray? Pet cats with tags need to be returned, maybe with a fine and a warning.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Roaming: serious fine for owner/ ie "contribution" to local spca; encourage microchips to help with relocation; licensing. No kill for strays/ferals/roamers. Rehome - seniors facilities, acreages, etc. wherever possible. Many groups do excellent work (including City) - financial support.
- Wrangle the troublemakers and let the others be.
- The city should stay out of it, but support citizens/businesses/organizations that wish to do something about it.
- Feral should be euthanized
- When reported, I'd like the city either to set traps, or provide traps to residents (& pick up captured cats).
- "DO NOT KILL THEM IT DOESN'T WORK"
- The neuter spay release program is the only effective solution invest more in those programs
- Please I beg you to invest in more programs that catch, neuter and rerelease the cats where they were found"
- If the cats are safety issues then the city should apprehend them.
- Help them or leave them be
- I would like to see feral cats caught and fixed, adopted if possible (barn cats). Stray should be caught, try to find owner and returned. Owners should pay a fine.
- Trying to locate the owner's for roaming before pound is used permanently and as suggested last answer categorize feral cats for how they behave whether they're not open to humans period or if they have curious to test their limits so maybe see less cats die because of euthanasia
- Capture and eradicate the animals. Also maintain strong penalties and enforcement so that people do not abandon animals. This may include requiring every pet cat, rabbit and similar animals to have a identification chip.
- Put more onus on the owners of cats to act responsibly by paying the same license fee as dog owners and paying fines if their cats are consistently allowed to roam and contaminate community and personal property. Treat all animals humanely and assist those in need of help.
- Call 311 and animal control can take the animal in
- Should be the same as other pets. Fine the owners and pick the animals up. If feral, then euthanize them.
- Higher fines for roaming cats and catching and dealing with them and feral cats.
- I would hope they would leave them alone.
- Stray and roaming cats a much larger problem than feral cats in the city. The city should have a pro-active role in fining owners of roaming cats.
- Fines to owners if owner is known. Trap and euthanize feral animals if required.
- To have them destroyed if no owner can be located. Animal control of number of animals roaming needs to be controlled.
- Faster response to complains
- None
- Calgary should work with cat rescue agencies



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Catch, rehabilitate and adopt out I suppose
- To deal with them. Trapping and fines for pets. Euthanization for feral strays.
- Dont turn a blind eye. There are 5 to 8 cats in riverbend that are always free. Maybe come by once in awhile and let the owners know the laws
- Pick them up and take them to a shelter. Deal with them the way stray dogs are dealt with
- Catch them and send them to the SPCA. Euthanize feral cats that cannot be rehabilitated.
- Work with the community members to trap them, spay them, and have them adopted and re homed as often as possible.
- TNR, or if they are social, adopting out, or sending to another rescue.
- I would like the city to fund spay/neuter/return programs to deal with feral cats. I would also like the city to ban owners from allowing their cats to roam free, and establish a warning/fine/animal confiscation program in order to enforce this ban.
- Not much - they aren't dangerous animals and owners need to be mindful roaming cats may not return home
- Let them be if they're not causing a problem
- Let them be, unless they are creating a real disturbance in the community.
- There are 3 different questions here. I have no issue with roaming Spayed or Neutered cats. I like them, I can deal with them pooping in my gardens and I believe they assist in managing rodent populations. I am more concerned with the abomination and abuse that is declawing and would like it banned.
- I would like for roaming cats to have to remain in their owners yards. It would be nice for stray cats to find homes.
- Catch them and put down if not adoptable
- Treat them as humanly as possible. Those that cannot or will not be cared for need to be put down. However, the complete reduction of non altered animals would be the best option.
- To safely trap them and hopefully return roaming cats and finding barn cat programs for the feral cats. Also, the City should help with the spaying/neutering of these cats. There should also be substantial fines for roaming cats.
- I think stray cats should be taken to the Humane Society for re-unification with the owner (hopefully) or adoption. Feral cats I am not sure - I have heard of organizations that deal with these animals. Roaming animals - not much.
- Capture and take to SPCA.
- No leniency. It should not be up to the home owners being bothered by someone else's cat to have to "talk" to the owners, or set up traps. The city should be setting up the traps and then taking them to the pound.
- Impound them.
- I had to try to trap the feral/roamer that was pooping and digging in my garden beds and stalking birds in my yard. I never could but caught someone's lost pet and a skunk instead. Animal services



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

not being open til 10 is inconvenient if you've trapped a cat overnight and need to take in before work

- More aggressive action should be taken to reduce the amount of prey available to wild predators to reduce the chance of interaction with predators
- More education on how to prevent this in the first place. More options for people to help capture them.
- If it is apparent that a cat is owned (collar etc) or stray then perhaps they should be taken to Animal Services and the owners found for the animal to be returned or put up for adoption in the case of a stray. Feral cats do serve a purpose so I'm unsure.
- That they attempt to capture and regimie if possible, but at a minimum spay or neuter
- More education and notices given to cat owners. Nothing has been done in regards to my neighbors. I was told I could rent a cat trap but on my money.
- Feral cats should be put down, roaming cat owners fined.
- Not sure about feral and stray cats, but owners could be fined for allowing roaming cats.
- not much, would be nice to see existing tnr programs supported and expanded, and penalties for roaming cats to keep pets indoors
- Catch them and impound them
- Pick them up and take them to their animal shelter; allow rescue agencies to re-home them.
- Euthanasia may be a good plan instead of re-homing all of these strays back to people who let them out in the first place.
- Collect and spay/ neuter..rehabilitate if possible
- Rescue and foster/adopt.
- Remove them from city limits if at all possible
- All cats should require a microchip. Roaming cats should be picked up and owners fined.
- Fines for owners that allow their cats to roam. Prompt response to reports of roaming cats.
- Capture. They have to be captured.
- Trap and get rid of them.
- Hard law enforcement, First warning, second offence pet removed from household, returned after high fine paid.
- I love cats and I would like all outdoor cats to be picked up and taken to a centralized shelter. It is literally impossible to tell which cats are supposed to be outside and which are not, which are owned and which are not, and who they belong to. It must be enforced to have an impact.
- They should start removing them all and making owners of these cats start being responsible for the damage their cats are causing. Cats should be as regulated as dogs
- Cats should not be allowed to roam free. The City should enforce a bylaw regarding this.
- Higher level of enforcement for managing feral, stray and roaming cats.
- Owned roaming cats needs to stop. Higher fines maybe. I don't know. But this definitely bothers us.
- I believe the city should just spay and neuter them and return them to the area they found them. They kill a lot of mice around the houses and don't do a lot of damage.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responding to complaints more quickly - Maybe leaving/sending a notice to the home resident if the address is known that their cats need to be restrained.
- Spay and neuter clinics
- We need funding to support spay/neuter programs to prevent this problem from growing, and legislation that deters individuals from allowing their cats to roam at will.
- If one is being a nuisance, a true nuisance, then maybe helping capture and release to organizations to rehome or rehab them.
- None.
- Calgary Humane society should work with other organizations to collect, shelter, and re-home strays if possible. Those not suitable for residential settings could be given to local farms or acreages, where they would be cared for.
- As above, no concern. The city is looking how to make money from us
- Trap, neuter, return programs tend to work well. Running these programs or supporting organizations which run these programs effectively. The support could be financial, but also data (location and population).
- Collect them just as they would canine.
- Culls don't work and they are cruel and inhumane. I support TNR programs, which have shown to be effective in humanely reducing populations thereby reducing the impact on wildlife such as birds as there will not be as many cats to hunt them. Feeding programs to reduce hunting of wildlife.
- Population control is always a concern, but my biggest expectation is around how the city handles owned-cats roaming free. They should have the same restrictions as dogs. If we are making bylaws about keeping cats indoors and licensed, there should be an active campaign to enforce this.
- Keep the peace and neuter roaming cats. If they're licensed bill the owner for the cost.
- They should all be spayed/neutered and vaccinated for rabies.
- We know that by simply removing feral cats does not work as new cats typically move in, therefore I worry by trading and rehoming/euthanasia of any unknown feral cats is not helping the situation. Again we need to look at TNR programs that have proven to be effective.
- To treat them as they would dogs. If my dog is roaming, the city is called and they come and pick up my dog. If there is a cat roaming, the city should pick it up, and the owner should have to pay a fine to get their cat back. I should not have to trap the cat and drive it to the bylaw office myself
- For strays and roaming, pick-up or trapping of strays and roaming cats, with fines to cat owners for letting their animals off of their properties without a leash. This is a real annoyance and a double standard.
- Trap, fine owners and euthanize feral cats
- Safety of cats, spread of disease should be a priority. Higher licensing fees, stiffer fines. Questions on licencing applications & renewals as to cat containment in their homes & yards should be required to be answered. If their cats are allowed to roam or they give false info charges should apply.
- Nothing.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- first, for the city to widespread promote and educate responsible ownership. to make available free or greatly reduced cost for spay and neutering, and vet services. and to fine not responsible owners.
- Owners of free roaming cats should receive increasing fines for repeat offenses. Free roaming cats should not be permitted within city limits. Feral and stray cats should be rehabilitated for adoption, or euthanized if they are critically ill or unable to be adopted/rescued/relocated.
- I think if a cat is picked up more then 3 times there should be a 1000\$ fine and it should be made easier to get cat traps.
- They should be sterilized. If a stray/roaming cat is an issue there should be a warning and then it should be removed from the owner/re-homed.
- Harsher fines for owners of cats who allow them to roam free
- Enforce fines for roaming cats
- Higher penalties for people with "outdoor cats" it's BS. And it costs about \$200 to build a catio if you insist on not restraining or supervising your cat while it is outside.
- Pick up stray/roaming cats that have been taken to a vet clinic, treat & re-home as needed via the CHS. The TNR program is great for population control.
- Destroy humanely.
- If they are just an owned, roaming cat, leave them be. Feral cats probably pose the risk of reproducing more feral cats so maybe they should be spayed, neutered?
- None
- Fine the owners, and capture and rehome strays.
- Collecting the ones that are causing problems and leaving those that aren't.
- That you help any feral cat in need, then release it back into the wild. That you apprehend stray/roaming cats and put the strays up for adoption/heavily fine the owners of roaming cats.
- Increased fines for roaming cats- increased way for residents to trap feral/ roaming cats
- None
- I don't know that there is much more you can do. Just fines for people you know have outdoor cats
- Manage feral populations by TNR and providing medical intervention when needed. Roaming cats should be collected and fines placed on the owner. Pet cats should have the same requirements as dogs regarding off property roaming.
- None. They're no harm to anyone.
- Fine owners who let their cats roam on a regular basis.
- More education and 'teeth' to deal with pet owners who let their cats roam free. What can I do, as my neighbors do not keep their cats inside and have had a lot of cats go missing over the years and they keep adopting cats.
- cats get out sometimes they can be very sneaky. i think unless someone complains i don't expect much from the city of calgary
- That they would be humanely trapped and taken to the SPCA for a second chance. But I know from experience the city does nothing. It's up to the homeowner to deal with a stray cat.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Prevent them. Catch them. Do more to discourage owners from allowing their cats to roam... bigger fines required?
- Little. Provide a trap if its reoccurring and can be dealt with.
- Heavy fines for owners. Pick up pets. Although if it is a one time event that cat got out by accident then that is different.
- While it would be nice to try to control the pet population I also understand that it is complicated and expensive. Realistically I am happy as long as the animals are not killed on purpose.
- Leave them alone. You can't complain about the wildlife being in the area, leave the cats. If you can leave the skunks and coyotes you can leave the cats. Guaranteed they are just domestic cats that are independent. Stop using cats as a cash grab and focus on the predator animals
- to come pick them up when they are spotted and reported and to fine the owners whos cats are running stray
- Founding up and neutering.
- If possible to catch and return to owners with orders to keep inside. Rehome feral cats if possible
- Capture, desex and release if feral. Capture, desex and attempt to reunite with owner if stray or roaming...give fine if owner does not demonstrate a reasonable attempt to keep their cat from roaming. Adopt out if cannot find owner within a reasonable time frame.
- Work to ensure there are resources available to provide care and potential re-homing for these cats. Clear communication to Calgarians on what to do if they have a concern about these cats.
- Trap them and for roaming ones make the owners responsible by paying a bigger fine.
- Crack down on people letting their cats out if you dont allow it, OR allow it.
- To stop being stupid and making money, stressing the cats out etc. If they are roaming look at it from an animal's perspective rather than a human who is uneducated and will only think about their self.
- I expect the city of Calgary to make the well-being of the cats a priority. There should be a no-kill policy, and exceptionally humane practices. The City should ensure that road-kill or deceased pets are handled as quickly as possibly, and make more of an effort to contact the pet owner afterwards.
- The bylaw needs to be adjusted to allow for trap, neuter and release programs for feral and stray cats.
- None
- implement trap and release programs or barn cat rehoming programs. Better public education on why you shouldn't let you cat roam. Tougher penalties for re-offending owners that let their cats roam. Education on resources /steps to take to deal with a roaming cat so people don't go straight poisonin
- As above, capture, then return to owner, adopt out, or destroy in that order.
- It's part of the municipal government's jobs. Educate people as to why cats should remain inside. Provide traps for people with cat problems. Trap feral cats. Do your job.
- Spay/neuter releAse program does feral (if no possibility of domestication). Rehoming of stray cats, capture and fines for roaming cats



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I expect the City to confine that cats and remove them. They are a nuisance, carry diseases, cause danger within traffic and destroy property.
- Big fines for stray cats owners. Keep your animal inside if they can't help but roaming.
- provide more budget for spay neuter
- Restrictions that pet cats must be kept indoors, for their safety and that of the environment. Increased funding for trapping of feral cats, rehabilitation of those suitable to be pets, & humane euthanasia of those too feral to live with humans. More funding for free & low cost spay/neuter programs
- Controlling the population
- I have no concerns about roaming cats. They have homes to go to and do so. Feral/stray cats should be treated as other wildlife -- if we control coyotes (which the city does badly), we should control feral cats the same way.
- exactly the same as dogs loose they should be fined and taken into custody
- More enforcement on licensing and owner that allow their cats to roam free, more education around spay/neuter programs and increase support for low income Calgarians
- Feral cats should be altered and returned. All non feral cats should be picked up / reunified / adopted out.
- I would hope they collect them to their shelter and/or enlist the assistance of volunteer associations (ie Meow Foundation) to spay/neuter and find them homes.
- Fix them. Itsxhumans who let them down
- Capture, re-home or as a absolute last resort, euthanize.
- Catch them and sterilize them
- The city should help citizens by providing rental traps and the ability to drop off a trapped cat at Animal Services.
- Leave roaming cats alone and, if the strays and feral cats are aggressive, deal with them as you do any other wildlife. Since the city doesn't seem to do anything about coyotes or bobcats, I assume this means they will do nothing.
- When dealing with cats the owners should face the same fines as a dog owner.
- Trap & spay programs, attempts at adoption if the animal is suitable
- None. They are good pest control and not dangerous to humans. Let them be
- Trapping, rehiring, vet care.
- Roaming cat owners should be fined or penalized. Stray cats should be rehomed when possible and feral cats should be trapped/spayed/neutered/released.
- More support on complaints of problem free roaming cats, not leave it up to person making the complaint to get a cat trap to catch the cat.
- Ferals and strays should be caught and spayed/neutered. Any of these feral or free roaming cats that can be adopted out should be. Any that cannot should be humanely euthanized.
- "City support for rescue organizations who can capture and either safely house or adopt out feral cats.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Public understanding through education is key to reduce the numbers of cats that end up as feral, stray, or roaming.
- Financial incentives through reduced licensing costs for responsible owners."
- Ban on roaming owned cats, more programs in place to rehab and rehome feral cats, mandatory microchipping to ensure strays return to owner.
- I would expect a prompt response and action as needed of any issues that I report through 311.
- I don't feel bylaw enforces the rules for roaming cats as they would for a roaming dog. Cats can cause a lot of property damage and are "allowed" freedom to come and go as they please. Bylaw is very fast to come capture a roaming dog, yet a cat is simply left alone.
- Catch them, increase fines to owners and euthanize as needed. As well as killing birds, cats poo in OTHER people's yards because they don't like to go in their own - that is why many owners let their cats roam. Most cat owners don't care about keeping their cats on their property. Increase fines!
- Expect the city to enforce the bylaws regarding people who let their cats roam about freely.
- Help return roaming cats without shaming owners
- That they will be collected by bylaw and that the owners will be fined
- Either enforce the bylaws or scrap them
- Help them
- Bylaw should deal with it on a case-by-case basis. I once had a lost cat living under our porch and we were asked to capture it and get a trap. Should be the other way around, bylaw should have come out to try and capture it and see if it had tags or drop it off to correct organization.
- If they're feral, don't hurt them. If they are owned, fine the owner. If they are stray, start your own cat Cafe and adopt them out at a reasonable cost. Regal has proved effective.
- To capture the cats and fine owners heavily for their return.
- There is a great number of stray and feral cats in the city. Certainly it is not an easy job to find and capture each one. All I expect is that a valid, and humane, effort is made to reduce the number of cats on the street.
- Stray and roaming cats should be picked up, ensure they are licensed and vaccinated, returned to owner with warning to keep them at home. Ferals should at least be collected and fixed, possibly handed over to a charity that tries to home them.
- I would like to see cats free to roam providing that they are licensed and spayed or neutered.
- Pick the cats up, fine the owners, spay or neuter the cats, and try to find homes for them.
- Spay, neuter and health check programs. Responsible animal trapping and rehoming.
- There should be more effort put into catch and release programs and providing people with the necessary equipment for it
- The City of Calgary should create stricter bylaws and increase penalties for owners who allow their cats to roam outside their own property.
- Work with a qualified, humane rescue organization to trap, neuter and release, or rescue, or set up a safe haven colony with a rescue group to monitor and administer.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be a trap/neuter/release program in place for feral cats. Strays and roaming cats should be collected and efforts made to return to their owners, or rehomed.
- To catch them themselves and charge the owners big time for it. If it was an escapee cat, I understand. But I've had 2 roaming cats in my yard and I called bylaw and I was told to catch them myself.
- Encourage catch, spay, neuter and release. Education of public.
- Notify pet owner where there is one. If is an overpopulation of feral capture spay and release
- Unclaimed or unadoptable cats should be humanely put down.
- Owners of roaming cats should be held to account (i.e. bylaws enforced). Because cats are not easily contained by most standard fences, the bylaw should be amended to be more stringent about the requirements for control.
- Capture, evaluate and either rehabilitate or euthanize
- To rehire them even if it is as barn cats for feral cats.
- Spay neuter return where possible with feral/stray cat populations, and legislation requiring owned cats do not free roam. Require leashes similar to dog licensing.
- I have called 311 to report a stray cat with tags. I was told cats don't get picked up. I would expect the City to at least come and record the owner information and enforce the bylaws. I do not feel safe picking up an unfamiliar cat.
- Capture them to see if they are someone's pet. If not let them go.
- "I think there are bigger issues to deal with. Cats are quiet and not much of a threat. Would much rather see the city focus on getting entitled dog owners and their ""babies"" under control. Dogs are animals 1st and need to be given some respect. We expect them to be furry children
- It's embarrassing."
- Provisions for capturing animals in need and adoption availability after capture. Vaccination and health care.
- Spay and neuter programs with rehabilitation if possible. No-kill shelters.
- To provide funding for TNR programs for feral cats, to respond to complaints and pick up "friendly" stray/roaming cats.
- Nothing
- Cats that are found roaming around should be dealt with like any other "lost" pet: if it's chipped, find the owner, if not, take it to a shelter. No one ignores a roaming dog.... why is it ok to let cats out?? My cat stays in my house, happily.
- They should be doing something about it. Give it tickets, enforce existing bylaws, make the rules more strict for people who let their cats out and have kittens that just add to over population
- To educate cat owners and whoever is dealing with cats, and to support animal rescue organizations that rescue, spay and neuter these cats.
- We do not feel that feral cats are a nuisance in our neighbourhoods. I think a concern that I have is if they could potentially carry some sort of disease that are uncommon for humans (i.e. rabies)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It seems that the homeowner is left to deal with any issues. Bylaw isn't proactive about it, but they likely don't receive the required support from Council.
- To aid TNR programs and provide funding and support for organizations working to help deal with feral cat colonies.
- I'm not sure about feral, but strays should be taken to a shelter and pets caught roaming should be punished accordingly.
- Feral and stray cats should be put up for adoption. Roaming cats should be left alone.
- They need to be caught/trapped. If pets, there should be an immediate fine to owner. A large one. If unlicensed fine should be doubled. If a complaint is filed with city and owner is known, i expect it be followed through. Fines are appropriate if warning is not adhered to
- Provide funding that will enable society to minimize their population and potential diseases. Increase taxes if you must!
- Try to reunite owners with lost strays. Educate owners of roaming cats, then punish them since it is not acceptable behaviour. Spay/neuter ferals if practical but there do not seem to be very many around in my experience.
- Pick up and take to animal services. Feral- stray should be spayed. Heavy fines for owners - this is trespassing if I someone's yards.
- I expect that The City of Calgary respond to citizen complaints about free roaming cats, and to capture and control them. Or, if a citizen has captured a free roaming cat, City animal control officers take possession of it.
- TNR
- I don't want the city taking it upon themselves to destroy these animals. TNR programs and fining owners is more than enough.
- "Roaming cats: fine owners; awareness campaigns
- Stray/feral: ensure safe capture and care from vets and available rescue shelters"
- none
- All should be trapped. If tagged, to the SPCA and high fine for roaming free (unless the owner had already contacted the city that their cat got out by accident). If not tagged (stray or feral), hold for specified period, make available to foster or rehabilitation society, otherwise euthanize.
- "Ferals - spay/neuter release
- Strays - catch and rehome as they are usually lost or abandoned pets and that is why they interact with people
- Roaming cats - fine the owners."
- People should be reprimanded for allowing their cats to roam freely. Feral and stray cats should be fixed and vaccinated, and potentially be put in shelters permitting space as it is unreasonable to put every stray in a shelter due to capacity.
- To treat them well and if trapped, when possible transfer the cats to organizations that will handle the feral cats better than the city.
- catch them, sterilize them, adopt them out if possible. fine owners for letting them run free



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Remove them, and fine the owners - remind the owners that cats are not allowed to roam freely.
- My dogs have to be licensed and maintained on my property or on a leash, I expect the same of roaming cats, might decrease the amount of feral and strays if cat owners were held to the same standard as dog owners.
- I would hope that they can be captured. Returned to their owners if possible, or put up for adoption. Though unpleasant I understand some would need to be destroyed or at the very least sterilized.
- I just want them to be reasonable.
- If there are a lot, take them to the SPCA or maybe euthanize them. The city if they ever have a mouse problem in their buildings could use them to control the pests much as they have done for years in different areas like the Hermitage in St. Petersburg. Put them to work.
- Feral cats should be dealt with in a humane manner, but they should be removed.
- I expect a trap-neuter-release program to be in place. I don't expect the City to attempt to adopt these cats out as they are not fit for a pet home. Short of culling, population control through spay/neuter of feral cats is all that can be done.
- There should be some attempt to capture said cats; especially if they are reported and known to be pets that are being allowed out!
- Have them fixed and providing caregivers for them.
- This is a tough one. I suppose I would like to see the bylaws enforced and people held responsible for letting their cat outside.
- The City should be supporting TNR programs run through Animal shelters and also running their own TNR program to help out people dealing with feral and stray cats. They should enforce their indoor bylaws and should have more spay/ neuter assistance and programs.
- They should be collected by animal services. Feral and stray cats, should be spayed/neutered, dewormed, & vaccinated, before being adopted to appropriate homes. Roaming cats should be seized and their owners heavily fined. Repeat offenders should be banned from owning pets.
- work with spay/neuter and rescue programs
- It would be ideal to see campaigns where the city reminds people that letting their cats outside without a tether is illegal. Not everyone likes animals.
- Any actions taken should be as humane as possible and every effort should be taken to rehabilitate problem animals.
- Animal Services should be aggressively targeting people who let cats roam, and should be handled similar to dog at large complaints
- Trap, Neuter and Release programs
- Wherever possible, capture, spay/neuter, and relocate the cat with a shelter/rescue.
- Stray and roaming cats shouldn't be allowed. Just like dogs. Feral cats should be euthanized
- Stray need to be picked up and brought to the shelter, as their health and safety is at risk if they were previously domesticated.
- Make sure they are kept safe. Neuter males if necessary
- " -all stray, feral and roaming cats should be captured and altered



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- -unclaimed cats should be put up for adoption. Those not adopted would be euthanized.
- -owners receive a fine and the bill for the spay/neutering
- -license reductions for microchipped cats as well as altered cats"
- Feral and stray cats should not be roaming around. Roaming cats usually do so at night and aren't a problem.
- TNR programs. Low cost/subsidies for spay and neutering
- These animals are dangerous. While not a popular position to take I think they should be trapped and humanly euthanized.
- FINE MORE PEOPLE WHO DONT FOLLOW THE LAWS OF OUTDOOR CATS. Dont euthanize the cat [removed], fine the [removed] owner
- Remove and destroy
- Round them up and fine owners
- That they set clear, but reasonable regulations while also providing support and access to pet owners who struggle to comply. Less fines, more help solving the issues, whether that means providing more services/info, or rehoming animals from repeat offenders
- Little.
- Trap, neuter, and release for feral/strays. If animals is able to be socialized or already domesticated, adopted out would be ideal. If roaming cats have identification, owners contacted
- Cats need to be licensed and if they are not when they are found roaming then they need to be captured and adopted out if not claimed.
- Round them up
- If they arent being a nuisance let them be
- Cats should be indoors or supervised on owners property. But cats are escape artists so ensuring ID (microchip AND tag), plus education for ALL citizens on what to do if they find a cat. Fines for offences should be tiered, as 1 or 2 escapes is not necessarily irresponsible, but multiple are.
- I understand that it is not normal practise to check cats picked up by, or handed into, the city pound for tattoos or more importantly, a microchip. This is appalling and pets are being euthanized without due diligence.
- If these cats are causing trouble they should be trapped- otherwise they might be helpful to keep mice under control.
- Catch, neuter/spay and adopt them out
- Trap and deliver to the humane society
- The city should eliminate the feral cats and put stray and roaming cats in the pound. If repeated offences and fines dont make the owners more responsible, then the cats should be given to other homes
- None
- "Feral cats: trap, spay, neuter, release. Has been show to be effective as a means of allowing these cats to remain outdoors without the increase in population
- Stray and roaming cats I think are being handled well by the city"



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Remove them. Fine owners for roaming cats.
- owners of roaming cats should be fined. I should be allowed to trap them and take them to the pound
- I believe cats should be contained in the same way dogs are expected to be. I think cracking down on people who ignore the bylaws and let their cats be outdoor cats should be penalized if and when caught.
- N/A
- Feral cats are treated like any other kind of wildlife in the city. Domestic cats need to be contained to their own homes and licensed like dogs. (Not a cat owner so I don't know if this is already done.)
- Decide whether enforcement and mitigation of attacks to birds or keep it illegal to have cats roaming. Feral and strays should be rehomed. Living in other countries where there are lots of strays I would say it is not a beneficial situation for cats nor people.
- Control the feral population. Stray and roaming cats should be caught, spayed or neutered. Stray cats should go to shelter. Roaming cats - owners give one more chance. If cat is caught again then cat is taken away.
- Stop them.
- should be controlled per siting report to eliminate future encounters and apprehended
- No harm causing, and to neuter/spay as many as possible to keep the population low for their safety
- Want city to pick up strays. Also want owners fined (increasing amount) if they continue to let their cat run wild. I have an extremely vocal cat who constantly wants to go out so I've harnessed and leashed him. If my cat can do it, others can too! Fines for non-licensing too. Follow rules or no pet
- I would like to have someone from the city come to relocate cats who are causing problems in a neighbourhood.
- I would like to see zero tolerance for allowing cats to roam, along with much stiffer fines. I have an indoor cat and he's happy and healthy. There is no need for people to allow their cats to roam. It's definitely a problem in Glenbrook/Glendale and they're a real nuisance.
- Capture those cats that can be re-homed and make it illegal to euthanize ANY healthy animal.
- Be more strict on roaming cats- fines may help.
- Lack of enforcement, not enough bylaw officers and exceedingly infrequent patrols
- Trap cats. Fine owners
- Support catch, spay/neuter, release/rehome projects, like those run by the Meow Foundation
- Easy to find and use Trap Neuter Return program for feral cats, and enforcement of owners not allowing cats to free roam.
- I have an expectation that the city would fine people with roaming cats and treat those owners just as they would treat a dog owner that let their dog run around the streets freely. When I have contacted the city for help they said they couldn't do anything. That is not okay!
- It is a never-ending situation. People seem to find it easy to dispose of cats. Live catch. Spay & neuter every cat you find. Give negligent pet owners a fine.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cat owners should be held just as responsible for cleaning up after their pets as dog owners. People would find it VERY concerning if random dogs were found in or pooping in their yard. This is how I feel about cats. Right now it is onerous to try and do something about stray cats. It needs to be easier
- Continue to use current methods to control population
- I don't know who owns all the cats that are in my yard. I wish the city would be more proactive in enforcing the by-laws.
- Feral: catch, spay/neuter and release. Stray: catch, spay/neuter and re-home. Roaming: accountability of owner.
- I haven't had any dealings
- Get stricter with pet ownership and clamp down on illegal breeding
- If feral cats live there; post a sign alerting community members, when stray or roaming pick up and notify owners
- Trap, fix, rehome where possible. If not, especially, feral, put them back into the neighborhood they were picked up from
- These animals need to be either rescued and rehabilitated or if their recovery and health is not possible they should be euthanized.
- Work with groups and provide a spay/neuter clinic for feral colonies
- Bigger fines for owners? Tattoo/chip all cats? Spay/neuter all cats that come through bylaw?
- All "found" roaming cats should be spayed/neutered upon capture, regardless if they have homes or not.
- The city needs to pick up stray cats, TNR feral cats and introduce a Barn a Buddy program.
- The city should offer free or low cost TNR programs and encourage organizations that help feral and stray cats.
- Fine owners whose house cats roam free and use those dollars for the "fix and free" program.
- Capture and cull as required. Dog owners held to far higher standard than cat owners.
- I don't want to see them or have to deal with them
- Spend money on something else
- Owners should not be allowed to let them roam free.
- Continuing to educate the public and enforce requirements for owners to be responsible
- I hope that as many as possible are saved, spayed and found homes. Or euthanised if they are very ill or can't be adopted
- Round up ferals and strays— euthanize ferals and strays that cannot be put up for adoption. Leave roaming cats be.
- Free-roaming cats shouldn't be allowed. There should be a penalty to discourage owners from letting their cats loose.
- I would hope that they would be trapped and the owners warned and fined. I have tried posting the city bylaw in our mailbox but it has not helped. I feel a fine or 'missing' cat might make these owners more responsible.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If the cats were licensed hopefully the owners would be tracked down and expected to pay for the expense/cost of whatever care was needed. Likely this is not the case, Is there someone to call if animals are an issue so the city can deal with them. Fine owners not abiding bylaws?
- TNR for ferals
- Be empathetic and humane regarding their health and welfare and become a "cat friendly" city! How about legalizing and encouraging things like cat adoption cafes and other kinds of innovative adoption programs?
- I don't feel that there is enough work being done to catch the stray cats, the longer they are left the more there will be.
- humane society or animal rescue organization can try to assist feral/stray and roaming cat bylaw should be enforced.
- Live and let live
- I hope the city helps to keep numbers at a manageable through through humane and reasonable efforts.
- Stray cats should be picked up by the city, roaming cats should not be picked up unless they do not have proper identification on them (I.e. tags and chipped)
- Capture, Neuter, release.
- Balance
- Reported stray and roaming cats should be caught and if microchipped returned to the owner with the cost of capture and transport being billed to the owner. Cats with no owner should be sterilized and domesticated and given up for adoption when deemed appropriate.
- Spay and neutered!
- Catch them, spay or neuter them and put them up for adoption. When numbers become too great, euthanization as a last resort.
- Cats that are owned should be chipped by law.
- I believe they should be trapped and the owners found and fined. Feral cats Sterilized and returned to the wild.
- Take them to a rescue foundation where they are properly dealt with.
- Adoption if able and culling if necessary.
- Give them a chance.
- Educate and do more TNR
- To house them at least temporarily
- Pay the non profits who are providing your city a service and make bylaws reasonable so they can actually do their work here.
- Cooperation with rescues and volunteers, support for sanctuaries for ferals and cats who are not rehomed.
- It is hard to get a cat trap and all the laws seem to favor the cat owner. It is not even safe for the cats as I have seen ones that have been killed by cars.
- None



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Pick them up see if they have owners. If not try to get them adopted. Fine owners that let their cats roam. Spay the cats if they are not and charge the owner's. Might have to resort to euthanizing them which is so painful to acknowledge as possibly necessary for control
- To enforce the bylaw.
- I think the city should have a trap, neuter, release program for feral cats to reduce the ability for feral cat colonies to grow. I think the city should also provide more information for owners about bylaws around outdoor cats in the city.
- Set realistic expectations with some possibility of enforcement. Support programs for humane trapping, neutering, treating, adopting if possible, supporting in the wild if healthy but not adoptable, euthanizing as a last resort.
- I think there are way too many enforcement officers wasting their time over this issue. I would encourage people to report anonymously a person who has kittens. A visit and a fine for breeding without a permit, which I think should be purchased by people who intentionally or unintentionally breed.
- To keep them safe and hold owners accountable. We don't allow people's human kids to roam freely without supervision and we should not allow this of animals that are the responsibility of a human owner. If you cannot care for an animal, don't own one.
- Trapping and homing them.
- Neuter or spay them. Then release.
- nothing. just leave them alone.
- Bylaws to ensure people are responsible with their animals and cats are not left to roam free, ensuring the pick up and care of feral or stray cats - delivering them to appropriate care facilities
- I hope the city would try to keep the numbers of feral down and try to rehome stray cats.
- Work better with rescues and caregivers to allow for well maintained TNR colonies to help reduce breeding, disease transmission and suffering of otherwise uncared for ferals.
- Catch strays and enforce laws when people let their cats roam.
- That stray cats will be taken to a rescue organization. Feral cat colonies can be put through TNR programs. Roaming cats are tough, but all pets should be microchipped so contacting their owners if found roaming.
- That the city strives to ensure there are few if any feral cats, catch what is possible and rehome them.
- Be more active in removing cats if called by homeowners. None of my neighbours seem to care or change their behaviour with regards to their free roaming cats. They don't seem to think there are any consequences.
- I think stray or roaming cats should be picked up for retrieval by owners or rehoming if possible but if they are not causing trouble, leave them where they are. Feral cats can't be domesticated unless they are very young
- They need to apply the law and give tickets where warranted



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Get the public educated & enforce the bylaws more effectively. People think the city does nothing about this issue & therefore don't care that they cause problems for their own cats or other people. Every neighbourhood has cats roaming at large & people who believe that it is acceptable.
- Fines for people who allow their animals to roam unchecked and well as trap and release programs to sterilize feral cats
- If an owner allows their cat to roam and it gets caught by a neighbor or city the owner needs to be fined a lot.
- Cats abandoned by human should be rescued and rehome. Before owning a pet, potential owner shall send application to city and go through all responsibilities to reduce abandon later and reduce pressure on human society. In case, something happens, people know where to surrender.
- The city should be enforcing pet ownership bylaws and prosecuting those in blatant violation of those laws
- "Feral cats should have access to food and water.
- Stray cats should be trapped and attempts to locate owners and unsuccessful, adoption.
- Owners who allow roaming cats should be fined."
- Feral -help reduce population to zero with a catch, neuter/spade, release plan. Strays- find owners or a new home. Roaming- educate owners on the benefit of keeping cats indoors & provide free or inexpensive classes or some other kind of help to support owners with transitioning their cat indoors.
- If they have a license, tattoo or are microchipped, find the owners and fine them. Adopt out the ones you can, the rest should be euthanized.
- It would be great to see stiffer penalties handed out to those who let their cats roam free. Especially those who have not spayed or neutered their cat. They are contributing to the growing problem of stray/feral cats in our city.
- Making sure these animals get home safely or providing sterilization and release program for feral cats.
- Help to do vet care. Although stray they are helping keep mice and other rodent populations at bay which also help in our own health care with rodents not spreading diseases.
- Remove all cats should they be reported wandering, set humane traps in key areas
- Feral and roaming are two different types. Ferals only know that way of life and sadly should be left to it, but neutered as mentioned before. On the other side are lazy owners who let their "family members" free roam. That is inexcusable and those cats should not be outdoors unless on a leash.
- Higher fines for roaming cats. Taking away of cats that require numerous warnings and fines
- All family pets must be kept indoors. No such thing as roaming or strays. Feral cats are all neutered and have caregivers.
- None unless there is abuse, neglect or distress
- See above
- Roaming cats should be trapped and taken into custody by the city - euthanized after a 2 or 3 week period.
- "It's shouldn't be allowed at all.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If dogs are not allowed to be off leash in all areas, either should cats."
- To find an appropriate barn home for feral cats, or a rescue or society that could try to get them to trust humans. For stray and roaming cats, taking them to a safe place, a warning for owners if they can be found, a fine if it happens again, and rehoming opportunities if needed
- enforce the by-laws and have some sort of reporting system for people to report cats crapping in their gardens/yard
- If the cat is registered, or has been claimed to have the owner fined
- More fines to owners of cats let out, allow for people to prove a cat was off its owner's property without having to trap it. Have traps that can be used year-round, do TNR programs.
- To catch them and place them to the shelters.
- A clearer process for getting any of the above picked up if necessary
- "Feral - treat them as any other wildlife.
- Roaming - fine or jail the hell out of anyone who lets their cats outdoors. Confiscate the cats and other pets in the household. If the owners care so little for their cats that they let them outside, they clearly do not care enough to deserve them."
- I need context - quantity of feral cats dealt with annually, # of man hours, \$ approximate cost. Since I don't experience the problem, I have no expectations
- If cats are spotted and can be caught and taken to either a vet or animal services, then that should be done. (Pretty sure that's what happens now, anyway)
- Tolerance
- I would love the city to collect them all. And if an owner is found negligent, they should be fined heavily or denied the right to own a cat.
- For strays, the city needs to try & find their owner, & if can't then fix & adopt out. For ferrals, catch, spay or neuter, then release. For roaming cats, find the owners, that is why you have us license them.
- I don't call the city o leave them be.
- If it has a collar, try and find owner, keep for xx number of days, euthanize
- Enforce bylaws regarding these issues
- Provide funding for Trap Neuter Return programs to reduce feral populations. Use pet registration fees to reunite found pets with owners as soon as possible. Fine owners who knowingly allow their pet cats to roam. Encourage use of harnesses or "catios" for pet cats instead.
- Humane care. Public education around animal cruelty and welfare.
- Removal and fining owners (if an owner is applicable). I.e. make sure owners abide by the rules.
- Making it more known for people to report potential feral cats.
- Provide some winter shelter in form of insulated boxes or something. Fund TNR.
- Spay / neuter
- I believe that cats owned by people should be licensed and kept indoors, and if they are not, the city should fine them. The city should make every effort to reduce the number of roaming and stray cats
- education and enforcement. I'd like to see a lot more enforcement



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Leave them alone
- Solution re feral cats answered in #2; tougher penalties for repeat offenders of roaming cats, licensing requirements for all cats should quickly allow pet owners to locate their strays
- For roaming cats, to enforce high fines for second offences and publicize it alongside education.
- Higher fines, more enforcement, anything to deter irresponsible pet owners.
- "Fining and educating irresponsible pet owners.
- Feral cats must be captured, given medical attention, and hopefully domesticated and adopted out. Outdoor feeding programs just hurt wildlife as even fed cats still hunt and kill wildlife. especially birds."
- To respond to complaints & help mitigate the situation if someone is not following the bylaw or if their cat is a nuisance. Remove problematic feral cats
- I think cats should continue to be licensed and fines should be given for stray cats. Maybe the city should add family pets to the city census.
- They should be trapped
- Humane population control and ensuring identified colonies are healthy and protected because they play a role in the ecosystem. Helps keep us rat free. Also protecting them from animal abuse.
- Car management.
- If a cat is abandoned, especially in winter, with evidence, I expect the city to investigate and charge for animal neglect. This has not happened and very irresponsible pet owners are able to support, and neglect, more pets. Animals suffer at the hands of irresponsible adults with no consequences.
- Catch them and bring them to CHS.
- Catching these cats & if they have an owner charge them & do not return the cat to them if they catch them. As well cats if outside should have to be put on a leash (like dogs) & kept on the owners property. Not charge other people for catch crates to catch a cat that is roaming.
- For stray and roaming cats, they should be captured and taken to the pound. Feral cats may be best handled in co-operation with specialist groups; the city should sponsor a TNR (Trap-Neuter-Return) program to humanely lower the population of feral cat clusters.
- I would prefer if the bylaw allowed for roaming cats in a reasonable manner. Having a bylaw that says cats must stay in the yard is unreasonable, as cats are not containable in the same way as dogs. Chaining cats can be very dangerous due to their climbing nature and they can climb fences easy.
- To act in good faith and with reasonable compassion. Create a SNR trap-return plan with a few rescue partners and implement it to reduce and control the population in a reasonable manner and timeline.
- Capture, spay and neuter and adopt all that can.
- TREAT COMPLAINTS SERIOUSLY. We've been told that we pretty much have to catch the cat in the act...and yet, even if we do, the officers say they can't do anything. Visit the offending houses, set up traps in the neighborhood. DO something.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- When city captures strays and ferals they should be euthanized or used for vet or medical studies. Untagged roamers should be euthanized, too. Identified cats' owners to be contacted and can pick up for a fee, and hefty fines if cats aren't licensed.
- I would like the city to fund shelters and have programs to mitigate this issue. For example a program to fix feral cats to prevent more from being born. Working with cat owners to transition cats to being indoor.
- Clear guidelines with enforceable consequences, transparency around how complaints are resolved, consideration for cat safety and overall wellness
- Ensuring that only spayed or neutered cats roam will reduce the feral cat population.
- If the owner can be found, fine them. Otherwise.... oie... the hard call. Euthanize.
- To capture or take in the animals and return them home, find a new home, or euthanasia for the ones who should not be homed(extremely sick) also the collection of deceased cats with the photo book for owners is a great service.
- Funding for spay and neuter clinics; continuing to promote responsible pet ownership by requiring roaming cats to have tags; rehoming services for found stray cats.
- Maybe harsher penalties if you're cat is found to be roaming. Having the availability to respond to roaming or feral cat complaints would also help.
- There are such little bylaw resources (available officers) that enforcement measures are virtually non existent. By the time the assistance is available the problem is no longer trackable.
- There's quite a number of NGOs interested in tackling these issues; the City should partner with them.
- I'm a HUGE supporter of the system of humanely catching, neuter/spay, and rerelease. Red Deer has a program like this.
- What is done now is sufficient
- - feral cat populations need to be vigorously controlled, coupled with an extensive education campaign to help people understand why it is necessary
- stronger enforcement in trapping. Ensure cats are licensed and fixed. All cats caught should be fixed and the cost included in the cost of cat licensing.
- Chip pet cats, fine owners when cats are found roaming. Ensure ALL cats are spayed and neutered. I don't support euthanasia of any animal when dealing with animal control.
- Trap, assess, and turn over to CHS.
- Capture, spay and neuter program. Ticketing irresponsible pet owners
- I expect the City of Calgary to be able to capture and sterilize roaming cats. If they are rehabilitated then allow them to be adopted responsibly.
- I would expect the city to fine people who are not looking after their pets or to collect them and put them up for adoption.
- Bigger fines/consequences for cat owners who allow their cats to roam onto other properties.
- Concerned about cost to the tax payer about control efforts.
- Where possible cats are caught and neutered and rehome if suitable.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education to pet owners about risks. Feral cats could be spayed/neutered and released near areas with rodent populations, or offered to businesses who have rodent problems.
- If they are aware of the animal, trapping and transferring to a shelter (where they would be domesticated or put down if health issues offer no other alternative).
- If not licenced then euthanize
- The same as when there are loose dogs, catch them, give the owners of the *stray* (usually the owners let them out) a fine and an at large fine. Cats should be treated exactly the same as dogs
- They should be picked up and removed from streets and owners fined
- See above
- Animal services should assist in catching, removing and ultimately dealing with feral or stray cats. There needs to be more severe penalties for people who allow their cats to roam free as it's not safe for the cat and is a nuisance for neighbours.
- Hard to say. It's not really a problem that's the City's responsibility, but someone has to show leadership.
- The City should increase the fine for stray cats and should have a spay/neuter catch release program to control numbers.
- Better reproductive control via ensuring there are no feral, stray or owned cats roaming free.
- capture and put down or owner fined
- "Regarding feral cats, they should be captured and released on the wild.
- Regarding the other cats, they should be taken to a place where they could be adopted, such as ARCS and Calgary Humane Society"
- "The owners of the roaming cats should be fined for the disturbances they cause.
- Feral cats trapped and if possible rehabbed and adopted out to responsible pet owners."
- Humane trapping, attending calls about feral cats, ensuring that if they find a litter of kittens that they WAIT for the mother to return so they can all be brought into a shelter together.
- Owners should be fined for their roaming cats. Feral and stray cats should be spayed and neutered.
- Let people take care of the problems. Make the rules very clear about how residents are allowed to deal with unwanted stray cats on their property.
- Support to rescues who care for these animals, protection for these animals in the form of prosecution for abusing or poisoning them, actually protecting them, not just saying there's a law against it then ignoring the problem because it's too much work.
- These cats must not be allowed to roam free in Calgary and should be addressed quickly when spotted and before they roam on to a new area. Cull feral cats and donate the meat to qualified wildlife rehabilitation centres.
- Strays need to be licenced , fixed and kept until owners found feral are a huge problem and could really get out of hand they need to be euthanized sadly.
- That licensing and other bylaws are enforced.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I want to see more action on cat owners being fined for allowing their cats to roam. Better education as well as enforcement of fines (steeper fines as well?) for any cats that end up at Calgary animal services. Bylaw could set/rent out traps in areas where they have been notified of a nuisance cat?
- Trap if a nuisance
- Domestic cats are an invasive species that take a massive toll on native bird populations. They should be treated as such. They're cute and fuzzy, but still highly effective predators.
- Given the risk they pose to wildlife and residents, it's the city's responsibility to control them, either directly with animal services or by getting help from animal rescue groups.
- It would be nice if the city could capture and spay or neuter feral cats but in a city this size it's probably financially impossible. Cats who are pets will escape their owners and the city should ensure thru identification that such cats are returned to their owners with a hefty fine.
- Roaming cats should be returned to their homes, and if the roaming continues the owners should be fined. Stray cats should be adopted out, and more aggressive efforts to do so should be made by the city. Unfortunately, feral cats need to be put down.
- Traps could be made available for no charge (as are now) so citizens can contain problem animals and deliver to animal services
- Cull them.
- Pickup and rehome, not murder them!
- Feral cats should be caught and sterilized then returned to the street. Stray/roaming cats should be caught and either returned to owners or re-homed.
- feral cats- round up and rehome or euthanize. strays/roaming- attempt to find their home, fines to owners who let them roam. euthanize if not claimed/rehomed.
- Destroy these animals. They are not natural wild animals.
- The city should trap and destroy them. They're an invasive species.
- Leave them alone
Keeping your car on your property is ridiculous
It's not a good life to be in a house your whole life
- None, simply leave them alone.
- that they treat them with respect. It isn't the animals fault....it's the owners
- See answers for 1) and 2).
- Help with rescue of kittens.
- Appears to be my problem. I am not going to spend money or time to deal with the cats, city won't do anything.
- Little to none. If a cat is somehow identified as very problematic (aggressive, injured) then perhaps capturing them and "helping" them.
- Catch them, stop expecting people to deal with the nuisance themselves by paying for traps and doing bylaw's job. Put the cost on the negligent owners.
- To care for these animals in a kind, humane way.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They should catch them and if not tagged then euthanized. Or make sure the predator population is sufficient.
- Monitor for disease
- The City should do a spray/neuter program with feral cats as we should reduce those populations. Strays should be trapped and brought to shelters to be adopted. Roaming cats are fine.
- no opinion
- Feral? Help homeowners remove them if they are nesting in their yard. Stray and roaming? Let homeowners trap them and take them to a shelter. More convenient shelters and more awareness about proper trapping would help.
- spay/neuter the feral cats, work with rescues to find homes for the young kittens, provide vet care to the sick
- Pick them up as they do with dogs or provide free traps for the home owners to be returned after animals are caught
- Make sure they are checked for health concerns and make sure they have tracking to make sure they can find the cat if need be to do the health checkup
- To provide citizens with humane traps so the cats can safely be contained and taken to the shelter.
- They are doing fine as is.
- I would hope that they could be rescued and hopefully rehabilitated in order to be adopted into a loving home. I would hate to think that these cats are being destroyed if they do not have owners to speak on their behalf.
- City can't deal with everything, but it would be great if the City had/continued their programs to collect feral cats for shelters or destroy them if necessary.
- Catch females, spay and release. They are terrific in keeping vermin populations down. Done in US cities.
- Removing and destroying any wandering cat.
- I'd expect the city to be involved in a trap, neuter and release program for feral cats. Stray and roaming cats should be caught and returned to their homes or rehomed when possible.
- We built an outdoor enclosure so our cats could still enjoy the outdoors, but be safe and not bother anyone. Cats that are allowed to roam, get hurt or into trouble. If cats have no trace back to an owner, then I guess the local shelters do their best. OFFER A LOW COST YEARLY SPAY/NEUTER CLINIC
- I expect the city to control the feral cat population and to enforce the licencing bylaws in the city. Too often do cats roam the city and the owners believe that this is acceptable. It is not and bylaw officers need to enforce this.
- Trap, spay/neuter and release for feral cats. Roaming cats should be picked up and the owners fined. Stray cats should go to the Humane Society where awesome people can adopt them.
- I hope the city will do more to combat this issue.
- The City does not help with feral cats or stray cats in any way unless you catch it and bring it in. Even if you know the who the owner is and where the cat lives.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Bylaw Officers should be dealing with these animals.
- All animals at large should be captured and the owners fined. Cat owners let their cats out at night, when there are no bylaw officers at work.
- I think The City of Calgary should stop restricting the movement of cats entirely. Registered and collared for owner cats, yes. But no restriction on movement at all. It's unhealthy to the animal to be cooped up inside or put into a leash. They are not dangerous in any way.
- They should be taken to shelters. If they are licensed the cat owner should be contacted and fined to get their cat back and given a warning they will charge with cruelty to animals for a second offense. Shelters should assess if the feral cats are adoptable and try to adopt them out.
- Fines for owner who allow pets to roam.
- If the cat has a license/chip go to the homeowner ie: applicable by-laws. If the cat does not have license/chip, take it to the shelter and see if it is suitable for possible or eventual adoption. Otherwise as sad as it is, follow with the usual policies for cats that are in place at the shelter.
- An effective trap/neuter/release program.
- I am not sure if you have a no kill policy at the shelter or what you do with stray cats but it isn't the tax payers responsibility to pay for these stray animals.
- No expectation from the city.
- Needs to be more stringent to change attitudes. Too many people believe the term "outdoor cat" is valid.
- Feral: trap and spay/neuter or euthanize
Stray and roaming: owner fine, if the cat is identified and you can find the owner
Capture and place for adoption if appropriate
Messaging about what to do if you are concerned about these cats.
- Perhaps spaying and neutering any cats that aren't meant to be bred so we don't have an influx of stray cats.
- Enforcement. Plain and simple, people will not alter their behaviors regarding letting their cats outside unless there are proper and regular patrols as well and issuing and tickets to those who don't follow the bylaws.
- provide assistance to organizations who are providing spay and neuter services for feral cats. Stray cats should be rescued and placed. Individuals who are responsible for roaming cats should be fined for each instance that their cat is found roaming to support the other two programs.
- - Screen the animals to make sure they do not pose a risk to owned animals.
- I think that The City needs to support the groups dealing with feral cats in dollars and in kind and make this approach a City policy.
- none
- That they fine the homeowner and advise that cats should stay indoors.
- Feral cats should be scooped, fixed and returned. Roaming and stray cats should be licensed so they can be returned home.
- Should be removed and destroyed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Capture them humanely, take to Animal Control or other animal welfare agencies, to be rehomed (and neutered), if the owners are not found. People, unfortunately, often treat cats as replaceable. Relying on people to come get their animals, with a fine, does not work. (Dogs seem to fare better.
- I think feral cats should be managed in the same way any other wildlife is managed in Calgary. I think that owners of roaming cats should be fined and I think stray cats should be re-homed.
- The city has a responsibility to work with the SPCA and other organizations to catch them and ensure they are not diseased and that strays are returned to their homes or adopted if they are abandoned. Pet owners should be fined if they abandon their animals. Roaming animals are fine.
- Engage MEOW Foundation re. dealing with feral cats. Enforce the bylaws re. roaming cats. I see the Calgary Animal Services now has a Facebook page to try to reunite captured strays with owners - a good move. Educate the public on hazards of allowing cats to roam; info on building catios.
- Should be regarded the same way as feral, stray, and roaming dogs.
- Trap them or allow the neighborhood to trap them. Humanely of course.
- The city should euthanize feral cats. Stray and roaming cats should be spayed/neutered and only returned to owners upon payment of fine and cost of medical procedures. If not paid, then adopted out.
- capture & destroy if no licence
- Roaming cats should at the very least be required to wear a bell, and at best, kept on a leash. Stray cats should be humanely captured and rehomed if possible. Stray cats should be humanely captured and put down, or maybe be relocated to become barn cats.
- These cats need help and should be assisted with the help of calgarians.
- My only concern has to do with the well-being of these animals. If they are not in distress, leave them alone, as we would any other "wild animals" in the city.
- I think the City of Calgary should work more closely with organizations providing TNR programs and advertise the option to become a TNR caregiver so these organizations can ensure that when they trap ferals that cannot be rehabilitated that they will have a safe place to return with food and shelter
- If the stray or feral animal is injured, is suffering, starving, or is a danger to the public, the city should remove the animal.
- None. Seems like a waste of money.
- For ferals, provide/promote TNR. Stray/roaming cats need to be returned to their owners.
- It would be good if somehow the City could get the people to quit letting their cats roam freely. I know it would be extremely hard to do but if they could fine people as they do with dogs if they see a cat not licensed or just roaming about.
- Catch them
- Educate people about what to do with all of them.
- I do not know what the answer is ... capture and spay?
- The City should - capture, and fine owners who do not keep cats indoors and are not responsible pet owners
- To work with shelters



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- More than making me rent a cat trap and do all the work.
- Capture, spay and release programs for feral cat colonies
- I would hope that strays can get re-united with their families and feral cats populations can be managed.
- There's so many I would imagine that the city is doing their best I think again you have to make it harder on pet owners to have a pet
- I think they should be captured and returned to owners with warnings of keeping pets indoors, feral cats should be fixed, and be put up for adoptions.
- provide traps assist the public in capture and management
- they should be caught but our shelters are another major concern. (way over cap.) a way bigger issue.
- Stray cats should be neutered/spayed through a City-wide program. This will help to keep populations down.
- I once got a cat trap from Animal Services but was not successful in catching a problem cat in my garden. About a week after I returned the trap, I caught it. Animal Service and the Humane Society would not accept it because it was not caught in a proper trap. So how do we address this problem?
- None.
- Owners should be penalized (small fine?) for repeat offences of cats roaming. Something helpful might be an app where you can report either if your pet accidentally got out/lost or if you have seen a pet that may be lost? (upload photo/location, etc)
- If an animal does not have a City of Calgary registration tag, the animal should be brought to the City of Calgary SPCA
- Leave the indigenous feral cats alone. Stray and roaming cats should be picked up and sent to SPCA like dogs are/or used to be done. For clearly domesticated, no euthanasia.
- Trapping in response to complaints.
- Feral- put down
Stray/roaming give a healthy ticket to the owners
- There needs to be higher fines for people who constantly allow their cats outdoors to roam free. Have a catch neuter release program that can help more animal's health and the population.
- Support trap, spay/neuter and release programs. Work with existing agencies. If there a a feral cat colony, there is likely a food source.
- When the cat becomes a problem that the city picks it up.
- 1. Supporting/funding TNR programs for feral cats.
2. Enforcing rules when roaming cats are off the owner's property without supervision. I.e. fines for owners.
- I think the City of Calgary should only intervene if a feral cat looks to be starving or injured.
- If they become a nuisance ... trap and eliminate ...



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I expect them to be examined by a veterinarian, vaccinated, treated for illness, and spayed/neutered when they are caught. There should be no exceptions to the spay/neuter (even for roaming cats), unless the health of the animal prohibits the procedure. Stray and feral cats can be let free again.
- If home owners feel they are a nuisance, capture them, health check them at a vet and release them in a different area or return them to their owners.
- Roaming cats at the very least need to be collared and microshipped. Stray cats should not be euthanized. Feral cats should be spayed and there should be checks on their welfare.
- If feral cats become a threat to humans or small pets in populated areas they may have to be euthanized.
- The animals should be treated humanely at all costs. Actions should only be taken when specific animals are causing genuine problems.
- Cats that are clearly homeless should be homed.
- I would love to see Istanbul's approach used in Calgary. Don't euthanize the cats, simply sterilize, vaccinate, dock the ear and release again. I saw that when stray cats were treated this way, the locals were extremely friendly towards them as well. It saves so much cost on sheltering them.
- Only deal with rare problem cases.
- I feel that the city bylaw employees should help capture and deal with feral and roaming cats.
- I have had feral cats and the City provided traps for the capture of these animals - we were expected to ensure they had water and food and shelter until they were picked up by the city - it was very effective.
- Trapping stray and roaming cats and return to owner (if marked) with penalty including non-compliance registry. Otherwise holding for limited period, followed by elimination. In dealing with feral cats, elimination seems to be the best option.
- None, other than enforcing licensing requirements
- To try and find an owner, provide spay/neuter surgeries.
- Their health and well being (preventing zoonotic disease transmissions) and keeping their populations under control through trapping, vaccinating and spaying or neutering.
- I expect feral cats to be managed with the same severity as feral dogs or rats.
- I expect the city to not waste money on it
- Work with rescue partners to spay and relocate, i.e. barn buddy programs.
- to give them a fair chance at a good life
- Administering fines to owners of stray cats, and running catch, spay and release programs for feral cats to reduce their population.
- Spay/Neuter release, or barn cat programs
- That if there is a stray or roaming cat, officers will come and try to catch it. Then the owners (especially repeat offenders) should be fined.
- Sadly these animals need impounding, attempt to regime, and if not rehomed after a set time, euthanized



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Providing programs that reduce the amount of reproduction is the best way to reduce uncared for animals.
- That they actively patrol, catch, neuter, and re-home stray and feral cats.
- 1. Live trap all roaming cats
- 2. Fine owners for license/by law infractions
- 3. Euthanize unclaimed animals
- To make sure they find their family ,to be compassionate, to not euthanize.
- Trap and kill
- They need to be picked up.
- Enable spay and neutering at affordable rates
- They should be caught whenever possible. Animals being adopted out should be indoor only.
- see #1
- That they are carefully and respectfully collected by skilled professionals and taken to no kill shelters
- I expect support and approval for Trap-Neuter-Return, or "TNR," efforts.
- I expect the city to work with rescue organizations to deal with humane ways to deal with feral cats and to hold owners responsible where they can. Too often the cats pay the price and the owners just go on with no consequence to their irresponsible behavior.
- Improve process to match lost cats with owners. The city should provide the owner's contact info to the person who finds the cat directly without the cat being picked up by animal services. Or the person who finds the cat should be able to consent to the City giving their contact info to the owner
- The City should leave it up to organizations such as Humane Society and AARCS to rescue and help them. The City should NOT be in the animal business.
- I think the city has a responsibility to uphold their bylaws...
- I think they need to be caught, spayed/neutered, given medical treatment and rehomed
- Unlicensed cats should be removed to shelters and euthanized
- The city should collect them if they are interfering with humans. If a home can not be found, then they should be killed.
- They should be captured and brought to Calgary Humane Society -spayed or neutered and homed.
- Catch them and deal with them. They shouldn't be able to roam free all over the place. If they have an owner & can't be returned or they have no owner & can't be adopted, as sad as it is, they either need to be kept in shelters or put down. They are not wild animals and shouldn't be treated as such
- Neutering and spaying program for feral cats. Heavy fines for free range outdoor cats.
- public education regarding strays. Capture programs for feral/stray sightings and/or provide public with tools such as cages and info to capture/recapture cats.
- To identify the difference between the 3 and work with neighbours having problems so everyone can coexist peacefully while still allowing cats to live a more natural life rather than being cooped up indoors 24/7
- That they be dealt with humanely. Re-uniting stray and roaming cats with their owners should be a priority.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If you see a cat, take it to the pound
- - To have an overall plan on how to address growing feral/stray cat populations based on science, best practices and animal welfare
 - Appropriate enforcement of bylaws and holding cat owners responsible for their behaviour
- I would expect that the city would be collecting any roaming cats and notifying the owners for a charge. I don't believe the city would allow dogs to be roaming around neighborhoods. Beddington Heights by nose hill has a problem with animals roaming loose.
- Round them all up, please, and take them to shelters.
- Treat them like dogs. Impound, charge owners if they are off property. Try to find homes for them. Enforce the licensing law.
- Take them to the SPCA and either try to contact the owner or put them up for adoption if possible.
- I'd expect the city to eliminate the problem.
- If stray cats are not licensed and returned to owners through that program, they need to be adopted or euthanized. Feral cats I have not experience with. Roaming cats will be a problem for all of time. The city is too large and cat owners don't care, just as long as the kitty comes home. GRRR
- Continue enforcement and trapping
- Treat them, give them a home - a decent home.
- Try to rehabilitate or euthanize
- Roaming and stray - continue to work with SPCA and try to rehome them or reunite them with their owners. I think you do a good job of this
- They need to be captured and rehabilitated and found homes.
- Catch, rehabilitation
- Respond to nuisance cats, follow up with owner &/or destroy
- Look to reduce population through education on pet ownership. Fund and promote spay and neutering programs. Catch, sterilize and release.
- The city should help fund all the organizations that are contributing to society by dealing with these cats.
- deal with them when/if they become a nuisance
- I guess if they are a bother, they should be trapped and either given to humane society or put down if necessary
- Increase fines and have strict policies regarding owner roaming cats. Particularly cats that are picked up unaltered, not dewormed and not up to date on vaccines. Feral cats should be trapped and at the very least altered and vaccinated. Ideally domesticated and regimes.
- I expect more than a letter to the owner not following the bylaw. We have kept endless records of the neighbors cat who roams into our yard, deck, hangs from our screens terrorizing our cat indoors. We have gotten no where with the neighbor nor with bylaw services. Why have laws if they do nothing!!
- [removed]

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Keep feral populations at a healthy level with spay/neuter. Roaming cats - seriously punish those irresponsible owners so they keep their cats indoors.
- Get rid of them
- I expect them to be properly vetted and fed and either adopted out after minimum 1 week or given to a rescue to properly care for adopt out. None should ever be killed unless medically necessary .
- Catch them and fine owners
- Cull them, you did it with beaver and Canada geese and this is an even worse problem. Introduction of a non native species with devastating consequences to native species.
- Invest in TNR programs! They work well, keep cat populations under control.
- That the city can try to help these animals. Especially as the weather starts to get colder. It feels as if the city doesnt care much for animals and does not want to help animals unless they have owners they can bill
- They should be trapped and sent to the pound like any other unwanted/problem species.
- Stray and roaming cats should treated the same way stray and roaming dogs are treated. Feral cats should be dealt with on an individual case basis.
- I expect the city of Calgary to develop a program and determine a budget to care for these cats in a manner best for them.
- Ownerless cats should be captured and removed. Cats should be licenced and owners of roaming cats should be fined.
- Leave roaming cats alone to do their thing. Put more responsibility however on the owner that abandoned their pet to allow them to become full strays.
- I expect the city to ensure the ferals are altered to keep the population manageable but to keep the ferals in their home communities where they have a registered community care giver which again can be done through the MEOW foundation. Stray cats should be adopted out and roaming cats = home & fine
- I expect them to limit but not eliminate feral cats. I expect stray and roaming cats to be chipped and if they become feral to fine the past owners.
- Cats must be licensed. Owners fined if cat caught outside. All household cats should be neutered/spayed. I trap them....you take them.
- I don't have any concerns with roaming cats providing they are not causing any harm or danger to the public. Stray cats should be taken to a veterinary practice to see if the are chipped and if not taken to an animal shelter.
- None. Found them to be useless. The rescues do more with no government funding
- The City of Calgary should be making efforts to attempt to capture the cats.
- I expect that feral cats be spayed or neutered and addopted (if possible, even a barn cat program) or released if not.
- Euthanize feral cats. They are not needed and are a strain on the system. Deal with at large roaming cats as complaints come in. No change needed. Eliminate the 1 warning per year in the bylaw.
- -they uphold the bylaws when someone complains about nuisance cats

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cats should be treated the same as feral and stray dogs.
- ALL should be picked up and removed from the area
- Keeping public (children especially) safe.
- Humane treatment of animals even in euthanasia program.
- To identify the different types and treat them properly. Re-homing where possible and treating for diseases. Putting unsalable animals down
- Licensing of owned cats with identification when outside. How are feral cats different from wildlife? Deal with them the same?
- I have no problem with responsible owners allowing cats outside for pest control
- Make bylaw so anyone poisoning cats gets charged a fine. Roaming cats should be allowed to roam the neighborhood, cats are smart, keep to themselves and kill mice for us. Roaming cats can climb fences, trees, get through small spaces and if they're tied up outside, they still get out of the harness.
- Institute a tnr program and have colony care takers for the cats to ensure they are healthy. This would reduce disease risks to other cats and help the bird populations
- Cats should be taken in, neutered and spayed and injuries/illnesses should be treated. Feral cats should be homed with knowledgeable people. They don't always make good pets.
- Idk man like [removed] cats going to do what cats going to do I just don't want corona virus or poo in my backyard.
- Cat owners should be expected to keep their animals on their property or risk a fine
- Make owners of roaming cats pay a high fine and if they are a repeat offender then increase fines.
- Support and ensure that cats are spayed and neutered.
- Help with spaying and neutering programs. Prevention is better then playing catch up.
- Trap, spay and neuter is key. Other cities have successfully done this feral cat colonies.
- Find stray owners and if not found, all cats should be spayed and neutered and adopted out so that they stop reproducing and contributing to the overpopulation of cats problem.
- Acting in the best interest of the cat. Even indoor cats escape sometimes so I don't think punishing owners whose cats are out is a good plan. Humanely catch cats that are roaming in unsafe places and scan for microchips & return to owners when owner is know.
- Higher fines, responsibility on the city to catch feral cats rather than on the home owner
- Engage with partners in TNR. Make it easier for citizens to participate in TNR programs. If a cat is caught roaming, give the owner a grace period and make reasonable contact before a fine.
- To ensure local animal shelters have running TRN programs for ferals and that they are being kept out of shelters and saved from euthinasia.
- Being humane. Finding their homes.
- Get rescues more involved and help fund spay and neuter programs to prevent overpopulation in a humane manner. For roaming cats, fine owners.
- Potential of offering live cat traps to people that are having problems with these cats.
- Catch and spay/neuter them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None doing a great job.
- Feral cats should be trapped and euthanized if need be. Stray cats should be picked up and put up for adoption. Roaming cats should be returned to thier owners with a hefty fine.
- Put them down, they are suffering and will be extremely hard to domesticate. The shelters are already full of unwanted domesticated cats.
- Helping animals in distress
- I believe that if someone takes a roaming cat to the City of Calgary that the owner should be immediately fined and they should not be allowed to have the animal back. But only if it is a repeat offence, fine the first time, give the animal back. Stray and feral should have a safe place to go.
- not sure as i hate to see any animal put to death.
- Trap, fine owners of roaming cats including prohibitions for repeat offenders. Ferals are a tougher subject but medical care and spay/neuter/release programs are a start.
- There should be no charge to the cat owner when an indoor cat accidentally escapes and is returned to the owner providing that the cat is licensed, identifiable by tattoo, identification chip or cat licence.
- Euthanizing is not ok. The city doesn't need to do much - citizens often bring cats in and help find their homes. I've never even seen a feral cat here in 14 years so it really can't be a huge issue!
- Capture...
- I haven't had much
- Keep petowners responsible for their animals at all times; cull feral cats and allow landowners to trap and kill feral and domestic cats on their property.
- The city of Calgary should invest in humane spay/neuter TNR programs and rehome any feral cats that may be suitable as barn cats. I would love to see the city allow people to build or alter fencing to allow cats to have outdoor time in their backyards without escaping.
- Strict enforcement of bylaws. Unfortunately, I know this is a big city and there are not enough bylaw officers to deal with all of the cats running loose.
- I think the current system seems to be working ok. I think they should keep the law of cats not leaving the owner's property.
- catch, Spay/neuter and release would be my expectation of the city for dealing with feral cats. Stray cats should not be picked up by animal services, it's one of the stupidest bylaws this city has. You can't keep a cat on a leash, and I don't understand why Calgary is the only city requiring this.
- I expect some realistic and measured change to the management of this scenario as well as the guidelines enforced. Cats breed fast and shouldn't be left to populate. They are responsible for many bird deaths in a year.
- Let them be unless they are reported by an individual to be pestering a domestic animal
- None
- Response to complaints with live traps. If licensed return to owner, If not adoption
- As same treatment as with a dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cats should be registered. Feral or loose cats need to be caught and impounded. Owners should be required to pay a fine equal to the costs of capturing and housing their pet. Require all cats to be spayed or neutered unless owned by a registered breeder. Euthanasiation is sad but necessary.
- Help return them to their families. For feral cats, continue with TNR.
- Compassion. Above all, kindness to the animals. Intervene if a cat is in distress or is being destructive to someone's property.
- I would like the city to fund spay neuter programs for feral and stray cats.
- none. Just leave them be. If people don't want to lose their cats they will keep them inside
- That I am allowed to safely and humanely live-trap and submit to animal bylaw officers any feral, stray or roaming cat in my yard. That I do not have to wait for/drive distance to obtain city-approved trap or transport such an animal in my own vehicle. Card box with air-holes and water will suffice.
- Feral or stray cats should be brought in for spaying/neutering. Feral cats should be released and stray cats should be found suitable homes. Roaming cats should be captured and owners fined.
- come pick them up or set a trap. Don't make me drive and get one, and then have to take it back. I don't want to have to deal with a cat, wild or not.
- Tickets being issued. Monitoring Facebook groups for people that blatantly let their animals out. Having programs on how to retrain owners about keeping your cats inside (they claim that they can't train the cats, we should train the owners on how to then). More adoption (no kill) for the ones found
- No kill shelters and ensuring proper education to owners on the dangers of roaming cats to the environment and animal itself
- The City should implement and enforce much stricter fines as a deterrent.
- I would expect the city to help return cats to their owners. Feral cats should be spayed/neutered
- Large fines for cat owners. Eradication of feral cats.
- Allow public to capture (City to rent live traps), trapped animals to be 'donated' to City for 'relocation'.
- Same as dogs. Collect and take to the impound. Cats and dogs should be treated the same.
- They should be captured, treated, spayed and rehomed.
- Support a subsidized spay and neuter program. Subsidized program to provide food and shelter to feral cats that have been spayed or neutered and released.
- It's a pretty complex problem and the city doesn't have the manpower to fix it. I'm not sure you could do anything different.
- Trap them, and fine the owners, if they are feral then spay and neuter and put up for adoption.
- I expect feral cats to be treated humanly in trap/neuter/return programs. I expect stray and roaming cats to be taken to shelters and then reunited with families.
- Catching such cats
- None, let em roam.
- trap and fine owners - same as dogs
- Capture and rehabilitate. Fine owners.
- I think if the city finds a cat is consistently allowed to roam free, there should be more repercussions for the owner.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I hope they will continue to do as they have been doing.
- Round them up and put them up for adoption
- Pick them up and if the owner comes in to take them back charge them/fine them
- Calgary should monitor feral cat populations and increase enforcement for free-roaming cats.
- Impound. Fine owners of stray and roaming cats.
- Apply the bylaws and fines to repeat offenders instead of continually trying to "educate" them.
- To ensure their safety.
- I expect them to be humanely captured. If there is an owner they should have to pay a fine for having their cat loose. If there is no owner, then the cat can be put up for adoption. If it is a feral cat that cannot be adopted, I expect it to be fixed, vaccinated and ideally opted out to rural areas.
- Roaming: please return the cat(s) to their owners.
- Roaming cats should be returned to their owners and fines placed. It is unacceptable for dogs to roam free, the same should be for cats.
- there should be a mandatory spay/neuter policy for owned, roaming cats. There could be a fine if one is found, not spayed/neutered and returned to a household.
- Proper care, reigning or relocating.
Spay/neuter.
- I would like to see a trap, neuter and release program. Studies have shown time and again that it helps reduce feral population, and disease. Trapping and moving them or having them go to rescues to be euthanized only allows new cats to move into the area
- Feral/community cats should be sterilized and returned to their community. Roaming cats treated as roaming dogs.
- I expect more from the city. There should always be a 24 hour location to drop off feral, stray, or roaming cats.
- Humane treatment.
- This is too broad a question. Stray/feral cats and wandering owned cats are two different things. Cats without homes should be picked up and cared for.
- Capture and neuter/spay and rehome- maybe as barn cats if they aren't able to tame them.
- Bylaws that lead to consequences for pet owners allowing un-spayed or un-neutered cats to roam as well as subsidized spay/neuter services if this is happening due to financial barriers from owners. A plan to manage feral and stray cat population size without killing/harming them.
- To remove them when they are causing problems for people.
- Work with local animal rescue organizations and a single shared data base as a mechanism for reporting lost, stolen, feral animals to assist in homing. Many citizens could also volunteer. Animal lovers step up when a call to action is needed. Utilize that
- They should be impounded. Owners should have to pay to get them back. If they don't have an owner, they should be adopted out. If they are not adoptable, they should be put down.
- Catch, rehab, rehome



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I feel the bylaw against letting cats out is shortsighted. Yes they do poop in peoples flower beds, but also kill a lot of mice/eat flies, etc. Cats do not pose the same dangers that loose dogs do.
- I simply expect that they deal with these unfortunate animals humanely. They are at great risk if inhumane treatment if they enter the wrong properties around town.
- Limiting or banning roaming cats after dark and during winter. Or during rush hour. Observing population and doing checks to see if a disease is spreading or population curb measures need to be taken.
- Provide humane traps to catch the cats then spay/neuter and adopt.
- Enforce the bylaws and increase the penalties for non-compliance and don't rely on people making complaints first (be proactive and get the city people out in the neighbourhoods looking for problems and fixing them - residents should not be doing this work - it's your job).
- That they be picked up and if it happens twice with the same cat they are NOT returned to the owner. I should not be responsible for "housing" a stray while I wait hours for bylaw to show up!
- My expectation is the entire feral cat colony is trapped, spayed or neutered, and then returned (TNR) to their colony location. I expect the city to not euthanize feral cats unless they are very diseased or sick and it is the humane thing to do.
- Same with dogs, take them to the pound. If cats are not for pets than euthanize them.
- Rescue stray and feral cats and relocate them to a more appropriate home
- Feral and stray should be brought into the city but roaming cats should be aloud.
- Use live traps to round them up and follow present protocol to deal with them.
- Rehabilitation and adoption of these animals should be available.
- Harsher fines for people who just let their cats outside.
Feral cats either TNR or euthanize because most of them have zero socialization and want nothing to do with people and are honestly just pests who kill excessive amount of wildlife.
- Control the cats, and if the owner can be identified fine them for allowing their animals free to molest wildlife.
- Enforce licensing, fines for roaming cats
- I would expect the city to follow other major urban areas lead. Lots of places have feral cats.
- I expect the city to enforce bylaws without the redtape and hassle being placed on complainants. Ticket offending cat owners. Require all cats to be altered and licensed. Enforce bylaws with fines
- Take the roaming cats to the SPCA, etc. to be rehomed. Do not return the animal to the owner
- I think feral, stray and roaming cats should be picked up and removed from the urban setting. Let unchecked these potentially wild animals could breed out of control and cause nuisance.
- continue program for spay neutered of feral cats and return them to the area found.
- I think the city does a fairly good job of managing feral and stray cats but should do more with respect to cat license enforcement for roaming cats.
- Educating cat owners that roaming cats are illegal, and must be licensed, spayed/neutered to control population.
- I think the city has an adequate system in place for dealing with cats.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Pick them up, neuter/spay, find owners or adopt out if possible.
- Respond to calls about and trap and impound roaming and stray cats, enforcing the licensing bylaw
- Not much
- To trap them and charge the owners a fine when they get picked up. After three fines the cats should be forfeit to owners who will be responsible for them.
- see 2) above
- At least do capture, neuter and release if our shelters are really full, that way their population can't multiply as fast.
- between april-october nothing, in the winter time cats need help to be warming
- Have owners be just as responsible for their cats as I need to be with my dogs.
- Feral=Extermination
stray=fine non compliant or seisure sterilization and or extermination, disease control.
- Irresponsible cat owners need to have the same rights and responsibilities as dog owners. Fines for being roaming, pooping in neighbourhood yards.
- As much as possible, cats should be kept indoors. Stray and feral cats should be caught, given veterinary care, and placed in homes through foster it adoption programs as much as possible. Maybe a contained sanctuary for feral cats that can't live in a house.
- The city should be setting clear expectations for residents and enforcing the bylaws.
- If momma has feral kittens, kittens can be adopted. Check for microchips and tags to return to owner.
- Feral cats should be spayed and neutered but left to live their lives the same way other urban wildlife are. Strays and roaming cats should be found homes. I don't believe in allowing cats to roam. My cats go outside only when supervised and on harnesses.
- Try to reunite stray or roaming cats and failing that have available to be rehomed. . Rehab ferals if possible or euthanize them.
- Make it easier for people to catch the animals. Have more locations where traps are available for pick up.
- The city should support stray and roaming cats through rescue and adoption or transfer to other agencies to achieve the same. Feral cats should be part of a TNR program wherever possible & not euthanized. City recognizes MEOW's TNR program - this supports Calgary's role as leader in animal welfare.
- Now I want to he city to catch cats they get multiple complaints about. To put this on the neighbours is not right.
- Trapping, big fines for known owners, property and veterinarian fees retribution, removal and rehoming of at-large animals, banned ownership for offenders.
- I think the city of Calgary should capture all stray and feral cats, hold the owners responsible by issuing fines and spaying/neutering cats at the owners expense.
- People who are found to have failed to license their cat(s) should be fined. Calgarians should be required to spay/neuter all cats, unless there is a medical reason not to



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I have no expectations as I don't think the City is doing anything. The City doesn't do anything about dogs attacking people and dogs, so what's the concern about roaming cats? If people don't take responsibility for their cats, there are consequences - usually death.
- I think the city licensing program is a good idea IF the cats are aloud outdoors, otherwise it seems like a money grab to license an indoor cat. Again, allowing cats to hunt, as is in their nature, without fear of being ostracized or fined would allow many more stray cats to be homed.
- Pick them up!! Take them away don't let them just roam free
- Capture and put up for adoption, if not claimed within specified time, euthanize
- Fines and penalties for roaming cats should be equally severe as it is for dogs.
- Mobile spay and neuter services
- Making it a bigger offense to let your cats roam.
- Trap, neuter, release. Contact owners where possible.
- Cats should all be neutered or fixed. Too many litters then the rescues are inundated with kittens and adults for adoption.
- Stray cats get a chance to be rescued and adopted.
- I expect you to do something about it, not tell me to 'try talking to them' when I call 311 to complain. The lack of enforcement is what causes ppl to do stupid things, and then [removed] in the neighbourhood. Like always Cory of Calgary- just do something for once
- The capture and spay/neuter of all Feral and strays. Larger fines for those who continue to let cats roam. Maybe a sliding scale for repeat offenders?
- Mandatory spaying and neutering of cats.
- Keep the numbers of such cats reasonable.
- Collect and get rid of. Nobody uses licenses on stray cats, fines.
- I expect them to enforce the existing bylaw if there is a problem. I do not believe we will be able to eliminate them.
- All of above trying to catch the animals and charging those who let their animals roam get charged for it.
- If someone reports a feral or stray cat (no collar or microchip) the city should try to capture them, ensure a vet check, rehab them and then rehome them.
- For feral and stray, humanity trap and neuter/spay before finding them a loving home. If they are aggressive and can't be rehabilitated, unfortunately I would euthanize. For roaming, huge fees to owners who are repeat offenders and a registered list made public.
- Purposely letting a vicious animal loose without supervision, is not just irresponsible, and illegal, but it is narcissistic and malicious. A dog cannot just roam free, vicious or not, but vicious cats can? Because its name is pickles? Stop returning them to bad owners. Trap and relocate to forest
- Give negligent cat owners an educational pamphlet and a couple of warnings before giving a fine. Work with MEOW foundation or other experienced cat rescue groups to find the owners or possible new homes, euthanasia should be a very last resort. There should be severe fines for people who abandon.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Fine owners who do not follow the laws. Trap, spay +neuter feral cats.
- Pick them up, increase licences for cats to be par with dogs. My dogs do not roam free in this city!, I pick up after my dogs. Yet they are terrorized by these cats I now have a young charging my fence because my neighbors cats are in my yard or on fence teasing.
- Put feral cats down
- I would love to see a TNR program developed for ferals. For strays and roaming cats, further public education and increasing fines for those who allow their cats to roam.
- That it is enforced
- Enforce where possible.
- Just do the best you can.
- To do their job,especially when it comes to dealing with the cat owners,fines are a must,the warnings do nothing,we have had constant trouble with a cat,no matter how many times we complain nothing gets done,other then telling to keep the cat in their yard,how many chances does one get???
- make the laws stiffer for cat owners that allow their cats to roam free. Use the cat bylaw you put in place. Treat them the same as dogs.
- Stray and roaming cats make a mess all over properties that are not their own. They sit on my doorstep and tease the dogs. They are often left out and when the weather turns extreme they are not able to get back inside.
- That action is taken, when this is called in. I have heard excuses that the city has far too many complaints to deal with. City should request for photographic evidence and have a high fine to owners. Also, have a limit on how many pets owners can have.
- To take a leadership role. Have programs/partnerships with other agencies to help address the issues.
- Bylaw officers can trap any roaming cat. Also fine irresponsible pet owners when a verified complaint is made.
- If cat has owner, per tag, chip, or tattoo, then owner to be fined. If third offence, or if fine not paid, then cat to be adopted or euthanized. If no chip, tattoo, or license, then consider as feral cat.
- The City should strongly enforce bylaws against them, fining owners, and capturing feral and stray cats, destroying them if they can't be rehabilitated or homes can't be found. They're doing a lot of damage to native species that are hard-pressed by habitat loss and other human impacts.
- None
- To do the humane thing to prevent this and overpopulation of either type. Offer help to the public with education on this, or perhaps volunteer program using youth and adult voluteers to help with this project if there is not one already.
- Feral cats should be taken in by the city vet checked and immunized and then placed up for adoption because every cat deserves a loving home
- Get them off the streets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Help humanely capture a problem cat if reported. Encourage owners to spay and neuter. Otherwise leave them be.
- There should be massive fines for owners allowing their cats to roam free.
- As above
- To help when needed but to also assess the situation appropriately, some cats are happier outdoors and as long as their needs are being met, why is this a problem?
- I expect some kind of way I can complain atm 311 is useless they say there is nothing they can do unless it gets picked up. SO COME GET IT!
- Humane treatment
- Spay or neuter and release.
- Keep them safe
- I have no problem with fixed roaming cats some cats it's nearly impossible to keep them inside. However feral cats are different we need to round the up fix them and find them homes
- Actually not much, if they come into contact with people then action can be taken.
- Funding ethical management of feral animals. If they must be slaughtered it must be ethical and we should consider using cat meat for protein composting and possible animal and or human feed after research and testing.
- If they become an issue I expect the city of Calgary to reduce the amount
- Provide funding to animal organizations and rescues to ethically control the growth of feral populations with trap neuter release programs or animal adoption.
- Have a bigger disciplinary action, in order to minimize roaming cats from being accidentally killed or chosen as prey, or simply them being reowned. As simple as if it was manditory to microchip your cats and dogs to minimize the animals staying in shelter for so long
- Set up humane trapping options and let it be known to the public so cat owners think twice about letting their cats roam freely.
- TNR for feral cats. Pickup and At Large fines for owned free roaming cats.
- That the cats are being caught and brought to a safe place. Owners are trying to find. Have pet owners get their cats microchipped at an affordable price.
- To support rescues who help the feral cat population. To increase consequences for owners who purposefully let their cats roam and break the bylaw. To pick up cats found roaming the streets.
- A spay/ neuter and release program for feral cat would be nice. Stop them from breeding and keep the numbers down
- I expect the city to make sure all animals, including cats, should be provided with medical needs and should have a program to adopt them out
- I think that cats that are in danger outside should be taken into custody and kept safe until their owners are found.
- Ensure that all cats are treated humanely and are having basic needs met (if a cat is emaciated or diseased, the city should ensure the animal has access to the care it requires). Owned cats should be limited to staying within the owners property, or be under control in public areas.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No expectations. Just if you do catch them, they are not Euthanized unless due to health reasons.
- There needs to be a focus on cat owners who let their cats at large. We are on a busy street and we have found a few deceased pet kitties on the road. You can only do so much for strays. But we need to work on bad cat owners.
- Ticketing owners of cats that are roaming.
- I think the city is doing a good job with feral cats keeping them safe by finding them appropriate homes.
I think if people allow thier cats to roam they need to have a form of identification. And should also be licensed if roaming to account for protiental damages. It's just responsible.
- None
- None
- there need to be an easy way to collect and possibly rehouse
- To keep the cats safe and not hurt them
- Not sure
- Feral cats should be caught and euthanasized. Roaming cat owners should be fined the same as dogs at large
- I think that owners of cats should have to license them and I think that other than that they should be free to roam...if they get hurt that's on the owner.
- Roaming cats should be captured, attempt for owners to be found and fined
- More and stronger enforcement.
- With all the coyotes around I think this would self regulate.
- Roaming - hold owners accountable
Stray - inhibit breeding, re-home
Feral - inhibit breeding, limit population.
- Have owner abide by the rules.
- stray and roaming cats should be sheltered and adopted out if not claimed. It is not easy to try and contain a cat in your yard as they are known to escape. There should not be penalties for roaming cats found and claimed if the owner can show that they have containment set up in their yard.
- Prevention and education in prevention of this population.
- The city should deal with reported feral cats by asking folks in the neighborhood Who, if anyone, is caring for them.
Stray cats should be take to the Humane Society for rehoming.
And neighborhood cats should not be allowed to roam, period. allowed to roam
- Be more strict on picking them up
- Offer communities information on where to help in problem areas providing tote bins with insulation for the cats to stay warm in the winters with.
- None.
- I think the city should leave them alone



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None, our neighbors are responsible thankfully but in Royal Oak, we had cats pooping in the garden all the time.
- Feral: educate the public, do TNR. Stray: rescue and adopt out, Roaming: warnings to owners, lower penalties/fines as some people would rather surrender their cat, then to pay the fee. Or be able to afford the fee.
- None, we have bob cats, squirrels, skunks, owls hawks ets and it is natures cycle. Owls eat skunk, bobcats eat squirrels, cats kill mice, birds kills other birds.
- Doesn't seem like they are being brought in unless the public takes the initiative to trap
- I expect them to be reasonable and understand that cats are pets. It is also not possible to contain a cat who is allowed to go outside. Don't even talk to me about a leash. Please consider the way other municipalities operate . Calgary is backwards on this.
- Treat them the same way you would treat any other animal, ie: if they're being a nuisance then manage it. By nuisance though, I don't mean people complaining about their gardens being dug up - those people need better things to do with their time.
- Roaming- taken to SPCA/humane society, if owners found then fined.
Ferral- perhaps a program offering them to farms for barns/rodents etc as they might not be appropriate for homes
- capture and set for adoption/
- That they be picked up and reunited with owners or help them become domestic if possible.
- The city must employ knowledgeable, animal-aware and trained-in-animal-behaviour staff at all levels of city interaction with dogs and cats. We've had too many conversations with city staff (especially by-law officers, but not limited to them) who are completely ignorant of the most basic facts.
- I would say the City should pick them up/collect them; work with non-profit agencies for sterilization clinics (even if they are just released afterward).
- spay/neuter, trap, adopt out kittens
- Nothing
- education and if/when that doesn't work enforcement
- That homes are attempted to be found
- I expect the city to be utilizing TNR programs and making sure the feral and stray cat population are looked after.. leave collared owned cats alone.
- If it's an owned cat - a big fine for the owner. It's the only way that they will understand. If it happens more than 3 times then it's time to re-home the cat. Stray and feral cats need to be re-homed, if that's not possible then they at least need to be spayed.
- that if roaming cats come into backyards when they are not invited that they be asked my owners to become indoor cats. A dog would never be allowed to roam free and many kids are allergic.
- That feral cats are controlled.
- Education for pet owners, free trapping and neuter/spay, cats must be fixed to roam
- provide free traps to home owners and city pick up of the cat once trapped



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think if a stray or feral cat is causing problems then animal control should be called to come deal with it before it hurt someone. Owned cats that roam need to have harsher laws surrounding that. My dog has to be under control and on leash so why doesn't your cat?
- Catch them if they know one is in the area. Roaming cats owners need to be fined
- I have lived at this location for over 20 years and have yet to see an animal by law officer. I have no expectations as the City is cutting back on manpower.
- none at all
- Reduce them
- I have few expectations for the City at the best of times.
- I would like to see the city remove cats that become a nuisance, due to noise, aggressiveness, or causing damage
- Unsure of the expectations, as I don't quite fully understand how the process works now.
- Ensure animals are spayed or neutered. Roaming cats should have identification.
- Stricter rules for cat owners are necessary. Cats need to be housebound or on a leash, period. It is in the nature of cats to wander, a common fact.
Stricter rules around purchasing a cat may help.
- That they would be dealt with humanely. Or returned to their owners. Roaming are their owners responsibility.
- They should enforce the bylaws. As an innocent neighbor trying to look after their own yard, it should not be my responsibility to get a cage, trap and take the cat in. It belongs to someone and a complaint has been made, a cage should be placed and the homeowner who owns the cat should be billed.
- I expect that the City would introduce and trap and release program. Furthermore, if you're going to farm out your work of roaming animals to other organizations (such as the Humane Society, AARCS, MEOW Foundation) you should provide them with funding to care for these animals.
- Fines for owners that are not in control or allow their cats to roam.
- see above
- The City should fine pet owners who let their cats out to roam unattended and without a leash.
- Get rid of the bylaw requiring cats to be kept indoors. That is not consistent with their nature. Do insist all cats be licensed/tagged in some way so if they are in fact strays, they can be reunited with their owners. See comments re; feral cats above
- The City does a wonderful job, but the task is so HUGE. All animals should be spayed or neutered. TNR is good, too. Far more low-cost or free spaying/neutering would help with the problem.
- I wish there were stricter penalties for roaming cats. Owners are putting their animals in danger (no one lets a dog roam free?!?) and they cause a lot of destruction to property and song birds.
- Higher fines for the cat owners.
- More support so homeowners can trap and handover nuisance cats would be appreciated.
- That they be treated with kindness, rehomed when appropriate, or humanely put to sleep.
- Have animal control staff put out traps and use licence dollars collected to euthanize the animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I hope that they will pick them up and provide a safe space for them with the possibility of adoption
- Roaming cats should be picked up and owners fined.
- Leave owned outdoor cats alone. Help strays get spayed/neutered and adopted. Spay/neuter and release feral cats.
- Feral cats: kill if reports of concern
Stray/roaming cats: collect and send to SPCA for owners to collect (after paying a fine)
- If a cat is identified as coming from a particular home, and a complaint is filed, Bylaw Officers should visit the property and issue a fine. Stray animals should be caught and hopefully adopted out. Feral cats should be trapped, spay/neuter, and identified if they can be homed
- Capture and find pet owners whose cats are roaming free.
- To be responsible to owners
- Depending on their size, If it's just a small cat who cares but if it's a lynx I would like you to prevent them from eating cats/dogs/people please. But let them go somewhere else- no need to kill anything
- It would be nice if we had a way to submit complaints for roaming cats if we could describe them. I know that at least one is the pet of a very close neighbour.
- People should not be allowed to have roaming cats.
- 1. fine owners
- same fees as picking up stray dogs for the owners
- -support trapping of feral and strays in safe way
-promoting having roaming cats chipped or tattooed so if trapped can be returned to owner with fine.
-continue to have adoption and update website for animals and promote adoption
- Hmmm. I expect something to be done but it's not the feral cats' fault. It's the people who get kittens then decide they don't want them and let them go, they breed and more kittens are born to fend for themselves! If cats were licensed, the city would have recourse to fine bad pet owners
- They city needs to act to trap these cats and enforce the no roaming bylaw that is place.
Responsible pet ownership and following the current bylaws is essential to good neighbor relations and safety for the cats themselves and others.
- Free to roam
- Fines for owners of roaming pets, cats or others. Trap nuisance cats, If pet owners really love their pets they would not let them roam free due to injury and possibly being preyed upon.
- Not much they do far more good than harm. The concern is no access to a spay/neuter program
- Oh god these all felt like the same question .see above
- There should be appropriate feeding stations and proper shelters. The city should spay and neuter and microchip to keep more accurate records of where the cats are coming from and what areas have the highest population
- More bylaw, trap them!
- Only pick up cats that are sick or hurt
- Fines for roaming cats. Spay and release feral cats.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- More cat trap or similar device availability, harsher punishments or fines on owners who let their cats free roam. Stricter rules on adoption of cats or mandatory spaying/neutering by all cat selling establishments.
- The responsibility really is up to the owners. Stray cats - it would be nice if the city could spay/neuter them & have a farm program to send them off to. If not, let them loose again. They kill mice, gophers & even rabbits. Let's not talk about the birds.....
- Collect the cat - determine whether it is a domestic or non-domestic cat, and then either return it to the owners (with a fine when appropriate), put it up for adoption, or partner with an organization that cares for stray/feral/outside cats who cant suitably become inside cats for adoption.
- Improved management of feral cats requires more resources - shelter and enforcement. I do not think pet issues are a current priority for city council.
- Humanely euthanize sick feral cats, tag, spay, provide shelters and some food in populated areas. Strays should be photographed and kept for a few weeks to help find homes.
- Controlling the number of feral or un-owned cats in a humane way such as rehabilitation or sanctuaries and ensuring they are spayed/neutered. Roaming cats should be reunited with their owners or, if they can't be located, given to the Humane Society or similar organization to be fostered or re-homed
- If the cat has become a nuisance and the owner isn't willing to keep the cat within the boundary of their property, then the owner should be fined. But "nuisance" would need to be defined since not everyone will have the same level of tolerance for cats.
- Give a reasonable amount of time for animal to be claimed, then euthanize if not suitable for adoption.
- Feral and stray cats should be treated humanely. They are often fearful and stressed by humans. Roaming cats should be returned to owners and their owners should be fined(exceptions would obviously be allowed for cats who escape, etc)
- Enforce the bylaws.
- Partner with a shelter to provide options for the cats safety such as barn cat adoption program for example.
- I expect owners of roaming cats to be ticketed when cats are found. As far as feral and stray, when found taken to a shelter.
- Trapping, neutering, and rehoming or releasing where appropriate
- We need more funding for feral TNR programs. I think hefty fines for owners allowing cats to roam is a fair penalty. Too many cats are dying outdoors.
- Ensuring they do not have infection and wouldn't harm other pet cats or dogs
- I think if they are informed of a home that allows their car to roam, that home should be fined. Feral and stray cats should be captured.
- TNR programs for feral. Public feeding and water stations in high density areas. Permanent outdoor shelter in high density areas.
For stray and roaming, pick up and try to notify owner where possible. Find new homes. Education on risks for outdoor cats.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Leave roaming cats alone. Help cats out that are feral or stray.
- Pick them up and try to find their owners. If they are feral, maybe find a farm for them???
- I wish the city would collect the roaming cats in my neighborhood. I'm tired of chasing them out of my yard and cleaning up after them when they use my yard as a toilet. I'm not even sure who on my street they belong to, all I know is they have collard but they never let me get close enough to check
- All need to be micro chipped as kittens
so they are easily identified
Provide services for spay neuter program
License and renewal should be manitory
Educate yourself and others
- Continue with current process. Pick up cats when there are complaints. Not every cat is a nuisance.
- Spay and release
- The city does not deal with them and pass the buck such as telling callers to call the CHS and say the cat is abandoned when in fact it is a stray.
- remove feral cats, and chat with neighbors and owners about stray/roaming cats.
- I expect the city to ensure that all cats are spayed and neutered to prevent unwanted litters
- Fining owners caught letting their cats roam free, catch and spay and neuter feral cats.
- I expect the city to work with vet clinics and rescues to find the cats owners or find them a home. I expect the city to work with rescues on the feral cats to find the best option for the cat
- Should have traps easily accessible so I can trap the neighbours cat when it comes on my property. The city could come pick it up
- The city should take roaming cats to the pound (as they do with dogs) and fine the owners. I think the city should also take more care to ensure people are licensing their cats.
- I would like to see them all trapped and brought to shelters that can decide if they are feral...that they go to a feral community. If they are domesticated then spayed/neutered, vaccinated and medically cleared for adoption. If they have an owner they are fined,educated and responsible for all cost
- It would be great to give some aid to be able to catch, spay/neuter, then release again. Feral cats are happier without people, i dont know if itd help them to rehome them. The stray/roamers should be rehomed.
- Collection and then re-homing or euthanizing the cat
- Owners should have their feline stay in their own property, should not let them out to roam the neighborhood.
- - attempt to find the animals home
- fine owners
- Trap feral or stray. Roaming cats owners need to be fined and ensure they are licensed. Work with vets to ensure they are licensed
- I believe strongly in spay/neuter/vaccinate-release programs for truly feral cats who will never become pets, as this will diminish their numbers humanely over time by nature. Strays should be



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

taken in and rehomed. Roaming cats should be confiscated from their irresponsible owners and rehomed.

- If the city is contacted, I would expect them to try to catch these animals, fine owners (where they are known), and find humane solutions to any growing feral population.
- treat them differently - no problem with roaming cats, but strays should be reunited with family or rehomed, and feral cats should be left alone
- I would hope that all cats with homes are kept inside. I understand sometimes they escape but if they are allowed out all the time, that's an issue. If owners are caught with multiple offences, they should be fined and I think it should be hefty enough that people just keep their cats inside.
- More collection of all for safety and population control, and stronger penalties for reclaiming pets.
- If the cat is in harm then they should help it
- Fines for owners, I shouldn't have to trap and bring in their cat for them
- I expect domesticated animals that have lived in a home to be sheltered and put up for adoption. I expect feral animals to be spayed or neutered and offered as "barn animals" if possible. Otherwise, they should be put down in a humane way.
- Feral- protocol for people who come across them
Stray- Strong support for adoption/fostering initiatives
Roaming- Cat-ID so that owners can be easily reached and the cat can be retrieved within 1 hour
- Honestly, not a lot.
- The City of Calgary could attempt to spay or neuter stray cats to keep them from putting a strain on the cities shelters.
- Clear guidelines, solutions for communities to control feral cat overpopulation
- Collection. Reunite with owner when possible. Feral cats should be put down.
- I think the city should support (both in the bylaws and financially) TNR programs.
- That if a cat is found that is registered owners should pay to have them back
- To treat them the same as they do dogs.
- Feral and strays should be caught and domesticated. Roaming cats should be caught and owners should be informed and fined if not compliant
- If they are fixed who cares the coyotes will get them. I have more problems with coyotes in the city than cats
- The city needs to fine cat owners and if the cats are feral they should be put down.
- To leave roaming cats alone. Stray cats should be placed in a shelter neutered and place for adoption. They should never be euthanized unless they are suffering from incurable disease
- I would like to continue to have opportunity to bring free roaming cats into the city facilities, I would like to be able to borrow a trap as needed.
- None. I want you to leave them alone. If owners care enough about their cats, they'll have them registered so they can be returned like lost car keys through the War Amps.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I believe that all cats in the city should be identified as household pet (tattoo). If they are not a pet they should first be put up for adoption and tattooed (at a cost to the new owner) before owning the animal.
- I think the by-law for not allowing cats to roam is good. I think paying yearly for a cat license is too expensive for responsible pet owners who don't let their cats roam. Stray and feral cats should be picked up and assessed if they are healthy enough to be adopted.
- spay and neuter them.
- Enforce the bylaw about keeping cats inside or on leash. Night time patrolling neighborhoods (not every night) I'm sure would find quite a few roaming cats.
- That they EDUCATE people, act upon complaints humanely, EDUCATE, punish those who disregard bylaws & abuse cats (and dogs) EDUCATE, allocate resources to rescue ferals/strays and NOT kill them. Private rescue organizations are always overloaded & underfunded, the City & the CHS need to step up.
- Cats should be allowed to roam during day light hours..I have more concerns about bobcats lynx's, coyotes hunting in neighbourhoods and skunks. Outdoor cats should be allowed to roam, be licensed and wear bells to help birds and should be inside at night.
- Catching them and returning them to their owners is important, whenever possible.
- Capture and put up for adoption to responsible home. Put down if required
- Stray and roaming are a concern.
- None really
- that owners keep the cats in doors , if not they should be charged for letting them regularly roam free
- Humane treatment, attempts to find and return cats to responsible pet owners. Our cats female have largely stayed close bt the back yard, encouraging enclosures or containment systems for pets might help owners keep pets close to home.
- Dogs have to be on leashes when they are outdoors. I strongly believe that cats need to also be on leashes when they are outside. I don't have problems with the dog owners in the neighbourhood as they keep their dogs on leashes and their dogs don't jump over my fence and poop in my backyard.
- Continue to lend traps to those wish to become feral community caregivers
- To do due diligence to ensure pets are returned to owners, strays are cared for, and feral cats are relocated when possible.
- I expect the city to enforce fines and or jail if there is animal abuse whether feral or domestic animals. I expect the city to offer reduced sterilization fees.
- there doesnt seem to be much enforcement of bylaws about keeping cats on your property :(
- Cats should be kept indoors or outdoors on leash
- Fines for owners who allow their cats to roam.
- Catch and neuter.
- Respond to animal control calls. Do their best to make sure cats are actually strays and not pets. Humanely euthanize diseased animals. Support spay/neuter programs
- Would like a spay/neuter and return program if one is not already in place



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Capture and spay at the very least.
- Make people accountable with heavier fines.
- Owners are warned and then fined if the cat is catches again.
- owners should face fines/penalties when they allow their cats to roam free. The city should better enforce the regulations because people don't understand the impacts their cats are having on songbird populations
- None...
- Unless there's a mass issue with them .. catch what you can and help find them a loving home
- The city should ensure feral cats are treated humanely. Heavy fines should be levied against pet owners who allow their pets to roam free, in order that they not become feral. A capture spay/neuter and release program fund by the city should be seriously considered
- Little to no expectations. Feral cats are wild animals and generally do not need human intervention. If I'm going to let me cat roam free I'm accepting full responsibility that it may never return or be killed.
- To pick them up just like we do with dogs, it is harder but possible with cat traps and monitoring.
- I am not overly concerned with roaming cats.
- I don't have any expectations.
- The city needs to crack down on owners not registering their cats/ letting them roam free - bigger fines. I'm tired of cats using my garden as their toilet.
- Education! Cost microchipping, spay/neuter clinics.
- I feel the city should help a little bit more with cat complaints - maybe warning for owners who have roaming cats - and have they're own trap/catch system for these cats
- Nothing!! unless one is injured let them be.
- these are not naturally wild animals. they are more like an invasive species. if they are cited as a problem, eliminate them. They kill large numbers of song birds.
- Every person (including the city as our representatives) is responsible for helping domesticated species whether they are owned pets or community cats.
- Impose harsh penalties on owners who let cats run free
- Humane solutions, including live trapping if necessary, domestication if possible.
- The City should have a process in which they can be trapped and put down in a humane way..
- As above control when diseased or overly populated
- stray and roaming cats should be returned to the owners free maybe up to 2 times a year. There is the chance that even to best owner has a time when they get out and you dont want a fine to make the person just leave them in the shelter. after than a fine like for parking
- None, focus on skunks and coyotes, cats are harmless
- If the cat is feral they should be PTS, a stray should be caught and rehomed, and roaming cats should be caught, returned to owners and fined - if the owner can not keep their cat contained after x amount of warning. Cat should be rehomed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They should be controlled by holding the owners responsible for the roaming ones, insisting on sterilization of all pet cats, euthanizing the feral cats. Cats should have to be licensed the same as dogs so the city will have an idea of the numbers.
- I want people to face fines if they repeatedly let their cats roam free.
- I expect that feral and stray cats are picked up and taken off the streets to shelters for rehabilitation and hopefully adoption. I expect that roaming cats be allowed outside as research has shown that cats do better outside (I feel very strongly about this).
- Provide more funding from licensing to spaying or neutering cats. Unless the owner is a breeder they should be altered. Cats are easy to obtain but many cannot afford vet costs for fixing.
- Feral cats should be acknowledged as a reality in our community and need protection. We believe our City should support T-N-R (trap-neuter-return) initiatives to humanely manage feral cat populations.
- Some of these feral cats can be domesticated, some cannot. Capture them and spay and neuter them and then see if some can be adopted out to farms where they would be happier.
- I feel the city should advertise more about the responsibilities of owning animals and the city by-laws. I'm pretty sure people aren't aware of the fines for letting their cats run free, or they just don't care cause they don't get caught.
- To make sure owners do not let their cats out
- Rehome.
- Support TNR programs!
- As long as they are being monitored and not spreading anything they are valuable
- I expect them to be humanely trapped, vaccinated, fixed, loved, fostered and when ready - put for adoption.
- Unsure.
- Pick them up and bring them to a shelter where they can be properly fed, given proper shelter and where families can find them if they got out of the house and/or adopt them
- The city should assist home owners in trapping cats and ticketing owners if cat not licensed and caught it does not go back to the owner. If they cared about cat they would have it licensed
- Penalize the owners
- I would expect cats to be caught and attempted to reunite with owners. Feral cat could be neutered and returned to where they were caught from or put in areas needing pest control
- Trap and hand out big fines to owners if they are repeat offenders.
- If it's a stray, maybe captured then release fixed! If it's an owner's cat that is not fixed, they should be fined by the city!
- Put them to sleep / get rid of them!!
- Maybe trap spay release
- I expect the city to fine owners who allow their cats to roam and if one owner incurs multiple penalties that the animal be taken from them as they have shown that they are not a responsible pet owner.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They should be caught, spayed neutered and checked for disease
- With stray or feral cats I do think that the city should trap them and have them spayed or neutered to prevent more stray cats. If roaming cats are being a nuisance to the neighbors then yes they should also be trapped and make the owners pay to get them out of the pound.
- No responsibility.
- I expect the city to enforce the existing bylaws regarding animal control. I have spoken to some of my neighbours about their cats defecating in my garden and they have done nothing about it. There should be stiff penalties for roaming pets.
- capturing them, microchipping them or tattooing them, spay/neuter them, vaccinate and if possible get the animal re-home
- Eliminate them
- If cats are truly feral, then trap, neuter, and release. Stray cats should be returned to their owners or rehomed. Owners should be seriously punished for letting their cats roam free (not applicable to lost cats)
- Ensuring spays and neuters to avoid more cats. Other than that, its hard on cats to force them to stay indoors.
- The city needs to do more about cats at large complaints. A neighborhood has been warned multiple time by bylaw, yet continues to allow his cat out. This cat causes alot of issues locally. I believe heavy fines should be implemented for secondary and subsequent offences.
- If there are problem cats, I would expect the city to capture and turnover to SPCA for adoption. Or raise funds to cover costs of spay/neuter program
- Humane treatment of the animals.
- Feral cats - maybe a sterilization program can be put in place, They should not be killed. Stray cats - should be taken in by bylaw and re-homed/provided to other animal rescue centres to be rehomed. Roaming cats are the largest issue, owners should be fined if cat roams, more enforcement needed.
- Help find them homes, work with other agencies,
- Public service announcements on calgarys bylaws and responsible cat ownership. Maybe a frequently updated lost pet website. Outdoor cats should be on leashes. Reduced spay/neuter costs. There is currently nothing regulating/stopping people from breeding and selling kittens(they sell them on kijiji
- To provide education about not releasing pet cats, providing an effective high volume spa/neuter program and supporting TNR.
- Feral cats- euthanised right away
stray/roaming cats- Owners should be charged a fine for not containing their cat and another fee if they are not licensed, up to date on vaccines
- To spay and nuder them to control numbers.
- that they are scanned for owners infomation so that they can be returned to owners if applicap=ble.
- Spay and Neuter, Trap and release if unadaptable. If aggressive humane euthanasia



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- For stray and feral cats, working with local shelters to SAFELY trap them and help them find homes. Feral cats can make great barn cats.
For roaming cats, stricter fines for the owners. Cats shouldn't roam when they are owned, it is unsafe for them and becomes a nuisance for others.
- None
- Information about spay and neuter programs to prevent unwanted kittens from roaming cats (owned or feral). Assistance to low income families to help with spay neuter programs.
- I expect the City not to confiscate or pick up domesticated cats that clearly have owners, unless they are in distress. I also encourage the City to make use of incredibly helpful spay/neuter programs for feral cats!
- I expect them to deal with cats as they do dogs- tolerance zero for multiple infractions
- That every effort is made to contact the owners of the cat, for a reasonable amount of time, at least two weeks. If owner isn't found they should be placed in a no-kill pet shelter or foster home.
- I have no expectations of them.
- Feral, and stray cats should try and be adopted/rescued. Roaming cat owners should be fined if their cat gets recovered
- Picked up and relocated (as appropriate) if a nuisance or attempt to see if behaviour modification is appropriate so they can be adopted out. Euthanasia should be the last resort!
- Feral - TNR programs.
Stray and roaming cats - stricter policies and penalties. Change the bylaw from "Confined to owner's property" to indoor cats only since a cat's territory can be 500 meters. If the owner can't comply to this then they shouldn't own a cat and/or have the pet taken away.
- I would love to see a trap, neuter/spay and return program to manage the population. Spay and neuter is the only way to really and truly deal with an over population challenge.
- Roaming cats - locate owners and spell out bylaws, maybe educate on cat-proof fencing for their yard. For strays, trap and make every effort to locate owner - someone probably loves and misses them. For ferals, TNR to reduce the number of cats and kittens living short, miserable lives outdoors
- Feral cats - little chance of finding them a home. Too much expense to neuter and get shots. Send them immediately to a cat rescue group or euthanize. Strays - keep and try to find them a home. Roaming - severe fines when returning them to owners.
- If a cat is sent to the pound it should be neutered before being adopted out. Should make it easier if trapping a cat. I have a car and I am nit putting a cat in it to take to the pound incase it sprays
- Assisted spay and neuter programs and a tnr program
- Stray and roaming cats should be caught and impounded juSt like dogs
- Get rid of them. Give to spca or other animal shelter.
- Remove them and place in rescue.
- Fine owners if their pets are causing a problem.
- Fine the owners



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I expect that cats that are owned should be returned to owners. Feral or roaming cats should be re-homed if possible. I think spay and neuter clinics are also important to limit the number of unowned/uncared for cats
- Educate citizens on bylaws and enforce the bylaw more visibly (fining owners of roaming cats).
- Reminding cat owners of the damage to birds and yards caused by roaming cats, and reminding them this isn't allowed.
- Eliminate them.
- As long as it's not being a nuisance none. I think if it becomes destructive or causing a problem that is another issue.
- Bylaw should ensure owners keep their cats on their property. As for feral, trap and put up for adoption as complaints are received. What else can you do? We don't need a Feral Kitty Police.
- Capture and destroy, rehome, or fine owners.
- support of spay/neuter programs for strays, ticketing owners for allowing intact cats to roam
- Be nice. They're scared. Show them care. Find them a forever home or let them live their lives on their own. Cats are smart they know how to take care of themselves
- (1) Respond to concerns on the phone or in person (2) React with the most modern, compassionate approaches to set the highest socially-humane example. (3) Work in partnership with organizations that practice TNR, feral-socialization, and re-homing programs that put no-kill values first.
- My expectation is that they require try to find their owners if possible, if not that the cat is fixed, medical treatment given and re-homed, moved to acreages for feral cats
- Be fair and judge by the case.
- I would like to see heavier fines for cat owners. Not just a warning either! Make them think twice about letting their cat outside! I called about getting a cat trap but couldn't afford the insane amount to get one! Make it free. Why are responsible pet owners paying for irresponsible pet owners!?
- More support for those dealing with roaming cats is necessary. I've used the cat trap available several times, but it's a hassle picking it up, baiting it, checking it regularly, and then delivering a cat to Animal Services. Sporadic or threatened action similar to this by officers would help.
- I think people who let their cats wander should be fined
- Deal with complaints only. Provide education to communities with known feral cats (wild animal) and how communities coexist
- Trap, remove, and fine repeat offending owners.
- All should be caught and be brought to a shelter. Ones that have owners should be ticked.
- To intervene where required to ensure the health and safety of cats.
- For the City to recognize that cats roam by nature and are not trainable the same way as dogs and do not pose a threat to public and therefore should be allowed to roam out of the home
- Feral needs sterilization...roaming cats are harmless
- To monitor the situation and identify a threshold that will require intervention .
- I would hope that they are not being harmed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Support for TNR programs as this is the only effective and humane way to control feral cat populations.
- Trap, spay/neuter and release.
- Due to concerns for their safety, the health of our environment and belief in personal responsibility for the animals we choose to keep, I believe that cats should be kept inside or on a leash outside. Change the law.
Also, put down feral cats that have no people skills.
- Encourage people to be responsible pet owners.
- Look to other cities to see what works to keep the population low. Discourage people from feeding them.
- I feel that heavier fines for irresponsible cat owners might deter them from letting their pests roam free. Unfortunately, I cannot afford the renting fee for a cat trap so I just let it go. I talk to my neighbours about the bi-law but they could care less, sadly.
- the city of Calgary needs to support neuter-trap-return programs to keep the cat population down. Feral, stray , and roaming cats are a problem to wildlife
- Implement stricter bylaws reducing amount of returns of cats to repeat offenders who allow thier cats to roam,
all existing clinics/petstores to house cats until rehomed
Do not allow pet stores to buy/sell from breeders
Volunteers for identified feral communities in all quadrants
- I expect them not to be put down! I expect stray/roaming cats to either get help to get back home, or be adopted out. Ferals should be trapped, fixed, then released.
- Enforce bylaw for stray cats
Educatee people who take care of feral cats
- - Capture them
- Good job
- Education
- Not seeing them as a nuisance
- Attacks wildlife
- Some communities
- Not seen
- Feral Cats - if you've got cats who aren't being looked after and may be carrying disease. If they're not managed, could they become like rats? Could be a big cost. I expect the city to control feral cats
- That the city will treat these animals with compassion. We should co exist with these animals.
- Appropriate Trap Neuter Return programs should be made available to ensure that feral colony sizes can be controlled. Any friendly stray cats should be sent to a shelter to be rehomed. Roaming cats bylaws should be that cats MUST be contained within owners property.
- It would be the same as dogs...collect them (fine owner, if applicable)
- Spay/neuter, disease control by having vaccinations program for feral colonies, fines for owners who let animals intentionally roam without proper vaccinations/sterilized sexually.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think that the city should impound stray, feral and roaming cats. If the cat is proven to be part of a colony that coexist with the community, alter their sex and return to that colony.
- Actually enforce the bylaw. There is no consequence for ignorant owners who break the bylaws. Add more cat traps to city's lending program-have been on list 2 summers without getting one. Tie complaints (whether or not fine resulted) to licensing fee.
- Licensing cats seems to have made owners more diligent about keeping their pet inside and hidden from bylaw. Dogs are always top priority. More affordable sterilization
- Trap, neuter, and return feral cats to their colonies. Catch strays and try to rehome them. Trap and fine the owners of roaming cats - they are a huge nuisance to responsible cat owners.
- Don't want them to suffer so would like people to help care fore them. Would like spay neuter programs
- Help find the owners and if non help find proper homes.
- Be humane. Attempt to find owners of stray and roaming cats, possible fines for roaming cats that haven't been neutered. Return feral cats to the wild if possible.
- An increase in by-law officers would help.
- TNR
- Feral cats should be acknowledged as a reality in our community and need protection. I believe our City should support T-N-R (trap-neuter-return) initiatives to humanely manage feral cat populations.
- Continue the programs in place to encourage spaying and neutering of pet cats. Keep rules that cats stay on property and the few that live as feral are not a huge issue.
- I would like the current bylaws enforced more actively, and for cat owners to be made aware (educated) on the impacts that roaming cats have on wildlife.
I would also like the city to consider a mandatory spay and neuter program for ALL cats in the city.
We do not more more cats.
- I don't expect anything. There are plenty of agencies that accept cats to rehome. Stay out of it.
Always about the money
- More effort to rehabilitate/re-home captured animals, more effort to educate the dangers of roaming animals
- set out traps when requested, if it is a bylaw it should be treated as such, and not told 'nothing to do about it' when calling to complain about the cats on the streets
- -Ensure rules are followed/enforce
-capture as required
-spay and neuter those captured
- Complaint based service is best.
- Cats should be subject to licencing and rules the same as dogs.
- Spay or neuter. Any animal that is a descendant of a domestic animal should be spayed or neutered if they are going to be outside. Obviously we can't round up all the ferals or strays and do this, but as they are collected it could be an option.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None - the cat bylaw has not been well advertised or enforced. My neighbors almost all let their cats roam free.
- We need to provide a free of charge spay and neuter/ education programs. Catch and release or adoption to good homes to stop this cycle of people breeding cats or letting there cats outside to get pregnant, have kittens, give them away, and repeat. To many need homes.
- owners that let their cats roaming at large should be fined.
- The fines/punishment to the owners of roaming cats needs to be increased/harsher. This has been a regular discussion on my community FB page with several owners of roaming cats expressing that they don't care about the bylaw or their neighbours and will continue to let their cat roam regardless.
- I think feral and stray cats should be taken to animal shelters. I think the city of Calgary needs to do a better job of educating cat owners to not let their cats roam. Fines should be tougher.
- TNR, provide food and care/housing for them.
- Respond to nuisance reports, educate owners on the rules around roaming cats.
- If the animal is not causing any problems, or not in distress, leave them alone.
- Stray or roaming, if an owner is identified, should be educated and/or fined. They should also be spayed or neutered if not already. Feral cats should be spayed/neutered and released to a safe environment.
- Educate and hold owners accountable. Nuisance feral cats should be trapped, spay/neuter and transferred to rescues for farm mousers.
- TNR when able, help owners afford spay neuter programs ; especially if cats have been picked up stray, but also do everything possible to get that cat home again so it doesn't need a new owner.
- All cats must be contained in people's home. If they are roaming around - they should be picked up by animal control or significant fine should be given.
- Be a vocal leader to educate citizens. Be an active, supportive partner to rescue orgs
- Work with reputable animal welfare orgs
- The City needs to have a proper program for each of these specific categories. Volunteers would easily be found tp help.
- they are spayed or neutered and they have had their shots and vaccines before being released
- The City needs to fine more owners that allow their cats to roam. As far as stray and feral cats, that's a tough one as there are so many, and to spay/neuter them would be costly!
- feral cats = X
stray cats = catch and fine owners unless local neighbourhood agrees to cat roaming...special licence?
- An example is on my block, alone, there are 3 homes, where they allow their cats to roam. I reported one of them Animal Svcs, they sent a letter to the Owners, but, they Owners totally ignored it. Animal Svcs will not go an speak to the Owners and I think they should.
- Continue to bring them in to spay/neuter, feed and adopt out. Education is critical. My cat does not go out and he seems fine with it although he sees the dogs go out he doesn't try to escape.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The city should treat free-roaming cats the same way as they would treat free-roaming dogs. It's unsafe for the cats to roam free, and it sends a message that cats are not as valued if they are not treated the same way as dogs. An exception to be made for well-managed colonies of feral cats
- This should not be on home owners to trap and deliver cats to bylaw. Fines for cat owners who allow cats to roam free. This could be warning first with escalating fines.
- Bring them back to their owners if possible, educate the owners of these cats and if not a fine that can increase for each mounting case.
- I would like to see the City put in bylaws that would not allow pet owners to let their cats roam free.
- Roaming cats should be treated like roaming dogs and picked up and the owners fined for letting their cats out. They will then say they escaped but again proper pet ownership and the would be a rare occasion
- Roaming cats should be treated like roaming dogs and picked up and the owners fined for letting their cats out. They will then say they escaped but again proper pet ownership and the would be a rare occasion
- I've had a few officers come about my cat that gets out. Some are reasonable and some are just on a power trip and are rude and unreasonable. Maybe a better screening process for these people?
- Trying to contact their owners if needed. Picking up any reported sick or injured cats and assessing them.
- NA
- I would like the city to let them be. Cats are not meant to be house cats. If people knew how much of a difference they make (catching mice) some would think differently. I would like to see some kind of program in general to help control the pet population
- Should be destroyed if they are too plentiful and out of control.
- I feel that it needs to be stressed that owners need to do everything they can to keep cats inside. Having a cat that would "dart" out was very frustrating for me as a cat owner, but I never let mine out. I've built cat runs. Feral cats should be spayed and released in a barn program where possible.
- Impound them and fine the owners.
- We would hope that the City could take measures to curtail the behaviour of irresponsible cat owners not to allow their animals to roam from dawn to dusk thereby allowing the animals to behave in an unsociable manner which can be detrimental to local wild life i.e. birds
- I guess the only thing the city can do is catch them and give them to the humane society to domesticate with a new and living home. Easier said than done though.
- I don't believe that the City should be held responsible, but they should respond to complaints.
- I would expect the city to be collecting these cats and dealing with them. Feral cats have come from people setting cats free. There is no reason those of us who do not own cats should have to contend with the damage or an aggressive cat in our fenced yards.
- Re-homing, and bylaws requiring spay and neutering if no proof of intentions to breed.
- Use city money other places.
- Not sure. Likely support and work with existing NPOs and Charities to help deal with them.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stray cats with owners should be fined and removed from owners after repetitive offenses for risking their safety and well-being. City should allow people to report stray cats with owners by owner name, not only an address. currently it's too lenient and easily avoids fines. TNR support for Ferals.
- animal services does a good job of trying to reunite owners with their animals; owners that let their cats out need to follow the rules, but when they are broken, enforcement of rules needs to be a priority for the safety of the birds/wildlife and the cat;
- I expect them to be treated kindly and not just put down.
- Treat them as you would a dog
- The city should provide or supplement TNR programs for ferals, and promote better education on keeping "owned" cats from roaming.
- We need the City of Calgary to neuter/spay our stray/feral cats to aid the over population problem and the effects it has on our ecosystem. I would also like for more action in regards to cat owners allowing their cats to free roam, especially when they are not sterile/vaccinated.
- Patrol the streets and pick up any cats you see
- Try to assist if you can
- I support tnr programs to reduce the population of feral cats.
- Possible solutions would be a spay neuter and release program for feral cats.
- Same bylaws as dogs, no exceptions. Hold cat owners to account for their pets.
- I would like them to provide methods for capturing these animals to keep everyone, including the cats, safe.
- Calgary should have better low/no cost spay and neuter programs separate from vet offices, shouldn't matter what your income level is. It's the only way to deal with stray and feral issues.
- To work with local rescue agencies to help find them adoptable homes
- It's not their fault they are homeless it ultimately was a 'human' that put them in that position in the first place and then multiplies from there. Set up a program partner with Vets educate people, stiffer fines with mandatory lessons on caring for pets; psych evals for animal abusers.
- Humans need to take responsibility for their owned cats and not allow them to roam. Unfortunately we can't count on people doing this, so The City should place the same restrictions as they do for dogs.
- Education and penalties for owners of free roaming cats. Mandatory spay neuter for ALL owned cats unless medical reason or special license to breed. More access to affordable spay/neuter programs. TNR programs, education and compassion for ferals. Definitely NOT kill them!!!!
- The City needs to toughen the existing bylaw and enforce it! The City needs to collect stray, free-roaming and feral cats and deal with them humanely to ensure that native songbird and mammal populations are protected.
- Nothing
- Trapping and taking to the shelter for adoption after they are spayed/neutered, vet checked and vaccinated
- see above. Also, continue programs to spay/neuter feral cats; re-homing kittens if possible



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Humane practices - humane cat traps, spay/neuter, 1-chance-only warning to owners before levying a hefty fine
- I expect them to fund or at least offer support to TNR programs. I'd love for them to control people letting their cats roam too but I don't see how that's possible.
- Only to ensure they are neutered and if stray / feral, picked up when seen and dropped off at shelter
- capture nature, spayed and return to the outdoors
- Collect and assist feral and stray cats. Allow tagged/tattooed/chipped cats their freedom outdoors.
- Roaming cats are fine. Feral and stray ones may need to be cared for in a different environment
- The City of Calgary should concentrate efforts on dealing with feral and stray cats if they are causing issue in neighbourhoods. If the cat is licensed there should not be all the effort put into fining owners etc. because the cat is controlling mice populations and is not a threat to a human
- Owners of Stray and Roaming cats should be fined
- Owners of stray and roaming cats should be fined
- Not much
- Help citizens understand their responsibilities when it comes to dealing with any of these types of cats. Particularly the cats that are pets.
- With stray and roaming, I think they should be managed like any stray or roaming dog. Strays taken in and found homes if possible & roaming having owners fined. Feral are a different story and difficult to manage but spay/neuter program with an adoption option for those suitable can help manage.
- My expectations is to have the city work with rescues and feral colony providers to make sure all are TNR and kept healthy to live out their lives. Perhaps help find other feral colony providers so more colonies are TNR
- I'd like to see the city partner with rescue organizations and invest in trap/neuter/return programs to prevent the growth of feral cat colonies.
- No idea. With the feral rabbits maybe use a chemical contraceptive, same for cats.
- Feral -offer spray and neutering to control population growth. Roaming - offer better deterrents (ie higher fines) Stray - expand facilities to deal with the expanding numbers
- Every effort is made to reconnect stray animals with their owners. That non-profits working in animals welfare are supported through the city so they can work to manage these populations as well.
- Tag them and monitor them? Return to owner? Shelters cannot be overloaded either...
- To pick up the animals, or give guidance to individuals dealing with them. NOT to pass it along to another organization.
- All cats must be 'fixed' before being adopted out.
- Spay & neuter and perform health checks if possible. Keep feral cat numbers low in residential areas. I don't mind them, just don't want their populations to become an issue
- Use common sense



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- We need low cost spay and neuter clinics add less to the population and the feral and strays will decrease.
- Mandatory license and spay/neuter.....if none then euthanize
- i think that the city needs to pick them up. If they can be gathered, fix them and relocate them - or if there is a chance they can be adopted then even better
- Trapping and neutering. Fining owners.
- I don't have any ideas about how the city should deal with this.
- Stray cats should be picked up and rehomed when possible, roaming cats should be picked up and returned home, but repeat offenders should be subject to high fines or possibly removal of the pet from their care.
- Stop wasting time and money with roaming cats and help rehome stray cats.
- If the cat is seen and phoned in, it should be brought to animal shelter. If not phoned in, just left alone.
- Would hope the City would trap and try to help these Cats. Many of the rescues do trap and help these cats.
- None
- Perhaps only trap them if they are "caught in the act" of raiding a bird's nest. Otherwise let them hunt mice, gophers and (possibly) rats.
- Stray should be caught and owners fined
- I don't know what I should expect.
- continue with not permitting cats to roam free - it is safer for the cats and citizens.
- Provide more support to control the amount of cats roaming
- Given the numbers of free roaming cats in my neighbourhood over many years, I have low expectations the City of Calgary will do anything to deal with roaming cats
- Trap and euthanasia's.
- Trapping and re-housing with spay and neuter
- Attempt to capture and rehome, at least capture and spay/neuter
- Take control and enforce.
- A fully-funded Trap Neuter Return program for feral cats. They should make every effort to reunite owners with roaming pets where possible. The enforcement of strict penalties for allowing cats to roam/ abandoning an animal.
- I expect the city to keep picking up caught cats and giving them proper care and into responsible homes. One of our pets was a very injured cat that Animal Control captured and offered vet care to. He has been a wonderful addition, and given the serious nature of his injuries, wouldn't have survived
- Focus resources and processes on animals in need and addressing feral cat populations.
- Please catch and (re)home stray and roaming cats. Sterilization programs for feral cats have worked well in other municipalities and could be tried here if needed. Please don't kill feral cats.
- Euthanize nuisance cats that can not be traced to an owner.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Feral and stray would need to be contained by the city but a roaming cat would be the responsibility of the owner
- Stricter requirements about outside cats which first step would be more education. Education that helps pet owners understand the rules and commit to following them (easier said than done, we know). That will help their pets safe and content - and keep others' pets safe and content.
- Do something ? Do more
- It seems that the onus is on the public to capture these cats and then turn them in to the City of Calgary.
- Ticket offenders and provide traps where needed.
- Encourage the public, lending of traps and taking the cats once trapped. I think the city has a responsibility to euthanize any unadoptables and adopt the rest out. It's not good enough to sterilize and release them. They're still a vessel for sick individuals to torture. And, a predator/food source
- Feral and stray should be caught, vetted and rehomed if possible. Roaming cats should have owners having more accountability to keep them inside and safe. Too many cat owners act arrogant about this. Licensing a cat and following laws should be equal to a dog owner.
- TNR including educating public
- All cats should be scanned for any ID, or have thier tattoos checked. If they pop up, those people should face a fee. If it happens often, the animal should be taken away. Stray cats should be taken to shelters.
- Don't classify them all as feral..some are displaced or abandoned..no fault of their own ..help find safe homes
- They enforce the rules and do not wimp out when talking to the owner. They also take the person making the complaint at face value.
- These are still living creatures no matter what the city thinks of them, so they need to be treated kindly and gently by qualified workers no matter what.
- if they do have ownes it would be great for you to get them back
- They should be removed and either rehoused or kindly euthanazed
- I like a catch and release spay/neuter program.
- I'd like to see a municipal campaign to identify & treat feral cats at least once a year across the city...a 'save-a-cat weekend' all Calgarians can participate in.
- City bylaws must strongly encourage greater control by the owners of free-roaming cats.
- I expect the people who own cats that are permitted to roan free or go and leave their kitties because "they are no longer cute" to get fined, and even not be permitted to own a cat after X # of infractions. I am not sure what to do about the feral population...
- If they are healthy, DO NOT euthanize them. Either fix them and let them free again, or find them warm and healthy homes or farms.
- No expectations
- I expect that stray and roaming cats will be picked up for their own safety, and that feral cats can be relocated. Owners of roaming cats should be fined.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The City should enforce the by-laws regarding roaming cats, provide shelter until adoption for stray cats and support TNR programs for feral cats.
 - Cats must be treated humanely and given every opportunity to be returned to owner, rehomed or surrendered to a cat rescue if possible (preferably spayed/neutered). Owners found to have abandoned the cats need to face heavy fines.
 - Many places have catch, neuter and release programs that work.
 - I think the city should be working with rescues to ensure stray and feral cats can be worked into adoptions or barn cat programs. Pet owners should have penalties that go up based on repeat offenses. It should be stressed that outdoor cats and nuisances and cats should be indoors if not on a leash.
 - I'm not sure what exactly can be done but I feel like it should be taken care of.
 - trap them
 - at least spay/neuter them. if not feral should attempt to adopt. feral could maybe be returned once spayed/neutered
 - Mandatory spay and neuter of all cats
 - I expect them to pick the cats up and return them to in pound where they can be assessed and moved on from there.
 - capture and deal with
 - Stray/roaming cats are at risk from urban wildlife and people. More consequences for owners who do not properly care for their pet should be considered. Not spaying/neutering is a big issue with cats (and letting them roam) - I love cats but I don't love irresponsible pet owners.
 - I appreciate the service provided, when my cat accidently got out I was relieved that there was a safe place for him to go if found. Fortunately for me he came home on his own and all was well.
 - capture and cull, or allow citizen to
 - Unsure as I am not completely sure what they do now.
 - There should be higher penalties for roaming cats. There should also be more awareness for the cat bylaws.
 - Keep the feral population under control, continue providing compassionate care and adoption services to stray and roaming cats. I think The City is doing a fantastic job!
 - Hopefully a rigorous spay/neuter program will bring these populations under control
 - Catch and euthanize only when presenting a problem.
 - Pick them up as soon as possible.
- Everyone knows cats are not allowed outside of their owner's property. A steep fine should be issued for the cat owners who consciously make the decision to let their cats roam the neighborhood.
- I would hope that the city would incorporate this into the bylaws, educate the public that feral, stray and roaming cats is against the bylaw and then enforce the bylaw for the protection of the public and the health and safety of the cats.
 - enforcing the bylaw for cats to be on the owner's property

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Feral cats - trap, neuter/spay and release. Stray/Roaming - if reported more than once, capture, read microchip and contact owner of record. If no owner, spay/neuter and adopt out.
- these cats should be taken to adoption etc.
- I expect that they will deal with these issues humanely, with things like TNR programs.
- None
- To rehome feral cats, Fine the owners of stray or roaming cats with fines that would prevent this action in the future. Stronger enforcement abilities for peace officers that have been informed of pets about. I knew a guy that would get a small fine for his 3 cats and laugh it off as a joke.
- Make a law that if you let your cat roam free people can press charges if anything damage or eaten. To suggest to leave the cat on the leash so no damage is done but they can still be outside.
- take them to a pound
- sAVe ThEm
- To have animal control and be able to put them in shelters
- To help them get a home if they're not feral.
- manage the health and wellbeing of public and public spaces, control ferel cat populations
- I'm not too sure how the city does it now, but fort mcmurrays animal control will pick up any cats left roaming and release them with a fine. The same should be done here maybe
- they should be collecting them up for owners to collect from pound
- The cats will be removed. If they can be re homed that would be fantastic.
- None -establish a few areas to provide food/shelter/water and I bet they would gather in those places. People could watch. There must be some semblance of oversight re: disease control which would be easier if they congregated a few areas. The water could have medicine added. Calgary can be a leader!
- Trap, euthanize as necessary, attempt to return tagged pets to owners and warn or fine them
- I wish there was a program to spay/neuter and vaccinate feral cats but I do realize the cost would be very high. I'm not sure what the answer is because they just keep breeding.
- Capture, spay or neuter then attempt to rehome
- Heavier fines, euthanasia of feral cats
- If anyone complains then collect the animal, otherwise leave it alone.
- Leave roaming cats alone. Help reunite strays with their owners.
- Unless the cat is problematic, nothing. I also think people shouldn't care so much simply that a cat has walked across their property.
- Assume every cat brought in is an indoor cat who escaped. Get 1 "get out of jail free" pass along with educational materials on indoor vs outdoor cats and spay/neuter stats, require microchip to go home, if the City ever gets that cat back fine the crap out of their owners.
- I don't know what the best approach here is. Ferals need to be sterilized. Strays ideally would be trapped and put into rescue programs for rehoming. Roaming cats trapped and owners fined.
- Animal rescue
- More needs to be done



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I expect the bylaws to be enforced, and would like to not have to deal with cats of any kind on my property.
- Nothing
- Catch and alter, then look for homes.
- Harsher or at least uphold the same policies you have for roaming dogs that you do for cats
- Feral cats should be humanely euthanized. Fines for stray & roaming cats should sky rocket, as that's the only way to get through to ignorant people.
- To handle them in a humane way.
- the City should bugged off and worry about getting spending under control
- Mandatory sterilization and tattoo/microchip of cats brought in to Animal Services before returning to owners.
- Don't allow people to have outdoor cats.
- They need to ticket owners of roaming cats - my neighbor has 3 alone.
- roaming cats should not be permitted
- handled humanely
- Trap and neuter programs. Fines for owners of cats found to be roaming and can be traced to a specific household.
- enforcing bylaw to cat owners. assistance with animal pickup, if a stray cat is reported. feral cats could be treated as general wildlife or control breeding, if possible.
- Support from The City when dealing with them on private property.
- They should be collected by a bylaw officer
- Trap neuter clip release
- The same rules should apply to cat owners as dog owners. Issue fines as necessary.
- It is impossible to restrain cats to your home or property if they came from the streets, they should be allowed to roam.
- We should be able to call the city and have them trap the cats. If it turns out the cat is a stray or roaming, then the owner should be required to pay a fine before getting their cat back. If they are not claimed, then they could be adopted and if that are not adopted, they should be euthanized.
- Compassion and human decency. Leave them be or humanly capture them and provide care and re-homing services
- I m not sure - people who let their cats roam probably don't care because they know they will likely never get in trouble for it. Maybe more City places cat traps in areas that are of concern - or I assume home owners can place cat trap on their property so would make that easy to fo
- I expect the city to continue becoming like a jail
- Spay and neuter feral cats. Rehome or return home if possible.
- I expect the city to support groups like the meow foundation and ensure that those who adopt animals understand the responsibilities that come with it. I expect the city to discourage if not punish animal abuse.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I would like the city to educate people about spay / neuter. Offer discounts / funding for spay / neuter. Or make spay / neuter mandatory without some sort of breeding license. Have trap, spay / neuter & release program for feral cats. Significant penalties for abandoning an animal.
- The city takes reasonable care dealing with roaming and stray cats, and attempts to home (if possible) feral cats.
- Licensed or microchipped cats should be returned to the owner with fees incurred if there are successive captures of the same animal. Strays and feral cats rescued, assessed for health, spayed or neutered. Feral cats would make excellent farm/barn cats
- I expect the city of Calgary to set an example to Calgarians that animals must be treated with respect and compassion. It increases my confidence in a city that treats animals well and shows a high ethical standard.
- Capture
 - Spay and neuter
 - Try to adopt out
 - Euthanize only when necessary
 - Make proof of spay and neuter a necessity of pet ownership
- Trap, spay/neuter, adopt. Humanely euthanize those animals that cannot be put through that process.
- That the Bylaw Office can discuss the issue of a roaming cat with the pet owner, as appropriate.
- Levy fines to irresponsible cat owners who allow their cats to roam to deter them from this behaviour.
 - Cull feral and stray cats to prevent wild cat populations from growing.
- Spay? Place in parks to control pests? Rehome to farms, acreages as pest control?
- They should be caught and euthanized humanely at once unless an owner can be determined. If an owner can be found, they should be fined for allowing the cat to roam. Fines for repeat offenders should be sufficiently high (and sufficiently well communicated) to deter irresponsible ownership.
- As sad as it is to say feral cats ought to be put down.
 - Stray cats need to be adopted if possible, if possible returned to owner and owner fined if necessary
 - owners of roaming cats need heftier fines. Mandatory microchipping at owner expense and education of risks when the pet roams free
- As pets have to be licensed I would expect the City to enforce bylaws related to cats more stringently. Additionally more strong regulations related to spaying and neutering pets. While your pet should be confined to your yard, if it gets out and is able to procreate, it just exacerbates the problem
- Strong partnerships with local animal organizations to engage in evidence-based treatment. For example, TNR, contraceptive and feeding programs etc. Strong public education surrounding feral cats
- I think people who let their cats roam should get fines. Or not be pet owners.
- I believe our city should have a Community Cat program. In no way, shape or form should they be trapped and euthanized!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Owners must neuter their cats and keep them from roaming freely. Stop people from breeding their pets by implementing a license program and limiting how many cats may be breed.
- Pick them up to rehome as needed
- Catch and vaccinate, spay/neuter.
- Strict enforcement of city By-laws and providing of readily available and return of animal traps. Also removal from By- laws of the REDICULOUS onus on aggrieved neighbours of having to go door knocking with the aim of identifyin scofflaw owners and having to face them in court if they are prosecuted
- If I know where the cat lives and the home owner continues to let their cats out after I have spoken with them, then I would hope an officer could attend and speak with the owners.
- You should not be allowed to have your cat in the city roam outdoors.
- I had big issues a few years ago with stray and feral cats in my yard. I was surprised that the City wanted me to catch them myself, put them in MY car, and bring them to the shelter. I would never do this. The city should trap them.
- None. Perhaps if there was an issue with population control but I do not believe that is an issue at this time for the City of Calgary.
- The city of calgary should fine the owners if they can find them.
- Fines to owners who allow their cats to roam free.
- make the owners responsible in whatever way you may and can.
- Respect, kindness and ensuring the animals do not suffer emotionally or physically handle with kindness not rough or harsh as I have seen. Try to re-home. Don't people to trap cats as some then leaving them to dehydrate, starve or exposed to die, ban trapping by residents.
- There is a huge difference between a feral, stray and roaming cat!!! Most house hold pets won't run from humans and should be left alone. Strays and feral cats need to be altered to keep population down.
I actually think all cats should be altered unless they are being bred.
- People who let their cats roam should have a stiff fine and if not licensed perhaps have the cat taken away. It is hard to trap these cats and also the feral cats and many cat owners do not believe the cats should be kept indoors. When a complaint is made for roaming cats I believe the owners pay
- I expect that Animal Services would provide me with a trap if a feral cat were entering my yard, and that I could be confident that the animal would be spayed or neutered and then set free to live what would likely be a fairly short life.
- Educate owners to love animals say they are a part of us . Animals are not a nuisance.
- People should call in feral cats more, and be more aware of what they're seeing
- Maybe the city should designate land to animals. It seems like the governemtn puts more and more responsibility on people to volunteer. It would be great if the city could give some money for animal charities
- Uinsure. Not really the city's problem
- I think you should heavily fine the owners & seize the animals



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Owners should be fined. More staff should be provided from city to fund it.
- When they get the cats off the street and treat them/their infections etc. instead of leaving them how they were found sick
- - Trap and spay & neuter and try to find homes.
- - Trap and put them in a shelter
- Have the city of Calgary have traps and then trap them and spay or neuter.
Trap and take them to a shelter, no kill
- To deal with the problem, to help find them homes reduce population.
- Feral cats should be part of the trap and release programs.
- Leave em alone. They help control the rodent population.
- They should be picked up and put in an animal shelter or destroyed
- That they will not euthanize them.
- None.
- Providing cat traps to home owners.
- They should be TNR and provided with food and shelter and necessary vet care
- Ownera of roaming cats fined.
Strays caught and rehomed.
Truly feral see above
- Trap, spay/neuter, attempt to find home
- spay/neuter, vaccinate them when you spay/neuter them, kittens can be trapped, spay/neuter vaccine and adopted out
- Not sure what to add here, I just would like to see more cats kept indoors or on harness then I do see. I can't walk my cat on leash without being harassed by free roaming neighborhood cats.
- Pick them up the street, spay/neuter, adopt them out if non-aggressive.
- I would love to see a trap, spay or neuter, and release program for freaks. For strays, continue to adopt out adoptable cats. For roaming, owned cats, fine the owners. Increase fine for subsequent offences. Continue to require licensing of cats.
- Catch and rehabilitate whenever possible. If rehabilitation is not possible, then neuter/spay and release back to their colony while ensuring there are adequate protections in the community so they have appropriate shelter and food in winter. You can work with communities on this.
- The city should be showing up to deal with strays, find the resources and do not push the burden on to other agencies
- I expect the city to enforce stricter bylaws surrounding these concerns and educating the importance of safety for cats and appropriate indoor stimulation to the public. I expect the city to use all resources from the humane society, aarcs, meow etc. Expansion of city animal services is needed!
- Respond to feral or suspect stray
If id then contact owner. If repeat Rainer/stray - nothing as if you fine people they will not pick up their animals
- To capture, rehabilitate as necessary and find homes for them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- More patrols to pick up cats and to ticket owners who let their cats live outside
- Manage them. Might be tough to get them all. Like the cat traps available currently from bylaw.
- I would love to see the city implant a TNR (trap neuter and release program) instead of the destruction of these cats. It is not their fault humans have been irresponsible about spaying and neutering their pets which has heightened the situation
- Consult with strategic stakeholders for public messaging on link to wildlife
Pick up service similar to stray dogs
- The city should have more trapping efforts and higher fines for offenders.
- To make sure they are placed somewhere safe (Shelter) and to make an effort to contact the owner if possible.
- TNR program for feral cats, low cost spay/neuter for families that need it.
Returning roaming or stray cats to owners, providing permanent ID (tattoo or microchip) if they do not already have it in order to increase chances of reuniting with owners if cats get out again.
- I expect feral, stray, and roaming cats to be treated the same as loose dogs. They should be collected by the city to ensure their safety. The city should provide traps to help citizens to trap a loose cat.
- Feel City of Calgary should step in when requested. The "ideal" response of us contacting/communicating with neighbour about incident isn't realistic. Will create bad blood, have already tried this. won't again, but every request made to C.o.C. personel is met with essentially deal w it yourself.
- If they are feral then for human reasons they must be put down.
- To enforce the bylaws & fine offenders
To educate to ensure the animals are properly cared for
To educate on bylaws
To manage the licensing/fines which should cover the cost of the program.
- To inform owners of their responsibilities when it comes to roaming cats and then to enforce rules through ticketing
- Unfortunately, no alternative but to destroy them. A cat owner who truly loved their cat, would keep it in the house and not roam around.
- Trap and adopt out cats. Don't tell citizens to do it themselves, have the animal bylaw officers help with the problem.
- consult with strategic stakeholders for public messaging on link to wildlife
pickup service similar to stray dogs
- Use all pet license revenue to alter & reduce cats and will lower animal control costs. Work with all levels of gov't for stronger legislation; as abandonment leads to overpopulation. The cat crisis causes anguish amongst those at rescues, kill shelters & vet clinics who destroy healthy cats.
- For ferals - A humane, sustainable approach to reducing the feral cat population through TNR and providing vet care, food and water, and shelter.
For strays and roaming cats - educate pet owners about cat care and things like catios and be tougher about neglect and roaming.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- All need to be spay/neutered to control the numbers. Treat strays and roaming cats same as dogs.
- None. Let people allow their cats to go outside.
- Give all an equal chance to be homed.
- I would like the bylaw to stay the same, which is that they cannot roam free.
- Start ticketing roaming cats/owners
- Ideally, feral cats should be tracked or at least tagged by the city in the event one animal is creating a host of issues. Stray and roaming cats should not be tolerated and fined just as a roaming dog would be.
- Cats must remain indoors or be humanely euthanized.
- Pick up service similar to stray dogs.
Consult with strategic stakeholders for public messaging.
- The City should offer more help to residents who see neighbourhood cats that are roaming free. Some cat owners do not understand the rules. Printing the rules in community newsletters or in City mailings to communities would help.
- I would like by-laws to be enforced for stray and roaming cats.
- I have a problem with a cat for 3 years. I have tried to trap it with sardines but the cat is too well feed. I expect the City to catch the darn thing and then bill the owner for the expenses.
- Gather and re-home where possible
- I have seen an automatic spay/neuter process in other parts of the world that works quite well. Would like to see a similar policy in Calgary
- I would like to see more animals, with and without owners, spayed and neutered.
- Consult with strategic stakeholders for public messaging on link to wildlife; Pick-up stray service should be provided by City similar to stray dog program.
- Periodic catching of feral cat population. Spay/neuter any cat found roaming/stray, and place for adoption if possible. Euthanize those not able to be adopted.
- I expect that the City of Calgary does not over enforce bylaws against cat owners. I expect that there be clear, transparent guidelines on good reasons on when to call bylaw regarding a roaming cat to avoid petty complaints.
- They should be picked up. Cats should be licensed and chipped and when not either, a fine should be issued to the owner. If they haven't been spayed or neutered, then an additional fine issued that will be removed if the pet gets the surgery.
- Roaming cats probably captured if they are causing a problem and take them to Humane Society and try to re-unite with owner. Feral/stray cats could do the trapping but then what? Not easy (or desirable?) to try and find a home for them, hard to rehabilitate, especially when there are lots of cats.
- Trap-Spay-Release programs seem to have been designed to help reduce shelter numbers without attracting the negative attention associated with culls or euthanasia. To properly deal with the problem of invasive, feral and stray cats, cats destined for re-release into communities should be put down.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Keep the city streets tidy and safe.
- Wishful expectation: Enact law limiting pets to 2 and enforce bylaws. Eliminate feral cats. Actual expectation supported by personal experience: Nothing
- Honestly, there's not much you can do - It's just an ignorant, but very common mindset amongst cat owners. Somehow they seem to justify allowing my yard to be used as their litter box.
- Feral cats can not be adopted out, so a catch and release spay/neuter clinic can help decrease the population. Stray or roaming cats need to be picked up and owners penalized. More education is required so people understand you must register your cat, and the benefits of spay/neuter
- Neighbours have tried talking to cat owners about problems but are told it's too inconvenient for them to keep their cats in. They know the rules. They don't need education about the rules. They need consequences. Enforce the bylaws. Trap cats. Ticket owners when address is known / photo/proof.
- I suppose the expectation would depend upon the number/subject of complaints that are received in a given community. If there is an excess combination of cats roaming about where it starts messing with the bird population (except for nuisance birds) then an effort should be made to control the cats.
- How much money would be spent for this issue? Don't see the point, since for every dollar the city spends is translated to ten or a hundred times the real cost due to a top-heavy extremely expensive bureaucracy and ineffective city council.
- There needs to be stiff fines for people allowing their cats to run free and it should not be up to neighbours to trap their neighbour's cats in order to have something done about them. I don't know what the solution is for stray and feral cats, because people get so upset when there is any talk of removing these animals.

Wildlife

Co-exist

- Increased public education about urban wildlife and how to coexist with them and what to do when you encounter them.
- Education. All wildlife serves a need. Some species carry seeds and populate areas with free trees and shrubs, some eat ticks, which can kill humans. Don't encourage huge human population thus forcing species to scavenge from humans. Laws and education MUST change. This pest ideology is outdated.
- First of all, remove the designation of 'nuisance' from wildlife. Attitude changes are a good place to start when wanting to co-exist with anything, including wildlife. Then practical information and strategies on how to co-exist better should be communicated by the City.
- Kill them all
- Harsher punishments for people feeding city wildlife
- A better understanding of who to call with concerns and which group would be responsible for addressing each type of wild animal. Minimum regulations to ensure that wild animals are not being lured into urban settings posing a danger to pets, citizens and the wildlife



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Wildlife fences on major highways and roads, especially in areas known for deer, like in Ogden by the train yard, and Deer Run.
Some kind of wasp control program. Never in my life have I lived in a city with so many wasps! And they're MEAN here. People have serious allergies to wasps!
- More information about how to co-exist with various types of wildlife. There is information about bobcats and coyotes online but people do not really know about the prevalence or behaviours of most of these creatures.
- I am not so sure as I love to see diversity in the city and there are typically no concerns regarding wildlife in our city, except for coyotes that sometime attack dogs, and aggressive magpies and crows that nest in spring. For both of those wildlife animals the city should post more warning signs.
- Education of the public. Knowing when breeding seasons are etc. Who to call. Non use of poison as that enters the ecosystem.
- Education.
- Mandatory supervision of pets at all times- such as watching dogs in backyards and offleash parks, and keeping cats indoors or on a leash. Off leash unsupervised pets can agitate and injure wildlife, or become harmed themselves. They also could draw wildlife deeper into the city as they prey on pets
- We live so close to the mountains that this is just excepted, what everyone seems to forget is that the animals were here long before Calgary was.
- Magpies, mice, skunks, Wasps
- Calgarians need to respect wildlife. We are on THEIR land. Unless it is an invasive species I think it is pet owner's responsibility to be watching their pets and not the city's job to deal with any "nuisance" animal.
- Co-existing with wildlife would be easier if neighbors would take care of their property, including limiting places for wildlife to nest or providing resources such as food to wildlife. This is a responsibility for every Calgarian to participate in.
- We need to encourage more wild areas. Encourage Calgarians to cohabitate with these animals.
- **MAYBE NOT BUILDING ON EVERY AVAILABLE PIECE OF LAND SO THAT WILDLIFE ARE NOT PUSHED INTO THE SUBURBS**
- More funding and expansion of Wildlife Rehabilitation Center. More information about it circulated in the media, more engagement regarding the work they do. This will in turn drive more funding!
- Education for people. We moved into the animals territory, not the other way around.
- So tough, it's great we live in a city where large wildlife can exist.
Wasps/pigeons are a different story, feeding birds should not be permitted in urban settings, just feeding the bloody pigeons. Wasps are getting quite bad and I don't have answers to that.
- Bats should not be considered nuisance animals. Bats should be encouraged as a healthy and at-risk part of the ecosystem.
- Education about food wastage storage and impact of feeding or interacting with wildlife.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education of residents on how to deal with wildlife. I think there is a big disconnect between people and the right of way/space wildlife requires. Not feeding them and disposing of garbage responsibly is a big thing. Banff/Canmore is a good example of food/disposal control.
- People need to learn to co-exist with these, so called, nuisance wildlife. Can anyone say we have more right to exist than these critters? People need to be educated on how to keep their homes protected from wildlife "infestations" and their pets safe from attack by wildlife.
- I have no issues with any of these except for wasps and squirrels. People should be encouraged not to feed wild animals, as this makes them more likely to come closer to human habitation.
- More information on how to/how not to act towards these animals and how to peacefully live in unison with them.
- People need to realize that we have encroached on THEIR area and be more understanding, and smarter about where we walk and more humane.
- Educating people. That is the main source of issues with the wildlife we have in Calgary
- Animals that are a threat to human life should be relocated, for their safety not ours. The rest, leave them alone.
- Bats are Not a nuisance animal. They are major pollinators and aid in the fight against mosquitoes.
- Tracking the more common species that result in public conflicts and then using this information to identify if there are practices that can be implemented to minimize conflict. Working with wildlife organizations to develop educational guides to help citizens identify ways to minimize conflicts.
- Stop building in their habitats. Maintain large green spaces and corridors. Coexist.
- I believe that if people were more educated on the habits, needs and instincts regarding these animals, they may have more understanding for them. Fear and irritability are derived from ignorance.
- Public education about the dangers of feeding wild animals and consequence if found doing so (e.g., mandatory education program), as well as education about what to do when encountering wildlife. Enforcement of garbage pickup and property cleanliness (e.g., skunks go where there is garbage to eat).
- Education!! The animals were here first.
- the more the merrier. Calgary should have more intertwined greenspaces to allow wildlife to flourish and move freely. Nature will police itself.
- Our sprawl has led to increased conflict with so called "nuisance" fauna. Education is always a useful tool...
- To a large extent their populations within city limits needs to be controlled. For instance, if city living causes a particular population to be greater than it naturally would, the city needs to take measures to control that population (either directly or by addressing the underlying causal factor)
- more naturalized green spaces. More human education. Signage to not interact / feed wildlife in parks.
- Education. Teach the kids safety. Skunks and wasps have no place in the city and cause more harm than the other creatures in the list.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Propoer park maintenance (cleaning up garbage and pathways)
- I think the City should be responsible for trapping and removing skunks.
- A culling of the magpies! They harass the smaller song birds.
- Skunks in Canyon Meadows was non existent 4 years ago, now they are everywhere, i think a controlled removal of them would be a great help to people and pets in the communities
- Proper understanding that we must co exist
- Keeping dogs on leash in natural areas, and cat indoors will help prevent unwanted pet-wildlife interactions. Calgarians need to shift their perspective, and realize that we do not need to control wildlife, but shift our behaviors to coexist without conflict. Healthy wildlife = healthy ecosystems.
- Humans quit leaving out trash that attracts wildlife into their yards. Most of these animals are NOT nuisances.
- I think more education is needed. People see them as pests but there are many ways we can learn to respect these animals
- Education - especially regarding coyotes - for people with cats and small dogs
- Honestly let them live their lives, we're in their home more than they are in ours.
- Leave them alone!!! Educate yourself, be vigilant and stop trying to destroy any of them. We lost the gophers behind my house for years due to eradication programs, they are just coming back. All animals deserve to live their lives with minimal human contact or interference.
- Acknowledging that we live in a shared environment, and that we can not mold the environment to just encourage human habitation. Our world will be more healthy if we can coexist with wildlife.
- Have city services provide removal or relocation of these creatures and their dens/nests if on a person's property or allow the property owner to do so.
- Education. we can co-exist but have to respect that they are wild animals.
- I think a lot of the problem is man-made due to the inappropriate storage of items that animals sense as food. Most of the animals listed are of an "ignore them and they'll ignore you" variety. Pets can be a "pinch-point" of trouble, as coyotes and bobcats would view them as prey.
- We only hear about these animals when there is a problem, A commercial ad like the one the city has for recycling would be great for people to know when these animals are most active and where.
- allow them to be. just that simple. proper containment of citizen's garbage to keep them out of yards etc. would help a lot.
- For a start, not labelling them as nuisance. For example, magpies eat dead squirrel carcasses, coyotes control the jackrabbit population, etc. Clearly there is a need to identify the values these species provide. Bobcats have nursed their young in my backyard with no issue. Nuisance?
- Only allow off-leash dogs in very specific and totally fenced in areas. Also do not allow any cats outside. This is where so many problems come from!
- Education yearly about migration and animal traits. What can one do to co exist with this particular species. Who to call if you feel the animal might be in distress.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education to adjust expectations is needed. It is not desirable to eradicate wildlife from the city. However, we need to take action when significant risks are present such as coyotes denning under the deck of a house or under rocks at a playground.
- I find Calgarians need to be educated on wildlife via commercials, Emax inserts & Calgary Newsroom, is the way go..the education should state what to do with each wildlife, what is considered a pest so as to exterminate them humanely & whom to contact/ph#..these commercials should be always ongoing..
- The city should provide homeowners with information as well as where to purchase or rent traps. They should have a list of reputable companies that deal with nuisance wildlife.
- People need to realize we live with these animals, and make adjustments to their own lives to accommodate. Don't leave food eat, don't go near wild animals. Maybe more workshops would help.
- I think Calgary currently does a good job at co-existing with wildlife. I think to be safe, it is necessary to keep an eye on small dogs and cats, even if they are in a fenced yard. The city can only do some much and their needs to be responsibility on the owner to ensure the animal is safe.
- How to deal with each species safely and how to minimize associated risk
- Education. Most people don't know anything about these creatures. Just leave them alone!
- It would be great if there were bylaws put in place to stop people from FEEDING these types of wildlife. The rabbits in Erlton are out of control, digging under houses and porches, and people in the area still put food out for them. It's infuriating!!
- Many of these wildlife species become issues because people do not take care of their home and yard. Homeowners leave garbage exposed outside that attracts wildlife. Issues with wildlife would decrease if better bylaws existed for property care.
- A better policy. We cannot expect to live wildlife free within the city. However, if destructive the city should have a plan to step in and relocate the animal and their family, safely for the animal.
- 1)A bylaw on homeowners to keep their properties free of garbage that may attract wildlife.
2)Have lids closed on garbage containers.
3)If yards are attracting wildlife, neighbors can call into 311 and anonymously report
- Provide a species-specific resource document for each urban wildlife animal, similar to the current "Urban Coyotes" page, so Calgarians have tips on preventing conflict, keeping pets safe, and discouraging unwanted wildlife visits for these species; and highlighting the benefits of these animals.
- Calgarians should not be forced to "co-exist" with animals that are dangerous and spread disease. We don't live in the woods.
- Leaving wildlife alone, giving them as much space as possible and not having wildlife officers involved. Also keeping our pets on leashes and under control.
- Training for humans. Animals would greatly prefer to live in peace. We can live peacefully with all of them, but many humans need re-training, and re-exposure to nature. Also build urban natural environments supportive of animals, with clear signage for foolish humans.
- Education on how to properly coexist, with respect to keeping areas clean, personal space, and natural wildlife Behavior.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- While I do not believe that mice have any purpose in this world, I do understand that they are food for other species. We need to educate people (I know the City hates this approach) on how to deal with wildlife. Alberta Wildlife needs to be called when there are problem animals
- Less fear, more basic information & education.
- Something needs to be done about the green bins because it is a 24/7 salad bar for raccoons. Now I have raccoons, which are impossible to get rid of and the city won't remove them but it am not allowed to harm them.
- I admire how much green space Calgary has, and think that it is very important to keep up the per capita ratio for green space. I think more wild/ungroomed areas (like nose hill) will allow for nuisance wildlife to have their own space. I don't think there should be culls.
- Hopefully better knowledge about the roles they play in the ecosystem and the consequences of culling them.
- education
- It would be good to do some Humane birth control for certain species. Assistance relocating coyote dens so they don't get too comfy in yards Otherwise I don't have issues.
- Natural green space habitat where they can live in peace. Stop suburban sprawl
- I think we're doing well for the most part, but wasps and magpies could be dealt with more frequently.
- Allow the wildlife to come and go as they need. Make it punishable and harsher penalties for people who attack or try to disturb wildlife.
- Educate people so they understand when a wild animal is a nuisance or when they are just acting normal. Educate people to keep their pets by their side and not running loose in the Parks where they can fall prey to wild animals.
- There needs to be a culling of the coyotes. They have proliferated in the last few years and have moved into very urban areas. People should not have to worry about their pets in their own back yards and at off leash parks and pathways. Trapping and relocating of skunks
- Stop letting cats roam and ruin our ecosystems by destroying the bird population. Hold owners accountable for their cats killing/injuring wildlife like you would if a dog harassed the wildlife. You are doing Calgary's wildlife a disservice by allowing this to occur with out repercussion for owners.
- Being provided with a means to protect themselves and families, pets etc from being harassed by wildlife. Permit higher fences, links on installation of coyote rollers on fences. Look for ways to prevent denning in yards/under steps.
- More awareness campaigns. To have the city remove problem animals like skunks/racoons. Otherwise people take it into their own hands to kill/injure from lack of knowledge/hatred. To enforce the bylaw about keeping pet cats and dogs indoors/not to feed them outdoors.
- Relocation and removal of coyotes. Allow trapping of squirrels and rabbits. City could treat certain urban areas for mice and rats. Allowing trapping of gophers and killing after review. Wasps can be killed but bees should not be harmed.
- make fines for people that antagonize in anyway.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

most of the pigeons are not wild. they are pets or flocks that people owned that have let them free. they breed and take over shitting on the community. Catch and dispose.

- Making sure roads and communities are clean, monitoring communities and possibly relocating wildlife what are close to homes
- Keeping Garbage picked up. Picking up dog poop. Being mindful of community alerts of wildlife in the area. Keeping areas cleaned up so there aren't any food sources. The wild rabbits everywhere are the bigger problem and they attract the bobcats and coyotes.
- Stop approving new communities - animals are coming into urban areas because they have no where else to go. Also you need to deal with situations like coyotes coming into in residential areas - once they attack a pet, something needs to be done because a human is next.
- Education on these specific rodents and animals. I think with better knowledge people would be able to better cope and interact.
- We need to get a solution for the coyotes in the city, too many of them are roaming free and you are hearing more and more reports of attacks on domestic pets.
- Quit ruining wildlife corridors! i.e. urban sprawl is impinging on these
- To enact LAW ASAP for the protection of all wildlife in Calgary. To NOT allow residents of Calgary to harm nor trap wild animals around their house. This is APPALLING as the animals were there prior to you moving in and it is the humans who are invading & destroying wildlife habitats for new areas
- I would like to say the skunk issue deal with the most and they are the most annoying
- Education is key to understanding the wildlife and co-existing with them. Many people over react to wildlife and put themselves and the wildlife at risk.
- Pushing predators like coyotes and Bobcats back to the outskirts of the city would help pet owners with yards feel more comfortable letting them outside without supervision.
- Making sure our garbage is all picked up . Weekly pick up of black bins for people who need it large family
- Education on how to co-exist without creating issues. Many people still don't understand about feeding wildlife, what to do and what not to do. Also providing information on how to discourage pests and deal with pests in a humane and sustainable way.
- Monitor coyotes.
- Stop expanding the city and taking their homes.
- Rabbit population in hawkwood is out of control. We have to deal with
- Rabbit population in hawkwood is out of control. Rabbits poop in the same area and is a health hazard. Eat flowers in garden I. Front yard
- Please work on pushing the coyotes out from the inner city. Too many pets and people are being attacked.
- Naturalize all municipal land, increasing hanitats. Develop property tax credit for those with naturalized yards. Start a massive levy new suburban homes; kill suburban expansion to reduce encroachment into ecosystems. Leave "nuisance animals" alone, give them habitat, Biodiversity is the answer.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- better Trapping and moving of creatures. Especially coyotes and skunks, sadly we are moving into their native areas but they do carry diseases and aren't very neighbor friendly.
- Leave them alone
- These are not nuisance wildlife, people need to exist with natural wildlife and not be the problem. Examples like the City of Calgary's green cart program has created an human caused food source for most wildlife. The smells from the program will attract more wildlife into the city
- Learn that we don't want to live in a perfect concrete box...education, appreciation, even wasps are helpful. Keep cats in at night and they won't get eaten!
- Hawks should be added to this list. Having to deal with them for roughly the past 4 years, it is frustrating that they are more important than our pets. We have a small dog and one summer we had to constantly go out with him in our yard with a bat for his protection. They are not endangered!
- Maybe some direction or even help from bylaw services. We have had skunks burrow in our foundation and needed help trying to get rid, even advice but we're told they were pests and I needed an exterminator.
- Fines for individuals feeding these animals that then leads to more problem interactions
- Education about the ecosystem, and the ability to relocate the animals if need be.
- I dont mind bats,skunks, raccoons etc. I RESENT THE HELL OUT OF THE FACT THAT THE CITY DOES NOTHING ABOUT COYOTES ATTACKING, & KILLING PETS IN 6 FOOT FENCED BACK YARDS. I'M EVEN MORE IRATE THAT NOTHING IS DONE ABOUT PACKS CIRCLING AND STALKING PEOPLE IN THIS NEIGHBOURHOOD. SERIOUSLY. DO SOMETHING!
- These are part of our biodiversity and shouldn't be called 'nuisance'. Change the language. We often create the niche where they then fit into. Or, they find our environment attractive as there is less pressure for good or carnivores.
- Skunk removal I'd badly needed in the north east.
- Gophers moles skunks wasps coyotes are animals that should not be within the city and should be removed. There have been to many cases of damage or harm to the animals and ppl
- wildlife/vermin/pests on private property should fall in the city responsibility. I have called about pests infestation (pigeons) on a neighbours vacant property and was told the city would not do anything because it was private property. Unacceptable because it impacts the whole neighbourhood.
- Keep corridors for wildlife. Education on wildlife and co-existence.
- better management of domestic pets
why are predators (coyotes, bob cats) moving into my neighbourhood? ?We have lived here for 21 years, lots of deer bunnies and quail first year predators
magpies are terrible have chased robins and pecked fatally in our yard and garage
- Less encroaching on their habits. We have plenty of the above "pests" near us, but because they have a green space (near carburn park), we are able to cohabitate the area.
- STOP building where the wildlife live!! Educate owners buying where wildlife exists BEFORE they buy!!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Quit allowing golf courses to be sold to developers and push more wildlife into residential areas. Residents shouldn't have to pay to trap skunks / other animals to have them located. The city should take care of it (especially when neighbours leave dog food and garbage outside to attract wildlife)
- Stop approving building permits which sub-divide properties when these subdivisions remove all green space from the property. When the city destroys wildlife habitats with a ring road, take that square footage and designate new parks in its place.
- I think people need to be better educated on how to react when they encounter wild life.
- Fines for feeding wildlife that bring "dangerous" predators i.e feeding the 'cute' bunnies and the then wanting the city to kill the coyotes that come to eat the rabbits because the coyotes or "dangerous". **DO NOT FEED THE RABBITS!!**(and leave the food out all over the lawns!!
- I have had no problems with wildlife.
- Quit building new neighborhoods on the outskirts of the city.
- less encroaching on wildlife space
- Calgarians need more education on how to coexist!! I have worked in wildlife rehab in Calgary for over five years, and the public does not have the information they need. Wildlife bylaws need to be taken more seriously by the public.
- Education and responsible waste disposal would go a long way. It was their land first.
- Mice and moles can be reduced in Calgary if we had everyone maintain their yards and not provide a haven for them. They attract predators, so if you don't want them in your backyard, keep it clean.
- Do not feed them or leave anything in your yard that would attract them
- Unsure
- Just advise the public to be aware of wildlife.
Gophers/mice...poison to control the population
- these animals become a nuisance when people don't clean up there yards and leave junk and garbage around to make it prime habitat for them to live in the city! I had a severe mouse problem due to my neighbor, not keeping his yard clean. called the city and they came in and cleaned part of it up!
- Education about how to coexist with different species. Safety information about what to do with encounters.
- An understanding of the positive impact all these animals have on our eco system. Calgary is a great city with many natural spaces at our doorstep, we need to protect these wild animals in order to keep the delicate balance in tact. Education is key.
- How about the ever increasing duck and goose populations? How about an open hunting season after the migratory birds have gone for the season. The rest of the animals you list can be dealt with on an as needed basis by someone in your office who has the ability to do so.
- Not providing human food and not to feed wildlife
- Education to the public. Public should not be feeding wildlife.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Some people can co-exist peacefully with wildlife and some people can't and never will. Unfortunately the wildlife will inevitably lose as we keep taking over and destroying their habitat. Kind of don't like the idea of calling all these species nuisances.
- Stop encroaching on the territories of wildlife. It's disgusting to see the sprawl of Calgary into areas that were once wild. If people choose to live in areas that belonged to the wildlife, they should be prepared for wildlife encounters. Kill the wasps though.
- Quit building new housing and other buildings in wildlife corridors.
- Leave green spaces alone
- Coyotes are here to stay, allow populations to grow old and we can adapt together. An older population should create less problems for us. Rabbits are over populated, we should allow more predation in our city.
- Humans need to chill out—their wild animals who lived here long before we did. We need to conduct ourselves in a manner that doesn't cause upset to wildlife (Eg, providing sources of food to wildlife, intentionally or unintentionally, staying away from denning areas, etc)
- Increasing the green spaces and encouraging wildlife corridors for the animals to go in and out.
- I often wonder about having areas or sanctuaries they could go to. Insects are also important wildlife.
Having wildflower meadows instead on grass in many places and growing more forests, food forests to feed all.
- Better education
- education and strategies, killing wildlife is not the answer.
- Quit over developing and chasing the animals out of their natural habitat. More education for people on how to coexist.
- We need to respect what wildlife lives in our city. We are in their space. We moved in their territory. We need to respect and love the nature that we infringed on. Please keep the space abs respect for the wildlife. Allowing farm animals in backyards is a big problem.
- Population control. Predator animals are getting out of control in this city. As the natural food sources become scarce the predators are turning to domestic pets for food. They are no longer afraid of humans and see us only as the holder of their lunch. I no longer walk my dogs as I dont feel saf
- Preservation of habitat, education
- Physically constructed barriers should be the only permitted control method to control/block access to areas where their presence is not preferred. No chemical control should be permitted.
- 311 assistance with advice for dealing with these creatures.
- Stop destroying their habitats and forcing them into the city.
- More compassion
- Have a better plan of action for coyotes
- A biodiverse and balanced ecosystem.
- Learning to live with them



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Clearly posted warning signs when danger exists in an area that is open to dogs both on and off leash
- That the city would help remove wild from residents home and relocate them safely
- Removing these animals from the city.
- In general not overly concerned. The city should control if they become too numerous and aggressive. If there is a big wasp outbreak please spray.
- City/bylaw needs to mobilize and be willing to remove skunks, coyotes, wasps, bobcats, etc. animals that are dangerous to family members (small children and pets) must be dealt with. Community members should not be afraid to go outside (walk/backyard) because of these animals in our communities!
- Less intrusion and use of wild spaces by people
- Most of these animals are only found in small numbers and can safely be ignored. Rabbits are however out of control and a plan needs to be put in place to address them.
- Coyote's seem to be more rampant and getting accustomed to humans. They are starting to stalk people walking their pets. My wife had one stalking her and my dog the other week in quarry park by the river.
- Cleaning of trash, mowing greenways will help with unwanted wildlife in mmost of the residential areas.
- Information packages on the animals and their roles in the ecosystem. Education should help us coexist.
- I feel since as humans we are intruding on their territory. Our homes/yards should be as nature friendly as possible without put ourselves or the wildlife at risk. There are things we can do to safely deter wildlife from taking up residence in our homes/yards. We need to educate ourselves!!!!
- Deter them from coming into neighbourhoods but allow them to live in non populated areas such as Fish Creek, Nose Hill Park etc. Education informing people to not leave garbage, food, seeds etc out to attract animals. When one animal increases its predators are sure to follow
- Education forums about how to live with these animals and re program people to see them as a valued part of the ecosystem and not pests. It also seems that reports of these animals that are causing problems do not get taken seriously which further angers people
- Let them exist. Home and pet owners should be aware
- Stop building into their territory. Set up more parks.
- Residents need to take better care of their surroundings...don't leave food out etc . Residents need to understand their surroundings and take adequate steps to co-exist without detriment to wildlife
- Calgarians need to realize that the animals were here first, we stole their homes and land. Be aware, ensure pets and small children are close.
Animals are more scared of humans, keep your distance and humans and animals can live in peace.
- Deers are also a nuisance, and they should not be fed by public. Wee live near Fishcreek park and the number of deers roamong in gardens and street is too high for the surface, and this is caused by the feeding by humans. It is an issue for gardeners and a traffic hazard.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stop destroying natural watering areas and forested areas for development- we have too many dwellings dittingh empty already.
- City is overrun with feral rabbits. thousands around cemetery at MacLeod trail and 34th. Auburn bay over run ... these populations need to be drastically reduced or eliminated.... not native to AB. Wild hare pop can stay...
- Wasp nests should be eradicated when found near public parks and playgrounds, aphids should be treated to limit attracting wasps. Wasps are the largest nuisance our family experiences in Calgary
- I'm not certain. As an owner of a 23lb min dog that frequents off leash parks I'm concerned about the increased sightings and aggressive behavior of coyotes
- More education about the animals, the dangers, but also the benefits they may provide. For example bats aren't nuisances unless they get stuck indoors. They provide natural insect control and are not likely to interact with people or their animals during the day.
- Understanding they were here first and we need to live with them...they have a right to live to
- Coyote control. There are way too many of them in residential area and they are aggressive and dangerous. I have been actively chased by coyotes in multiple different areas of the city while walking on paved pathways. Too many Bobcats now too. Both dangerous and too many around.
- Not enough garbage cans in Midnapore. Food waste is attractive to wildlife.
- More city trash cans cleaned more often wasps scare the heck out of me. A warning system of sorts for bobcats so people know to keep pets indoors. Bat boxes they provide excellent pest control! A city supported system for pigeons so they don't roost in weird places and poop everywhere.
- Information on how to proceed/act in different situations involving wildlife.
- Let em do their thing. Remove problem animals from the population as the need arises. Murder all skunks as they like to chase me.
- To stay away from the animal call animal wildlife for assistance
- Education that coyotes are dangerous. Keep kids and pets away
- education
- Exterminate the Mice, Magpies, Coyotes, Wasps & feral Rabbits.
Remove the Skunks.
The rest of the list are not a problem.
- I think when these animals impact quality of life city officers should intervene. Ie a large magpie nest causing havoc in yard
- Education about their habits and habitats
- Parks and education. But quality of life is key for the community. The ones that are deemed to impact quality of life should be relocated
- Stop robbing the animals of their habitat without giving them an alternative - like 'wildlife corridors'; realize that they were here first and are not on the loose' in a neighbourhood. Offer FREE informational sessions on the habits of the animals so people can learn how to relate to them.
- Ticket people who litter, feed or harass the wildlife.
- Provide education to the public on how to interact or avoid nuisance wildlife.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- People keeping smaller pets indoors or in super cages (allows movement and observation of nature in a safe cage space.) if you choose to live near wildlife be smart and live WITH nature. Be responsible to the animals who used to live where your house is now!!
- I don't believe any wildlife should be considered a nuisance. Proper signage in areas where wildlife is spotted. Instruction for pet owners on how to keep their cats and dogs safe and what to do in the event of an encounter. Maybe literature on safe ways to interact. I am not sure.
- Better pest control measures (specifically magpies and squirrels) to keep the populations in check
- Please, please do something about the feral bunnies in Erlton, they are everywhere, hundreds of them, and they are absolutely ruining everything. These are domestic bunnies, not jack rabbits
- To stop the sprawl of Calgary. Calgary can grow up, and develop more within the borders we already have. We don't need to grow out abs take up more wildlife land.
- First and foremost these animals are not a nuisance. Treat them with respect. Educating people about how to and how not to interact with these animals is the first thing to be done.
- More fenced urban dog parks so you can go play without worry of having a coyote attack
- Providing education when animals are reported in an area, and as much as possible, leaving wildlife alone. Only taking action if the wildlife is an active threat - not merely by its presence (such as coyotes along roadsides, this does not call for action).
- More sanctuary spaces for these animals to safely exist or hide out in
No killing of them
Implementing things like bat houses or bird houses etc
Monitoring them from a distance
- More staff to respond to problems with wildlife.
- Balance with nature. An equilibrium of predators and prey to control populations. I think younger people have an easier time coexisting g than older generations that seem to want to shoot all wildlife in the city.
- Remove coyotes from the nuisance list. Coyotes eat small rodents and help us control rodent population. We can easily co-exist with coyotes by following leash laws, keeping cats indoors and cleaning up after ourselves by not leaving garbage out. How sad coyotes are on your list.
- an appreciation that we share our living spaces with other creatures and that these creatures improve our lives
- Suggestions would be to maybe start with slowing down expansion of neighborhoods without before examining areas to see if better off left as is
- More spraying for mosquitoes and wasps. They need to be killed to reduce their numbers. There's a rule to not kill magpies especially during mating season. Yet they can have eggs right where theres shops and schools. If one attacks me im attacking back. You cannot place a birds life above a humans
- Education improves our ability to co-exist. However moles, pigeons, and raccoons are invasive and should be eradicated.
- Learn to appreciate that Calgary is still a location where wildlife can find habitat and raise offspring. I cannot imagine a community devoid of the animals described in the above list.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Tolerance for wildlife. They are not a nuisance humans are ignorant.
- More information and consistent messages about how to live with them. We have bats, coyotes, porcupines, beavers, deer, etc in our neighbourhood and we need to understand how to live safely with these wildlife.
- I object to the statement above: naturally occurring wild life is certainly not a nuisance and perhaps the problem starts with the city labelling animals as such. Bats a nuisance? All of these animals play a part in the natural ecosystem with the exception of (introduced species) pigeons. Education pls
- May be some dedicated wildlife only areas?
- To understand that most of these animals belong here and we should learn to live along side them
- The ability for homeowners and the city to be able to deal with nuisance wildlife, including removal and euthanization is critical. I point to the situation of the rabbits in Canmore and the racoons in Toronto, where the well being of citizens is being severely impacted due to inadequate control.
- They don't mention beavers that are taking down trees and growing exponentially. There are fines of people remove any park trees. We need to do more population control
- There is no place for nuisance wildlife in an urban setting. The health and safety of citizens, especially children is #1 priority. With increased pandemic concerns we cannot allow wild life that spreads disease and harms people. Coyotes and bobcats are becoming more aggressive and pose a risk.
- This wildlife is not "nuisance" wildlife. As our city expands and the move in on their habitat we are bound to have more encounters. Keep as many park spaces and natural land for them as possible and realize that we are the cause of this problem
- More focus on wildlife corridors through the City.
- city needs to do more about the coyote population. Coyotes are starting to infiltrate urban areas, and making it unsafe for people to walk their pets or have them outside. It is to be expected if you live near a wild area, but having packs of coyotes stroll through residential neighborhoods is bad.
- Stop building outwards, start building upwards. Education. Continue notices of breeding seasons.. Obeying leash laws.....
- Ability to discourage habitation in or near homes - capture dead or alive as they can pose a lot of issues - noise feces infestation home resale problems destructive behaviour towards home exterior n attic etc
- Providing more appropriate homes in park space for these animals, so they less often create homes on property. Not sure if this is realistic, I am thinking specifically of skunks and their love of creating homes under balconies.
- For coyotes specifically, we need a public education objective to teach us what to do when faced with them. What do I do when they approach my dog or myself in a park? what do I do when there is 3 of them? How dangerous are they?
- Respect. They're wild
- pest animals such as skunks and coyotes should be put down in residential areas



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Many of these animals become problems simply from garbage building up in alleyways. More steps need to be taken to remove these problem and toxic food sources. More suitable habitats that will provide escapes for wildlife.
- People need to stop feeding wildlife as it encourages the animals to stay as close as possible to our homes. People also need to stop littering as this encourages wildlife to see our homes as feeding stations.
- Education for people on how to avoid, respect, and if needed, safely interact with wildlife in the city.
- People need to be educated about the wildlife in Calgary. Understanding is key to co-existence. We are encroaching on their habitat and we have to accommodate their existence and right to life. We need keep our pets on a leash when outdoors or inside in areas where/when predators are present.
- Give wildlife lots of room if you see them. Do not feed wildlife. Keeps pets under control at all times
- Wild animals that present a danger to humans and licensed pets should be relocated or destroyed. That includes skunks. Magpies and rabbits are out of control in some areas and need to be destroyed.
- More information provided to residents about the native wildlife in the city.
- Nuisance wildlife should be removed at not cost to the homeowners. There is no place for skunks, coyotes, gophers, bats porcupines in a residential neighbourhood.
- Have more respect for wildlife because after all, they were here first. Build our communities with more green space and if there are certain species in an area, to inform those who live there to expect interactions as part of daily life. We need to protect our ecosystems and show we are caretakers.
- Education is key ie: bats eat so many mosquitos, skunks eat mice and wasps and will leave you alone, some animals that are considered "nuisances" are protected species.
- Coyotes, skunks and Bobcats should not be allowed to live in parks, they should be removed or killed as it is a public safety issue.
- More education to the population. We all need to co-exist. More signage for areas known to have such wildlife.
- better education as none of these creatures are inherently a nuisance.
- Education and empathy. Humans are more of a nuisance to the planet. Most do not want to co-exist with many of those mentioned in the above list and think they should be controlled or eliminated. We have all of these in our community and we get along just fine. Respect your neighbours. All of them.
- People leaving them alone
- The city needs to have some kind of resources to help the homeowner get rid of these unwanted pests.
- Do not allow people to feed rabbits in the City. This helps grow the population which in turn brings in more predators. Deal with the coyote problem with more than a fence and a note in a neighbourhood.
- Cooperation from the city and or fish and wildlife to help the homeowner get rid of these pests at no cost to the homeowner



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- EDUCATION! Educate people about each species. Maybe more web articles shared across social media. Fun family-friendly or adult-only education nights and events. Fundraisers for awareness and donations to protect these species.
- I think it's nice that you are asking for public opinion, but the public at large is not educated in these matters. Please consult wildlife experts about this one, Veterinarians about Vicious Dogs, Ferals, Strays etc. People's opinions, thoughts and feelings should not trump science in any of these.
- Effective measures to trap and exterminate pigeons, large magpie flocks, domestic rabbits that have gone feral.
- I would like there to be a centralized source of information on sightings of potentially dangerous wildlife by area.
- Increased enforcement against individuals who harass wildlife. We are in a shared environment where it is possible to coexist.
- Attempt to keep populations under control by determining viability and survivability of the species.
- Coyotes are a problem in the SW due to fish creek but are increasingly moving into residential areas causing a huge risk to having your dog in your backyard. Or even going for a walk before work.
- Greater education on how to co-exist with the animals we share our space with. No wildlife should be considered a nuisance.
- Education
- Leave them alone, control overly aggressive wildlife.
- Culling of coyotes & skunks in areas where they have frequently caused problems and their numbers exceed one the area can safely sustain without being a nuisance.
- Some animals, such as raccoons are pests which can (and will cause significant damage) and need to be destroyed. Others such as rabbits can multiply to the point where they also cause damage. We live in an urban environment and aggressive animals must be destroyed. Balance is required.
- Awareness. Keeping cats and other small animals indoors.
- Stop expanding the city into their areas and destroying their homes. Educate people better, city people seem to have unnecessary fear of a lot of these animals. Some for sure one needs to be wary. We need to share sightings more we can take precautions for ourselves and our animals.
- Education and actually imposing fines when laws are broken. I am so tired of seeing off leash dogs chase coyotes and other wildlife or people complaining when coyote visits their neighbourhood drawn in by unkempt garbage. We need all these animals for a healthy environment.
- Stop feeding wildlife.
- When your yard is invaded by one or more of these animals, and you have pets, there are surprisingly few (none) resources to help you protect your pets and yard. Animals on the area are great, but we have to have resources when personal property is adversely affected.
- in our neighbourhood I find we co-exist well. I find the problem wildlife is Wasps, and I really hope we can keep Raccoons from getting a foot hold here as they will upset the eco balance. they are not natural to Calgary.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There needs to be more education surrounding the importance and the role these animals play in the ecosystem and how to co-exist. We need to look at humane solution versus trapping/poison or culling.
- Knowledge of how to interact with them, and preventative measures (quickly removing 'roadkill' so it doesn't attract more animals), good garbage removal. Except for wasps - they're jerks - removal of nests when found is definitely a bonus.
- Give wildlife space , dont feed wildlife.
- **RABBITS ARE NOT NUISANCE ANIMALS!** Calgarians' must learn to coexist with all animals that call Calgary home. If they wish to deter them from their household area then they must be educated on **HUMANE** and **NON LETHAL** ways
- **KNOWLEDGE!** Calgarians need to be aware of the role of these animals in the ecosystem and the common behaviours these animals exhibit. We are infringing on their habitat. We live near Fish Creek and have many of the “nuisance” animals come through our yard with no negative consequences.
- If the sign says 'coyote den stay away' people should stay away. If they get too close and the coyote attacks them or their dog, the coyote should not be destroyed. It was the humans fault and 100% preventable. This was their lands first and we invaded them, just like the First Nations.
- Better education, and website information on what to do if you are affected negatively by any of these. I haven't had any problems, but presuming one can always call 311.
- More signs if there has been an issue and other then that leave the wild life wild.
- Stop continually expanding the city limits & encroaching into their space. Harsh punishment for people that feed wildlife/leave garbage that attracts them. Relocation/culls of wildlife if necessary to control if they are truly a nuisance.
- Coyote are a pack hunter and pose a danger to small children and pets, city should be removing them to areas outside the city.
- Education, the animals were here first and we need to learn to live with them. Learning how not to attract nuisance animals, how to deal with them when you see them, not letting your pet off leash. People need more info on who to contact for different animals.
- Public information on how to deal with nuisance wildlife. Stricter bylaws being enforced about those who are irresponsible with their garbage as that's what attracts most of the wildlife
I personally don't have a problem with Magpies, crows, or rabbits.
- Culling populations of dangerous nuisance wildlife. Coyotes roaming my area has started to become the norm, not the exception and it's not good.
- Education campaigns!
Better lighting in high traffic wildlife areas, and signage for those who may not be local to the area, denoting the presence of wildlife.
- Not sure. This question would be easier to answer if you provided some examples or ideas on how things could be improved
- We have invaded THEIR territory. It's up to US to adapt.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Bat houses should be encouraged, to fight mosquitos. Backyard chickens should be encouraged, since they're omnivores, and will help control mice. We should be allowed to trap and kill the rabbits and squirrels. They make it very difficult to garden.
- Stop removing their habitat and forcing them into ours
- Bylaw against feeding nuisance wildlife. Neighbor feeds the squirrels, they come burry their stashes in my yard, putting divits all over the backyard that I bought specifically so that my kids could run around and play, now they trip. Then magpies decend to eat the stashes and poop EVERYWHERE
- We as people have taken over in the animals territories. And they want to live, so increasing awareness for people of how to not attract these critters.
Kill all the wasps, but try to peacefully coexist with everything else.
- Not feeding wildlife, excluding bird feeders that have protective cages around them to prevent squirrels, magpies, and crows to access feed. Encourage homeowners to call information to access how to deal with nuiance wildlife. Have more engaging and effective by-law/wildlife officers.
- Help with removal of skunks from property. Have lived in Calgary for 44 years and have only seen skunks in the past 3-5 years. What has changed?
- Have more habitation available so the animals have less opportunity to travel into urban areas. Have more regulations to ensure food sources are not readily available so there is less desire to inhabit developed areas
- Let us use pellet guns on crows, magpies and seagulls. the rest are no harm.
Also, ""Newsflash"", Wasps are insects, not 'wildlife'... [personal information removed]
- Have a dedicated hotline to give guidance for understanding of the species and if needed humane methods of relocation/deterrance or have professionals who specialize in humane methods come out to help.
- More waste receptacles in parks and on pathways. Signage in parks and on pathways. Education on cohabitation with wildlife.
- Let them be. It was their home first. If a larger animal becomes problematic it should be humanely relocated! Not killed!!!!!!
- Easy access to information about the various types of wildlife. Maybe signage on trails on how to interact with that wildlife. Recommended methods to remove them if they are in your home/yard. The impacts poor human behaviour has on the wildlife.
- Education on the specific dealings with those animals.
- A massive cull of coyotes. Allow bow hunting on nose Hill for coyotes for a select time frame. Allow more beekeepers to reduce the wasps.
- having proper information to deter these animals form being on or near their property
- For the city to provide more support regarding problem animals (capture, relocation etc)
- City should pick up skunks and replac in woods. Way to many skunks in communities now. Dangerous wildlife ie coyotes..wolfs, wildcats etc should not be allowed to roam streets, access homes. Need to be removed from areas.
- Public education on co-existing with wildlife and using ethical forms of wildlife control before heavy handed ones. change our behaviour, is control necessary, what is the goal/how to monitor, are we



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

using humane methods, consider community values, long term plan/ prevention, rushed "pest" labeling

- Stop being stupid and just co-exist. Bigger brains would improve the ability because people wouldn't be as stupid and selfish.
- More education of the public so that people learn to coexist with wildlife and to understand the benefits wildlife provides.
- Better enforcement of bylaws relating to outdoor cats, leashes on dogs. More education regarding coyotes and Bobcats to minimize negative interactions, and to instill an understanding that it is the owner's responsibility to keep their pets safe.
- Larger undeveloped areas for wildlife so they aren't forced into urban areas as much. Stricter rules about garbage storage so there isn't a food source for them.
- You should add deer to the list. They eat plants etc that people have put in their gardens. Little buggers! LOL Also, we had a bear in the Lk Bonavista area many years ago, add them to the list. Really though, I think that skunks, raccoons, coyotes are the ones to worry about.
- Stop expanding into rural areas.
- prevent of leash dogs from harassing wildlife
- Signage and alerts about sightings of certain animals, for example if coyotes are present in an area. This allows dog owners to take proper precautions
- Homeowners need to pick up feces as coyotes eat them, this scent draws them into backyards and parks.

Coyote areas need to be marked with signage. Warning need to go up when they are becoming a danger to pets and people. This is the coyotes home , killing or culling don't work. Maybe catching col

- Reducing attractants, such as garbage and compost bins left outside. Many houses have no ability to keep the attractants indoors so either it needs to be picked up more often, or the containers should be more wildlife proof.
- The ability to call animal services if any of the above enter your yard or hinder the community. I am experiencing a problem walking dogs in parks where regretrfully coyotes and bobcats have had to migrate to. I respect this but it is also a safety for a person walking if the pack comes at you
- Education and tips. The answer is not to go around eradicating everything.
- Wildlife was here first. I am still outraged on how the injured deer was handled by police in Lethbridge. Yes accidents happen but a designated agency or Vet must be available 24/7 to properly euthenized a injured animal. Anyone not reporting should be fines. It's a new way of thing but it's the kin
- More awareness. This is a weird list of wildlife -- do we have any choice but to co-exist with wasps? Problem animals need to be dealt with, leave the others alone.
- Educate the public. What and how to limit our exposure to the larger of these. How to dissuade the animals from being a nuisance ie: quite feeding them (mice,squirrels)
- Leave them alone.. I enjoy spotting them



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- More education on how we live with those animals in a mutually beneficial way. Make sure people are not using poison to kill wildlife.
- People need to be aware that wildlife is a fact of life. Don't approach, don't try to pat -- leave them alone!
- Population control (coyotes only). Coyotes have injured / killed more people than wolves / cougars / bears in Canada, not a lot of people but people should be aware.
- Controls on waste (such as eliminating open dumpsters) would limit the continual reinforcement scavengers get in populated neighbourhoods. Leaving pets unattended in yards leaves them at risk to predators.
- Changing the designation from a negative connotation, nuisance wildlife, to urban wildlife. All these animals perform important functions in nature, including an urban environment. Understanding the needs and value of urban wildlife is critical. This understanding is achieved through education.
- Education on how to identify certain types of wildlife and which could be potentially harmful. Reminders to keep pets leashed/indoors and safe.
- The number of coyotes in the city needs to be limited. Coyotes should be allowed in the major parks such as Nose Hill or Carburn. When coyotes stray into residential areas they need to be controlled as they can be a hazard to pets.
- Education! Why don't you put on your "Coyotes in the Area" signs that breeding season is Nov - Feb with Feb being the highest time and to give them space because they don't have many brains left come February due to hormones driving their lives for a few months?? People really have no idea
- Our neighbour keeps pigeons in his backyard and is registered with the pigeon association so bylaw can't do anything about it. We have a disgusting amount of pigeon droppings in our backyard and we know it is not from other birds as the pigeon racing has ran out the natural birds we used to have.
- I called about a coyote in the park by my inner city house and was told nothing could be done. How about relocation.
- Allowing more wild spaces within the city, education. Assistance through the city for non-lethal relocation of animals on property.
- Prohibit feeding wildlife, which encourages them to breed and stay in locale (ie. leaving peanuts for squirrels, leaving domestic animal food outside like bowls of dog/cat food). Actively track down and fine those who do.
- Manage the populations of the various animals. Example: Rabbits. As the rabbit population in the city increases so does the appearance of predators such as bobcats and coyotes. Pets such as small dogs and cats can also end up on the predators menu within the city.
- I have no issues with any of these nuisance wildlife.
- Better understanding on what to do when faced with them and options for if those ideas fail.
- Relocation of animals that are a threat to humans and pets.
- Respect the wildlife, in that they are here before us. We are violating their space. Do not allow any chasing or annoyance of any of the above mentioned wildlife.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

These are not nuisance: they are a part of nature, and we need to co-exist with them.

- Fining people heavily who feed them. Our neighbours use peanuts. This attracts a lot of squirrels. They destroy my garden. I do not think bats are a nuisance. Educate people on bat houses. And help install them. I can't get high enough safely to install mine.
- Educate people on avoiding encounters, and leave them alone.
- EDUCATION! People living in neighborhoods near parks desperately need to be educated that it is NOT ok to let their dogs chase/kill wildlife (esp. Nose Hill/Egerts Park). They need to be educated on the circle of life eg. Killing rabbits causes depletion of Coyote's food and puts pets at more risk!
- I believe we should be able to coexist unless safety to humans is a concern. Most often Bobcats and coyotes will leave people alone. Bats help curb insects so not sure why they made the list. Unless there is an extreme over population of any species or there is a danger let the animals be
- Public safety is very important. Providing education and methods to controls the pests.
- Ensuring proper vegetation in park areas to keep wildlife there and not force them to roam within the neighborhood
- Have relocation services available.
- Bats are not nuisances, they are essential members of our eco system. The only legitimate nuisances on your list are seagulls and wasps, which cause harm to native species and compete with less bothersome species. Educate the public and instruct them not to interact with wildlife.
- Education of the public. They must learn how to understand the habits of and live with wildlife. They must also be educated as to how to live safely with wildlife.
- Stop endless development of new communities which encroach into the habitats of these animals. These animals are not nuisances. They play important roles in the ecosystem, bats and wasps eat mosquitoes and pests. Crows, magpies, porcupines, raccoons, skunks and coyotes are carrion eaters.
- Ability to trap, kill and or dispose of nuisance wildlife.
- As we encroach into their lives we need to respect their right to life, habitat and food. Calgarians need education and awareness programs via schools and media. Heavy fines for feeding these creatures.
- The number of coyotes need to be kept to minimal numbers. there are far to many and are a threat to pets and small children. They are everywhere including in my neighbours and my own backyard. One was stocking my small dog in the backyard. Also found 2 half eaten cats along the walking path
- Skunks are a HUGE problem in this city.
Ive never experienced anything like it elsewhere in Canada.
I haven't the slightest idea how to take care of it but, something has to happen.
- Some bats may be endangered, so educate people that they must be protected. Seagulls are considered migratory birds, and cannot be harmed. Make sure your City policies align with higher levels of regulation. All the animals on that list have a place in the ecosystem, leave the alone.
- Calgarians need to be better informed on the habits and needs of wildlife that are in urban spaces. Personally, I don't consider these types of wildlife to be nuisances any more than some of my human neighbors..



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Signs to alert calgarians in areas of higher density wildlife. They live here too, encourage the idea that we could coexist well. And protect greenspaces and wild areas in the city where many of these creatures call home.
- None listed are nuisance. When mice in my house I blocked their entrance point, trapped the ones inside, never a problem since. I see coyotes crows magpies rabbits squirrels wasps regularly. I give them their space and they leave me alone. Solution: Leave them alone. Need them for our well being.
- Support from the city if wildlife provides issues in family property. Help removing a skunk
- Education for those who didn't grow up here. For example, don't approach a skunk. Or how to hang bird feeders to avoid squirrels or magpies. Or how to take care of an aphid problem so your garden doesn't attract wasps. For those who grew up with different animals, they wouldn't know
- Leaving their habitat alone
- Yes, signs need to be posted to advise people of what wildlife can be in the area so they can be aware and no surprises. Also, animals have the right to roam about and can appear anywhere so that cannot be controlled. Calgarians should be aware of this.
- Education on how to coexist with wildlife. If not desired education on how to make yards and homes less attractive for wildlife.
- We need to learn to live with the wildlife that we have disrupted their habitat with expanding our city. Keep the city cleaner and not leave garbage out. Keep your cats and other pets under watch so they don't become prey.
- No change required.
- Corridors for these animals to travel within the City. Easy to find information on how to co-exist and/or interact with these animals along with tips on how to avoid attracting them. Resources on how relocate if they become a problem.
- Pulling their entitled heads out of their butts and realizing the animals are just trying to survive.
- We have experience with unwanted rodents in our homes. As long as we provide information for our tenants to ensure doors are closed and they doing what is required to prevent rodents from entering the home that is all we can do. We just have to make our home less desirable than others...
- It could be better for everyone to keep more nature intact, to preserve the environment.
- People need to become more tolerant. It's possible to co-exist and they need to need educated that there are benefits to living with wildlife
- I think the city should help with relocation of these animals.
- In some cases, nuisance wildlife must be controlled. For example, my neighbourhood is overrun with rabbits. They frequent my vegetable garden and I'm thus concerned about the health effects of eating these vegetables.
- An understanding that we encroach on their land. We shouldn't kill or resent them just for wanting to survive.
- Bobcats and coyotes are now a danger to our pets in our own yards. Can something be done proactively to dissuade them from coming to residential neighbourhoods. They no longer fear humans and are therefore dangerous



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- People HAVE to quit feeding wildlife. Attracts all types till feel like a zoo. The residual impact on others is horrible. Wrecked decks, plants, skunk spray, lawns due up as wildlife feel like they are in a kitchen. Attracts bad species like starlings, magpies.
- Stop invading on the animals' habitat and if you do encounter them you should leave them alone. We are encroaching on their territory, not the other way around. Things that would help are keeping your dog on a leash when in regular parks and realizing that you risk running into wildlife.
- Education on the animals: how they live, why they are where they are
- Educate people on how to stay away from them, how to deal with them safely and remind people that we are growing in their area.
- Education. I feel like some people just are not educated on HOW to properly co-exist with these animals. Coyotes are a big one, especially when it comes to smaller pets. This kind of comes back to people letting cats roam free, if they didn't roam, they wouldn't come into issues with cats.
- Less Development and more natural spaces. People should encourage cohabitation in a health way. You can use bat houses and other things to help control where these animals set up house.
- Education. I don't see any of these species as nuisances, especially bobcats and coyotes. All of these are wild animals, and we just need to learn what to do and what not to do to be safe with them and enjoy them. I hope I can see a bobcat some day!
- Education is most important for any of this. Most people don't know the correct way to deal with these animals. Also wasps are horrible and I would be happy if they all died and were replaced by nice pleasant bees.
- Education on how to co-exist
- More natural spaces reducing the amount of manicured areas. Stop mowing grass along paths and respecting them as the natural habitats of the area and us humans as the invaders
- The city needs to be more vigilant when it comes to complaints about wildlife like coyotes. In the countryside coyotes do not interact with people and pets. They keep their distance. There is no reason for this to be happening in the city.
- Proper waste disposal (ie using bins and not leaving trash in bags)
- we have so many skunks in and around our yard it's more than a nuisance. The coyotes in the neighbourhood are also very bold and there are tons of rabbits. too many of all of these. wish the city could control the populations.
- Gophers, mice, pigeons, porcupines, racoons, seagulls, skunks, squirrels, rabbits, wasps, should be kept in control and culled in different years. Coyotes and bobcats only show up when it is a bad year to hunt in the wild but need to be watched
- Education online and in the community (can be community specific issues) on value of species; how to tolerate species; what they can and can't do themselves for control; what the city will / won't, can / can't do; how to manage property to reduce negative encounters
- People having more common sense and NOT feeding wildlife. Not allowing their pets to antagonize wildlife.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Let the wildlife live in their spaces and in our spaces, as we have taken over their territory. Locks on garbage bins so the animals cannot get into them. Clean up your space so that there is nothing that attracts animals to your property. Have your pets on harness and leash under supervision.
- The humans involved should recognize that all of the above animals are just trying to live their lives, and deserve the respect to be allowed to do so within the bounds of parks.
- Stopping urban sprawl so their habitat is undisturbed. Ensuring all garbage containers are secured (and no, the plastic carts we have aren't secure), and ensuring that all garbage spilled by collection trucks is picked up, to prevent habituation to human food sources.
- I don't think they are a nuisance. We have to share the space.
- Improved management of offleash dog parks where coyotes have approached owners/dogs. It seems it is reported and the city just puts up a sign, which does nothing to help. Relocate wildlife if they start to become aggressive to pets/owners. Worried it's a matter of time until something serious happens
- Ensure that wildlife has suitable natural habitats and that there are clear humane policies for dealing with problem wildlife.
- Education and awareness, maintaining city cleanliness, securing garbage and other animal attractants, giving wildlife space and relocating only when necessary
- Destroying crows and magpies. They are very vicious especially in the spring. Coyotes need to be relocated from the panorama hills area
- Education on benefits of animals - particularly for non-predatory animals listed above, like bats. Also, effective methods to not encourage nuisance wildlife on your property (e.g., wasp deterrents, low feeders for mice, squirrels, pigeons and magpies, garbage for raccoons and porcupines)
- -the city should be removing nuisance wildlife from homes and yards but allow them to exist in parks
- Maybe tips on how to deal with them and how to discourage them from becoming a threat or problem. Ex. How do I deal with skunks?? Is there anything to discourage magpies coming around? Who can we call to help? Etc.
- teach people especially children how to respect wildlife and behave when they see wildlife. Who to call if there is a problem with the wildlife
- Residents need to be more aware of the possible wildlife (all of them) that may be living or accessing their residential area. Keep your pets properly protected. If there is a possibility of confrontation pet owners must be thinking ahead of it and watch their pets!
- Removing them if they are acting aggressively. Alerting people if there are coyotes around. Telling people to stay clear of an area if they have babies.
- Education on how to live with urban wildlife. I've heard horrific stories of pellet guns or inhumane traps with intent to injure/kill wildlife, which could injure essential wildlife, or even children or pets. Option of municipal assistance to relocate problem animals would also be beneficial.
- Humane trapping and release when they are in harms way or a harm to others



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- More education and better understanding of these species. It is inevitable to have them in the city and trying to eliminate them is not the solution, People need to learn to live with them and behave accordingly. They are not nuisance and can actually be helpful
- Providing wild spaces for animal habitats, education on animal attractors and deterrents, education on appropriate human/animal interactions, and recognizing that we share the spaces with wildlife.
- We need to stop expanding our city boundaries into the wildlife areas. As we continue to encroach into their space we limit the space they can survive and thrive in. Then the animal is destroyed for coming into our area. Stop expanding out and start building up. We are the problem
- Public education! Not feeding wildlife. Keeping garbage locked up. So forth. Letting coyotes, skunks, etc exist peacefully.
- Don't feed them. Keep garbage in containers.
- Keeping enough wild spaces for them to be in. Public education on how to be safe around them
- Educate people so that they don't leave out food, garbage that attracts wild animals, don't let cats and dogs roam free, train humans to share the space in cities with wild animals
- I am an animal lover but also grew up on a farm and understand the science of population explosion. The City is out of control in that it does not do "culls" of many wild animals. They need to eliminate and reduce the numbers of coyotes, magpies, bobcats, rabbits and crows in the city.
- More corridors for said wildlife and education to the public regarding how best to manage interactions with wild life.
- Trap and release out of core areas
- I think calling animals native to this area "nuisance animals" to begin with is an issue. I think public education about cohabitating properly and demonstrate how to avoid attracting these animals to your home would improve wildlife/human interactions.
- pigeons wanting to nest in peoples houses provide a lot of damage and should be culled. never have had a problem with the rest.
- The city needs to take care of parks and green spaces that are near homes. By allowing weeds and natural grasses to grow out of control it provides places where mice, moles, gophers, rabbits can live. This in turn draws in other predators which may be dangerous to pets and people.
- Education on appropriate behavior (e.g. how to behave on encounters, preferred habitats, do not feed, garbage management, stay on trails in natural areas, keep pets away from wildlife), incentivising natural and permaculture backyards instead of lawns.
- Education on animal behaviour, how they are beneficial and not going to cause harm, and how to avoid conflicts. le not leaving food or things around that are beneficial for animals to nest or den in (unless they are prepared to share their space with the animals).
- Allowing the animals space to coexist with humans. Pet owners need to take responsibility for their pets and makes sure they are not put in harms way and encounters with wildlife.
- Population control of crows and magpies. Better relocation options for rodents and such. If people could borrow live traps and be given assistance in relocating animals to designated places, that would be great!
- secure a fence where they're often seen to prevent accidents or incidents from happening.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It is important to distinguish what are wildlife that present a risk to the community and pets (coyotes, bobcats, etc...) and those that are just a inconvenience. Risks should be dealt with but others people just need to deal with
- Wasps must die.
Skunks should be rehomed to the country.
Gophers/moles should be managed so that they do not destroy our parks with holes everywhere.
I'm good with implementing coyote management protocols - although not quite sure how you would do that. Can't set traps.
- Do not allow anyone to harm them, poison any animal, or kill any of them. If there is a large population that is harmful towards kids, animals etc then bring in a team to relocate BUT NO ONE SHOULD BE HARMING
- Out of the above list I only consider mice, moles, pigeons, seagulls, gophers, and wasps a nuisance. Large predators are a danger, so relocation is an option. Wasps are the biggest nuisance, but I don't know how to get rid of them.
- education on prevention, management and what to do during encounters
- Stronger penalties and more enforcement for people seeking excessively close and unsafe interactions. Heightened respect for animals primacy
- Less food attractants.
- Informing the public what value these animals bring to the city by dispelling the myth that these animals are "nuisances". Reminding the public that we are in THEIR space and must make accommodations
- Teach children how cool they are while also teaching respect and safety.
- Educate the public about leaving these animals alone. Leaving them alone will reduce the risk of bites and negative animal interaction
- Change in attitude. The world belongs to all living creatures. It only requires minor adaptations to accommodate wildlife. Please remove the word NUISANCE. It sends a negative message. More education is needed for the public.
- Pigeons, wasps and rabbits are the only ones I have encountered. I am not aware of current methods of control and do not have the level of knowledge to make comments in this area.
- To start with to stop referring to all the above animals as nuisance wildlife in Calgary. Education will also be key to having them live alongside us.
- I have had no problem with wildlife. They are less of a problem than irresponsible pet owners.
- Educate the public. The animals are not always at fault when the interaction goes bad. The public is uneducated and has little understanding how wildlife behave.
- The city should learn to respect the wildlife area as well. We are busy just building away new communities with no respect for the wildlife, where do you expect them to go?
- I don't have any problem co-existing with them. Keeping areas clean cuts down on the food and housing opportunities. I'd love to see more bat boxes.
- More fully sealed garbage cans (the large metal brown ones) instead of open/flap containers - to keep from attracting that wildlife



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- More education - many of these 'nuisance' animals actually provide a service to us. For example, coyotes help keep the rodent population under control! Many of the birds help eat garbage and roadkill. And they do it all for free! And...they were here first.
- Living near NoseHill park we always expect some sort of wildlife to cross our paths.
- Penalties for people who poison/kill any of the so called nuisance wildlife. People should be educated on how minimize interaction with these creatures if they do not want them on their property, such as properly storing food attractions. Tolerance of these animals should be encouraged.
- Animals such as bobcats, coyotes, bats, porcupines, and raccoons should be trapped and relocated well outside the city. I can't even walk safely in my own neighborhood without being concerned about the presence of some of these animals, particularly coyotes and bobcats. They don't need to be killed.
- Making sure all garbage is properly covered and disposed of to prevent it from attracting wildlife. That's about it. We moved into their territory. They have a right to be in ours
- Cull the magpies and non-native rabbits
- leave them alone but don't dictate to homeowners what they can and cannot do on their own property regarding them
- Able to kill certain species.
- More education of the public is required. Officers should be patrolling parks speaking at community gatherings like festivals monthly meetings post in newsletters. Eg walking dogs on retractable leashes in areas where coyotes den. Cats are still often allowed outside
- Education on dealing with and deterring wildlife from the home
- I think wildlife in the city is important, but I am concerned about the number and boldness of the coyotes. There is general signage on their whereabouts, but I would prefer to know exactly where their dens are to avoid them. They shouldn't ever be allowed to den in off leash parks.
- Foremost education. Second, How to coexist peacefully if this occurs there needs to be understanding that their home probably displaced the animal. Who to contact quickly/easily for information. Hold workshops to learn about local animals. Parks Canada has pop ups in parks to educate-people enjoy it
- Keep garbage put away no bags left out and dumpster areas kept clean all back lanes should be checked by bylaw to that people aren't dumping stuff This would prevent habitat for the skunks Or coyote looking for food
- Education and the knowledge on how to deter wildlife from property
- Education regarding coexistence without threatening the welfare and survival of urban wildlife. They were here first!
- People not feeding wildlife, in carburn park, fish creek I constantly see people bring or toss food for deer and birds food and they become dependent. Also signage indicating "do not feed, "warning coyotes in areas," inform people when they may be in a park where there may be for porcupines.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Thin out the coyote population in parks. At Carburn Park we have witnessed 3 coyotes trying to take down 3 deer together at the same time. Our neighbours have been stalked by coyotes while walking their dogs.
Magpies, keep garbage bins closed-less food or trap them. Citizens safety should be priority
- I can't put much faith in people being willing to do anything of the sort.
- Monitoring of dangerous animals in the area. Also dogs on leash in provincial parks.
- Proper garbage and attractant education. Realize that the animals are evolving and learning to coexist with humans and humans need to learn how to avoid behaviors that cause conflicts. Human's need to be educated on animal behavior.
- Have people not leave garbage out and available to wildlife. This is their home too.
- Provide a sign with a number for whoever to call around areas where wildlife is most. Preferably they are all kept alive and people are just more educated about wildlife if they are headed to an area where wildlife inhabit.
- I disagree that people living in the city should have to co-exist with the wildlife especially large animals. It is our fault they are encroaching on our property because the city builds out instead of up. They are better off in the wild where it is natural for them to hunt what lives there.
- NO POISONING OF THEM to unfair to the ecosystem
- Education. While driving around I watched an elderly woman try to put a cayote in her vehicle as she thought it was a wounded dog lol
- Education on all these animals. And stop labelling them with "nuisance", live and let live.
- Increased funding to wildlife rescue and rehabilitation and greater education to people who are likely to interact with wildlife
- Education. None of these are nuisance. Humans are the only legitimately nuisance animal.
- Education. I don't think people understand why/how wild life benefit us. A better understanding of safety precautions to coexist safely.
- Heavily fining people for leaving garbage strewn all over and inappropriately feeding wildlife. Stop the glut of needless Housing development encroaching on their land.
- Trap and release or removal of them especially dangerous ones to pets and children
- Better enforcement of bylaws against people letting their pets harass wildlife. For example, dogs running loose in the non off-leash areas in Nose Hill chasing deer and coyotes.
I do not consider any wildlife to be a nuisance.
More public education is needed on how to better coexist with wildlife
- Any dangerous animals, such as coyotes need to be removed. The people who allow them to stay will be held criminally responsible if anyone should ever lose a child due to an attack.
- Laws to protect wildlife.
- Reduce available sources human food to wildlife, ie reduce or better secure trash, reduce feeding of wildlife.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- City limit is pushed out again & again. The living environment for wild lifes are getting worse & worse. Don't let wild life living situation worsen. Give Calgarian enough education how to co-exist with these wildlifes. Protect wild life as setting up fence for coyotes in Arbour lake last summer.
- just ignore them. let nature be.
- Create throughfare for transitory animals. Greater responsibility in garbage disposal areas - cleanliness to not attract wildlife.
- People need to do what they can to prevent & decrease encounters with wildlife - keep their pets inside, on a leash, fenced off, & under supervision. They also need to manage garbage & recycling properly.
- A city funded task force locating, and monitoring, and providing assistance to Calgarians. Providing a space for these animals to live is a requirement of living in their world. We need to do it safely
- Need more educations, and harsher punishment for cruelty towards wildlife. Make people very aware if they are moving into an area on the edge of the city that there is native wildlife and that is a risk they are willing to take.
- Yes, they were here first. Stop listening to urbanites who don't understand that.
- Educate people on how to minimize the risk of pet interaction with wildlife.
Participate in local events with an educational and interactive booth/display/area that helps teach people about these animals, their behaviours, and how their existence benefit the environment.
- More control of prey population to help curb rising numbers of predators. Coyotes don't only pose threats to small pets but also to young children. They can get into yards and threaten children playing in parks
- Wildlife are not becoming aggressive or overly brave in human environments or with household pets
- Education.
- Not referring to these as nuisances. We moved into their territory and are increasingly encroaching due to suburban sprawl. Change your mindset.
- Better education to help citizens understand the beautiful relationship wild animals can have within our communities and how to co-exist peacefully.
- The notion of "nuisance" wildlife is ridiculous. They are just wildlife. How are deer, bears, cougars not on this list. The natural areas of Calgary should be enhanced and restored to natural habitat as much as possible and Human/Wildlife education be increased.
- Actually co-exist would be a good starting point. They're not a nuisance if you don't leave food/garbage/etc available for them. 9 times out of 10 the animal isn't the problem
- Better knowledge about the animals, we are in their space not the other way around.
- Could be improved.
- we should be more respectful of the animals that we're encroaching upon. Do more to protect them.
- Ignore them and be responsible humans. Clean up garbage to not attract, keep a close eye on your dog if outside and obey signs that may warn of recent sightings. Know your surroundings and that wildlife could be around, so just use common sense to work with that concept that they were here first.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- please do something about the domestic rabbits that were released, even if its to trap neuter and return them so they dont keep breeding with the wild population.
- People need to start respecting that we live near the mountains and humanity has taken so many homes away from wildlife! We can easily co exist as long as there is respect and common sense. I think the wildlife needs more right than they have. TRAPS, LEG TRAPS AND SNARES should be ILLEGAL!
- If an area is over run the removal of such animals
- Limiting further encroachment on land where these animals live
- Better education and way more provincial park rangers!!
- No food or garbage on the ground. They should be disposed of in garbage containers.
- Education
- Probably just education. I've never had an issue with any of the animals.
- Education
- More education. I like the team that goes to parks to educate dog owners on wildlife. Educate dog owners that letting small dogs loose in coyote prone areas, even the backyard, is not wise. The City also needs to remove problematic & habituated coyotes. Or reduce populations.
- Focus City interest and response to predators - bobcats and coyotes as the have a clear and present danger to Calgarians. The rest can be handle by Pest Control companies
- I love how humans and wild life coexist in my neighborhood. No concerns
- I'm sorry, but I don't want to co-exist with wasps or bats! If people weren't feeding some of these creatures there probably wouldn't be as many nuisance animals around. ex: bird seed doesn't just attract birds, but mice, gophers, squirrels then, hawks, bobcats...its all a food chain.
- Education, learning compassion young.
- Information about cool it is that we live in a city with so much wildlife. Info in the animals themselves (many of those I don't consider nuisance). What to deter, if someone does see them as a nuisance.
- Population control for bobcats. We used to have 1/2 in the south fish creek area but the population is growing. This year we saw one mom with 3 kits and one with 2 kits. That more than doubles the population we usually see. They are now coming into yards to kill pets. It is stressful for pet owners.
- Responsible waste management, including litter prevention measures and litter clean-up to reduce wildlife scavenging opportunities. designated protected areas/parks to provide safe habitats. Wildlife associate with humans because of habitat destruction and because we leave food waste everywhere.
- If people didn't feed any of them! You put out bird seed, yhen you have mice, gophers and squirrels, then hawks, owls, bobcats, etc...Feeding attracts not just what you intend it for
- Public education around co-existence, respect and importance of the environment. With urban sprawl where are these animals supposed to live? We have taken away their homes and land to live on. Interesting that you call these animals nuisance wildlife... maybe we are the nuisance.
- Education! It's awesome we have so much wildlife in the City!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education. These are all wild animals and many people do not understand that relocating or killing these animals is, in many cases, not the right thing to do.
- More public education on habits, needs & challenges faced by each of these species would give understanding & empathy for these creatures.
- Education. I watch the coyotes at the end of my street play in the field and hunt every day. But everyone I know fears them. A few simple precautions and we can coexist happily. They've never even looked at my dog, but everyone fears for the safety of their dogs.
- off leash rules need to be enforced. Education about how we can minimize conflict with our pets and how to reduce attractants on property
- Create or leave existing wildlife areas intact where these species can flourish regardless of our designation of these animals as pests. We need more connectivity with wild areas and wildlife
- Keeping a clean city with no garbage to be scavenged can help with certain nuisance wildlife, many we have to coexist with.
- Open hunting seasons for these animals - they are not things to 'co-exist' with inside city limits but rather they are pests.
- Maybe if the organic trash bin was stronger and had a lock, they wouldn't try to eat in our houses
- Education. Education for Cougar Ridge residents has already helped. Awareness and education so that we can all coexist and not be in too much danger.
- Education, a website on what to do. They don't seem like nuisance animals to us - there was a bobcat on our street and people were super pleased, everyone just kept pets indoors.
- Make it illegal to use poison outside. We had a family of beautiful little weasels that would temporarily take up residence under our front step and they would clear up all the mice in the area. Someone put out mouse poison, which also killed their natural predator.
- Coexist with wildlife and leave it alone unless they are setting up home on your property or in your yard. You should be able to have the right to call wildlife or remove nesting wildlife from your property.
- None of these are nuisance animals any more than we are! All except pigeons are native species in a healthy biodiverse ecological system. People must be educated to understand the ecological role each animal plays and learn to live alongside wildlife. Bats control mosquitoes, coyotes control rodents
- Education. During the Lougheed years when I went to elementary school we learned about indigenous species as part of our science and nature unit. This helped me understand as an adult their role and how to behave around them. Also signs for coyote and bobcat sightings on the paths etc
- They should relocate shrinks and coyote.
- Wildlife management.
Natural deterrents.
One department responsible, without passing the buck back and forth between Community Standards and AB Wildlife.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs on leash outside of specific dog parks. Increasing urban wildlife corridors to allow animals to pass through the city without crossing major roadways. Education to the public on the minimal threat these animals cause.
- Find humanizing ways to defer coyotes away from off leash dog parks.
- Its more on the home owners and animal owners they are beautiful i love seeing the wildlife around however i keep my property clean of garbage, keep my yard clean after my dogs, and when i see wildlife i dont approach or bother them. If you antagonize the wildlife thats not them.keeps cats inside
- Coyotes and bobcats have been an issue this year in our neighborhood. Lots or rabbits around. People should be made aware of the issues with signs at the entrance to parks at minimum. Pet owners should keep their animals under control as much as possible to protect their animals and the wildlife.
- Continue to invest in public natural spaces so that wildlife can coexist without getting squeezed into places that get them into trouble with some humans. People need to be accountable for keeping their own spaces, children, pets safe from threats - it's not wildlife's responsibility to avoid them.
- Better public awareness and significantly improved trash pickup. The city garbage trucks in my neighbourhood often leave large portions of the bin scattered around the alley, which sometimes include bones and meat that attract animals.
- Humans must curb behaviour, learn and teach respect, not fear or feed them. Pets to be controlled and kept away, not walked or left in yards as fodder for wildlife. Maintain yards, trash, gardens accordingly.
- The city could maintain parkland, including wild, natural areas. The city could offer advice on how to deal with wildlife that encroaches on private land. I have a nest of skunks under my shed. If I closed off their entry point once they are gone, they might not return.
- I think controlling the factors that make the animals move into the city, like food and garbage left out. Containing our sprawling footprint that encroaches on wildlife habitats might help.
- In Lake Bonavista, one should not let pets outside our they'll get eaten by Bobcats. When this does happen it's the pet owners fault. While we may consider them a nuisance we have to coexist. Common sense and proper bylaws should prevail. Perhaps ward specific regulation about pets?
- Warnings to pet owners that in areas are close to green space to work with animals. Education on how to trap, discourage and remove above noted pests.
- Information and resources on deterrent or relocation measures
- I think we're in their habitat so to coexist pet owners need to take more precautions (in cases of predators) like not allowing their dogs off leash in known wildlife areas. I had a bat issue once & there was no one to call to help me! Ended up talking to someone in Red Deer who only advised.
- Problem prevention education, easier to access (and more willing to help staff) resources to remove problem situations such as skunks instead of leaving it to the homeowner
- Tougher regulations on open garbage cans, more accountability from food providers to ensure outdoor areas do not have food, maybe a law and some enforcement against feeding wildlife. More public outreach on the animals and how to deal with them



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Add a different category to reflect that some of the above species can be both beneficial and a nuisance. For example, many bats in my dwelling (house, garage) is a nuisance but bats in my backyard or park are beneficial to eat insects.
- A lot of interactions come from insecure garbage. As the City provides/requires garbage containers, a clearer route for requesting more/bigger containers would be helpful.
- Education. Keeping their pets inside or supervised.
- - whether we like it or not, we are all part of the natural world, and we need all these animals even if they are sometimes a nuisance. About the only thing I can think of to encourage acceptance of these animals is education.
- Co-existence is an honorable principle. However, when natural prey-predator dynamics are stifled or out of wack, we are overrun. A recent skunk problem in our neighbourhood is exacerbated by only relocating the 'offending' critters. Culling is not inhumane in my considered opinion.
- Education when someone calls 311 to say they saw a coyote or to complain about squirrels to stop wasting City resources and get over it.
- I love seeing animals in the city, except there are some summers in which wasps are too plentiful. We trap them on our property, magpies are a similar nuisance, currently learning how to trap them. Educate people on how to protect their own properties, make information available.
- Its fine how it is
- I've had a major problem with jackrabbits in the neighbourhood eating plants and burning the grass with urine. I love wildlife and would like to coexist peacefully, however I would support trapping and relocating rabbits and other pest animals to outside of urban areas.
- There should be fines for people who leave refuse out that attracts wildlife. There should be more education of the public on how to safely coexist with urban wildlife.
- a better understanding (example, bats eat mosquitoes), and clear instructions on what to do when you have issues (who is responsible, who do I call, what do I do when...)
- All of these animals play their role in our ecosystem. Providing education on what that role is and how to coexist would go a long way. Discussing the importance of securing food and garbage so that the wildlife does not get it would be of equal importance, and the dangers of feeding wildlife
- Prevent urban sprawl, public education
- A campaign educating Calgarians on these wildlife
- I find Coyotes a huge issue around Nosehill and Edgemont. I think having a better idea of the coyotes breeding season and how many are around an area at any given time would help me ensure my dog is safe. I know coyotes move around a lot however I have noticed trends and signs would be helpful.
- There should be a service that can help people living in Calgary deal with ALL wildlife especially those that encroach into your living environment and can cause damage to human health (with disease or bites).
- Provide more natural green space for these animals to live and travel through.
- In an urban area, any wildlife that causes damage or discomfort should be strictly controlled.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Keeping garbage well contained is very important. Don't have hidden spaces such as under a deck for them to live in. Some species are becoming too numerous and may need to be dealt with such as magpies and crows who seem to gather in large numbers, are noisy and chase away other wildlife.
- Quit feeding them, make sure your home is in good repair so they don't nest under porches, sheds etc
- Limiting/restricting development of green spaces. Ensuring garbage is not left exposed (at the dump, near shopping centres etc. Allowing animals to coexist and be given priority even in urban areas. Ensure wildlife corridors are maintained with access to water.
- Co-existing is key and destroying wildlife that enter into the city should not be considered an option. Proper restriction to possible attractants (garbage, food, small animals) should be maintained. Education is a key step.
- Educate idiot city dwellers. Stop the insane urban sprawl.
- We need a rabbit cull in the NW - these are becoming such a large population they are making driving and cycling more dangerous
Moles on public land need to be dealt with. The hills left behind are unsightly and can damage to grass mowers
- Educating the public on the responsibility they have to keep these animals safe by removing sources of food and avoiding interaction with them. Advising Calgarians that we CAN coexist with these animals pleasantly by remaining respectful of them and teaching their children how to be respectful.
- A way to get rid of invasive species like the grey /black squirrels which displace our native squirrels.
- I want to live with all of the above (well maybe not the wasps) and let them do what they do naturally. However, I think there should be more effort on the part of the city to maintain safe areas for pets and people. Dog parks where there are bobcats or coyotes present should be monitored more closely
- Updates when large mammals are presenting neighborhoods (coyotes, bobcats, raccoons). Tips on how to live peacefully with these animals.
- Information that helps keep pets and children safe. For example, sharing information that the city has about coyotes and bobcats in a community or area, so pet owners can keep dogs on lead
- Improving people's understanding and respect for their natural behaviours so that people can maintain property so that it does not attract wildlife or provide nesting areas.
- Mostly I would just like to know that there is dependable, easy and quick access to someone who can help if there are safety or disease issues with the presence of wildlife and perhaps education on how to prevent/decrease safety or noise (crows, magpies, pigeons, gulls) issues with wildlife.
- Control and limit the geographical expansion of the city. The farther the city spreads, the more impact it has upon wildlife as it takes up the areas inhabited by wildlife.
- For the record, a lot of bat species are provincially and federally listed species and need to be removed from this list. Specifically, the little brown bat is the most common species which live in human spaces and they are considered May Be At Risk in Alberta and Endangered under the SARA
- Wildlife should get a right of way unless they're dangerous. Wasps are dangerous and coyotes can be ..



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Keep garbage and waste away from them. Allow trapping of damaging wildlife.
- Education. As a conservation biologist, I'm often amazed by the uninformed opinions and fears about many of these animals in the community. Rodents, etc. are a nuisance, so info on eradication (from yards and homes) is useful. With larger wildlife, basic info about safety for kids and pets is useful.
- Stop developing massive suburban communities and taking their homes away. Divert more natural space for animals within already developed communities. Public education that the animals live there, humans are visitors and humans do NOT trump animal rights.
- More parks and habitat for wildlife
- Stop regarding some of these species as nuisance wildlife of course. Bobcats are necessary predators as are coyotes. Wasps do have an important role in the ecosystem. This list of animals needs to be cut in half which would require the city to spend less in order to control them.
- These are wildlife. We should simply learn to live with them.
- Increased communication from the City Parks department.
- Stop thinking of them as nuisance wildlife
They have as much right to live as we do
- The only things that concern me in this list are bobcats and coyotes, due to lack of understanding of how to handle an encounter with them, and worry of risk to life. I can coexist with the other animals as I feel more familiar with their habits. Public education in multiple media would help.
- Don't call bats nuisance wildlife!
- I think education would help Calgarians co-exist with the wildlife. Maybe if the city educated the citizens that expressed concerns directly to them as apposed to trying to find a way to educate all, this may be more effective.
- Letting these wildlife exist on their own with no human interference, i.e. supplying food. Once the wildlife has presented danger to humans then wildlife officials or city exterminators should provide assistance in removing the danger.
- None, I do not consider any of them a nuisance. I notice that deer, who camp in my backyard and eat anything in sight, are not classed as a nuisance
- Calgary is doing an awful job co-existing. More growth is taking away the animals natural habitat. People that don't throw away garbage properly attract magpies and mice and seagulls.
- Limit lethal solutions at all costs
- A better attitude; live and let live.
- The City should trap and relocate wild animals in urban areas that pose a threat. Our dog has been sprayed twice by skunks, and Animal Services won't respond.
- Problems occur when there is an effort to cull only one animal. The response needs to be balanced when addressing an issue in a specific area. e.g. there was a coyote cull and then the skunk population in our neighborhood skyrocketed. Once the coyotes were back the skunk problem is minimal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- People have to be aware and leave them alone. Simple, if they consume a few cats, so be it, cats should not be roaming about by themselves.
- Live and let live. Humans are the problem, not the animals who's land we have encroached upon.
- I think we need to educate the public that the wildlife is endemic in our area and they need to accept it, not try to eradicate/minimize/remove it.
- Population control or rehoming of coyotes at Nose Hill Park. They are living on an island in the middle of a metropolis with no way to migrate to more wild areas. As such, many are habituated to people and dogs and are dangerously bold for a city park. Frequent attacks are unfair to city dog owners.
- Calgarians keeping their dogs on leash when not at a designated off leash area and cats indoors. People being more responsible with their garbage/clutter on their property. Business keeping lids on garbage bins closed. Keeping property free of nesting areas (skunks/'coons/coyotes etc)
- Make people aware of risks to their pets and themselves and accept that some improperly supervised pets will be taken. As for non dangerous animals, educate people that living in a healthy ecosystem is healthier all around
- Spaces within the city that these species can exist without interactions with the general public are the best solutions. For the most part, these species flow in and out of the city without incident.
- Give the predator wildlife more space so it can chase the real nuisance wildlife. Small rodents can get into houses and transmit diseases. I can easier protect myself against a coyote or bobcat than against mice, moles, gophers. Don't ban larger wildlife because of dogs not on a leash.
- If the city won't control the populations, then people need the ability to deal with nuisance wildlife, just like in rural areas. Not all the animals in your list are nuisance animals though. Coyotes are a danger, magpies are just [removed]. Bats are endangered and should be protected.
- Learn to live with nature as it is and appreciate the wildlife.
- Education ... short videos about these animals, their needs and habits would help Calgarians' to find the room share the outdoors with all the wildlife that we're lucky to find in our city.
- I have had no concerns about wildlife and welcome it. If animals become a specific problem (aggressive, over-populated) the city can look at resolutions but generally I think we should just leave it be. We should be looking for ways to re-engage ourselves with nature.
- Recognize we are the intruders in their homes not the other way around. Learn more about wildlife and what not to do. **DO NOT FEED WILDLIFE**
- wildlife is not a nuisance! We are the nuisance, we are the ones encroaching on their land. animals have been on this earth for millions/billions and years! Us, only a few thousand years yet we have destroyed the air, water, land etc... We need to co-exist because we are the problem.
- More education on why these animals are in our environment. What they do for the environment and how we can co-exist and minimize harmful interactions. People benefit from having these creatures enrich our neighborhoods.
- Awareness and education



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stop expanding city boundaries into natural territory of many species in the city and have a system in place to make sure animals in the city can't live there life in peace including have areas in which citizen can't disturb possible places where babies of these animals are kept
- Better/more education more readily available on each species to provide info to Calgarians on how to coexist / live with them, and what counts as a danger/nuisance vs. the animals being themselves.
- Some are nuisance and some are dangerous. Nuisance could be left to home owners, (mice and moles and small wasp nests). Again, traps could be made available for gophers, skunk, porcupines and racoons. the rest is up to the City to deal with
- Ridiculous you expect input in 269 characters for 16 creatures. Who is this possible. Idiotic!!! to put all them in the same category shows your ignorance. Waste of taxpayers money, this survey!
- Why does it need to be improved? They are part of our community. I love it.
- Stop the city sprawl that is taking over the habitats of these animals. Keep your dogs leashed when out on walks.
- Coyotes that attack dogs in our off-leash park need to be dealt with. It is inevitable that these wild dogs will become less and less frightened of human presence unless they have negative experiences. I think there is a huge difference between a "nuisance" animal and a dangerous one.
- Leaving the wildlife alone. Keeping cats indoors and untrained dogs on leash.
- We need to assess the current wildlife situation in Calgary and determine where wildlife and the city are clashing and solutions.
- Education & communications to reduce fear. Also training people how to react in case of a bad encounter. The media around bobcats I've heard has been really positive. Lake Bonavista facebook group shares amazing photos of the bobcats and it has actually become a source of pride in the community.
- The City of Calgary should be responsible to help a homeowner get rid of, said wildlife, if any are encountered on homeowner's property. The homeowner should not have to pay hundreds of dollars to dispose of such wildlife. After all, not many have any experience to deal with same.
- A wildlife sighting app that includes a map where public can upload photos showing recent activity. It could also identify problem areas within the city so those recreating in parks can be aware in advance. Maybe it could show what issues city parks staff are currently addressing.
- Coyotes are a threat to pet owners when using trails and parks. More efforts should be put in place to keep them out of city limits. People should have the ability to safely walk their pets without this fear.
- shooting coyotes would be a big help
- Cull coyotes. We've had a pack of them roaming in our neighbourhood.
- leave them alone. Love that coyote dens are marked off in Bowmont. Good to know when bobcats and coyotes are around so we can look out for our pets. Surprised by the list other than wasps, the others aren't much of a nuisance. We should tget away from lawns. Basfor environment and give us something
- Remove skunks!!!!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Some of the wildlife is a nuisance, i.e. seagulls while some of what is listed poses more of threat, such as coyotes. I think education is important as I know of people who feed animals either deliberately or because they leave garbage out.
- Raccoons should be kept out much like the rats in Alberta. They are very destructive. Rabbits are fine. Coyotes and bobcats are being seen very frequently in our neighbourhood which is new and makes small pet owners nervous to let their pet out in the yard. The rest can co-exist very well.
- Education regarding the fact that most of these animals belong here, that we're in their territory and should learn to adapt and appreciate what they bring to the city environment. Education re what to do when encountering a wild animal in the city environment (including not kidnapping baby hares!).
- Only issues I have are with wasps and lately squirrels. But that is because the neighbour is feeding them.

I think we could better coexist if we didn't destroy so much of their habitat for single dwelling homes. I frequently have Rabbits/Hares in my yard and have no issues with them hanging out.

- I think we should better preserve wild spaces for most of these animals, and encourage a diverse biosphere even within our city limits. Protect spaces and provide the ability for people to best co-exist with these animals.
- Making it clear that we came after the animals-- we need to share the land with them.
- city get more involved in controlling the wild animals in people's properties. The city taxes everything and when it comes to the public safety with regards to the wild animals including rodents the city does nothing and everything falls in the owner's hand
- - ongoing messaging about not disturbing wildlife; e.g. giving them space
- - ongoing messaging about minimizing attractants, such as dog or cat food outside and ensuring that garbage is secure
- - increased messaging about what to do when wild animals are injured and have become particularly worrisome
- There should be absolutely No co-existing for the 'dangerous ones' like Bobcats & Coyotes. Good grief, pets, kids & even adults are all at risk in our own yards & trails. We pay the taxes here, so they need to move on out!
- Deer should be added to the nuisance list. They have decimated our yard along with the rabbits. I am all for culling populations that are increasing unchecked.
- Public education: there are ways to discourage skunks, coyotes, etc. from looking for food/garbage around a homeowner's house.
- More knowledge on the animals that live here and how to react when encountering them, either by yourself or walking your dog or having wildlife walk into your backyard. Proper protocols on how to deal with them.
- Please remove coyotes from arbour lake. They are a threat to domestic animals and people. They are very scary and come too close. We are afraid for our pets and children++++.
- Education so that we can learn to coexist with wildlife. We are encroaching on their living space so of course there will be problems. What can we do to prevent problems from developing and how to



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

resolve problems. Keep animals and people safe. Attitudes need to change from nuisance to neighbour.

- Remove them from the areas as they're (coyotes, bobcats) not safe to the kids in the areas especially when the kids are walking to and from schools.
- Laws that prevent interference with these animals. I don't believe that wasps should be in the same category as the other animals on this list. Citizens need more assistance from Community Standards with respect to when these animals are injured or problematic.
- Adhering to the current bylaws, specifically keeping animals on leash at all times, unless in a designated off leash area. As well as having you pet under your control at all times.
- We need to learn to get along! Garbage in wildlife-resistant containers. Keep cats indoors, or on leashes. Keep your dogs on a leash, or voice command. Roaming dogs and cats are a much bigger issue! I am quite offended to see so many species listed as 'nuisance'! We are the interlopers, not them.
- Start with changing the city's attitude and verbiage - these are not "nuisance wildlife"; most are native species that are essential to ecosystem function, whether within city limits or not; most are inoffensive & harmless. Set the example & educate the public to respect/enjoy, not fear & destroy.
- I think there should be a cull of non-native species (squirrels, raccoons) that negatively impact native wildlife species. There should also be some form of population control for species that are missing natural population control in the city.
- An information hotline explaining how to act when encountering each species. More education
- less fences
- If people left them alone. If people were fined for feeding wildlife.
- Residences should only be residences and these wild life came from somewhere. They should be brought back into their natural surroundings before they become dependant on humans and become a havoc on society and dangerous.
- More education regarding wildlife, its importance, and ways to coexist.
- Removal of dangerous animals such as coyotes and bobcats. Lawsuit waiting to happen if someone gets hurt.
- mostly let them be. remove when a threat to health and safety only
- Signage in areas known for wildlife, about the risks/dangers/behaviours of those species, and what to do if you encounter them. Who to call to deal with wildlife nuisances. There needs to be resource available by the City to deal with them, even on private property. You cannot put residents at risk
- Take into account the wildlife movement patterns, ensure they have enough space to thrive. Use humane catch and release methods.
- Leaving them alone, give them space
- Educating the public
- First, it is up to homeowners to be diligent not to attract these animals. Wasps are dangerous pests and should be removed immediately. Moles and mice can be managed by trapping. Unfortunaltely, If any of these listed animals become a danger to the public, they need to be relocated or destroyed.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- -Have a resource officer that has the ability to handle the nuisance wildlife. -Population control.
- -provide free traps and have resources to have wildlife picked up or drop off at locations. Too often the “nimby” method used
- the population of skunks is not being addressed by the city as the skunk population has become overwhelming and it is hard to go outside without encountering anywhere from one to six of them at a time. something has to be done to reduce their number. I am worried for my dogs and my safety.
- Education regarding actual risks. Managing of perceived risks, and deprioritizing nuisance.
- create better education and awareness of the animals within the city limits. improve and educate about what to do if these animals present in one's community.
- Co-existing is respecting the animals, don't feed them, don't try to make them your pets, Keep your pets away from them.
- People should not feed any wildlife including squirrels.
- as we keep taking MORE & MORE of the wild lands and wilderness these animals do not know where to go... maybe the city should stop expanding OUT and focus on areas in the city that could be upgraded and made more feasible ... I have encountered all the above mentioned animals at one or more times .
- Education on the animals and their well being. None of these animals should be considered Nuisance wildlife and they are incredibly important to our ecosystems and way of life. People need to be educated on why they are important and why we shouldn't be trapping, relocating or exterminating them!
- Leave them alone. They all serve a purpose. Educate the stupid people about why ALL species are important. Nothing is a nuisance it has a purpose. Bats? Do you know how many mosquitos a bat consumes? Porcupines? They are just minding their own business. I just dont understand the list. Crazy
- People need to do a better job of managing their garbage bins. I have often seen piles of garbage left beside bins or bins overflowing that birds get get into.
- Send out pamphlets let newcomers know these are not pets be cautious be aware of your surroundings and respect they were here first we are taking over there territory. Of course some of this category do need to be weeded out like magpies raccoons? Seagulls crows
- leave them be
- Better cleanup of city, less garbage less wildlife coming to eat it.
- Better education about them. Like what to do if confronted by a coyote and to not take baby bunnies away from their nest
- Carefully store waste so that it does not attract wildlife and co exist with it.
- Get rid of invasive species (ie. Black squirrels).
- tolerance
- Unfortunately when garbage and recycling cans are left out, there is incentive for people to rummage through them. When they are not properly closed or items are strewn about it encourages nuisance animals in inappropriate ways. This is also happening when people are overfilling their garbage cans

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I do not think wild animals should be considered a nuisance. We live across the street from a large natural environment park (Bowmont) and have had no concerns.
- Coyotes are a problem. I have been chased twice this year as they show no fear towards me and my 75 lb dog. I think when someone complains they need to be educated to avoid humans. There is an issue in Douglas dale where I have seen 5 coyotes in a pack numerous times. I
- Education on how to co-exist. Protection from development of primary areas of residence for these wildlife.
- I not needed support myself, but hopefully we have clear and concise steps for people to take in different situations clearly listed somewhere that is easily accessible.
- training of Humans not to interfere-
- Public education. I had a porcupine in my yard, and was directed from one agency to another.
- People need to give wildlife it's space. They were most likely here long before us. I interact with wildlife with no problems at all. Don't scare them or hurt them would be my advice
- Stop feeding the wildlife ... no peanuts for the squirrels ... no dog food in the yard for the Magpies and Crows ...
- Provide more space within the city for wild animals. If they are a problem have the city relocate them instead of home owners.
- Educate people so they aren't stupid or cruel to the animals
- Published information highlighting the key roles that each of these species play in their natural environment. Also providing solutions to mitigate being inconveniences by these species: patching openings in homes and fences, hanging artificial wasp nests... Pigeons are an invasive exception.
- Education
- Legislation should be put into place which prevents all animal poisons from being sold directly to the public. These products are inhumane and unsafe for humans, pets, and other wildlife. All rodenticides should be restricted to licensed extermination and pest removal companies.
- Enforcing restrictions on roaming cats to reduce conflict with wildlife.
- Provide sufficient space for wildlife and be mindful of human encroachment on natural area boundaries, particularly with new developments. Avoid positive attractants (i.e. roaming pets, bird feeders and un-contained refuse/composting). Make use of control measures wherever possible.
- I personally dislike crows, seagulls and magpies and wish there was some way to control them as they are noisy and dirty. I believe the other creatures should be left to get on with their lives, as we've taken over much of their habitat, leaving them with no choice but to come into our neighborhood
- I do not think that co-existence is appropriate where the wildlife in question poses a threat of injury to humans or domesticated animals. My main concern is with respect to coyotes. When walking my dog in Varsity/Dalhousie , we have been followed on a number of occasions by up to 3 coyotes.
- Education that they have equal right to live here as we do and our pets; keep posting coyote etc warnings



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education. The animals listed above are not a nuisance. They are indigenous to the city and we need to be respectful of their space. House cats and chihuahuas that can be prey to these species are not indigenous and need a responsible pet owner to learn how to supervise them to keep them safe.
- KILL THEM ALL!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Education and people being responsible. All the above have very important roles in the ecosystem. Eradication of wildlife would be horrible, ineffective and make Calgary a much less wonderful place. I have never felt threatened by Coyotes/wildlife. It is my job to make sure my pets are safe.
- Education on what animals to expect to see in what areas and how the City is helping manage the animals existence in the City.
- Try to keep the coyotes, bobcats, etc. away from parks etc. Our daughter in law has experienced several instances of being stalked by a local coyote! We see them around a few times per year. Worrisome.
- Firstly, I would suggest we cease categorizing these animals as nuisance.
- shoot the coyotes.
- To keep those so-called nuisance wildlife in check e.g wasps, they mostly arrive at dinner time in the summer, when eating outside. Instruct the public not to respond by flapping around with their arms, they become agitated and will defend themselves and put some food away from the dinner table.
- More public education that these all have a right to coexist with us.
- More information on what to do if animals are encountered, on large signs at entrances and exits of parks and greenspaces. More garbage and recycling bins replaced when the lids are broken.
- - Stricter laws regarding pets roaming without owner supervision. (as in, pets not allowed to roam the city.)
 - Pet food should not be left out of doors.
 - Leaving food outside for feral animals should be illegal.
- Educate people
- Awareness about how to live with the wildlife, not how to eradicate them.
- Maintain wildlife corridors and control inappropriate sources of food for urban adaptor species.
- Better information on how to manage the nuisance wildlife when they become an issue (more resources or support on the website, 311 etc)
- Education. Tv spots. Radio ads. Telling people not to freak out. Keep your dogs on leash. Show people that wildlife is ok. Posters and signs.
- leave the animals alone. they were here before us. We are encroaching on their hunting areas. By eliminating the predators like coyotes, we will have an increase in unwanted rabbits and gophers.
- Do we want to co-exist? Or would we rather establish practices to discourage nuisance wildlife away from the city. Bobcats and coyotes are newer to the city. Do we do enough to make sure our garbage is in a sealed container as done in parks?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- better wildlife "highways" through the city to connect parks and create larger safer spaces for the wildlife in the city.
- That there is a division of Calgary services that can help with relocation dangerous and smelly animals (bobcats, coyotes and skunks) and education afforded the public when it comes to nuisance creatures (mice, magpies etc) I like having nature in my back door and non invasive / no harm strategies
- I believe from living near green spaces and being fearfull of walking my small dogs that problem coyote and larg cats should be removed and sent to rural areas (relocation) should be considered. These animals are dangerous and I would like to feel safe in my community. Banff does it we should to.
- Leave the wildies alone, except skunks should be trapped and moved to the country.
- I think nothing special should be made to make these wild animals more comfortable in the city. They can live on the green areas; parks, etc. not within neighborhoods.
- being aware of wildlife's existence, where they live, how they live, how they interact with the city environment and keeping all pets away from wildlife
- Educating citizens, and fining citizens that harm wildlife. Also not making it an option - they live with us period.
- less suburban sprawl into their habitat. More public awareness about the risks of having unleashed/unsupervised pets. Bigger and more prevalent signage where wildlife (i.e., coyotes) are noted.
- Just stay out of their way.
- - Proper waste management by land owners/residents
- - Keeping dogs on leash or contained
- Proper yard maintenance (keeping attractants under control)
- - Better public education on how to safely coexist
- - Reasonable and educated response by the City to resident concerns
- Public education. There is no reason for people to interact with wildlife. If concerned, it should be called in.
- More public education. Tighter leash laws
- Any animal that is being a pest, then the city or trappers should be able to remove them from the area.
- Improved wildlife corridors, honestly. We are invading THEIR homes.
- Remove all coyotes from YYC.
- the city should be able to control nuisance populations and should relocate out of the city when possible (ie racoons). there needs ways to control and decrease out of control populations (ie gophers, wasps, mice, moles, squirrels)
- Coyotes should be removed from Residential areas, moved out to the forest humanely
- Eliminate these coyotes. All of them.
- More education and a direct source for questions. Ask for more assistance from Fish & Wildlife



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education and more assistance from Fish & Wildlife
- More public education. I'm surprised to see the animals on this list be characterized as a nuisance. Many of these animals contribute to healthy habitats and ecosystems, such as bats! People need to learn how to co-exist with wildlife in our city.
- Satisfied with current system
- Education about wildlife. Signs in parks.
- For Calgarians to learn about them. We may think they are a nuisance but they are a part of the food chain and nature. We must learn to coexist with them.
- Crows and magpies need to be controlled.....coyotes, bobcats tranquilized and brought outside Calgary to the mountains again.....
- More green space. Strategies to limit effects on property. Education about the importance of these animals.
- Let people be aware of how to control-exist. How to learn not to attract them in a positive way. Maybe being allowed to build slightly higher fences so some cannot jump into the yards.
- People being responsible with their garbage and pets in green spaces and maintaining adequate green space in the city.
- Education & conservation
- Squirrels are a huge menace if one is a gardener.
- Understand we share the same space, education not elimination.
- City to take responsibility to actively discourage potentially dangerous wildlife within City limits e.g. bobcats, coyotes, cougars & bears.
- People need to recognize that wildlife has a right to be. If you WANT to co-exist then you WILL co-exist. It would help if the city quit expanding outward and taking up space non-human animals could use.
- reasonable opportunities to get rid of them
- We could all deal with wildlife better if we had more knowledge about these animals and strategies to use if they are damaging gardens, presenting a risk to our pets or ourselves. I think deer should be included in this list, as well as elk in some areas.
- Accept that if we want green spaces in our city, wild critters will inhabit these spaces as well.
- Trap nuisance animals in peoples yards and return to wild. Otherwise, they need to be given space. Their natural habitat is being encroached upon and they only seek to survive.
- Common sense & an acceptance that wildlife is a part of our city. Many should not be labeled "nuisance" Bats for instance are critical & we should be protecting & encouraging them
- An open mind. I think it's peoples personal issues that prevent them from coexisting. There are certain case, like if people are attacked, that there would need to be measured in place to relocate that problem animal.
- They were here first. Owners should not allow their dogs to chase wildlife in Calgary parks and natural areas. On leash in a off leash area when wildlife is present.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Less urban sprawl and development that destroys natural habitat, forcing wildlife into suburban communities.
- Better education, particularly for animals beyond coyotes. Info on other common animals (like rabbits) should also be made available. Educate children and teachers in Calgary! Go to schools in the spring. Kids see baby bunnies and think they can pick them up without issue.
- People should not feed these animals or use bird feeders which are attractive to more than birds.
- Education - Understanding that we live in their home, not the other way around.
- Public education. Many people view these animals as scary or pests and they arnt. They are part of the ecosystem.
- Education in relation to the types of wild animals that may pose a threat . Also signs in public spaces that notify people when specific animals are likely to be present and what to do in the event of an encounter.
- Most of the above species are an annoyance but coyotes present a danger to pets and humans. Coyotes denning within city limits should be removed or destroyed. Personally I have trapped and removed skunks and squirrels that have come into our yard. But again, those two are only an annoyance.
- A more robust initiative to educate citizens of Calgary. These animals are simply trying to live and thrive. We need tools to live along side each group with minimal animosity.
- Education programs emphasizing the importance of wildlife to ecosystems, and green corridors to wildlife diversity.
- If people leave these animals alone, that would be good.
- Dedicated green spaces where they are not controlled
- Ensuring that people are aware of the importance of not feeding animals such as coyotes, bobcats, raccoons, skunks etc.
- Education
- People to educate themselves about animals they expect to find in their neighborhood...and EXPECT wildlife.....we are encroaching on their space! I love to see the wildlife and get excited to see them. I suggest that people not feed the wildlife. Don't leave out garbage/food to attract them
- Feral rabbits must be trapped and spayed or killed. Denning coyotes should be removed if near homes/people. Have traps available to public for squirrels/skunks/raccoons/feral rabbits/porcupines etc & the city can take them away. Control the population of these critters.
- More education on not feeding/habituating also approaching wildlife in the City. The City is doing a good job closing coyote dens that are problematic. However, feral domestic rabbits released in the Repsol Center area need to be CULLED!! NOT wildlife as the posterboard indicates. Invasive =harm
- Not leaving garbage easily accessible for wild animals.
Educating people not to approach wild animals.
- Humans need to understand that we are encroaching on the habitat of these natural creatures. There needs to be more enforcement of people feeding these creatures and encouraging them to be more comfortable around people.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education. Community open house reviews of wildlife within neighbourhoods.
- -People being cautious of their surroundings
- -Not feeding wildlife and making sure garbage and compost are not attracting wildlife
- -Having respect for nature
- Capture and relocate coyotes outside city limits.
- Education
- Knowing how to deal with them or prevent them from your yard.
- Information regarding importance of species in ecosystem. Advice on safe cohabitation of spaces eg around garbage, Children etc
- Create a law that stops people from feeding the pests like skunks and now raccoons. People keep leaving food out for stray cats and skunks are getting into them and spraying my dog.... I'd like to take one of those skunks and put it in the house of my neighbour that feeds all the neighbourhood pests
- Managing the populations, reducing human and dangerous species interactions
- Education about interacting with wildlife, commercials posters, talk about and let people know what to do if they see a moose or a bobcat some people call others don't and everyone including the animals have a right to be safe and given space.
- Lower collisions rates with cars and deer or coyotes by putting up sensors along highways and roads like Deerfoot to trigger flashing lights so cars slow down because animals are near.
- I think people need to be more realistic, animals were here first often we need to learn to live with them. The city has zero programs to help people live in harmony with these species
- Reminding people that letting their cats out unsupervised attracts wildlife and puts their cats lives in danger. Garbage should be cleaned up to not attract wildlife and wildlife should not be harassed.
- Relocate animals whose homes are taken over by humans
- An understanding of the wildlife and what their natural tendencies truly are. That they don't want to engage with us. We are forcing it with our actions. It's on us to be responsible, not the animals to pay for our mis-steps.
- More education on how to keep everyone safe.
- I think sometimes pathway closures are necessary for the safety of coyotes and small pets. I'm a runner and frequently use pathways but I'm totally ok with closures when necessary. Calgary should also stop expanding out and taking over more wildlife habitat. Only build on existing areas.
- Making sure people understand that natural parks are there for wildlife, that people understand that and stop treating them like dog walking parks as many Dog owners seem to do (aka nose hill park)
- Culls as necessary. Patience on the part of humans. Removal of wasps.
- Stop all the new development in their habits. Or require developers to have parts of habits preserved and require them to work with experts on how to best coexist with the animals
- Have designated areas where the animals can be, free of humans. A refuge where they can go so they don't have to "intrude" upon areas with a human population in order to have their needs met.
- Knowledge about these animals and the benefits of having them around providing a balance



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Fine people for littering, especially food items. Tax fast food outlets higher when their items are amongst the litter so as they will limit their excessive food packaging. Educate people to not feed the animals.
- There is no way we took their homes we need to just deal with that and accept they are here.
- Better enforcement of garbage disposal, i.e. no dumping garbage in alleys so as not to encourage "nuisance" wildlife to feed there. More enforcement for illegal dumping of garbage in alleyways.
- Education
- Coexist with skunks? My dog was sprayed by a skunk in my fenced backyard due to a neighbour letting them breed in her back yard. Skunks breed well and are not endangered. Please go back to having animal control provide traps and removing them. Not everyone can afford \$200.00 to have them removed.
- Leave them alone. Just be vigilant and become knowledgeable is the best approach.
- Let cats back outdoors to kill vermin and reduce a food source
- I think that the parks should have more fences to prevent the coyotes and bobcats from entering. No harm should be done to the animals, unless they are on the property of a home owner, then I feel as if it should be legal to take necessary action to save your pet.
- Drink more beers, smoke some weed and calm the hell down :)
- educate people thru library workshops how to handle these encounters. I personally see only skunks, mice, wasp, pigeons, black squirrels as nuisance. Had the first spring skunk walk thru my neighbour's yard tonight due to neighbour leaving out old loaves of bread for birds
- City providing tools/services to deal with problem wildlife, especially ones causing damage.
- Stop leaving garbage out and if you're walking your dog and there's a coyote, have a noise maker that will scare the coyote away if he or she comes near. We have to respect wildlife - nuisance or not - we are a nuisance! Humane trapping and moving of wildlife like porcupines, skunks...
- Leave them alone.
People that leave garbage out need to be charged. Alleyways are filthy attracting animals deeper into neighbourhoods.
- I believe we have invaded their territories with our ridiculous sprawl and every effort should be made to coexist with wildlife and minimize our impact on the natural environment
- Education of the public on what to expect and what to do when they are in the presence of wildlife
- I think it's important that Calgary doesn't use chemicals (pesticides) to deal with animals they consider to be pests. I personally don't consider any of these animals to be pests and think they should be left alone.
- I think education is probably a big factor. A lot of the animals on your list are beneficial to our environment, such as bats, which eat insects like mosquitoes. Also, people need to understand that we have encroached on the wildlife's territory and taken over their homes, not the other way around.
- There is an unnatural plethora of some of these animals which could benefit from being culled occasionally



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education. Wildlife is not a nuisance it's a system. Wildlife numbers ebb and flow with climate and food source. Unfortunately green bins have added an easy food source for wildlife. Wildlife is predictable. Stop feeding them and they will go away. Education
- I'm not sure what can be done but I have small dogs and bobcats and coyotes are a constant concern for me. I feel that I can't even let my dogs out for a pee in my fenced backyard unattended for a minute in fear of an encounter. I know they keep hare populations down but I don't feel safe.
- I do think that, if more effort was made to control the population of smaller animals, eg, rabbits, squirrels, skunks, there would be less of an issue of larger animals coming into the city.
- Education. Our city needs to be able to coexist with the native wildlife.
- Education on what to expect, and warnings from the city about when to keep your pets/small children indoors (not just for house owners but for renters and condo owners too). This applies especially to coyotes and bobcats.
- Safety protocols around coyotes. Wasp traps in frequently used public spaces.
- Catch predatory or nuisance animals and remove to another location far far away. Tag predators when captured
- Bylaws and enforcement of these bylaws to reduce resident behaviours that encourage these wildlife to become a nuisance. Many of the animals on this list I would not consider a nuisance - residents need to understand that accepting the presence of these animals is part of living in Calgary.
- City should provide assistance in dealing with skunks. Inglewood has an abundance of skunks. After dark I have to check my yard with a flashlight before letting my dogs out. At times I have to close all doors and windows due to the smell (skunk on my or neighbouring properties or on street)
- Better education for Calgarians. I live in a wildlife rich neighbourhood and I love it. Seeing deer, weasels, porcupines, and even coyotes is peaceful to me.
- Information sessions or social media posts on the wildlife. Benefits they can provide, how to properly and humanely shift things if there is a problem, information on their intelligence and social structures to bring understanding and compassion.
- Speed monitoring for cars to reduce chance of harm to animals.
- Too many cats are being let outside which encourages wildlife into areas they normally wouldn't venture. Also the mass amount of bunnies downtown need to be addressed. There were coyotes walking in Lindsay Park with dog owners unaware. Need more wildlife caretakers involved.
- Nothing.
- Education. We are encroaching on their territory so we need to leave them alone and let them be.
- Stop allowing more development. With the economy why is the city approving new development. Calgary has an abundant amount of homes. Protect areas that are wetlands and parks. Educate people.
- Education to Calgarians about being safe around said wildlife and keeping their pets safe around said wildlife. The wildlife was here before us and we need to learn to coexist peacefully and take steps to provide a safer life for the wildlife and us.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Leave the gophers & rabbits alone. Skunks -> trap and relocate or destroy, parks should do this! Leave the bobcats and coyotes alone, they 'take care of' rodents. Raccoons need to be destroyed, no relocation. Wasps are a home owner problem - usually. Porcupines are inconvenient! Trap and release.
- I don't have concerns with most of the above animals. Overpopulation of coyotes in urban parks can be concerning when I am walking in the pathways.
Bats are incredibly effective at managing insects and are beneficial to the ecosystem. Perhaps creating bat boxes for habituate in parks would help
- People need to be more respectful, but I'm not sure how you can educate them to do that. There shouldn't be off leash areas where there is a know coyote den, and maybe they could be relocated or enforce leashes.
- Education
- City of Calgary should consider supporting bat boxes to encourage bats to create homes in appropriate spots. the effects on the ecosystem are incredibly beneficial.
Coyotes should only create concern if they overpopulate and/or threaten people in urban/suburban areas.
- Having the ability to forcefully remove problem animals. Such as coyote.
- engage citizens to leave these animals alone. ask citizens to not capture, or try to destroy these animals. I have seen deer, bobcats, coyotes skunks, porcupines, rabbits in my Charleswood neighbourhood, and these animals just seem to be passing by. they do not pose a threat.
- We all share the land in Calgary. Be respectful that wildlife has as much right to be here as humans.
- Keep garbage properly contained so they are not attracted to people. Don't feed them. Remove pigeon crow and magpie nests before they get to big discouraging reproduction in urban areas.
- People having more common sense. This is rare, so maybe getting notified if there is a significant amount of wildlife in their area that could do harm like Bobcats or coyotes. But if you live near a wooded area or park, they should know animals live there.....
- More weight given to science, ecological researchers, and Treaty and Indigenous experience and knowledge to maintaining balance.
- Providing designated areas for these species to live and thrive amongst Calgarian neighborhoods. They are not in our homes, we are in theirs. They were here first. If we take away their homes, they have no choice but to encroach on ours and thereby become a "nuisance".
- Intentional spaces for these animals to safely thrive within our city. Education about the importance of these creatures in our ecosystem.
- For most-where do i call when I'm having difficulty with a skunk for instance. I don't even know. Make this more accessible.
- I have no issues with any of these animals. People need to remember when they move into new developments they are encroaching on the animals home
- Assisting owners with education about the animals and resources to assist in their removal, if necessary (gophers, mice, skunks, wasps, etc.)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Maintain dedicated natural areas - not manicured lawns, but grassland and woodland habitat that is not infiltrated by paths/human interference
- Have more open spaces and parks with lots of trees and brushes within the city limits.
- Dogs should be kept on a leash and or not allowed in areas where interactions could be hazardous to wildlife. Too many times I have seen owners allow their pets to chase wildlife along the river.
- Stop building out and start building up. When we have cougars walking into hospitals, we've stretched our boundaries too far.
- Not leaving garbage out and keeping cars inside and dogs leashed.
- I love the local wildlife in the city; however the feral pet rabbit problem in Mission is quite significant and I would like to see the city do something about them. I think supporting citizens in learning how to coexist with native wildlife through education would be helpful.
- If people were more knowledgeable about wildlife.
- Humans should leave them alone. It is unfortunate that they take refuge close to homes or in parks. If they are in danger of attacking humans, then they should be trapped and relocated. otherwise, let them be.
- We need to provide areas for these creatures to thrive, and surface for them to coexist... none of them are even a real problem, and most benefit us and our ecosystem..
- Not sure, but I will say some years ago after the ground squirrels were poisoned on the berm by Anderson/24th ST, the hawks which hunted that field were on the ground making awful cries. I assumed they had also been poisoned. That was a sad day.
- Wildlife should be left alone. Downtown, there is a gopher hill near City Hall; people stop & there are expressions of sheer joy on their faces to see these little animals in the sea of concrete (yet every year you send someone to exterminate them)? Maybe celebrate them - less \$\$ than Arts Commons
- Stop calling them a nuisance and realize they serve an important part of our eco system.
- Education on proper garbage disposal/storage many people overfill their bins and therefore repeatedly attract "nuisance" wildlife.
Education on how to repair homes or Create natural/non toxic barriers to prevent wildlife from nesting within structures. Also, didn't think we had racoons in yyc..
- A healthy eco system should allow free movement of wild life in urban areas, unless there is a danger to human health, life or limb (in this case apply animal control to relocate them). Non native invasive species should be exterminated.
- None.
- Why are bats on that list? We have them and they keep bugs away? We even built bat houses.
- Nice and Skunks are becoming a problem. Because of biweekly garbage pick-up, we've noticed a huge increase in these animals in our alleyways and around our homes.
- Prevent feeding of wildlife (squirrels especially) as they then bury food in people's gardens.
- Manage citizens' expectations around wildlife, as in the animals coexist with people in the city, citizens should get used to them. Should an animal become dangerous, relocation should be the first option rather than destroying the animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- More protection for the wildlife. We've take. Over their land.
- Keeping dogs out of wild spaces. Particularly nose hill, which has become a dog park at the expenses of wild life. The city's interference in harassing coyotes and letting dogs to roam free is disappointing. This space shd be left to the wildlife, but it is being ruined by dogs and interference.
- We are living in a wildlife corridor. Some animals get land locked in the city because of development and some are just confused and need time to get out. I believe we need to keep our pets safe from wildlife and keep the wildlife safe from our pets. They live among us. Educate hard.
- Letting the animal alone. Give them spaceThey were here first we have taken over their environment
- Stop building out and pushing them out of their homes. We need to build up and not out.
- Perhaps some wildlife education provided at community centers. We have had encounters with many of the animals listed and they add to the community and we should be able to live alongside each other. Some of the animals can pose a danger to pets and small children and good education would help.
- Monitor and deal with aggressive coyotes
- Calgarians learning to have respect. I live near a natural area and see all of the above in my area -- except porcupines. We especially need to appreciate the value of bats for killing mosquitos
- Not sure. Maybe areas that are off limits to people so wildlife have a place to be wild
- Why are any of these even considered nuisances? Bats eat insects like mosquitoes. Wasps pollinate our trees and flowers. The first thing that would help us coexist with these animals would be to stop seeing them as pests and consider them a natural part of our environment. We share their habitat.
- Provide wildl9fe corridors and bridges to allow them to get safely from green space to green space
- Humans caring for their property & others = no garbage left outside unsafely, nit feeding &/or leaving pet food outside, being mindful of small pets. Humans being aware of their surroundings & alert (paying attn to their pets, not distracted. There are no nuisance animals... we can all co-east.
- education on wildlife behaviors. what I see in my community is people treating wildlife as if it's harmful to a community. But they are a part of our natural ecosystem and people need to learn more about them instead of fearing the unknown.
- Some limitation and regulation. I'm 6 years in Calgary and looks as decries rabbits and squirrels population ((but more and more coyotes and bobcats in the city
- Controlled, targeted, humane, extermination.
- More parks, relocation of some dangerous animals (coyotes and bobcats), more public education
- Common sense to keep pests out of your house. Education on the ecological balances between animals - I.e., a top predator like a bobcat reduces the rodents and hares. Bats eat mosquitos. Seagulls & crows clean up carrion and waste.
- Education about these wildlife. Adequate green spaces for wildlife. Programs to support native species over invasive species.
- Pest control
- If humans would realize and respect that animals deserve to live here too.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Planting of more trees and native habitats would assist with Calgarian's ability to coexist. We also need to increase awareness about feeding and habituating these wildlife as it only increases their 'nuisance'
- Citizen needs to know what to do for their home safety and prevent invasion of said critters. Bobcats and coyotes have had to adapt with expansion of city boundaries. Educating and awareness of public for park safety and increased activities of coyotes and bobcats such as breeding and whelping.
- Reminding individuals not to approach or befriend wild animals. They have every right to be here and I have no sympathy for those people who disrespect their space. Magpies on the other hand are not even native to North America and we have to let those dick heads live, which should change.
- Education and awareness of keeping homes and garages vermin free. Educating and letting folks aware of increased bobcat and coyote activity such as breeding. Coexisting as city boundaries have expanded into wildlife habitat. No kill if possible.
- Educating and warning signs when bobcat and coyotes are active in local natural reserves and parks. Breeding and whelping times. Educating how to keep vermin from your house and garage.
- Home and landowners should accept these species as part of our urban landscape and take measures to prevent attracting them, such as contained garbage, secure gates, high fences and no bird feeders if you don't want squirrels, magpies, crows or pigeons,
- Education on how to avoid attracting nuisance wildlife to your community and safety precautions to take.
- Education.
- City should assist residents with relocating animals like skunks.
- I think the City needs to have a program to help downsize the gopher, mice, vole, & mole populations. These rodents have taken over the city and they are food sources that attract bobcats and coyotes. In our cul-de-sac we've spent hundreds of \$ on exterminators and we are still infested. Help.
- I truly believe that the rodent issue would be taken care of if cats were allowed to be let outdoors. Our cat caught mice and voles on a daily basis when outdoors. Magpies would be my top pick for a nuisance animal. Not sure what the answer is in order to cull these birds.
- Education and communication on what the city is doing to control
- Indoor garbage & compost & recycling storage - no bins left outside. Latched bins that require manual unlatching to access and specific tool on truck arm to empty. Better access to solutions for bird nuisances: pest control to eliminate property destruction and fecal abundance.
- Leave wildlife alone unless they threaten human safety or their dwellings. Wasps do not belong on a list of animal wildlife
- I appreciate learning where the wildlife is so I can avoid the area.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Parks needs to be ready and willing to help with any nuisances that are in trees and parks in the city. Taking preventive measures especially for magpies, and crows will be essential. Removing old dead trees, hanging shining objects. Etc
- Leave the wildlife alone. Monitor your own pets. Be aware of what is around you. The wildlife were here first and we have encroached on their land. Leave them alone. Magpies need to be dealt with. Not indigenous to our area??? Stop people from setting up food for wild animals.
- Doing something about coyotes in places where kids play. At the WRMA there is a family of 6-7 coyotes, they chase dogs and kids , even my adult husband -but the city says they can't do anything because no one has been harmed. What a joke that is!! We need to be allowed to get rid of them
- Safe and reasonable culls should be an option.
- Educating the needs of these animals to everyone. How to deter them from your property if you don't enjoy them. Don't leave garbage bins out, bird feeders, etc. Ultimately if they are injured I believe we should step in when in residential areas. It's not ok to make that the homeowners responsible.
- Advertise information on the correct way to deal with wildlife to ensure no harm or discomfort to the animal
- Eliminate the word "nuisance"!! There are many wildlife facilities that can provide humane ideas on how to deter or co-exist with these animals, the city should work on educating people. All birds and mammals squirrel size and larger should be protected from poisoning, trapping and cruelty.
- Animal services doesn't do anything regarding porcupines... Doesn't know who does either, just told me to leave it alone while it killed a cat on the front doorstep of a house.
I chased it at my own risk because you are too lazy collecting a paycheque to be concerned for animals.
- Trap and remove coyotes. Allow people to have backyard bees to keep wasp populations down. Magpies shouldn't be protected.
- Public understanding. We have wildlife, we shouldn't be putting our garbage out the night before or leaving our cats and dogs outdoors.
Controlled population of calgarians - we are building too fast and encroaching on too much wildlife, resulting in more and more displaced wildlife.
- Education
- Removing the "nuisance" appellation. They were here first. We're the interlopers. Well--except for wasps. I really hate wasps. Kill them all.
- Making it against the law to interact with them, no matter the excuse! Once again to many chances and not enough folks who know better get fined...people get it when they get tired of being held responsible....
- When they become too much of a problem (skunks), relocate them.
- Education and acknowledgement that we live in same area and must Co exist with these criters take the right precautions with pets and children
- If or when wildlife is a nuisance e.g., coyotes - pets, threat, or garbage, skunks - smell, garbage; racoons - pets, garbage, then have officers readily available to relocate animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- We have rabbits the live under our trees and a little skunk that loves our yard. We co- habitate as they move on. As a homeowner I can make sure my trees are pruned so rabbits don't find security there and block and fix any spots that wildlife may use to den or call an exterminator if necessary.
- Nothing? They're wild and exist, we can't change that. Can't control them. Watch your pets when they're outside, if you can't do that, don't have pets.
- Education would help and the realization that we need to coexist with wildlife, including if that means keeping dogs on a leash
- First, a distinction needs to be made between native and invasive species, and those that are at-risk. Re locally endangered native species, the City should try to educate people about them so that they are better understood and tolerated. Problematic invasive species should be culled or removed.
- Better monitoring and information about wildlife in an area, especially bobcats and coyotes. Even information posted at park entrances, especially about how to respond to wildlife.
- Keeping people and off leash dogs out of the green spaces and private property so the wild life can hunt in peace. We really need to have heavy fines for people and dog found walking off leash dogs outside of the 150 off leash dog parks
Let's keep wild life wild
- Education is key we need to have information given out to people
And teach different ways they can coexist with our urban wild life it really isn't that hard give wild life space to be wild, don't feed wild life, don't harass wild life and to charge people whom have dogs off leash chasing wild lif
- Making signs and putting out the media to alert public of any potential wildlife danger. We must not harm these wild animals because at the end of the day we are the ones invading their property
- Maybe education as to the animal's interesting biology and role in the ecosystem.
- Education on what to do if you see them, and resources to report and relocate
- Responsible food disposal. Keeping them and children respectful distance wildlife. Signs in park educating on habituation and respect. Fines for distance and food infractions to eildlifr
- More teaching regarding the benefits of the above and how we should act around them to not scare them. We should not have to exterminate all skunks and raccoons and those type of critters... they should have to be relocated if denning in someone's yard.
- Relocation services for skunks in neighbourhoods I'd rather have cats roaming around and have city pick up skunks
- I think we dont coexist as much as we take over and relocate or control wild life
- Education! More information on what the city considers a nuisance, how to report them and how to get rid of them!
- STOP EXPANDING THE CITY. NOT ONLY IS IT COST INEFFECTIVE BUT IT ECROACHES ON LAND.
- The wildlife that is most bothersome and is currently a huge safety concern for our pets are the bobcats and coyotes. It is no longer safe to let our dogs out to play in their own fenced in yards.
- Improve the bylaws with respect to animal cruelty and make it illegal for civilians to harm large mammals. (Shooting them, poisoning, etc)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I'm not sure. I have seen coyotes, bobcats, rabbits, and skunks in the neighborhood of Rosedale. I do not know if they are causing any issues.
- Learn to live and share our world with them.
- Education on how to co-exist with them. Education on safe and humane ways to deal with them.
- Help to relocate animals that are dangerous to family pets and small children.
- Have stricter rules for people to keep their cats indoors so they aren't eaten by wildlife. Re-location for wildlife putting people in danger. Less infringement on wild life's home with new developments and more conservation efforts.
- Not to consider these animals a nuisance but to coexist with them in a way that respects their lives
- To respect the right to life of these animals and not to consider them a nuisance
- Providing information to the public that most wildlife will avoid them, so the public doesn't spread misinformation and give wildlife a bad stigma. Provide people with information to prevent nuisance behaviours on their property. Educate the public on habitat limitations for wildlife in urban areas.
- Trap and release coyotes/bobcats to rural areas in rural areas but away from farmers who have livestock.
- Provide more natural habitats for wildlife to reside. Get over it. These animals are not of nuisance to me. Let them be. The only one that could be a nuisance would be mice as they can cause damage to homes, and wasps cause they are [removed].
- Leave them alone!! Don't kill them..
If there are safety concern for the animals relocate them.
- I think more education about the necessity of having a strong urban wildlife population would be beneficial.
- not too much... the key is communication. Give the public a simple tool to communicate when they see wildlife and ensure that the city uses available tools (twitter, etc) to get the message out.
- Keep dogs on leash when wildlife are present. Never allow them to chase wildlife.
- People realizing that we are encroaching on their space.... They were here first.
- People need to respect wildlife in our corridors and leave them alone. Keep your pets on leash or indoors.
- The city needs to be a safe place for wildlife. We need to address injured wild animals and provide them incentives to leave the city
- Until it is dangerous to human and pet life, ie more control over coyote dens
- More laws to protect them from being killed
- Education
- Respect that these are wild animals. Not encouraging them by feeding them or not disposing of garbage properly.
- Allowing Calgarians to eliminate the smaller nuisance animals such as squirrels, crows, bats, magpies, mice, pigeons, seagulls and wasps if they are causing damage or nuisance to individual owners. All other animals not listed in my list should be protected.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Better control over populations, obligations of businesses and private citizens to take proper steps to control environments that may be conducive to these animals building shelters or access to food/garbage.
- Cleaning up litter. Better waste management. Relocation of dangerous wildlife
- Ensuring that there are proper habitats for these species to co-exist. As our urban landscape grows and we destroy their natural habitat, they are required to resort to other means to live which can cause conflict.
- Public education.
- Accurate information vs Facebook hype and stereotypes. Maybe partner with the zoo, or fish and wildlife to show that living adjacent/together is possible if we respect each other's boundaries/needs etc
- Education--most of the above aren't a nuisance in yyc
- People abiding by the rules as well as realizing there are wild animals in the City and that THEY need to protect themselves as well as their animals when in open spaces
- Providing more spaces for the wildlife to live, co-existing with the wildlife and understanding that humans have to share the land, having bobcats porcupines skunks coyotes around make Calgary feel more connected to nature and more peaceful not just a gross concrete jungle (like deadmonton)
- My experience is with coyotes in Varsity/SSprings Bowmont area. Education about timing of mating, denning, birthing; family/pack composition so that people will be more respectful of where/when to leash dogs in off-leash areas. And importance of discarding poop, not just bagging, leaving on trails.
- Hold property owners accountable for keeping their property clean and free of loose garbage. Ensuring pet owners do not leave any pets unattended while outside.
- Education. Being considerate of their space.
- That we live in harmony with these wildlife animals and not consider them a nuisance. That the public should be educated on them and their importance to the city. But also education on if we don't want to invite these critters that we have ways without using relocation or poison
- Well we should not be coexisting with wasps, for one! That's really the only issue I have on this list. They are killing bees, and ruining everyone's 3 months of actual summer weather. Death to wasps! Replace with bees.
- Leave them alone, give them distance/space and stop trying to legislate what should be common sense. Look at the extent we humans went to on behalf of a coyote and her pups in Arbour Lake. Despite the signs, the fence, the very clear message of DO NOT GO HERE, humans went there, regularly.
- Unless they are a threat to human/children's lives just leave them alone. My dog chases the pigeons, crows, magpies and squirrels out of our yard. If you are consistent they will find somewhere else to make their nests and hang out
- if these animals are aggressive and have moved into residential they should be removed and relocated.
- Stop developing so many subdivisions into wild life areas. Also our home prices would rise if there were not an over supply of homes.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think bobcats and coyotes are the only real threats on this list, in the sense that they are the only animals on the list capable of killing a child. At the same time, they are also the only things keeping the rabbit population down, and even so the rabbit population continues to rise.
- Increased fish and wildlife presence/help when wandering to residential areas
- Suitable warnings when animals seem to be causing problems in a particular area especially coyotes or bobcats that can be threats to pets or children.
- Public education about what these animals contribute to the ecosystem and what to do when encountering wildlife, lowering residential speed limits, restrictions on the use of pesticides, poisons and other chemicals that are harmful to wildlife.
- Educate all Calgarians to understand that we're encroaching on wildlife habitat, not the other way around. Calgarians need to understand how to avoid confrontations with wildlife and the City of Calgary has the responsibility to ensure that understanding.
- ensuring garbage/waste is contained; picking up and disposing of pet waste. Not allowing house cats out to roam free!
- 1st of all, the BIGGEST NUISANCE is not on the list! There should only be one: PEOPLE! People are the biggest nuisance! People create kaos, war, pollute, kill for pleasure, steal, torture animals, rape etc... only to name a few. People need to take responsibility for their actions.
- Create safe Passages for animals. Move wildlife before tearing apart their home to create ones for humans
- Education, regular garbage disposal, help with fixing any destruction caused by wildlife
- We need to re-define "nuisance" wildlife. It is just wildlife. We need live with all these animals. Dog owners need to respect on-leash areas. Most think if there is not a sign then they can walk their dogs off-leash. Cats need to be leashed when outside. They are a major cause of bird deaths.
- Understanding that they have as much right (or more) to exist in the space as we (the people) do.
- Education
- More education required to advise persons that we are invading animal habitat and we must co-exist. Tolerance is a requirement. Animals travel through our area, some stay many leave. Knowledge is the Key.
- Web based education on how it is best to deal with these "nuisance wild life" including the benefits that they offer to Calgarians. ie skunks eat wasps ect
- The city of Calgary needs to become more responsible for the rabbits and hares and bunnies let loose in the city, and reduce the release of other pets such as fish or birds. They are invasive. Coyotes are dangerous
- try not destroying all of their habitat - and if you have to move them then move them don't kill them.
- Ideally support for relocation of problem animals. I had an experience where I couldn't use my front door because of crows in the tree in my front yard
- I dont see these animals as generally a nuisance.
I live adjacent to Fish Ck BECAUSE they are there. If they stay onto my lawn that doesnt make them a nuisance.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education to public, including signage where appropriate (like deer signs on roads). Working in closer partnership with wildlife organizations, or specialists in the fields, to come up with ongoing plans for current and future wildlife management.
- Educate people. We can totally live cohesively with wildlife.
- Accept that we have invaded their habitat. We should leave them alone, but we can't because that's what our species does, we wreak havoc on other species.
- I am of the opinion that some animals need to be culled by the city: squirrels, magpies, and pigeons. The Eastern gray squirrel is actually breeding out the American red squirrel. Also, wasps are beneficial insects - they are pollinators, and predators of pests.
- Areas that have active wildlife (bobcats & coyotes) should be patrolled with safe removal outside city limits. Neighborhoods 45 + years old have an increased activity of bobcats. People should not fear their own back yard or be afraid to put their dog out in their secure yard.
- Public education about them so one knows how to interact with them safely.
- Black bin p/u increase! When bins are full, setting garb bags next to, is only option. Left in storage room & resulted in mice and spider infestation- waste p/u is crucial because leaving garb outside (not in a bin) also results in major mess from wildlife tearing apart bags.
- Let's live and let live. But here are examples of some exceptions: please don't get after us if we have to trap a mouse who is eating our belongings. Please help us out if we have a skunk under the front steps.
- Education on these creatures -- their place in the ecology. What we miss if they are gone. Strategies for co-existing that are well publicised in those communities that have the largest "problem".
- None of these creatures are a nuisance. I LOVE them all. Organizations like AIWC & CWRS should be paid to visit schools & communities etc to educate people about how to love & care for our fellow creatures. Humans have invaded & removed the habitats of many of these creatures.
- Not have garbage outside
- Telling residents to back the F off. There is nothing wrong with a bobcat in the neighbourhood, and if you leave them alone they will leave you alone.
- Urban sprawl is real and it will impact wildlife. There is a difference between animals protecting themselves and those that become predatory. Animals that become predatory in behavior must be removed from residential areas where children and domestic animals can be injured or worse.
- People recognizing that we have moved into the wildlifes home and should be tolerant that they continue to live near us.
- A media blitz by Nose Creek and Fish Creek parks to inform citizens on what to do when they see or have an animal approach them.
- Learn how to exist with the wildlife while learning how to keep them out of your spaces
- Change the golf course to large forests for those animals to co exist.
- I'm not sure that co-existence is really an option! Some may need to be relocated, others may need to be eradicated.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Just leave them alone, keep garbage/food sources secured so as not to attract wildlife. For pigeons I've heard other areas use feed them with pigeon food that has pigeon specific birth control in it to reduce population since they are an invasive species.
- People don't have much knowledge about wildlife and how to co exist. I think Education in this would help.
Maintaining yards and parks
- I am not bothered by most of these animals. Larger animals we must be aware of to ensure that our pets are not killed or injured by them.
- Educate the public. More private place just for animals.
- Bobcats/coyotes need to be taken more seriously. We shouldn't have to 'co-exist' at the risk of our pets and children.
- 1. Education about how to manage the wildlife so we can easily co-exist.
- -set up bat houses in public areas/parks, so less likely to go into houses - helps reduce mosquitoes with less pesticides.
- -provide guides/information to home owners on how to deter nuisance wildlife from their property
- I strongly urge the city to not support the existence of coyotes with dens/pups within residential areas where there are families/children/pet owners. It is not fair, and not right for both the coyote and the residents of a community to be forced to be at continuous risk with coyote dens!
- People and wild life must co-exist. People have to be proactive, by keeping their children and animals in secure areas. Don't leave food or garbage out to attract wildlife. Don't walk in areas known as habitats, stay aware of your surroundings. Wildlife is losing homes/area to construction/growth.
- Education. I think most can be managed and some left alone will manage itself, having both predators and prey. Example: I walk my dog everyday in various parks and pathways, and use to see multiple rabbits everyday and night in the SW areas, now I've seen more coyotes and a lot less rabbits.
- More education so that people understand that most wildlife is not a threat if a few precautions are taken, ie, clean up after your pet, give wildlife a wide berth, keep pets under control
- A lot of wildlife is attracted to the green bins. They are smelly and garbage often falls out of them when they are being emptied. Perhaps some sort of different collection of the green bin would help with keeping wildlife away?
- Better education about how to coexist and keeping people out of spaces with den sites.
- Educate people how they can predator proof their backyards, increase trapping a feral and increase trapping of feral and Stray Cats will take another food item off the menu and decrease Predator populations.
- Education from multiple sources - tv, radio, social media and on-site at off-leash parks. Signs where presence is high or wildlife has been aggressive. Relocating wildlife when possible.
- As the city grows, the animals need space to live too. Educate the public that it is their duty as a human being to be respectful of animals as they all co-exist. The coyotes & bobcats need the mice & rabbits as food etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Safe passages to wilderness areas. Animal-proof garbage containers.
- Having more respect for the wildlife; they are just trying to survive and in general are not treated respectfully. Free roam cats, unleashed dogs, drivers running them over, being shot at with pellet guns, diminishing land being developed rapidly. There should be more protected areas for them
- Coyotes need the fear of humans re-instilled in them. This can be done by wildlife officials shooting paintballs at them to teach them to stay away from humans.
- Ensuring there is adequate segregation of natural habitats for these animals from the general public and pets. Reserves and game trails connecting areas these animals frequent with adequate signage to indicate the purpose of these areas and precautions if necessary.
- When people are outside with their pet they need to be paying attention to the area around them, not texting or talking on their phone. Especially in an off leash, you should know where your dog is at all times and if there are any present dangers to your pet.
- Education. Ways to make coyotes scared to approach people, or remove the ones who are tend to approach or stalk people or their pets.
- Better education. We need to co exist as Calgary has become so developed these critters have nowhere to go and are misunderstood. Also make people aware of wildlife hospitals if they find injured wildlife.
- Those are not nuisance animals. Seriously? We are living in their space and they are 100% harmless.
- Making people keep dogs on leash with the exception of off leash parks
And having good sized fines for people who harass or harm wild life by them selfs or through their dogs begin off leash
We need to insure wild life rehabilitations can go anywhere to help injured wild life including all parks
- I think it depends on which species, clumping these species as one and calling them wildlife isn't useful. Some of these species are introduced (e.g. black squirrels). I think from where I see things we coexist well but I live inner-city where we maybe don't see as much diversity.
- Protection for wild animals. Strict fines for citizens who break the laws and disrespect wildlife and put them in danger. Zones for wild animals to give them their own space.
- More education of the public via public service announcements, etc
- The only animals on that list I've ever had an actual problem with are squirrels & wasps. The city could encourage the sale of only squirrel proof bird feeders, but the wasp problem is harder. Everyone collectively needs to do a better job of locating and destroying nests on their property
- Addressing dangerous animals (ie. Coyotes snatching dogs). Nuisances are fine, but once the behaviour becomes aggressive towards people it should be addressed.
- A safe removal plan and resource office for large nuisance wildlife such as bobcats and coyotes. The current "live with it" strategy isn't working and endangers safety of pets, children and the wildlife. A resource office or wildlife strategy would be helpful for all.
- Understanding the environmental impact on our wildlife
Educate yourself and others



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Live by fish creek park 35 years haven't had issues with wildlife till this year. Have bob cats who are preying on my dogs in yard and can't do anything about it. I can't stop a cat from coming in over the fence or down from garage roofs.
- Teaching people how to co-exist. We are increasingly taking over their space.
- Rabbits, Coyotes & Bobcats - we back onto a school field & we have seen/heard coyotes in this field. Also heard stories of people having to alter their route to school due to coyotes standing its ground, making people fearful to pass. The reason we have coyotes & bobcats is due to the rabbits.
- Allow residents to shoot / poison the pests.
- I think that we need to control the magpie population. In my neighbourhood, the magpies terrorizes people and they have snuffed out all of the cute and friendly birds. I think they should be relocated or permanently removed as their population is out of control.
- Make it more visible publically when dangerous animals have been spotted, otherwise wild animals are wild animals not much we can do
- Educate people on wildlife and when it is safe and when it isn't to be around wildlife
- We are very lucky to have diverse wildlife in our city limits! I don't find any of the above to be a nuisance. It should be the responsibility of pet owners and parents to be vigilant. We share space with wildlife and we should behave accordingly. Trapping/relocating/culling should be a last resort.
- If the city stopped its sprawl and humans respected wildlife. Wildlife has been around longer than us yet we expect them to just go away when we enter their domain. The public needs lots of education on how to navigate with wildlife and that they are the intruder not the other way around.
- Continued education and public information re behaviours and seasonality of wildlife and what to do if encountered.
- The City of Calgary should have programs in place to be able to relocate or remove nuisance wildlife from personal property. Parks and protected spaces they should be left alone
- I think better control of the rabbit populations would help with the coyotes in areas near rivers and ravines (for example in Bridgeland and Lakeview). I think coyotes known to be in communities need to be relocated and dens should be destroyed.
- Ensure trash, poop and garbage is not allowed to be piled up in alleys and yards both public and private areas.
- I don't believe most of these animals should be considered a "nuisance." With the exception of pigeons, domestic rabbits, raccoons, and grey squirrels (not red), all of these are native species whose habitat WE have taken over. I think people need to learn to coexist and appreciate these animals.
- If people could understand that most will just pass through if you leave them alone. Also--keeping waste/attractants under control will limit interactions. Controlling pet/wildlife interactions. People need to understand how to properly react when they encounter wildlife (education).
- Cleaner trash areas to limit the undesirable food sources. More sustainable natural habitats to allow for natural food sources.
- Respecting these animals, allowing these animals to live in their natural environment without threat or harm



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Keeping natural areas and stop putting up new communities and banks and shops everywhere
- Ensure there are protected spaces in the city/outskirts of the city for wildlife to inhabit. Do not build in certain areas where they are natural habitats. Catch and release when possible.
- Reclassify bats as NON-nuisance wildlife. Ongoing education on non-harmful deterrents. Set precedent and expectation that humans and wildlife must coexist.
- A greater understanding of ecology, reducing Urban sprawl, and maintaining healthy green space within Calgary. Many of these animals do not wish to co-exist with us either, and would prefer their natural habitat.
- CALGARY is infested with moles/pocket gophers. They have moved into my yard from poorly maintained boulevards. As much as I hate interference with nature these pests need to be controlled and coyotes can't do it in regular communities.
- Greater understanding of their habits, eco-system and what urban features attract these types of wildlife and NOT permitting people to house them as pets
- Restrictions on times that owners can be with their dog in areas where coyotes may be. Kinda like a bear warning in effect. Then if people are there when during the times they shouldn't be or when a van is in effect they are responsible
- Stop releasing trapped skunks in fish creek park other parks. Take them several kms out of city limits
- Making poisoning them illegal.
Providing more natural habitat within our communities.
- Better information provided to communities on how to manage coexisting with these animals, and better options for aggressive displaced animals
- Humans are the problem not the wildlife. Humans create the problems and then blame the wildlife. destruction of their habitat and then humans are confused by wild life reaction to where did my habitat go?
- Seagulls Pigeons. Get rid of them.
- Better understanding of each species role in the eco-system. Eg. bats eat millions of flying insects, skunks eat grub and wasps, rabbits provide fertilizer and coyotes mange the mice populations.
- They need to be educated on why animals are attracted to living in the city. How they can keep their property tidy and free of areas to den, or food to eat to deter them from their area. Animals have a right to live here too and generally provide no danger to humans if we are not in close contact.
- Strong education.
I wish people could be dissuaded from using rodenticides outdoors because that makes its way up the food chain and kills raptors.
Bats are endangered - they should be the focus of conservation efforts not tagged as nuisance.
There are no ""moles"" in Calgary. Bio-facepalm, people!
- I have no concerns with coyotes or bobcats, I am happy to have them around keeping some of the other nuisance animals under control. Skunks are a big problem and I wish I had some helpful ideas on how to co-exist with them -- I very much dislike seeing them around my community!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- better education and information leaflets in our enamx/bills/community newsletters on how to co-exist. Is there a better word for nuisance? I don't see many of these as a nuisance.
- Wow, all of those animals were here before us. Most help keep other pests in check. Keep your cats inside, don't let them roam, which can attract coyotes. Don't litter, even food, and you will help keep seagulls and magpies from foraging.
- Population monitoring and control. Crows (also read Magpies) seem to have invaded Calgary in the past few years to the peril of other birds such as Robins, Wrens and house sparrows. Mice will invade homes if permitted, wasps will build their nests under decks--these both have to be controlled.
- I live in Cranston area and have wildlife in the area. We walk our dogs in the Fish Creek area and are aware of Coyotes and Porcupines, but we need to be responsible with our animals so that we have no incidents. If we want to live in an area where wildlife live, we need to adapt our behaviours
- Bobcats,lynxs, coyotes,skunks should be removed from neighborhoods. Any Wildlife that is a threat to domestic animals and people. Cats hunt mice,gophers, squirrel. Bats eat mosquitoes.. All good! Leave all the rest on the list alone...people need to be mindful of attractants in yards..ie garbage
- Knowledge of the common animals is important.
- More educational initiatives may help. I know there is a real problem on Nose Hill Park of people ignoring the rules of on-leash areas and letting their dogs harass wildlife, and I think authorized volunteers should be able to hand out tickets if there is not funding to send city staff there.
- Live & let live. Leash your dog.
- stop urban sprawl and a high amount of education to the public. we are the ones who came into their territory and changed their landscape. More signage? more natural habitats areas wildlife only . Dog owners should leash dogs more often.
- Leave the animals alone. Post signage where there could be a danger to humans or animals. Fine those who insist on infiltrating danger zones.
- Property owners/renters should not be putting garbage out for pick up until the morning of scheduled pick up, birds feeders should be less accessible for all wildlife except for the birds.
- more enforcement by by-law and provincial officers
- Provide information on how to deter nuisance wildlife in yards; track reports of aggressive animals and follow up in areas with multiple reports to remove the animals
- educate public about what to do if you encounter wildlife
- Learn about them, enjoy them, shoo them but do not hurt them. They have a right to live too.
- Education about native species and their habits. Proper storage of garbage/food waste to not unnecessarily attract animals where we don't want them
- better understanding of migratory bird act/wildlife act regs (what's illegal, fines). People should contact specialists to deal with wildlife humanely(not try to deal with animals themselves). Better understanding of wildlife behaviour ("nuisance" animals are usually harmless/will leave you alone)
- Get rid of the coyotes, they kill small pets and they are getting bolder in approaching people. We need a more aggressive way to get rid of the coyote population in Calgary. I believe they need to be killed, but that is just one idea.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Trap and feed rabbits to zoo animals. Survey numbers of magpies (I believe they are high) and eradicate to establish population control - the same would be for pigeons. Fine people who feed wildlife.
Establish systems now so raccoons do not become in Calgary like they are in Toronto.
- First, get rid of pest, nuisance lists, you spread prejudice and hate by having them and people have become violent towards them. Education is well overdue here in Calgary, teaching what wildlife do for our eco-system and how very delicate it is now and should be of highest priority to protect them.
- Closing areas to humans when the wildlife there is breeding.
- More natural spaces and corridors for these animals to move and interact (ie. naturally control population) with other species
- Education
- None of these animals are a nuisance, they are vital parts of our eco-system. If they (bobcats and coyotes) are threatening the safety of humans or pets, they should be relocated. The other animals should be left alone unless they are causing damage to property. They provide valuable cleanup service
- Some need to learn/coached on how to co-exist with these animals. We are invading their home so it's natural that there will be more interaction. If I can walk my dogs responsibly on or off leash with wild animals around then so can others. It's up to the owners to observe and have pets under control
- Education is the key to understanding urban wildlife, particularly the wildlife considered to be nuisances. Ignorance and misunderstandings cause the problems.
- Education to the public on these populations; teaching how to manage their properties to decrease the possibility of these populations from homing on their properties
- Eliminate all coyotes before someone gets hurt
- Remove coyotes from residential areas or deter them, just as other communities have done with garbage bears.
- Keep garbage secure, respect that they are wild.
- Many years ago we had an urban wildlife control team. I would like to see this brought back. They responded to problem wildlife calls providing great education opportunities along with humanely dealing with wildlife.
- I have two small dogs and live close to Nose Hill. I wish I felt safer walking my dogs, but there are a lot of coyotes in our neighborhood.
- Respect for the wildlife - let them be and avoid/work around them. Stop hassling/hazing the wildlife!
- Timely cleanup of street litter and refuse so that animals are not encouraged to seek garbage.
- More enforcement — too many users not following regulations, particularly off leash dogs in on-leash areas
- For the most part they just need to be given space. Don't let your cat or dog roam free, and 99% of the time wildlife can co-exist seems to be more a pet owner problem not a wildlife problem.
- Allow cats to roam freely possibly with some restricted hours to assist in keeping rodents and such under control



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals were here first only when numbers reach out of control should city act. Persons walking small dogs need to be aware of danger and keep their animals near. Wildlife rarely bothers humans
- Education on the species and tolerance to a point but when they become threatening to humans and pets then control needs to be readily available not on a 9 to 5 schedule
- Skunks need to be addressed, skunks are becoming increasingly common in residential neighborhoods. My dogs, children, and myself have all been attacked by skunks. More of an effort to trap and remove need to be focused on. Of all the nuisance wildlife listed, they represent the greatest threat
- Stay out of their way and leave them alone. They were here first.
- More education for people on how to coexist. Sadly, many dog guardians don't pick up after their pets and throw away a lot of garbage.
- I think people need to be more responsible. For example, having dogs off leash in a place where coyotes are active. Or letting your cat roam free. I feel it can be more of a people problem. But there is some fencing in certain areas that the city could provide.
- Education for most people on animals would be a huge help. Add it to classes in grade school. Teach people how to live with them.
- More education to Calgaryans to realize these are wild animals not pets
- Prohibit the feeding of squirrels, pigeons and rabbits.
Prohibit the improper setting out organic garbage that wildlife can access.
- More education. They aren't going anywhere.
- Education on how to deal with, live near, and co-exist with these animals.
- Information! Advertising on the importance of leaving wildlife alone!
- I don't consider any of these issues. It's wildlife people need to learn to coexist. If you do have a problem animal being destructive Calgary city should be called to remove and rehome said animal
- Education, we moved into the animals homes
- Education, these animals were here first
- Understanding that they are equally viable to all the space in the city. But let me remove a wasp nest with a spray, let me remove a skunk with a trap, let me put water down a gopher hole, and let my cat go after Magpies even if she will probably lose.
- Providing enforcement when an animal such as a bobcat, coyote or skunk is creating a dangerous situation or a nuisance for residents of Calgary.
- I don't want to exist with these
- Just to leave them alone and always take precaution. Remember we have built onto their land.
- More open space dedicated for wildlife and active humane management by City staff (or appropriate contractor) to allow for successful living for both wildlife, people and domesticated animals.
- Halt the City's expansion into their habitat.
Calgary doesn't need to be continually creating new communities and expansion. Especially with the amount of existing developments, and the flooded housing market.
The city planners should be thinking at building Calgary upwards and not outwards.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If the animal isn't a threat, let it be. People need to learn tolerance, WE are the ones encroaching into their territory.
- Many people don't recognize that there is a lot of urban wild life, I think a lot of people would benefit from a public service announcement regarding safety and wildlife characteristics. Most of these animals just want to be left alone, and are attracted to improperly discarded garbage.
- First, we should stop referring to wildlife as 'Nuisance' or 'pests.' Secondly, education around the benefits of wildlife and how to coexist peacefully. Third, better enforcement of having dogs on leash (in leashed areas), and enforcement of having cats indoors or supervised leash walk.
- If people would give them space since we took over their homes. The issue would be fine.
- Education/Information: Talk to Calgary Wildlife Rehabilitation Society
- I think a regular inspection of the Calgary areas that are known to have wildlife is needed. Pet owners should be aware of what animals are in the areas they frequently visit with their pets, as well as an up to date notice of what wildlife may be in the area or what has been seen
- Responsible pet ownership to prevent wild animals from roaming the city.
- Stricter laws around keeping dogs on leash (unless in a marked off-leash area), and making sure cats stay inside.

More education in parks and around communities on wildlife safety, to protect both the wildlife and resident animals/people.

More education on when/how to report wildlife issues.

- A better plan for keeping wildlife away from traffic
- I think these wildlife are part of our community. If people are worried about their pet's safety (or their own safety) they should be able to take precautions such as fencing in their yard to keep skunks and coyotes out.
Calgarians may need more information on how to prevent unwanted wildlife.
- Respect for their natural habitats! Urban sprawl is a huge problem, we can not keep building new communities on the land that these animals inhabit, then expect them to disappear. We need to stop building out and start building UP, and ensuring these animals have a protected natural habitat.
- I think more involvement from wildlife/animal services needs to happen as far as predator wildlife impacting people and pets..difficult to say how to better co-exist other than signage/community informed/animals relocated as needed
- I live near a natural area, and one of the best parts of living here is the interaction with wildlife. I live here and consider myself part of a shared ecosystem with all wildlife. I would not want anything done to change the wildlife in my area, including the overabundance of magpies.
- Leave them alone, keep traps and bait only if they nest in or on your property
- Have a relocation policy when ever possible.
- Bobcats and coyotes should be trapped and moved to a natural habitat outside of the city. We have coyotes that come right up to our yard and this endangers our cats.
- Halt the City's expansion into their habitat.
Calgary doesn't need to be continually creating new communities. Especially with the amount of existing developments, and the current flooded housing market.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

The city planners should be thinking at building Calgary upwards and not outwards.

- An education campaign on the benefits of these animals.
- 311 Services to remove or control the nuisance at a reasonable fee without a fine or having to hire a private company. We are so overrun with crows and magpies that songbirds no longer nest in our community when it was once filled with various birds. Voles and pigeons are rampant.
- Teach an appreciation of how lucky we are to have the wildlife around. Educate people why trapping and relocating (particularly bobcats) just won't work, and have stiff penalties in place for any cowboys who think it's OK to take matters into their own hands. Educate on how to keep pets safe.
- I think the bird project currently going on to save window impacts should be listened to to avoid building further buildings that kill bats and birds
- Better best control
- We've had some issues with coyotes taking people's dogs. This creates a hostile view of the wild animals. Maybe signage in off-leash areas known to have potentially dangerous animals?
- If there is a threat to humans, wildlife officials should step in. If an animal is injured, same thing. It doesn't always work to just ignore them.
- Signage at areas where they have already created a problem. Relocate or destroy where causing a lot of conflict.
- Educate and/or fine dog owners for not following the on and off leash areas on Nose Hill.
- Ha! It will never happen. But the city should do more about the coyotes - these guys are getting more and more dangerous
- Educating people on the purpose of the wild life. How to coexist. Not harming the wildlife they all serve a purpose in our ecosystem.
- More areas that are safe for off leash to avoid wildlife conflicts.
- Using Media asking people to be tolerant and reminding them of the low risk
- Allow for enough green space for them to live in. People are the ones invading on their home. Especially with all the expanding the city is doing.
- A confident, optimistic approach to upholding a pro-wildlife culture among Calgarians. E.g., the BearSmart program indicates a 'status' to having this knowledge. Suggestions: Training ambassadors for each community, or modelling pro-wildlife enthusiasm via community programs, projects & publications.
- Its only the bobcats and coyotes that worry me as i have both dogs and cats. I put my cats on a leash in my own backyard but now I worry when I see bobcats in my yard over and over and the city does nothing.
- Have protected areas where these wildlife can exist with no interaction from people or pets. Deal with individual ones when problems arise otherwise leave them alone.
- People need to understand that the wildlife have as much right as we do to be here. When walking at places like nose hill, be aware of wildlife. People don't like it, stay in the concrete jungle where wildlife is minimal. Culling because people choose to be uneducated about wildlife is unacceptable.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- STOP BUILDING MORE COMMUNITIES!! There will be no more so called “country living” because of all of the nonsense building! Fill up the empty places first! Take away their homes, they will definitely move into ours! STOP culling! STOP killing! STOP building into their territory. It’s simple! LISTEN!
- People education about coexisting, information posted online or in areas where there are sightings of larger numbers.
- Knowing they are there, what to do do you are not attracting it to your property. What to do if they are on your property.
- Stop referring to them as "nuisance wildlife", for starters. Who gets to decide who's a nuisance? Using what criteria?
- Information
- Protected areas outside city limits for the wildlife.
- More knowledge about the various species and how to handle them when they are a nuisance or safety concerns.
- People should leave wildlife alone
- Education and awareness of the risk and steps to ensure safe interactions.
- Calgary needs to educate Calgarians on the wildlife in our city and what can be done to co-exist. They need facts not fiction and know what to do in the event of an encounter.
- I think it’s fine. They were here first and our ecosystem cannot live without them
- I wish I had a suggestion.
- I have a hard time with harming any of these animals. I feel we should share our environment with wildlife.
- Education, and understanding. Support/noticed in areas experiencing an influx of these animals especially coyotes and bobcats.
- Skunks have been a particular problem, with many dogs being skunked...in the summer on almost a daily basis we smell or hear of another skunking...the city doesnt seem to do anything about it...we need some sort of solution.
- Help with rehoming them.
- The skunks smell up the yard but they also eat a lot of pests so its a mixed blessing. The squirrels get really out of hand but not sure what could be done about it
- PLEASE, stop building more communities and start filling all the empty homes/places sitting abandoned. You take away their habitat, of course they will encroach on our supposed space. Uprooting their eco-system is damaging. Building "green spaces" is a joke to me! Seriously!
- I liked seeing the sandwich boards notifying us of coyote sightings in our local off leash dog parks. Notices of when wildlife are breeding and what they are eating might help us plan around them. Inform people why they should not feed birds, squirrels and the rest.
- Public awareness facilitated by programs offered to public for participation of educating, raising awareness of impact of eco systems



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Information about not leaving food sources out to attract wildlife. We also have to recognize that we have many urban/woodland interfaces and have to learn to live with wildlife. We took over their space
- Education. Ppl are so entitled, they think the animals should be killed. We are in their home and continue to destroy what's left of it. Ppl need to be educated how to safely coexist & handle issues without harming the animals. We want to live close to nature then complain when nature is in our yard
- - Called 311 with coyote not much could be done
 - Fish and wildlife, will kill it.
 - Lived with coyotes for a longtime , control pets
 - More education
 - City sprawling no where to go
 - Diffrence between city-fied coyotes and wild
 - Used to be one in the neighbourhood
 - More education
 - Don't go off leash
 - Let people know when coyotes in area
 - Education about how to be proactive - tips like dealing with garbage
 - Education
 - Social Media
 - tips about wasps
 - Blitz out to cat and dog owners
- - Rabies has increased, passed on to domestic animals
 - Bobcat in yard - no one can help you, but not allowed to do anything
 - more public knowledge info about animals, what to do to avoid them, info about coyotes etc. in area
 - people send texts to city, have city pass that on
 - Bears tracking dogs in N. Glenmore, better signage
 - Urban interaction with wildlife is a reality
- - Education - about times of the year, baby den
 - Signs
 - Education
 - People release rabbits
 - learn to coexist
 - Educatuion in schools, what to look for
 - Should animals be relocated if a certain # of pets are being killed
 - They remove beavers from killing trees
- - coyotes take care of rabbits
 - animal control
 - my animal



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- cleaning up garbage, proactive
- don't feed wildlife
- releasing rabbits encourages dead wildlife
- education in schools, Eg. social medial pics - respect wild animals to live amongst us
- threat to public = police enforcement = better trained
- it's a nuisance issue = relocated
- lack of fear is an issue
- like for city to come out and trap skunks
- needs, attracts them
- good to have signs when it is time
- forbid pets to interact with these wildlife.
- Education on the benefits of having some of these creatures in the area. For example: skunks reduce the number of moles/mice.
Education on humane ways to limit nuisance wildlife.
Resources to help have wildlife in their area that need to be relocated. Community alerts for dangerous animals.
- Do not throw bird seed on the ground, it attracts prey, squirrels, mice, ground feeding birds, and predators, such as bobcats which we saw stalking them in our area last summer. Use catch trays under the feeders
- I firmly believe that the city should hold educational classes on how to peacefully coexist with the wildlife we are blessed to have in the city.
- Most important is open lines of communication for home owners to access truthful facts from experts for information as to co-exist or deter interactions
- Of the above list, the only ones that can harm pets and that can't be kept out of a yard through fencing is Bobcats. They've become way to comfortable in an urban setting and should be relocated.
- Realize that we are invading there spaces so be understanding
- Contractors should be paid by the city to properly & humanely remove nuisance wildlife if causing a problem in a neighborhood or park.
- Education about their purpose ecologically. For predators, relocating them to non-urban areas.
- more education
- More natural parks spaces, even small ones, so wildlife can also live.
Manmade nesting areas in large areas such as nosehill park to encourage and support wildlife in these areas.
Designate areas in large natural parks that are fur wildlife only - no human access.
- Tolerance and education. Information on how to deter unwanted pests.
- Better population management of pests, such as gophers, skunks, magpies.
In my experience, there has been little to no assistance when issues are reported.
-311 submissions have been closed without solutions
The public awareness that was brought forth for the recent coyote encounters was great.
[personal information removed]



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- more housing and natural areas so they do not feel cornered
- Skunks should be removed free of charge from residential areas. There is no way to coexist with these nuisances. They stink, and are vicious. Their smell penetrates the walls of homes and causes sleepless nights. Burning eyes and smelly clothes.
- I'm not impacted by any of these species. I know others are, however.
- I personally coexist with all wildlife fine, I believe they were here first and we are moving into their spaces and should respect them. By not leaving garbage outside the house to attract wildlife and having spaces for them to live peacefully with plenty of food might help.
- More articles about how smart magpies are, how interesting skunks are (and that they eat the pests in your gardens), how important bats are, what a good job wasps do controlling insect pests, etc.
- people should be responsible to appropriately manage their pets and garbage to co-exist with wildlife. I don't think coyotes and bobcats are nuisance. as the City continues to grow, it's human that invades into their habitat.
- The wildlife were here first and Calgarians need to respect that. Developers are causing the natural environment, which is home for wildlife, to vanish. The University District which was home to bobcats, coyotes, rabbits, etc is an example, Please reduce grey/black squirrels: getting overrun.
- Make landlords responsible for yard maintenance, especially garbage, compost and recycling activities so that wildlife is not attracted to garbage. Tenants may not be aware of, or care for proper garbage disposal practices.
Allow neutered and spayed cats to hunt, reducing prey for predators.
- More wildlife officers regularly patrolling communities and dealing with the wildlife in an ethical and safe way.
- More tolerance. They live here too and each serves a purpose in the eco system. It is unreasonable to think you can just eradicate them and not affect the life cycle of other animals. More education on how to coexist and less termination.
- Education for people on when to be concerned and how to coexist.
- Education about the importance of each species and their value to the well-being of cities.
Information on how to detour the animals to another area that is more suitable for them to live.
These areas need to be established to have natural balance.
- We need to do better at protecting the wildlife in our area & appreciating the uniqueness of having these animals among us. So, education & information that these animals should be respected and not harassed. Brochures sent to all households & information sessions about animals in certain areas.
- Education about what to do when you see one of these animals.
- We have over built in their areas, but the coyote population has exploded & is dangerous
- More information about wildlife provided to all calgarians. Like why they are in our spaces (actually we are in their spaces), how to happily co-exist, trouble shooting etc. Info provided by reputable animal welfare organisations and specialists



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Calgarians need to educate themselves and realize that WE are in wildlife's backyard! Be smart about having pets outside off leash. We as a city need to use more natural methods to maintain a peaceful existence with wildlife, as demonstrated by using goats to control weeds in parks-brilliant!
- I think the green spaces in Calgary need to allow for more wildlife to live and if conflict between humans and pets occurs with the wildlife, then the wildlife should not be put down. More intervention on fining individuals who do not follow the bylaws
- let them live unless they bring in or are diseased
trap mice & moles (kill), relocate skunks if bothersome, thin squirrel and rabbit population
- Support with relocation of the pest - not everyone can afford to pay. Education around simple deterrents or tips to deal with common problems.
- restrict off leash areas
create seasonal no go zones for dogs - heavy fines for people who don't abide by them
Education to curb citizen 'entitlement'
Add a clause to licenses that the owner acknowledges the risks of coexistence with wildlife and will abide by all notices and warnings.
- Keep green spaces available for them to reside.
Education programs.
Wildlife is not allowed to occupy the same residence as citizens. Trapping, poisoning, removal of nuisance should be allowed if wildlife is damaging citizens personal property or residence.
- Educating people on how to live peacefully with wildlife, and providing areas for wildlife to have space away from humans. Also, preventing pets from wandering freely, so they don't interact with wildlife
- Educate the public on looking for wasp nests early, how to inspect your property for evidence of any nuisance wildlife, what can the public do about it, etc.
- We need to stop spreading out and into their territory. I think people need to be aware that we share space. I am not in favor of killing wolves/coyotes/rabbits etc.
- If a wild animal is causing concern they should be relocated. Coyote's denning in an area near parks, playgrounds should be relocated. Raccoons are not native and should be trapped and euthanized.
- More education on how to deal with some of the larger animals (coyotes, bobcats).
- Keeping dogs on leash outside of off leash dog parks!
- Brains and more common sense from the general public
- People not being stupid and respectful that they are invading their natural habitat
- Moles, voles, ground squirrels, etc need City control, specifically on public land adjacent to homeowners property divided by fence. We pay private to treat our property yet issue is from untreated city-side next to homeowners' fence line. Why are we dealing with City Land problems! It's safety too
- Education, live and let live.
- It will never happen people like to complain and the city responds to the few who do complain versus most who try to coexist. most people understand we are growing and are taking over their territory. The city does a good job with most food being not accessible.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Many of these animals are following the food sources of individuals who feed them or the absence of predators. Control by the city of food sources for the predators would be helpful. Some of these animals are destructive in a city or farm situation. Population control measures are required.
- Each animal needs to be dealt with differently. Humans should not have rodents in their homes. Its very unkind to mice to leave pet food out and keep filthy homes that attract mice.
- Ensure dogs are on-leash when not in off-leash parks as they constantly harass and stress natural wildlife.
- City makes it illegal for citizens to put any feed out for ANY wildlife!
- Trap and release. Many of the pest control companies are willing to and if asked will catch and release. Certain species of bats are endangered because of white nose syndrome. The handling of the cougar a few years ago in sw Calgary was deplorable. The city needs to promote catch and release as we.
- Educating the public on how to keep wildlife out of their homes and yards, by keeping pets indoors or on leash where required. Educated the public that wildlife is important and has a place in our ecosystem. It's not the cities responsibility to remove these animals just because they are not liked
- If people would pickle up after their dogs coyotes would not be a problem but dog owners continue not to do this. I don't get it. I am a dog owner myself.
- Leaving certain areas as wild areas where these animals tend to live so that they aren't pushed out into neighbourhoods and yards. Ensuring pets are not off leash in known breeding areas. If the animals are not causing any issues then they should be left alone.
- Having slower speed limits on the roads where wildlife is regularly spotted. I love living in a city where I regularly see coyotes, skunks and rabbits. I think more steps could be taken to help protect the urban dwelling wildlife.
- Teach respect for coyotes, don't start killing them.
- More education.
- Educating the public on importance of these animals to nature's ecosystem. Protecting wildlife by Increasing fines and making legal action possible for those who try to harm animals (bats, coyotes). Calgary's response to injured wildlife is lacking. Usually no help is given. This should change.
- Education, and more aggressive tactics to keep aggressive coyotes from coming into our communities, other than in the green spaces.
- All of these animals have been moved from their homes due to our expanding city. Animal owners need to be diligent when they are out with their animals or let their animals out to respect the wildlife. I actually love seeing all the wildlife when out walking my dogs or sitting on my deck.
- Relocating the animals
- Domestic pets (and their owners) need to give wildlife a wide berth. Fenced offleash areas give priority to our domestic dogs, just as wild spaces give priority to our resident wildlife. Enjoying wild spaces with your pet includes avoiding the height of wildlife activity which is at dusk and dawn.
- More green space integrated into neighborhoods



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think that people should be aware of the wildlife in their area and take proper precautions with their pets. This means not walking your dog off leash in a area know to have coyotes or bobcats. Not letting your cats roam the neighborhood.
- Stop building and taking their space!
- Do not feed wildlife and let them be as much as possible... respect their space
- My main concern would be to keep the Alleyways clean. I live in Northeast Calgary and the nuisance animals live in the debris and feed on the garbage in the alleyways
- Stop the over building and taking their habitat away.
- Educate Calgarians about these animals - their useful habits (such as that bats eat mosquitos), their breeding cycles (so people know when to be extra careful around them), and their interesting behaviour (e.g. the intelligence of crows and magpies and how they communicate to each other.)
- More park spaces for wildlife.
- Education
- Enforcing yard and garbage clean up so not to attract wild life into the city. Is there no way to control the number of rabbits and coyotes? Some kind of contraceptive implants? Why are there so many domesticated bunnies that people have abandoned in the cemetery across from Stampede park :(
- Maintaining natural areas for them to coexist
- City be responsible & educate the public.Each neighborhood has assigned City rep who should do info sessions at community meetings, post information on the community websites and newsletters, send mailers to houses. City do info sessions at schools colleges, immigrant associations; education is key.
- I think that there are several animals on this list that aren't nuisance animals (bats, crows, bobcats, porcupines, etc.), they are the animals that should exist in this area naturally and should be accomodated to co-exist with. I think there should be more education and respect for where we live.
- It is us to humans to learn to live with all wildlife. Interventions should only be taken if wildlife is directly and intently threatening humans without provocation, or if they are causing potential damage to structures.
- Education, penalties for those who intentionally harm wildlife. Allowing for natural habitat to exist. Instead of developing every inch of land .. case in point Paskapoo slopes. Where are they to exist?
- Move coyotes and bobcats out of neighborhoods!
- Relocating skunks, and culling the coyote population as it has exploded in the past years. They have become a danger to pets in people's own yards. Risk of attacking dogs in parks, pathways and even inner city communities. Could put children at risk.
- More education about how to co-exist with wildlife safely and respectfully. Many people seem uneducated that we share our space with wildlife, and except for pigeons, they were here first.
- Rabbits are the only nuisance I encounter and I would be very happy for some population control to keep the predators out of the city.
- Education regarding proper behavior and interactions.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stop taking away their natural habitat! Don't leave garbage outside or otherwise accessible. Learn wildlife safety practices. Get educated on mating seasons. Don't allow pets outdoors unsupervised.
- when they come into the city humanely capture and relocate
- Let them be, it's their living space too
- Educate Calgarians about how best to co-exist with these wildlife, including which ones are native species to our area. Information could include safe interactions, how to discourage them from your property if they are a nuisance, how they interact with pets. etc.
- Education - like don't feed the wildlife (rabbits). How Bats are good for the community (eat mosquitoes)
- Education, awareness and myth-busting for Calgarians, and improved network of interconnected wild spaces for wildlife (so that they can travel between parks/river valley without passing through residential/commercial areas as much.) Recognition that biodiversity, even in cities, is a good thing.
- More green ways, parks and natural spaces in city planning. Public awareness and education on why it is important to have urban bio-diversity.
- Continue to educate the public and make them aware where the predators such as bobcats and coyotes are being spotted. Allow wildlife that becomes a nuisance or dangerous to be trapped and relocated. Create a resource where the public can turn to help them with nuisance wildlife
- Changing the messaging away from referring to these species as nuisance is a good start. Who wants to co-exist with a nuisance? Providing public messaging regarding safety around wildlife and how we can avoid conflict with them while also providing education about their ecosystem benefits
- More support in helping to keep the nuisance wildlife at a manageable level - how to control populations, limit damage to property, and safely remove or deter them from high population areas.
- City of Calgary needs to do something about the massive amounts of rabbits in the city. And provide education to the public on what to do when encountering any of the nuisance wildlife.
- Better access to resources/services to remove truly nuisance/dangerous wildlife such as skunks and coyotes. Education regarding things like bats to dispel myths
- Skunks in residential areas. I understand that they live here as well but there should be more help to remove an active den from a private property. We waited a whole summer for a skunk den to be removed before the neighbors poisoned them. We had no help and could not sit outside or leave dogs out
- Add humans to the top of the nuisance list! Who was here first? Who is the gate keeper for calling a creature a nuisance? What guidelines are used to classify a creature as a nuisance?
- There needs to be more public education, what to do if you see specific animals, when mating season is and do and don't, leash your dogs in areas where there is wild life is present.
- Predators follow food
 - Bats- beneficial
 - Crows/magpies pigeons seagulls annoying
 - Gophers foodsource
 - Mice foodsource
 - Moles you don't see them



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Bobcats coyotes just follow food

Porcupines not a nuisance

Rabbits foodsource

Raccoons

Skunks only stink

Squirrels foodsource

Wasps [removed] w/wing

- Bats and Bobcats are not a nuisance! 1) Control pets 2) keep garbage in proper containers 3) Understand that these animals were here first and taking precautions to stay out of their way would help.
- we need to do something when the wildlife is becoming a hazard in the city. We are being overrun by skunks in the NE and can't get rid of them. Same with coyotes. We don't have bobcats but other areas of the city do, and i think the city needs to help to relocate all the above
- Accept that we live with nature
- Understanding the habits and purpose of the wildlife
- Education on how to protect your yards, pet, garden from the wildlife. More information on who to call to deal with these animals.
- People just need to be aware of what wildlife is in their area and avoid it if possible. If you chase away the Coyotes some of their meals will flourish and then they become MORE of an annoyance. If you get rid of the Prey the Coyotes will become more of an Annoyance. The Answer is Balance!
- Leave them alone
- Ensure people leave them alone as much as possible, don't leave food around that attracts them.
- I think we already coexist to the extent possible. I don't see a need for change.
- Fining people who allow their dogs/children to chase them
- Info about what we are allowed to do about the nuisance birds.
- Calgarians simply need to educate themselves about the wildlife in their area. We are very lucky that we have the privilege of co-existing with the wildlife.
- Bat should not be nuisances. Is there a way to control magpies? They kill songbirds. Bylaws against feeding wildlife. A way to remove skunks?
- The city needs to control the rabbit population which is bringing larger predators. The city should be getting rid of all the coyotes, skunks, porcupines, and racoons in the city.
- don't have attractants in yards that will bring wild life in. Be respectful of wildlife
- Better understanding that we need to co-exist with these types of wildlife. Note - would not consider each of the identified wildlife equal. Ie mice and moles can damage house infrastructure and potential for fire, etc.
- Create areas that attract these animals to keep them away from residential and busy streets. Keeping them and citizens safe
- Training seminars and better coordination with Provincial fish and wildlife officers
- Educational programs that promote peaceful coexistence between these animals and humans.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Coyotes and bobcats are becoming too comfortable within the City and must be hazed and pushed back out to the City edges. For child safety Coyotes must be deterred from denning approximate to residential areas. Adopt New Zealand's successfully trapping and poisoning of nuisance animals program.
- Most of these animals pose no danger to humans and should not be considered nuisances. Coyotes especially are valuable predators who limit mice and vermin. Dog owners need to control their pets and not let them run off-leash or threaten coyotes. Bats are also valuable predators we should encourage.
- I've been unable to take our small dog to a dog park in town due the fact that a Coyote had attacked and killed someone else's dog in the park last year. There is a lot of tall grass and cover for coyotes to hide in during the summer. Enclosed parks or more established areas may prevent this.
- Control garbage.
- Don't feed them and keep animals inside.
- Educate. If you were pushed out of your home with your family, what would you do? Right. Get over yourselves and make room for other creatures. We created this mess so if we had any grace or intelligence as a species, we'd figure out we were no better than the above list, and, in fact, are worse.
- Giving wildlife some space in parks that is off limits to people & domestic pets.
- Bobcats and coyote can cause harm to pets and young children. Trying to find ways to keep them out of the urban communities. Especially during mating season.
- Education! Education! Education! The public and targaryens need to understand that these animals live with us and amongst us and they aren't going anywhere. We have to educate ourselves on proactive steps to avoid conflict with each species. Maybe the city can produce a proactive booklet for citizen
- Education
- I thoroughly enjoy the wildlife in Calgary. I have seen all the animals above in Calgary. I Firmly believer in the multiple wildlife corridors thru Calgary. As long as the individual animal has not shown to be a danger to humans, why classify them as nuisance wildlife.
- They are not the problem - we are. Humans have encroached on this territory to the point that we are spread out in a variety of habitats, and we can't expect to have no contact. Any decisions made must be at least as respectful of the animal as of the human. Maybe consult AB wildlife for ideas.
- We need to build up not out. Currently we sprawl and build roads where once there were ecosystems. We destroy their homes and their food source then complain that they enter our properties eating our plants or hunting our pets, then we euthanize the predators if they keep coming too close. Not ok!
- Educating the public. Unless they are a threat to anyone, such as aggressive coyotes, leave them alone. But; educating them not to feed skunks, raccoons, etc. is definitely needed.
- Control the food sources. Active efforts to reduce squirrel, rabbit and gopher population would reduce the number of bobcats, coyotes, and raccoons.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Set out rules that everyone must adhere to when dealing with wildlife, if you are in a park that is on leash, keeping dogs on leash, making sure that about the wildlife and pets are safe. Wildlife was here first. Make sure that people understand that there is wildlife around even if we don't see it.
- That Calgarians weren't so damn uptight. They were here before you were, and humans are invading the wildlife's home and natural habitat. Proper education on handling these so-called "pests" and possible relocation, rather than exterminating them.
- Leave it alone
- Ensuring that garbage is properly contained, so it isn't tempting for wildlife. Having enough green space for animals to live in.
- Education. Wildlife listed above are by a large not dangerous to us and, wasps excluded, are part of what this household enjoys about Canadian cities vs. those in other parts of the world. :)
- Education from wildlife rehab centers on how to live with or humanely deter the animals. Wasps should not be included in the wildlife group. The nest needs to be removed if there is danger of people getting stung.
- I believe magpies should be considered an evasive species. They have displaced the number and variety of song birds Calgary historically enjoyed. Measures should be taken to reduce the populations.
- Education, people have such negative perceptions of these animals. Some people have never even encountered a coyote but are terrified of them. It's needs to be less us against them and more let's try to work together.
- Teach them that many of them are beneficial to us (eg bats eat mosquitos, magpies eat dead critters) and most of them don't like us and would prefer we just leave them alone. I think most people don't like magpies because they are smarter than they are.
- We have a problem with moles. we have been trying to get rid of them. But 3 neighbours all have them so they seem to be spreading. I think more education as some of our neighbours are doing nothing and they are expanding.
- Better education and assistance with communities in close proximity to corridors
Fish creek Nose hill, river ways
- Not a large problem in my area. There are coyotes and rabbits as we live near the Bow River, however they keep their space. Pigeons destroy property frequently and I hate them.
- It is very important to coexist with wildlife. Have designated areas that are closed to the public so that wildlife has room to grow. Educate the general public and start to create awareness in schools on how to coexist with wildlife.
- More education, particularly about coyotes who we share our city with, could help. Co-existing with wildlife is a reality here - more coyote awareness about what to do if you see one, avoiding interaction and keeping pets away from them would be helpful; not waiting until there is a negative encounter.
- Better education on how to manage issues which may arise so that the wildlife can be appreciated without encouraging issues.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Unless they present a danger, or potentially will (ie predatory behavior) live and let live. (cull when appropriate)
- I am appalled at what is a 'nuisance' in Calgary. We need to learn to live with the animals instead of existing over them. I understand things can be frustrating, but perhaps if people were more educated on such things and cleaner, things could be better.
- Educate the public on how to deter the Nuisance wild life, what there typical behavior is and what may entice them.
- Educate public on how to discourage these animals from residential areas, know what there behavior is
- Education (media) that inform citizens about their habit and natural habitat and how to make properties less attractive to them
- It should be easier to relocate these animals when they become a nuisance. The city's response is often that you're on your own.
Perhaps a program to track the coyote populations would be useful to better understand their behavior and whereabouts.
- I believe that people (the city) have infringed on our wildlife's habitat. People should be aware of their surroundings to avoid contact with wildlife. Calgary should stop spreading out into the habitat of our wildlife. They were here before we were.
- Stop referring to them as nuisance wildlife? We have to expect to co-exist with wildlife that are naturally occurring in our climate zone. Education is helpful.
- City of Calgary could have information on the web on how we can interact or not interact with these animals to keep people and wildlife safe.
- giving these animals space within the city to live naturally so they are not forced into urban areas
- Better access for them to cross roads! Roads are huge barriers. Education - - no animals are a nuisance -they all have a purpose. Ensure we keep environments for them to thrive and eat. Make them a priority. It will make Calgary a better place. NO PESTICIDES! KEEP WETLANDS!
- I think that we should put them all in a pet shelter and then the pet shelter would train them so that we could buy them
- If you find wild animals just leave them alone so you don't get hurt. Just let the wild animal alone.
- I think that the wildlife should be left alone and not treated badly at all. If a certain animal over populates then we can get trained hunters or something like that to go put the animals to sleep.
- I think that if we don't bother the animals, then they will not bother us. If they do become a big problem in Calgary, we can sterilize some of them so they will not reproduce as much. This might be a large expense, but we could have a fundraiser.
- to leave them alone, and be friendly, so the older animals with long experience can tell there babies we are nice.
- Coyotes are coming thanks to all of the people letting their pet rabbits free and that can be annoying. Bunnies poop all over and eat the trees. They should be left at an animal center if people. Racoons and Skunks eat garbage so I suggest to put locks on the garbage cans that are still openable
- none.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Information regarding safe distances and keeping garbage/pets/anything attractive to wildlife inaccessible. I already don't mind them too much, wildlife should be protected and we should try to stay out of their way more than we do
- Education. If we know how to deal with these animals before they become a problem, they become less of a problem.
- Knowing when the activities of year are and where the active area are
- Knowing when active and where active
- I feel that some of the wildlife in Calgary is overabundant due to the lack of natural predators. Some culling would be welcome (beavers and coyotes)
- Reduce urban sprawl and consider revamping existing neighborhoods
- Only animal I have issue with are pigeons. The city should provide removal services.
- having wildlife training, first and foremost, people need to be educated. coexistence is possible, but only with education. it needs to start there. education on the behaviour of, the benefit of and the cons or things against. bats for example are not nuisance they actually provide a service.
- Relocate coyotes in residential neighbourhoods. They are too aggressive and dangerous. Eradicate wasp nests.
- More education, signage around known dens of coyotes, Open Calgary map showing all 311 calls for different species, by neighbourhood
- Better understanding for the HUMANS that they are encroaching on the animals space.
Except wasps. We can do without wasps!
Limiting urban sprawl and ensuring that animals have space to roam safely.
More public garbage bins (within Fish Creek, walking paths etc) to prevent garbage as an attractant
- Do not encroach on there dens/ homes
Have a system in place for the removal of the animal if it's stuck or made its way into some part of your home so that you don't bother then and they don't bother you
- Public education and respect toward animals and habitat available to them. Reliable agencies to receive reports of sighting or nuisance.
Expectation of prompt response and re-location if dangerous/ habitual encroachment on residential or playground areas.
- Yes
- Community sessions about how to properly deal with, approach (or not approach) wild animals that includes an understanding of the benefits (ie. bat boxes) as well as the risks (ie. mating season for coyotes)
- Not leave outside open garbage or food to lure and feed wildlife.
- do a MUCH better job of hazing the animals out of the city
- Education. The animals were here before us and will be here after we are gone.
- Education to the general public
- Wildlife attractants that are of human origin (poor garbage handling, outside dog and cat food) should be controlled where possible. Bats and bobcats should not be considered nuisance wildlife.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Covered garbage stored in garages or secure places. Not put out the night before pick up.
- Education and measuring its effectiveness is key to co-existence. Start with the predators. Coyotes and bobcats play a critical role in managing the populations of the rodents and other animals. All of the wildlife listed are a part of our ecosystem.
- There is no co-existing with Coyotes, Porcupines, skunks or bobcats. They DO NOT BELONG IN THE CITY where small children are at risk or pets.
- More effort on education in park areas
- We need to coexist with nature
- Control coyotes population, other than that nature will take care of the rest.
- We have a serious problem in Calgary with crows & magpies. They are noisy, make a mess by picking through garbage, and do not allow other bird to live in the area where they are - very predatory in that way. I think the city should consider a program to control them.
- Educate people to co-exist; teach of the benefits and ask why they feel so entitled and that their own needs are superior to any other creatures. Increase stigma, media awareness and punishment against offenders.
- Some sort of way to report where these nuisance species are and if there is an infestation. Some sort of way to remove them or assist with removing them.
- These “nuisance” wildlife are just trying to live in their natural area but now are becoming a nuisance to people and their small pets. What would help if to give these wild animals a wide berth and respect that certain areas including dog parks will have normal, wild animals in the area.
- Teaching Calgarians how to safely interact and avoid wildlife.
Garbage cans should be left closed and if animals are found in areas where they can pose harm Calgarians should expect them to be safely removed.
- Education. More support to wildlife rescues.
- I disagree with most of these 'nuisance' categories. I'd say the overbearing, ignorant, greedy City of Calgary that lacks compassion and humanity could itself be considered a nuisance.
- Wildlife bridges, more green space, safe relocation of potentially dangerous animals, better waste management and closable waste bins, education to citizens on safety in green areas, etc.
- Educate the public. I really don't see any of these as nuisance wildlife. They were here first and we are encroaching on their territory. We need to modify our behavior, not the other way around. An interactive map or website tracking sightings / encounters would be helpful. Its about being aware.
- Humans and wildlife live in harmony here.
- It is so important to increase education of people, to encourage respect and compassion for animals. There are ethical science based ways to deal with animals that can benefit people and animals alike. The greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated.
- Education and learning to coexist. It's heartbreaking when these animals are treated as vermin and killed



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education. We need to educate Calgarians that as the city expands and encroach further into wildlife's natural habitat, we are bound to see more of them, and we have a duty to take due care such as leaving them alone and keeping tidy communities.
- HOW ARE BEAVERS NOT ON THIS LIST??? Beavers are causing so much damage to the urban forest along the rivers. They kill so many trees every year. They need to be dealt with - removed, trapped, whatever. They do not belong in an urban environment! (This is not enough space to deal with all species.)
- They have as much right to be here as we do. The more we build and expand the more we will limit their space to be free and wild. Wild life corridors must be protected and further building restricted.
- HOW ARE BEAVERS NOT ON THIS LIST??? They destroy the urban forest. They are responsible for the destruction of hundreds of trees. They need to be relocated, trapped They are a nuisance and should be dealt with more effectively. This isn't enough space to comment on all species listed here.
- Create space for these animals to survive within the city rather than try to obliterate them. Try to keep all the animals in balance with each other.
- You won't have as many predatory animals if you get rid of the overpopulation of rabbits, voles/moles, and mice. It's crazy how many there are!
- Pick up pet waste. Pet waste is an attractant, and for those that do not pick up their pet waste, it naturally attracts wildlife and results in conflict.
Also, when people let their cats roam, it also attracts wildlife, and often results in the cats being attacked by wildlife (coyotes).
- Far greater collective consciousness than our species is capable of achieving.
- If we stopped considering wildlife nuisances. We are the invaders in their habitat and we should be focusing on how we can coexist. We should be looking to protect wildlife, and by default ourselves, not treating natural spaces as our private playground to do whatever we wish. Also, pick up dog poo.
- We MUST learn to co-exist. As humans we have the capability to keep ourselves, our children and our pets safe. The creatures we share our communities with have just as much right to be there as us.
- Educate the public because social media causes misinformation. Create corridors for animals to travel to and from the river, etc.
- More education ...
- Education, limit pesticides use, do not feed, keep garbage in recepticals.
- Easy access to information on wildlife situations such as: what to do when there is a Bobcat in your neighbourhood? How to avoid attracting pests (skunks to your property). What do you do when squirrels nest in your roof?
- Leave them alone.
- The city should be killing coyotes that are trying to attack/interact with humans and their pets.
- Squirrels should be allow but all other animals, particularly Raccoons, coyotes, bob cats etc., pigeons, crows, gophers and moles etc. should be eliminated in city limits
- more education



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- EDUCATION!!! My neighbourhood (Brentwood) has many skunks and bobcats. People leave garbage out all the time, in yards and alleys. I see the skunks going through it and making a mess. Teach people about skunks and how to not attract them. I enjoy the wildlife in the city. I don't consider a nuisance
- City employees should be authorized to assist all Calgarians when these animals, dead or alive, are on private property and causing homeowners concerns.
- public education on what to do scenarios, public notice posted in areas where they are
- stopping the sprawl of the city.
- Education, people fear what they don't understand. Educate how to live in peace with them, about the animals needs and how they contribute to a healthy ecosystem, how to treat animals with respect and kindness (e.g., don't refer to them as nuisance as above many that is a licence to kill or harm).
- For people to stop being so stupid and educate themselves regarding wildlife. They were here first.
- I find magpies will attack small dogs or people if you are near their nest. Wasp control if possible they get very bad. Other wild life I have not had an issue with.
- Huge fines for people caught feeding or baiting wildlife! Taking calls about these reports seriously and being able to fine.
- Education of the public to understand how nature works how these animals benefit the env. and how t help them live independent healthy coexistence. Referring to them as nuisance is detrimental to how people see them present a positive & healthy view of nature and the animals that live with us
- Education; communicating with people to tell them about non-violent ways to discourage nuisance wildlife from entering their private space, and to help them understand the body language of animals so that they know when an animal is posing a threat, and when it is simply going about its life.
- No culling Maintain migratory corridors through parks & protect spaces. We love animals. Indigenous people understand wildlife in a different way. Take the time to commune with nature. Then we'll know how we can coexist.
- If people aren't getting hurt, let wild animals live in the city.
- If they're in their natural baitat & not hurting anyone, leave them alone.
- Maintained parks when they can be around with trees. I think we should lern how to co-exist with wildlife as long as it is safe.
- The city should do more to encourage more wildlife. It makes life in the neighbourhood better. Educate people on how to be safe around wildlife, and so that the animals are also safe.
- I don't rwally have any issues with wild animals in Calgary. I like going to Fish Creek Park. I think bringing in Hawks to deal with pigeons is a good idea.
- Raise awareness that these animals live in the city. People should know who to contact if there's an issue. I feel safe in general, but some people may not.
- You can see coyotes raoming down the bike path in Beddington. It's a little scary. They can eat your pet out of yard. I don't know what we can do.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals on leash. Protecting Parks and Corridors. Education at Dog meetups & partnership with Dog/pet businesses.
- We should not hunt them. Leave them in their own habitat.
- There needs to be more education on how to deal with wildlife. People need to know to stay away. Growing up next to Nose Hill, we saw coyotes & never had an issue. Keep animals out of garbage. Secure it properly. Stop feeding peanuts. There should be a bylaw that people shouldn't be allowed to feed peanuts to wildlife.
- Should have more parks where they could freely roam. We shouldn't kick them out of their home.
- Keep companion animals safe indoors at night especially cats.
- - Leave alone
- - stay inside
- - Alarm houses
- - Educate
- - Sprays for protection
- - No litter
- - Quieter environment
- - Bigger forests
- - Planting plants
- - garbage cans designed
- - Put up signs (don't hurt, warning that they're there)
- - More spaces for animals to live & enjoy
- - Education on what to do if you see
- - No hunting in city
- - Animal drills
- - Rescue centres for injured animals
- - Don't approach wildlife
- - fenced areas for wildlife
- - walkways fenced off
- - Humane mouse traps
- Provide city personnel for trapping skunks.
- Stop expanding the city into areas where wildlife are being forced into urban settings. If some higher intelligence forced you out of your home, bulldozed it and then set up shop without re-locating you somewhere appropriate I would think you'd take offence to this. Why is wildlife any different?
- knowledge about how to rid them from our spaces, especially with pigeons, wasps and mice. I also think that Woodpeckers should be added to this list.
- Education, skunks living for 15 yrs, best security system ever & eat wasp nests! magpies & crows city should remove nests in the spring from all trees, devastating endangered birds. Pigeons should be removed from indoor parkades like Chinook- health hazard. The others are fine
- More fences to keep coyotes in their designated habitats (ie: Nose Hill Park), so they have less chances to cross over into neighborhoods nearby. A monitoring system to alert citizens of where



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

coyotes have been spotted recently so as to avoid those areas when taking dogs into these off leash areas.

- We have a big rabbit problem in our neighborhood, so I'd like to see more efforts done by the city to humanely remove these pests.
- Education. Wildlife should be allowed to continue to live and thrive. People need to understand that we are in their yard... they are NOT in ours.
- Moles - earlier intervention before they get so out of control and do so much property damage
- More education for ppl on how to coexist with these animals. Less development into their habitats
- In my experience, this is being handled properly.
- If you are aware of where you are and what you are doing and the time of day or time of year and use the brains god gave you not act like prey you should be fine
- Maintained feeders in popular areas for certain species to encourage their population to remain in certain acceptable areas in safety.
- all wildlife has a purpose on this earth. We as animals also have a purpose on this earth. Unfortunately we pollute air/water/strip land of nutrients, war, kill, rape, abuse, neglect etc... all lives on this planet. the nuisance is = HUMANS! thats who you should be concentrating on not wildlife
- Education - what roles the animals play in our ecosystem; how to deal with these animals when encountered; what assistance the City can and cannot provide when dealing with these animals.
- Neutering program for stray bunnies. Severe fines for dumping domestic rabbit, law against the sale of bunnies in pet stores.
- Educate public. Ensure their pets are vaccinated, especially for rabies. Ensure their pets are always under their care and control. Do not allow pets to run at large.
Unfortunately, this continual urban spread and transportation "improvement" negatively impacts wildlife habitat.
- Educate people and help them understand wildlife behaviour, the place of wildlife in our habitat (why it's important), the dangers of interacting, etc. Also, what constitutes appropriate interaction/engagement with wildlife and why.
- Clear boundaries for wildlife and heavy fines if your dog is caught chasing wildlife as well if caught crossing into a wildlife only zone!
All new communities need to take into account of space for wildlife and not encroach on their space
- Maintaining waste within city parks, community gardens and wetland areas& implementing designated areas for them into communities with these concerns.
- More education to the public on the wildlife, what to do if seen, how to properly trap ect, what not to do
- Education on what to do with mammal encounters, especially coyotes, who have become desensitized. Magpies, pigeons and wasps serve little purpose. Nest removal if magpies close to residential buildings.
- Stop treating wildlife like domesticated animals! Also do not cause them harm. The city is growing but this is still their home. They have a right to be here. Stop feeding them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Magpies are a nuisance. As are skunks. Would be nice to have more support and control options from the city. Coyotes are a danger to pets and humans as they are accustomed to people
- Not sure. Got a skunk that wanders the neighborhood now and then. Seems fine. Gotta be on my toes sometimes!
- Criminally charge individuals who purposely harm or kill wildlife within our city limits . I have often seen drivers swerve towards an animal running across road ways... this is a sickening act to witness.
- Preserving fish creek and other areas of provincial parks. The more the city expands the more “pests” will try to find new homes in our neighbourhoods. Also ensuring that individuals dispose of garbage properly. Garbage sitting outside of bins attract skunks, wasps etc.
- What they could take out of their gardens and not leave out that would attract them, as well as more information immediately available to learn how to deal with an encounter
- Clear public messaging in collaboration with strategic stakeholders on feral rabbits.
Information on humane pest control
Messaging on wildlife areas and effect on wildlife of pet owner behaviour.
- Better signage in parks and education in schools on how to enjoy and respect wildlife from a distance.
- More education so that we know how to handle possible close encounters with some of the more aggressive species.
- - info provided to citizens about wildlife in the area and how to coexist with them
- do not allow dogs off leash in on-leash areas. This disturbs wildlife and may push them into areas they wouldn't otherwise be in. Not sure how to mitigate the other pesky "wildlife" like squirrels, magpies, rabbits. If people are leaving food out for this wildlife, that should be stopped.
- Bats should not be considered nuisance wildlife, given the volume of mosquitoes they eat. The aim towards all wildlife should be coexistence, unless a safety issue or extreme nuisance occurs.
- More green space required when developments expand the city (ex the developments for the Southwest and West ring road). More education (short 1 min segments on local news channels?) about who to reach out to who can humanely relocate/remove animals that cannot coexist so people don't try themselves.
- I'm surprised that so many wild species are labelled "nuisance wildlife." Perhaps we should re-think this. In respect to coyotes, bobcats, and other species that occupy natural areas, I would encourage better signage and stricter rules for keeping dogs out of these areas.
- Information for people on what to do when they see/encounter potentially dangerous wildlife.
- Wildlife corridors that are off limit to dogs and people. The new development Wolf Willow at the south end of Fish Creek Park cuts off access for wildlife to leave the city, there's no more corridor. We're operating like we don't know the solutions but the developers run the city apparently.
- clear public messaging in collaboration with strategic stakeholders on feral rabbits
information on humane pest control
messaging on wildlife areas and effect on wildlife of pet owner behaviour



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education around the biology and ecology of the animals listed as nuisance wildlife. How to prevent these animals from making a home in their yard and precautions humans can take when in urban parks. Animals have a right to a safe space too.
- The animals were here first but maybe a nature preserve some can be taken to if where they are is unsuitable.
- Education and less judgement about the wildlife that are pushed into the city limits due to ongoing development. Smarter pet ownership (ie: don't leave animals unattended in yards or walk a dog off-leash in an area known to have "aggressive" wildlife (due to protecting young or breeding)).
- Allow us to shoot magpies.
- Leave no garbage out and to watch over your pets. Discourage all wildlife but do no harm.
- Need to be educated, many think most wildlife is dangerous. Wildlife should be left alone. Eg; need to understand a bobcat & coyotes won't kill them, but protect small pets. Skunks give notice by stomping their feet before spraying. Deer & rabbits leave their offspring alone & should not be disturbed.
- living near fish creek, I accept that wildlife may enter our community, however repeated sightings of a bobcat or coyote for example causes me concern for the safety of my pets in my own yard.
- They are needed in the ecosystem. I am scared of coyotes, but I understand why we need them.
- Education that these animals are simply trying to co-exist in their habitat. Perhaps, we could have communities in the burbs that would offer a dissolved boundary between suburban and nature. Animals found within the city could be relocated.
- Learn to appreciate wildlife. Human existence is constantly expanding and destroying the natural world and destroying the habitat ("home") of wild animals. They have no where else to turn. Calgary must share our river valley habitats with other species unless they are all turned into real estate.
- Information on humane pest control
Feral Rabbits: Clear public messaging in collaboration with strategic stakeholders
Other Wildlife: Messaging on wildlife areas & effect of pet owner behaviour on wildlife in these areas.
- cull the rabbits and the magpies
- Education of the public. How to deal with them and why you can just leave them alone.
- Leave them alone and only deal with the ones posing a problem to public health.
- Public education from the city
- Education on how the environment benefits from wildlife; each animal serves purpose in nature.
- Clear public messaging in collaboration with strategic stakeholders on feral rabbits (ie: Calgary Humane Society, vet clinics, etc); Information on humane pest control; messaging on wildlife areas and effect on wildlife of pet owner behaviour
- Not categorizing them as nuisance. Provide education about their benefits. We can easily coexist with these animals in most cases.
- We need to stop encroaching on wildlife habitats. We also need to limit usage of certain pesticides that are impacting bees, bats, etc. The city also needs to have a wildlife call line to come and get injured wildlife, and not leave it all to the province. Loud events, cars, etc should be limited



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think raccoons, feral rabbits (escaped/released) should be captured and euthanized, they are invasives and should be eliminated before becoming the major problem they are elsewhere. Skunks need removal from residences, perhaps then euthanized.
- People need to understand that animals move in when their habitat is invaded. They come in if food is easily accessible. Don't want wildlife, don't feed them, don't leave pets out unattended, don't let cats roam. With no food source the wildlife might stay away
- This is tricky. I'd agree most of the critters on this list are nuisances and should be population controlled (trapping, culling, reproduction control, City removal). Especially wasps and magpies, those guys are jerks. I'd add geese. I disagree that bobcats and coyotes are a nuisance in the city.
- I believe people should get along with wildlife, instead of targeting it because it does not fit into the perfect white-picketed house scenarios of a distorted view of the world.
- There is no definition here of what nuisance wildlife is or what that definition and inclusion in this list means for the wildlife. The concept of nuisance wildlife is a very 19th century concept and does nothing to address the issues of today where many creatures are becoming endangered because of habitat destruction. Most people have a very poor understanding of any wild animals or the out of doors. My [removed] neighbour tells me he shoots magpies and I have told him I will call the police if I ever see him doing that. Could we not have more education about wildlife and just try to get along? I enjoy seeing these animals in my neighbourhood. Many of these animals are native species and should not be treated like pariahs.

Vicious dogs

Expectations of owners

- Extremely heavy fines to owners of vicious animals to deter this. And bans on these owners being able to own pets at all with frequent check ups to ensure the offending parties aren't violating this. Vicious pets should not be allowed.
- My concern is that vicious animals are either ferally wild, bred with ferally wild dogs or are badly treated by their owners. Domestic dogs aren't often attacking humans. Any startled creature can only convey fear using their nature. A court is not equipped to decide. You need multiple opinions
- That they keep them under control and undergo dog training to help alleviate and aggressive dog.
- I think they should be expected to work with an animal behaviourist to work on the root cause of the aggression. Often it's the lack of training and socialization that results in aggressive dogs.
- Why do we allow people to even own vicious animals. Catastrophe waiting to happen. Ban large breeds
- Mandatory training for owners. Paid for by those owners.
- To vocalize them as such to passerbys. To retrain them.
- I expect them to purposefully move away/cross the street from other dogs/people when in public on top of being muzzled.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I expect them to be muzzled and under the control of an adult as the law dictates, but realize that management always fails. I expect the owners to be working with a qualified professional that utilizes modern, scientifically validated training with welfare first in mind.
- they need to go for training!!! the owner need to learn how to properly harness and muzzle there animal the also need to know how to handle there animal. you can be over the age of 18 and be pulled by your dog if you have a aggressive dog you yourself needs to be trained how to handle any situation
- To take responsibility and act proactively to control their dog and avoid attack. We have a medium-size dog who was attacked twice by larger dogs of two different ignorant owners who didn't want to take responsibility and did nothing to prevent such behaviour.
- To follow the rules and to understand that not everyone is as comfortable with their animal as they are.
- shame the owners into having total control of a loving animal + member of the family. Training if fined. Before + after behaviours improve.
- Behavioural training by someone with appropriate experience-not trainers that teach a dog not to jump by "ignoring" it. I'm all for positive reinforcement training but dangerous behaviours need to be dealt with differently.consequences for this Initially and this could be Avoided completely
- To understand the needs of their specific animal and take the proper precautions to ensure the animal is not harmful to others. To understand THEY are responsible for the actions of their dog.
- Enter into a training program and no breeding policy
- Be in control of their animal at all times. Warn those around them not to approach the animal. Be prepared to take responsibility if their dog hurts or kills a person or other animal.
- Owners should be charged and vicious dogs (although blameless) should be put down. Pit Bulls are a beautiful, kind breed but with the wrong guardian they are a deadly animal with the ability to kill, physically injure and emotionally scar a person or pet for life. Owners should severely charged.
- use common sense. i see many dogs that should be muzzled and yet are not
- I believe that the owner and dog should be evaluated on why the dog is vicious, whether it is protective or trained to be, and when that is determined both the animal and owner should go through training to prevent other incidents.
- They should be charged if there is an offense, and not be allowed to own animals in cases of attacks.
- Notify neighbours and/or guests that their dog is vicious.
- Confused. I often hear of seized animals in Calgary being euthanized, not declared vicious. Is there a loophole in the bylaw that allows this? If the animal is declared vicious it should be returned to the owner with conditions stated above. Never euthanized. If the animal attacks criminally charge
- The owner needs to be trained. Most vicious dogs are the result of stupid owners.
- They should provide clear passage for other pedestrians and citizens.
- Learn proper training techniques. Try not to be a total jerk and deliberately raise a vicious animal.
- Cannot verbally harass other people e.g. egg on the dog to snarl or provoke an aggressive stance.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Any animal that can be described as vicious should not be permitted period.
- That they get appropriate training to de-escalate the dog through behavior training and training for themselves to take control of the situation.
- Mandatory private animal obedience classes which needs to be passed in order to keep the animal.
- I expect them to be required to take dog training classes to gain better control of their dog, and to learn what they were doing wrong in the first place to cause the dog to become vicious as it is a learned behaviour.
- I think any dogs that are declared vicious should be put down. To believe that all people over the age of 18 can control a vicious dog is a false sense of security. The dog could easily over power an owner and attack someone/something else.
- I firmly believe poorly behaved animals is derived form lack of education. If an owner's pet is known to be in any way aggressive, they should have to take a basic online course in regards to animal behaviour and training.
- Owners of a dog deemed vicious or even one that is reported as vicious but not deemed vicious should have to take behavioural dog training to try to work with the dog to minimize its risk. There are a lot of dog owners that do not take training seriously, do not have appropriate control of their dog
- Having control at all times and secured properly
- Mandatory participation in dog training program specific to aggressive dogs.
- There should be no vicious animals allowed in Calgary. As this is not always preventable, owners animals must have recall or be on leash at all times. No exceptions. Muzzles are extremely useful.
- To communicate explicitly that their dog has been declared vicious.
- A sizeable fine along with mandatory dog training requirements.
- That they be licensed
- That they live outside of city limits with their vicious animals in a fenced in area. Minimum fence heights.
- The opportunity to be re-tested if rehab occurs successfully. Sometimes the dog is labelled vicious due to a provoked incident and this label follows them for life.
- I am fine with this for dogs with 1 offense only
- They must do training courses held by certified professional dog trainers. With refreshers completed every year.
- They should have to take mandated courses or training alongside the dog to correct or improve the behavior.
- None
- no off leash , muzzle if appropriate
- Professional training help. Not just to train the dog but for the owner to better understand the situation and take responsibility for their dog in an informed way.
- I would fully expect the owner to take responsibility and have their animal put down. However, I understand the not every person is capable of owning up to this.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

When on public property, a vicious animal: Must be muzzled and harnessed/short leashed, and Be under the control of the person over age 18

- First, no dog breed is inherently vicious. Charge the owner, remove the dog and rehabilitate it.
- That their ""secure"" enclosures be subject to inspection
- That owners must undergo mandatory training to train/condition their pets, and provide proof of certification.
- I have a huge problem with all stipulations requiring walking by individuals over the age of 18 even on private property and also public property.
- None
- Have them wear identifiable patches on harnesses (like service dogs) so they can be respected and treated appropriately.
- All owners should be compelled to take obedience training with their dogs, especially those with vicious animals. Why are people allowed to have vicious animals anyway? It makes no sense.
- Vicious animals should be euthanized.
- How about not being able to leave their private property with that animal because taking chances on anyone getting hurt by a "known vicious animal" sounds like a lawsuit and super irresponsible.
- Attend education on management techniques
- Keep them on leash!! I want all dogs on leash outside of dog parks. My dog is reactive and may bite their dogs while he is on leash.
- The pet owner must register with an animal behaviours specialist to help them deal with the dog and training.
- Just for them to keep their animal under control at all times when in the public, and not put them in a situation where they have no recourse but to defend themselves.
- Owners of vicious animals should have lifetime ban on pet ownership.
- None
- They must get a trainer involved as the animal and the owner requires training to make sure that the issue does not happen again.
- They should have to have the dog wear a "vicious dog" vest in public spaces.
- Control, not letting them run loose, not taking them to dog parks. Being responsible.
- I'd like to see that after 2-3 warnings that an owner be required by law to take a class to prove their fit to have said dog. It would save a ton of random attacks and dogs getting free of their owners.
- Not allowed in off leash dog parks, even if dog is leashed
- This seems good.
- I don't believe an animal should be caged or tied out to bark and suffer from the elements. Vicious animals should not be kept .period. If they are vicious, they are suffering and likely with bad people and it's a matter of time before they hurt or kill. Why would someone want a dangerous animal?
- That animal be update on shots and yard be locked
- I feel like mandatory training should be put in place.
- None



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- have the animal assessed and owner follow through on rehabilitation or recommendations.
- I expect that they should have care and control of their animals. The dogs are on leashes where the owners are clearly not in control of them, and I have met people in the parks that have been bit and the owners of these animals disappear. The City MUST do more to provide information on what to do
- Get them trained by a professional who deals with vicious dogs.
- Agree with current bylaw.
- dogs MUST be tethered/leashed at all times unless in their houses or confined/fenced properties..owners MUST be fined high enough so it's a deterrent, even the first time, unless taken to a court to be overturned..
- I don't expect owners of a proven vicious dig to comply with any of these rules.
- That they stay away from public spaces where that animal might interact with other pets and people. That they are securely contained at home. If there is an incident in which their animal attacks a person, animal or property, they are financially responsible for the costs associated with that attack
- 1)I would hope they would keep them on a leash if outside their securely fenced yards.
2)Have a sign stating to beware of dog.
3)Muzzle if needed when leaving yard
- Be responsible and recognise your dog can be aggressive. Not be in denial.
- I agree with the current rules. Owners of confirmed vicious animals should be consulted with by an Animal Control professional and should be recommending euthanasia. Animals that are vicious typically have severe mental health issues and are typically not enjoying their life.
- Mandatory human training. Mandatory dog training. If the human isn't capable of responsible pet ownership, they lose entitlement privileges.
- 2nd offence, put the animal down. They have no use in cities.
- Collar tags to identify readily from a distance to stay away
- Vicious animals should only be allowed in specific locations (not near playgrounds/schools), and have a warning leash/vest
- The above regulations seem appropriate for this type of animal, I just wanted to emphasize that no breeds of dog should be regulated as a whole - the behaviour of the animal is due to how is was raised combined with its genetics, not just based on genes alone.
- I do not have any additional expectations other than those imposed by the City. I assume the exception to the above rules is when the animal is visiting the vet and therefore on public property but requires the muzzle to be removed for assessment/treatment.
- I have a concern about off leash areas. I think there should be an area for small dogs and an area for big dogs. Separation by height/weight. I do not take my dogs to any off leash areas anymore as I have experienced vicious dogs there and they are never muzzled!
- Enforce above.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I expect owners of vicious animals (including cats) to keep the animal under control. It would be helpful if there was a way to identify the animal in public so that children, and others, would be aware that this animal does not respond well to others.
- Supervised if outside on private property and not locked up
- Must get the assistance of a behaviourist specializing in vicious animals.
- Control your animals, especially in public places, including dog parks and PLAYGROUNDS!
- If a dog chases another dog that is a vicious dog like really go to a dog park this is what dogs do. Wording of this bylaw has been abused in courts. Dogs chase children people etc they may grab a child going in traffic. They May protect from snake animal etc.. This Bite pull tug drag is a vicious dog?
- To take proper measures to control their animal at all times, but sadly that doesn't happen and then a person, usually a small child, is mauled or killed. Too often the dog(s) escape and run loose. It happens time and time again.
- Disposal of the animal.
- Training for owners. Enrollment of pets in behavioural classes or else be rehomed.
- Complete training program on how to keep control over your animal
- Owners of vicious animals me too except the seriousness of the situation and expect that if they do not fulfill what is required by law that the animal will be taken away and or destroyed
- should not be permitted to reside in a residence with children (under 18)
should be muzzled when in the presence of a minor/child under 18
- Harsher penalties for dog owners fleeing the dog parks when their dog attacks another dog. Ownership for the attack and compensation for the vet bills.
- If it's vicious chances are it can't be rehabilitated and it needs to be put down. I'm a pet owner and lover but there needs to be zero tolerance for attacks, especially those causing serious injuries and/or death.
- Depends on the circumstances, I myself would not keep an animal that has been proven to be vicious. the risks in my thoughts would be too great.
- Dogs are a reflection of owners and training. If the dog is poorly trained the owner is 100% responsible. Mandatory training at the owners expense should be a bylaw penalty with an instructor assessment at the end and additional requirements allowed at the instructors. Identifying the animal
- To ensure they can never escape. Proper training with an expert should be mandatory.
- That the owners keep vicious animas restricted to their own property. That owners must obtain licenses and training to keep vicious animas
- Owners need to have positive training to help them understand and how to effectively help their dogs.
- To take responsibility and accountability. Have their dogs ALL licensed and current vet records available at any time to show vaccinations are up to date. That there are HUGE FINES, consequences to the owners as it is NEVER the animals/dogs fault but ALWAYS 100% the owners fault



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Extensive training for the individual.
- Animals are under watch and unable to escape from their yards or homes.
If the animal bites it is put down
- Absolutely no Pit Bull (American Staffordshire Terriers) dogs.
- I think they should keep their animal under control.
- It must be mandatory for them to seek help from a professional and licenced trainer.
- These requirements all sound very reasonable. The path and effort required to have an animal declared vicious seem unreasonable. Example: if me or my child is bitten by a dog, how much time must I take off work in order to have a decision made to require a dog be muzzled?
- They acknowledge what vicious behaviour is and follow all the rules. Owners fo vicious animals be responsible for ALL costs associated with any injuries caused by their animal.
- To be held responsible & accountable for any & all damages, monetarily.
- Vicious animals should not be allowed in public off leash parks. Muzzles can suddenly come off and leashes can make aggression worse. In an off leash park, all dogs should be safe to interact with all other dogs.
- None.
- All dogs in the City of Calgary must have city dog licence attached to a collar, that must be worn on a dog at all times, when the dog is in the outside yard area of a residential city property, even if property yard is fully fenced front and back.
is fully fenced in the front
- Vicious dogs are not responsible it is the owners who trained these poor animals to be this way
- There is no need for vicious animals to be kept.
- I expect them to seek proper training to improve their dogs behaviour
- Not allowed in city
- Registration, mandatory behavior classes, clearly labeled on the dog and rescues need to be regulated when out dogs to inexperienced people
- Vicious dogs have no place in society. Dogs have been bred to pay positive attention to us. One's that don't and are dangerous shouldn't be put back in the same home where they have been taught or encouraged this behaviour. With small exceptions the animal should be put down.
- To go to a professional trainer to deal with the issue
- Ensure pet owners have financial resources available, like liability insurance in case animal cannot be controlled
- The animal should be muzzled when outside if its home.
- What is in place is fair. If you have a vicious animal you need to protect it as well as others
- Carry liability insurance and identify their animal with a coloured collar or vest au be red for caution?)
- Any dog could be perceived as a threat (people have phobias, allergies, emotional limitations) All dogs except muzzle should have same control regulations
- That a record be kept should they have a second vicious animal, and if there are repeat vicious animals by the same owner, that owner should not be permitted to own animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Some kind of vibrant visual indication of a problem dog that can be observed from a significant distance for everyone including the problem animals safety
- Be be charge, to have the pets removed and to be made to take courses in being a responsible pet owner
- I expect the owner to have control at all times.
- they should keep them under control and not in a public place around people /pets.
- People should not have vicious animals. The animal was obviously trained wrong or mistreated so those owners should not be allowed to keep the dog or own dogs going forward.
- If an animal is known to be vicious, they animal should be put down. The owner should be responsible for any attacks on people or other animals, they should have to keep their vicious dog in their house.
- Signage on fences/gates and front doors for delivery personal and door to door sales people.
- if in dog park: remove dog from dog park immediately
private property: contained in a safe and secure area
- To be kept in control at all times. It is not dogs fault but the crappy training that they have had.
- Not permitted in off leash areas or parks.
- The owner should need to have proof of training to deal with this type of animal
- Not loose in a yard as they can scale fences and get out. And not allowed to show aggressive behaviour to their neighbours. Not left outside unattended.
- Know your dog. Know it's triggers and work to get over them and work to keep them away from said triggers. If being in public causes them to lash out take them to private parks to exercise until they've worked past their issues
- Locking an animal in a kennel is cruel and only makes it more vicious. Owners must attend training classes if they have a vicious dog (the cause is poor training in the 1st place). I2nd, once a dog bites once, (serious bite) it will bite again. It should be put down.
- NO POINT HAVING EXPECTATIONS OF OWNERS OF VICIOUS ANIMALS...TOO LOW OF AN IQ.
- Vicious animals should not be allowed in any public place! We jail vicious people for a reason...vicious animals should be confined indoors so that there are no excuses by the owner...their lease broke, I didn't see or I didn't know or they escaped!
- No vicious dogs should be allowed period. My daughter was bit when a neighbour was opened their garage and the dog was off leash. Again the victims barely have rights and bylaw officers have no real authority without going to court.
- Warning signs, muzzled while in public and work with a professional trainer to solve the issues.
- None.
- Based on our experience, the existence of by-laws regarding vicious dogs does nothing if the owners don't comply. How can the above rules be enforced? They can't. So, why on earth are animals known to be vicious permitted in a densely populated area? They put people and other pets at risk.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Change it to 6 foot leash. You cannot control a vicious dog with a harness. Add that flexi leashes are NOT allowed.
- To pay for for the veterinary bills if their dig has caused harm to another animal. If they cannot afford to cover such expenses they should not be a guardian of a pet.
- The owners should need to take courses or be educated in some way regarding responsible pet ownership.
- Perhaps they could attend training sessions for reactive dogs or other types of remedial classes
- They should be required to take their pet to mandatory formal training.
- To control them and always be under control and on leash with their owner at all timee
- I think the rules, as they are, are probably the best way to go.
- None.
- If an animal is vicious, it is most likely the owners fault, they shouldn't be allowed to have an animal at all. I think we all know that even breeds that are considered vicious are often not, they are trained to be vicious.
- Mandatory behavioral training should be ordered to help rehabilitate the animal and an investigation on why the animal is aggressive (lack of training/confidence, abuse). Dogs aren't born aggressive.
- Mandatory dog training classes to help understand why dog is vicious and how to mediate that. Let owners know what consequence are for 2nd attack and make it a significant deterrent
- I think a dog should have to wear either a harness or some form of notice to others so they can choose to keep further or cross a road. Something like a red leash that says Caution. The Red, Green, Yellow system is fabulous for informing those around.
- How about a mandatory training course for them and their dog?
- If a dog has attacked a human I believe it should be put down.
- a good percentage is because of a lack of training and should be forced to attend training! I blame the owners, not the dog!
- They should not be allowed to have multiple dogs
- None
- That they are unable to license additional animals in the province.
- Must be secured in area . Too many incidents of animals getting free and then attack. Limit the # an owner can have
- Mandatory training classes
Bigger fines
Deeming a dog vicious shouldn't warrant them to be quarantined for the rest of their lives. You might want to look what's behind closed doors as to why that dog might be vicious. It's not always the dogs fault.
- Vicious dogs must be muzzled and secured safely on the property. No vicious animal should ever ever be at an off leash. If an owner can not abide, the owner must be penalized.
- Rabies vaccination mandatory for the dogs. Securely fenced backyards mandatory for dogs over a certain weight.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cameras need to be set up at all off leash parks because not only has my dog been attacked by 3 vicious dogs (with mean/stupid owners!) at Auburn Off Leash park but a small dog named Bella was taken from that park when the owner turned her back! Bad owners of vicious dogs should be charged!
- Training to help the dog and owner learn to cope with or end the aggression. Our city has zero balanced trainers. PP/FF are great at teaching a new behaviour but can not stop an unwanted behaviour. We need trainers than teach both yes and no to help these folks
- Keep under control, no exceptions
- Should not be breed specific. Owners should have training to care for volatile animals.
- They should NOT be allowed in parks and off leash areas.
- If the owner fails to confine the animal and it results in an attack ...they should be heavily fined and the dog taken away
- None. These are good rules
- Property owner required to pay for any and all damages by owner of property on which dog is housed, or is allowed to be housed.
- Follow the rules
- If you own a vicious animal then you have failed as a pet owner. You lose your privilege. One innocent child maimed or lost to a mauling is one too many.
- They should not have them
- Dog training for both the dog and the owner
- every dog owner should take a dog training class.
- Actually exercise control over the animal in public and do not frequent busy public places
- Insurance to pay for damages
- No access to dog parks even if they are on a leash.
- To keep the animal on a leash no longer than 6 feet. To have secure fencing that the dog cannot geet through or over.
- Visually identified (ie. Red tag on collar/leash)
- Owners usually don't recognize behaviour issues with their animals. I'd expect owners with vicious dogs to be considerate of other people, but that's not going to happen.
- Proper ways of communication to others that their animal is vicious (calling out to someone walking towards them that their dog is vicious and it would be great if they could give some space if possible)
- I feel all dog owners need to have proper control of their dogs! I do not believe that certain breeds eg: pitbulls etc. should be deemed as vicious, aggressive or dangerous unless the particular animal has been proven so.
- If The animal is being reckless in public owners should be cognizant enough to remove the dog from situations that make other people and/or pets uncomfortable or possibly unsafe.
- The protections in place sound fair.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Owner attends mandatory obedience sessions with dog or forfeits animal so animal has opportunity for rehabilitation. A second offence sees owner forbidden to own any dog. Follow up with bylaw in that no dogs are in owners possession or on their property.
- Due care and attention - not allowing minors or those who are not physically able/capable of handling them take them out in public. There is always the risk that they will escape - have experienced this in the past
- A significant license fee (over \$1000.00/year) should be imposed to limit the amount of people who would consider owning vicious dogs.
- Be aware of the triggers of their pet, take actions to ensure they have full control at all times.
- All the above listed are great. I'm glad our stuff isn't breed specific, but based on the individual animal.
- Pit bulls shouldn't be allowed in public areas ever, unless muzzled. They were bred to be fighter killers
- They should absolutely have to have a secure, SOLID fence! The city should be more responsible in enforcing laws with dogs that are acting aggressive on their property or not wether it's a problem with neighbours dealing with these dogs or the public that walk by and pray the dogs don't get out
- Must disclose the nature of the temperament of the dog when seeking care from a veterinarian, services from a dog groomer or dog walker to ensure the safety of employees in that field
- Rehabilitation courses and training to correct the behaviour.
- To keep people safe
- They shouldn't be allowed any more pets
- Keep them restrained effectively using muzzles, leashes, cages, etc.
- training, control
- They should attend a "human" course on how to raise, treat and handle dogs.
- A special visible license to insure dog owners and people know the dogs are vicious.
- That they go to dog training on how to control their dog
- Have their animal on a leash at all times when of the property
- With few exceptions, vicious animals are taking after the characteristics & encouragement of vicious owners. I expect them to be vile bully types, who will hopefully find themselves before the courts for any number of reasons, and released to their natural habitat - a prison. you can't change ass
- Owners should be made to take their dog to training classes to help teach them to be in better control of their dog. Educating them will help them understand the signs to look for and how to manage the issue. The amount of training should depend on the severity of the issue.
- To know when to euthanize their pet for risk of others, or at least be aware enough of when/where to walk your pet away from people/animals.
- Warned once and then severely fined. Third offense dog gets seized and destroyed. No exceptions
- Owners should be fined and lose ability to own animals.
- Maybe they should have to hire a trainer or something for themselves and their dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The owners should be muzzled. There is no reason for a domestic animal to be vicious - it is how it is raised. That said, if an owner has an animal of questionable behaviour they must be held to task to ensure the safety of others AND their 'beloved pet'.
- Put it down. The animal has already proven itself a danger.
- Both owners and dog go through special training.
- The owner should have to take training on handling thier dog and if unable or willing they should not be allowed to have a dog, as well as re required to pay 100% for all veterinary bills for the animal that was attacked.
- Dog is euthanized on 2nd infraction. Owner limited to one vicious animal. Owner to be tested by dog-expert to ensure he/she has dog & people smarts to have care & control of such an animal. Housing / yard should be inspected to ensure it is suitable for animal & to properly contain dog.
- None.
- I think these are reasonable expectations
- The property should have signage regarding the vicious animal /the owner of such animal needs to put up a 100,000 dollar bond.
- What right does an owner of a vicious animal have to risk public safety should their management plans with the vicious animal eventually fail?
- They are made to take courses in order to get their animals back and be prepared to be involved with probationary period 2 years or 3 years in length with no further impact whatsoever whether animal is a chihuahua or a pitbull
- seems reasonable
- Vicious dogs, or animals of any kind, should not be allowed to be kept in Calgary by anyone for any reason.
- If an owner knows that their animal is vicious, I have to wonder why they would keep it. Best intentions do not mean that an animal will not find an opportunity to attack.
- On public property, they should not be allowed - at all - ever!! There is no reason whatsoever to own a vicious dog. If caught on public property, the fines should be heavy and may include time in jail for the owner.
- They shouldn't have vicious dogs. Why is there a need for one?
- Take a "reactive" dog course
- Euthanized if any attacks occur.
- Once declared a vicious animal, they should be mandated into classes to try & rehabilitate. If further attacks occur, destruction of the animal should occur.
- None
- They know the difference between vicious and fear reactive and obtain training and preventative measures to keep both animals and people safe.
- None



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- This is a very good description of vicious dogs. I am an owner of a pet that I rescued that falls under this category due to aggressive behaviour towards other animals (never people) and I agree with all of the terms outlined in the bylaw.
- Keep them on a leash and if you have them in the yard make sure they cant escape
- If a dog attacks a person or other animal, and is declared vicious by the courts, it should be put down. conditions are not enough.
- None
- Ban pitbulls and other dangerous breeds. Other cities do. Why don't we? These breeds are only owned by people with aggressive dispositions. How many children need to be bit before someone comes to their senses? It seems that dogs are better protected than kids in our city.
- Training of the dog and owner to learn how to socialize dog with others. Avoid off leash areas where owners have no control over dogs.
- Owners are educated on the importance of following rules in public, so harm will not happen again. No off leash dog park access (because you know they are still going there)
- too much risk, vicious animals should not be allowed
- I have zero sympathy for this situation. If a pet has exhibited vicious behavior, and I'm referring specifically to unprovoked behavior, I believe the animal should be removed from the home. They are wild animals at heart.
- Clear posted notices on the property so I can avoid walking my dog in the are and exciting the animal.
- Mandatory education for the pet as well as, the owner. If the owner fails then a life time ban on ownership.
- I don't believe anyone should have access to or own a vicious animal. These are behaviours that are taught (in dogs). This is not responsible pet ownership, it is the domain of people on the fringes of society, looking for protection or status among their peers. Owners like this also abuse their pet
- I am fine with the existing rules.
- Breeds that have proven to be vicious should not be allowed in the city. Regardless of how responsible the owners are, the animals are bred with killer instincts and it is usually innocent people and other pet owners who are attacked.
- Get a qualified trainer involved before your dog's issues become so severe that they are regularly biting/chasing/destroying things. If a veterinarian certifies the dog's temperament requires it - constant supervision, leash and muzzle outside of the owner's private property.
- Follow above regulations
- Only on a leash and never in a dog park.
- If a dog receives a complaint but isnt quite vicious there should still be some repercussions.
- To have the knowledge and training to recognize what their dog is telling them/their behavior and to be able to deal with any situation that comes up both physically and mentally. Ideally making them go through an intensive training program.
- If a dog bites a human it should be put down.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not be allowed in off leash dog parks.
- Ensuring they are in control of their animals. Not taking them to highly public locations or at least taking the extra steps to ensure everyone knows not to approach
- These rules are sufficient for me
- TRAINING. Make dog trainers more accessible or known. Advertise good trainers and encourage dog owners, especially of vicious dogs, to train their animal.
- Keep your dog indoors at all times unless you're taking them on supervised outings on-leash. No off-leash. I would also appreciate some kind of kerchief to mark them as a reactive or aggressive dog.
- most dogs deemed viscous is all circumstantial. owners with small dogs laugh and say their scared as the small dog is aggressively barking and snapping at my dog who just wants to play. If my dog were to act the same to the dog he would be deemed viscous. We have an issue with untrained small dogs
- Must notify immediate neighbor if fence line is shared in order to prevent any fence fighting from either party's dog.
- Once determined to be vicious, either by behaviour, or an unprovoked confrontation, the animal is to be sent to a behavioralist (business) for re-training at the owner's expense. If not successful, then the animal should be destroyed.
- The owner should have a MANDATORY aggressive class taken on how to deal with a vicious dog. Rather than just pay a fine and get the dog back, learn how to treat the issue. As the last thing I want to see is a dog get put down because of a reckless irresponsible owner.
- Control and care taken to avoid confrontations
- Mandatory pet ownership training. Vicious pets are a reaction to ownership, and as an owner we bear the responsibility to manage our pets.
- To seek education, to handle them appropriately
- I think our city does a good job of managing these expectations already.
- Follow the rules. Be held liable for damage or injuries their animals cause to other people or pets.
- Owners of "small spirited" dogs must recognize that these can also be aggressive. Barking, snarling and attacking other dogs (even large ones) will result in a response, even from well behaved dogs.
- To seek appropriate science based behaviour modification and assistance from a trained professional.
- Sounds reasonable to me.
- Every pet owner should understand the characteristics of their breed and train accordingly
- To follow the bylaws! Maybe this means putting in stricter fines and punishments for those who dont.
- That they be muzzled and leashed in public and not tied up in yards (kept inside).
- Animals must be spayed or neutered to ensure that folk are not breedings dogs that have been labelled vicious.
- If another animal is killed, or a person attacked I believe an animal temperament tested as aggressive should be euthanized. Containment measures will typically fail at some point, and responsibility for the safety of the community should be held above the life of an aggressive dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They should have to have signage on their property informing neighbors/community members of their animals designation. I think vicious animals should have to have microchips with their designation. If the owner has/had multiple vicious animals they shouldn't be permitted to own future animals.
- I think the current laws are fine but the problem is enforcement. Warnings are given too often.
- none
- Mandatory training sessions
- not to own them.
- Support provided for owner with recommended specialized trainers that can give one on one time to help with behavioral needs. Also recommended specialized vets that can assess if there is a medical reason for behavior that can be addressed. Have these services subsidized if low income.
- That they follow the responsible pet bylaws. However, other pet owners need to be responsible too. I have talked with people that have reactive dogs and it's a big problem when dogs illegally off leash come up to them.
- If a dog cannot be controlled and prevented from being vicious it should be euthanized. Dog owners must be expected to keep their animals from hurting anyone.
- Failure to meet requirements results in a lifetime ban of ownership of animals.
- that the owners take responsibility for their animals. if they leave the scene of an incident heavier fines. and reward those take responsibility for any incidents. ie. pet training, reduced monetary fines.
- Training
- That they take animal training classes and properly socialize the dogs from the moment they bring them home. They should have to pass certain levels of training from a reputable training facility
- none.
- That they have control of their dog at all times.
- To receive education on Canine behavior/body language. To seek professional assistance to train and rehabilitate if possible. Not to enter into any off leash dog park. To alert any nearby persons that their animal should not be approached.
- Attend a training class specializing in aggression to help manage the dog's triggers
- Make sure you have a big backyard for them and don't take them out in public!
- Education, training should be priority and all city run off leash parks should have cameras or by-law at the park regularly. Owners of vicious animals must pay for any vet/medical bills. Surrender their vicious animal if it bites a person or kills a pet
- don't bring them to off leash parks or around kids. even though they might be on leash and muzzled it is still scary
- Why should they even have the right to take the risk on public property?
- To be responsible for their dog. Including all items listed above but if they are caught they must be fined and held accountable. Track those who have previously offended and ensure proper punishment is put upon them.
- I like the current rules



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I expect the owners of vicious animals to be well-informed of the rules they must adhere to, following the decision of the courts to declare the pet 'vicious'. Pet owners should be criminally charged in the case of a second offence; placing the responsibility on the owner, rather than the pet.
- They should be kept in their home property only and not allowed in community. No one should have a vicious animal. If for security etc they should be registered..licence with city as guard dog. If must go out to vets etc muzzled..harness leashed.
- Mandatory training for owners and animals.
- Ensure it is spayed/neutered & microchipped. Owner, anyone else that will have control, & the dog must attend approved training classes together until owner/handler has proved they can control the dog in a variety of situations.
- To attend a class that educates about responsible pet ownership
- If you cannot control your dog and it is a danger to people or other dogs you should not be in public with them.
- To not be stupid.
- have a collar or harness that states that they are vicious worn whenever in public
- Owners of vicious animals should get rid of the vicious animal and rethink their life choices.
- Obligation to attend approved training program as many of these “vicious” dogs are likely just reactive and would not be a threat with proper training
- by-laws on this seem reasonable... I'd add even if muzzled and leashed, that they shouldn't be allowed in off-leash areas.
- There needs to be more investigation into what lead to the incident. There are far too many animals incorrectly labelled vicious and not enough consequence/accountability to those that provoke animals.
- enforcement
- Retraining of the owner and animal at the owners expense
- The owner takes safety precautions.
- Dogs fight..it happens.. But just know what your dog is capable of ..muzzle so your dog is safe from a biting yappy yorkie
- They should always be on leash and be very aware of where they take them. Hard but unexpected things happen
- They are equipped and educated to manage the behavior, they understand what situations should be avoided with their dog, potential checks on properties to ensure guidelines being followed
- None. If anything, I have expectations of the people around these dogs. People need to be educated to not approach, don't let their dogs approach, etc.
- Cameras in dog parks , most people that own vicious dogs don't know what to do, mandatory dog training set by court
- Keep them muzzled when they are with people the dogs aren't comfortable with. Those rules are good ones.
- Should not be on public property, be risk averse.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education, management and training.
- Must have signs on property alerting of vicious animal. Must undergo additional training
- Animal is spayed or neutered
- That they seek help from reputable, highly experienced dog behavior it's and/or trainers.
- That the animal is under control of the owner at all times
- That the owner must go through mandatory training classes with animal. Follow bylaws
- Same as any other pet. The owner should ensure that the animal is in complete control when out in public and is properly secured when loose on private property.
- They should not be allowed on public property. The owners property should have a sign that indicates that there is a vicious animal living there.
- That they ensure the public is safe. No exceptions. If you can't do that your do shouldn't be allowed in the city.
- Animals deemed viscous should be euthanized. Owners of vicious animals have proven they can't control or train them, so the animal should be put down.
- No vicious animals allowed in the city
- mussel at all times
- Existing requirements around any dog deemed vicious seem reasonable, AS LONG AS the requirements are strictly enforced! This is an issue of irresponsible ownership, and these owners should be mandated to take education courses or be banned from animal ownership.
- Harsher penalties for those who do not comply and their dogs escape. These people should not be pet owners and I should not be worried about walking my dog past their yard
- Once a dog is reported/proved vicious (or is a Pit Bull) the owner should HAVE to provide proof of insurance or their dog license will be cancelled. The Insure. companies have the data/pay outs that made them decide they won't insure them! Why doesn't the City heed their warning/listen to them??
- Dog and owner must undergo training with a reputable organization. Clearly the owner has no control of their dog so needs to get training in order to manage dog. Organization should also be able to determine if owner is suitable for such dog or dog not allowed to be with such owner
- A notice/sign should be visible to neighbors. Not live adjacent to schools/parks/daycares
- If they are a hazard they should be banned
- That the animals are contained and controlled properly to ensure that there is no danger to the public
- They should not be taken to parks, or areas where it's heavily populated with other pets or children.
- Mandatory dog/owner training. Dogs are vicious due to lack of appropriate care and training, suitable activity, etc.
- Respect that the fear and worry caused by their animals is real.
- Must have a mullet, and or drive a rusty pickup truck or a 90s mustang or Camaro.
Must have cigarettes or a vape on them at all times.
Must have at least one article of mma clothing and tattoos on neck and hands.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I would expect owners should be forced to undertake training at their cost to be able to keep a proven dangerous vicious dog. Training should return some measurable form of testing and compliance.
- Dogs must always be on a harness, not leash and collar.
- Have adequate liability insurance
- Owners should be required to have an insurance policy covering their vicious animal that would pay any victims of personal or property damage.
- If vicious must notify people coming on property or around the dog.
- That these animals are kept away from children, even in the presence of an adult and that no additional animal is brought into the household
- Keep them under control.
- That they have control of the animal.
- None, continue as it is
- Owner training
- Minimum exercise requirements
- Unannounced check-in's with a bylaw officer to see they are following the laws.
- The rules above are sufficient, but follow ups from neighbors etc. need to be followed.
- Have the pet surrendered and rehabilitated the instant there is an event
- Vicious animals should be euthanized.
- These rules are appropriate as is.
- The above listed rules and procedures seem acceptable
- To be properly educated and to train their dogs.
- Those are fair guidelines.
- I expect the dogs to be under control at all times, never off leash
- That bylaws are obeyed and that everyone is working to best support the "vicious animal" living its best possible life, which means prevention of situations where the vicious animal may be provoked to attack, resulting in it's demise.
- You can get labels for harnesses, leashes, collars, etc. that say things like "nervous" or what-have-you, the vicious pet should be labeled accordingly too for the public, so say kids don't rush the animal to try and pet it.
- Enforce responsible ownership bylaws for all dogs. Irresponsible owners are more of an every day issue than aggressive dogs. Enforcing leash laws etc prevents incidents and bites. In my experience incidents with dogs are only taken seriously if skin is broken. This not okay and not proactive.
- They should be subjected to see animal behavior specialist.
- Must always been on leash
- It should be easier for animal control to seize an animal that attacks when they havent yet been designated as a vicious animal. Your "must have prior complaint" for them to have power approach



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

doesn't work. In my neighbourhood, 3 dogs have been killed recently by other dogs. Mine was attacked

- Investigations of the owner, deep investigation.
- They should need to attend training programs to address the issues presented by the dog not only for the public's safety, but for the dogs benefit as well.
- Over the age of 18 doesn't mean they can control animal. Someone who CAN control animal plus 18+. What if animal gets out. Being in back yard is not good enough as vicious attempted attacks constantly through fences is extremely uncomfortable when out in yard. Stressful.
- That they take their responsibility seriously and NEVER allow their dog to be in a position to harm a person or animal.
- They should be required to attend classes with the animal as it is rarely the animal that is innately vicious.
- If their animal harms another animal they should be responsible for the vet bill and the city should enforce this instead of having to sue the individual
- When in public, a collar or tag that indicates that the animal is vicious.
- There should be severe fines and the owner should be required to get strict training for the dog at their expense, at the very least. Frankly I'm not sure why vicious dogs aren't just put down.
- I would like to see more punishments for owners of vicious animals, especially if they do not follow the above rules. As for extra rules, any persons coming into contact with the animal on private property should be notified of the vicious animal designation, especially if children are involved
- They be evaluated in order to purchase or own another pet in the future.
- Participating in extensive rehabilitation training focused on the root of the problem, not only management. This includes muzzle training.
- Attend positive reinforcement training classes.
- People who have had a previous animal related offense conviction in any capacity should not be allowed to own vicious animals.
- they should be able to train and control their pets
- I don't think they should be allowed on public property.
- I think there should be large fines for owners of vicious animals.
- They should be required to participate in training to reduce aggressive behaviors.
- Proof that the owner has completed some sort of behaviour training with their dog if found to be vicious. And the dog being assessed by a professional to determine if the behaviour can be corrected.
- That they be barred from ever owning any other animals. Vicious dogs aren't born, they're made- their behaviour is a reflection of the training they received.
- Owners shouldn't be allowed animals that have been deemed vicious
- All of the existing rules seem good
- Mandatory dog training,



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- These animals must be fully trained. Maybe be tested for obedience regularly. Fully fenced in, perhaps inspected for safety.
- That the animal can be controlled, cannot escape, has a muzzle on when outdoors. That neighbours are informed
- They should be put down if they're vicious. People with vicious pets are generally not responsible pet owners.
- A yellow collar and leash should be worn to warn others. Owners must complete training classes. If they are not successful their dogs will be apprehended
- The current rules are adequate however.
- If a dog is deemed vicious or aggressive, they should not be in the same area as other dogs, adults or children. They should not be walked around other dogs or children. Hard to know, but often they are hard to control, even with a muzzle and leash. Others should not be put at risk.
- Must take a training class that specializes in aggressive dogs
- I believe that a vicious animal does not have its place in an urban environment like the city of Calgary. Unfortunately, the animal has to pay the price for the bad ownership.
- Keep them under control
- Do not own them. Do not have them in city.
- The above rules are reasonable. I would also add mandatory spay and neuter programs for proven aggressive dogs and perhaps city programs to cover the associated costs for those unable to afford the surgery.
- I think these guidelines are sufficient
- I think any pet that is trained to be vicious, that is the problem. I know folks with pitbulls and they are wonderful dogs.
- Would like to see more focus on training and behavioral assessment. There is a big difference e.g. between an engaged owner with a difficult dog and an irresponsible owner.
- Should always be muzzled. Fines should be huge if the animal is loose
- To get a trainer or a behaviorist to help with the issue.
- Don't take them to dog parks, don't take them near playgrounds, and don't take them for walks in busy/crowded areas (i.e. don't take a vicious dog for a walk in Eau Claire during the lunch time rush).
- None
- Owners need to have the dog muzzled or contained. They should not be allowed in off-leash parks not walked freely in streets.
- When they approach others on a pathway, they must have their dog sit on the right side of the path so there is no chance of an interaction.
- I do not want them to use retractable leashes on their dogs, especially when it is a big dog (Pitbull, German Shepherd, etc.), as those are not the strongest of leashes. It needs to be a good, strong leash that will not break.
Absolutely do not bring the animals to any off-leash park.
- Training to reduce reactivity.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There is a big difference between a responsible dog owner with a difficult dog, and an irresponsible dog owner. While I appreciate the focus on public safety, I would like to see an approach that includes owner behavior, more training and dog behavioral assessment.
- make sure those animals are secure and cannot get free. do not let children under the age of 14 walk dogs such as bull terriers, German Shepherds etc.
- That they will inform others coming onto their property in advance or provide signage, not enter off-leash areas even though they are leashed, they be educated on rules and have had one-on-one counselling with professional dog trainer well-versed in handling reactive dogs.
- Have control and keep the animal just as safe as other people.
- They should be working with a trainer to correct problem behaviour
- That they will seek and follow through on training. Vicious dogs are that way for a reason and any dog with time and attention can get rid of these tendencies. I believe the rules of the city in public and private property are great but they need to be paired with adequate training.
- be wary and cautious of actions that may inflict hurt or damage to someone that has never encountered such species
- Any dog can be vicious in certain circumstances. However, there are some breeds that can cause more damage than others. Training of these dogs should be strongly encouraged. Signs should be used to alert the public that such dogs are in the area/on the property.
- Training classes for them and the dog. Vicious dogs aren't born that way it happens because owners do not take responsibility for properly training and socializing their animals.
- They must leash their dog before it leaves a vehicle or before it leaves the house or yard. Be cognizant that those around you may feel uncomfortable with their choice of dog, so therefore they need to go out of their way that those around them feel safe.
- If only these restrictions were followed by existing owners.
- This could depend on if the owner is responsive and responsible. Investigation should involve education and resources- referrals to training as well as looking into what the owner is doing proactively. If the owner is irresponsible then fines and seizure of animal because the owner won't change
- Notify the public the animal is dangerous through collars or patches on vests that indicate things such as "Nervous" or "Do Not Touch"
- No bad dogs, only bad owners. Should be required to prove they know how to train their dogs and rehab them. Owners who cannot prove that through some Form of exam should not be allowed to own dogs anymore, and they should be checked up on regularly to make sure.
- I don't believe anyone should be allowed to own a vicious animal in the city. There is simply too much risk involved. Years ago I had a dog that was unpredictable. She was well trained, but I couldn't 100% guarantee anyone's safety. I ended up rehoming her to a farm in the Crowsnest.
- Have a contingency plan in case the animal gets out
- Consult a veterinary behaviorist and/or a certified behaviour consultant for evaluation of the dog. Demonstrate they are following the behaviour modification plan designed by the aforementioned professional(s).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They should have to show proof that they are taking the dog to a trainer and making efforts to deal with the dogs behavior. If someone owns a dog that has been declared vicious the dog should not be allowed to reside in a home with minor children. The owners should have to carry insurance.
- Register and pay an extra fee to own a vicious animal
- Keep their animals under control at all times, not allowed off leash without a muzzle while in public. Would prefer to not have vicious animals in public.
- I would hope that they would pursue additional training for themselves and their dogs.
- If the animal is not euthanatized and is able to go back home. There should be mandatory behaviour training for the dog and owner and follow up to ensure the owner has completed said course\training I truly believe every animal should have mandatory dog training. Viscous dogs would decrease
- Owners need to have a plan on how to exercise their pet. Leaving them confined just escalates the issue.
- They must loose all access to animals if their own animals are proven to be vicious. Should they regain the right to own animals they must attend mandatory training with their animals.
- None
- Steep fines for owners who let their dogs off leash and attack and/or bite children.
- None
- Owners of vicious dogs should have to take certain behaviour courses with their dog. Most dogs are not vicious; it's how they are trained. Proper training will help prevent more attacks.
- to demonstrate that given these restrictions they will still be able to adequately exercise them otherwise it can be expected for them to be more aggressive if they do not have an outlet for their energy.
- Ensure their animals are vaccinated
- I'm happy with the current rules.
- I agree dogs that have been proven to be viscous should follow the rules
- They need to be imprisoned if their pet attacks anyone plus pay all damages plus 5 digit fine
- Partnerships with Humane Society or other welfare groups to enhance dog training programs so that owners can retain dogs and turn them around.
- They need to be vigilant that their dogs do no interact with other licensed dog. Prohibited from any kind of dog park.
Having said that, there should not be breed restrictions on any particular breed or mix breeds.
- Be mindful that it is often the owner who is at fault, not the dog.
- Not allowed in dog parks
- Understand their dog's triggers. If possible, work with trainers to help correct behaviours.
- I think the person should also be able to control the dog, there are many pet owners that cannot control the pet should something happen. 18 is fine, but must have the physical ability to control the dog.
- They should have to be muzzled at all time and be under the control at least 18 years old.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Regarding vicious animals kept outdoors, there should be a minimum fence height requirement. There have been many times I have been out walking my 2 dogs and a dog has suddenly lunged and barked at us from behind a fence. I have often feared that the dogs would be able to hop the short fence.
- One chance, that's it. I was bitten by a vicious dog when I was young and I have never gotten over it. Scared & scarred, leery of all dogs off leash, that growl, bark or run/jump at me. Owners are not in arms length or in control of their-untrained/trained dogs go to any park. Bad owners dont change.
- I think fines always help deter people not following the regulations.
- Completely compliance of giving information in an altercation.
- The height of a fence can make a difference. They need to be at least 6 feet tall and able to keep the dogs in or keep in a pen with a lid.
- Just to make sure they have full control over their animal. Make sure there's no way that animal could possibly escape a yard or house. Don't leave said animals unattended outdoors.
- No animal should be vicious in the first place. People make them vicious. A dog will naturally protect its owner if it is threatened. There should not be any in the city.
- I love the Calgary rules of judging the animal and human vs breed. Please keep it up as so many of us have amazing dogs regardless of breed. Vicious animals should be muzzled always or if killed, possibly euthanized.
- Mandatory training of the human on how to care for their animals. Ensure that the dog is being properly cared for and treated by their owners.
- Follow leashing and GETTING TRAINING from a pro who wont mess up their dog even further.
- Pet should be spayed or neutered and be given food water shelter but also emotional care, also licenced.
- Proper training for owning certain dogs and that the dogs have been properly trained for obedience.
- To keep dogs on leash
- None. Too restrictive already.
- That they retain control of their animal and not allow them in environments where they pose a risk.
- Owners should be held accountable with stricter penalties.
- Attend training to recognize dogs body language
- Why allow vicious dogs? Owners of these kinds of dogs dogs are irresponsible. Don't allow them
- To take accountability as an owner and seek the help and support your animal requires. If you cannot do so, you should not own a pet. It is unfair to that animal. Also, common sense should prevail and you should not attend a dog park if your animal has behavioural concerns that risks safety.
- Abiding by the laws.
- Pet ownership rights for owner of dog should be examined. Ie owner has had two vicious dogs, therefore should have a 5 year ban on owning pets.
- Ensure public safety.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- i would say it depends on the particular incident and situation. training maybe, but again, depends on the circumstances of why it got designated vicious.
- Why have vicious animals to begin with? Even livestock guardian dogs who are trained to uphold the perimeter are capable of being around people without incident.
- It's the owners that have to teach their animals. It's not the animal's fault. The owners shouldn't be allowed to have animals.
- Vicious animals should NEVER be allowed in public areas. The public should not have to risk this. They need to be muzzle trained. Must be able to still provide medical care w/o putting vet staff @ risk. Need to give quality of life without endangering other people. Euthanasia if cannot do this.
- They should have to spay/neuter the animal and go to training with it in order to have a licence. if the dog is a danger to people it should unfortunately be taken away
- I would expect that if an incident were to occur, that they would stick around and take responsibility or else face charges of some sort. We had a few incidents in our community recently where several people were attacked by a dog with the same description and each time the owner and dog ran away.
- That they keep their animal away from other people. That they do everything they can to keep people safe from injury by their animal. That they be tasked with providing rehabilitation and/or re-training or lose their guardianship of the animal to someone who will be more responsible & accountable.
- Not allow them offleash
- I think the term vicious is misleading. Anxious would likely be more appropriate for most of these animals, which are likely suffering from extreme fear. My expectation would be that the owners work on improving fear through scientifically proven methods of desensitization and counter conditioning.
- That they have control of their animal at all times and the public and other animals are safe at all times
- I think the current regulations if followed are sufficient we need better enforcement that's all
- Vicious animals should not be permitted. Being muzzled and confined is cruel in my opinion.
- Owners should be forced into a training program to also help work with the dog.
- None
- Owners should be 100% responsible for the safety of the community an aggressive dog lives in. Aggressive animals can coexist peacefully but exceptional due diligence should be expected of the owner.
- Attempts by the owner to rehabilitate the dog. Vicious behaviour is not inherent, it is learned behaviour from experience (bad ownership, abuse, rescue, etc). It's dangerous for everyone else but it's also not ideal for the dog.
- Be a better owner, like most things in life it's environment not innate nature. I expect you to do right by your pet and get it the help it needs, perhaps seek therapy yourself so you can be a better influence on your pet.
- I think the current rules are great expectations



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None
- 'chasing' seems a bit extreme as a measure to determine a dog 'vicious'. A predatory animals they have an instinct to chase when something is running...it does not mean that they are going to bite. Also, a dog loping toward an uneducated person can be deemed as 'chasing' when the dog is playful.
- They should face huge fines and even prison time if injury to humans has occurred due to their laziness and irresponsibility and negligence. Once paid up, never allowed to own animals again in Canada and an eye kept on them to ensure they follow through.
- The owners should be the only ones that pay the price for vicious animals. Part of responsible ownership is ensuring that your dog won't cause harm. Maybe more dog training, maybe a muzzle.
- Fines for neglecting to meet expectations, with a limit of 2 or 3 strikes before higher fines, harsher punishment including arrest and or jail time.
- Follow the rules. Know how to handle the dog
- Have them muzzled at the park
Have a regulated 3 strike rule , if at an off leash park, after that they are NOT allowed to go at all , or must be evaluated by a professional or be required to seek professional help before attending again.
- To try their best to get appropriate training from a professional for help. To ensure people who come in the house or near them on walks are aware to be very cautious
- They must undergo several months of training with the dog with a trainer specifically knowledgeable of aggressive dogs.
- Owners must attend and prove they have specific animal behavior training. Must help the animal to succeed by giving them sufficient reactive training. Education.
- A vicious dog usually is the fault of the owner who has not taken their dogs to a training school. The owner will be fine heavily, dog to be taken away from owner. The owner is not allowed to have anymore dogs.
- None
- Post a \$500 performance bond until they complete additional animal training from a professional instructor
- They should be required to take a course that they pay out of pocket for on proper care and control of their animal.
- To raise dogs to not be reactive and vicious
- This is a hard question, because due to circumstances any dog can end up being deemed vicious. I think those rules are reasonable, plus having a dog at large/on premises sign should be posted as well.
- I grew up in Europe, any non friendly dog wore a muzzle. That is the culturally acceptable way to show others that your dog is not friendly and minimize any potential issue.
I've lived in Calgary for almost 10 years and I've never seen a muzzled dog.
You are responsible for your pet
- The standing laws make sense.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Consider behaviour classes, such as those offered by Calgary Humane Society. Always spay/neuter, vicious or not.
- Must be in the process of obedience training and having a vet check to see if any medical issues are coming from vicious behaviour. Failure to do so should result in a fine or having the animal taken away and put up for adoption.
- They train them to not bark and feel threatened by anything that moves.
- Owner is to blame. Mandatory dog school.
- If your dog is vicious don't bring it to a dog park. Even if it's muzzled.
- I feel the current expectations are reasonable.
- Intensive training of themselves & the dog. No dog was born to be vicious. There are problems that need to be dealt with to move the dog through that.
- owners should be required to notify the neighbourhood that their animal has been declared vicious. others deserve to be notified. how about a bright yellow leash - this could identify such an animal from a distance.
- None
- To keep them in their house at all times. No backyard access, no access or use of any public space, and they should also have to carry a special photo id license on their chest so if their dog kills other dogs or animals then the abhorrent owner can be found easily and held accountable.
- It may be helpful if owners of "vicious" animals are required to attend with their pet, obedience training. Other than that it appears the current Justice regulations are adequate. Re: danger of roaming cats; a dog whose instinct is to chase cats may unfairly be deemed 'vicious'.
- Have full control of them in public spaces or when the dog could escape to public spaces. Not ever have them around children even in the home.
- They should have to have a insurance policy
- Maximum control and care of the animal to protect others.
- Education to the owner to help control the dog. Encourage / support education for pet owners to learn how to care for a dog before they get to this point. Education for the public on the reality that there is not such thing as a bad breed of dog, just poor owners that lead them to become dangerous
- They receive court mandated positive force free training classes if they have been cautioned. Often the issue isn't the dog but an owner who abuses a dog and can't control it. Licenses kept up and bylaw checking on overall health of dogs not just default kill the dog attitude.
- Keep them on leash at all times, muzzles if needed and if they are not properly socialized keep them out of the parks. Create more off leash parks for dogs. If a dog causes injury the owner of the offending dog should pay all vet bills.
- Certain breeds of known vicious animals should not be allowed in the City
- I expect them to be responsible pet owners and understand the type of animal they are responsible for. Vicious pets should be identified with a 'red license tag' or something that can alert the public. Especially important should a dog get loose from their private property.
- The person who is in control of the dog must physically be strong enough to restrain the animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A collar isn't enough. Have the dog on a harness as well. Have the dog connected to the human via 2 leashes. And not in open off leash areas running loose.
- None
- That they ID their animals with micro chips that notify vicious animal apps. That they visually ID themselves mandatory armbands when they're in public places with vicious animals and that the animals have highly visible identifiers. Major fines for violations.
- I think the current guidelines are suitable.
- follow above noted procedures.
- Compliance with the rules, especially muzzle
Use of a 'do not pet' or 'I need space' sign attached to their leash or harness.
- If the animal is vicious, they should not be allowed. Period. Who needs a vicious animal? Seriously. Live out in the country if that's the case. Our population is too big to be putting people at risk. Even one dog attack is too many.
- When a dog is declared vicious it should immediately be put down.
- I believe that serious incidents of viciousness require the dog to be destroyed at the expense of the owner. I believe that breeds of dogs that have vicious tendencies should be restricted for ownership.
- On private property there shouldn't be regulations but severe consequences for the owners of the dog escapes
- Do not bring them to off leash dog parks. We have had multiple incidents of aggressive dogs with no supervision attack our puppy.
- Must be kept under control
- That's fine.
- - as always, the problems with such animals is not the animals themselves, but the owners. The owner who wants a vicious or potentially dangerous animal is likely an owner who doesn't care about the rules governing their control. Enforcement needs to be strict and rigorous.
- Owners of vicious animals should be required to attend a dog obedience course with the dog (at the owner's cost), then verify to the city what steps they will take to ensure this does not occur again. Further issues should restrict the owner from owning any pet.
- Keep it securely contained
- If dog is involved in more than one incident, the dog should be confiscated and the owner should be fined a large amount of money. That money can then go to rehabilitation /rehoming the animal once it has been thoroughly vetted to be safe.
- To be muzzled and controlled by the owner whenever around other dogs or people if they're aggressive towards people.
- Keep them away from children. Notify neighbours
- I don't understand enough of vicious animals so i don't understand why they are even allowed to live. If they could pose a hazard, why not mitigate risks and eliminate potential for harm?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Owners should be expected to attend a number of consultations with a certified force-free behaviorist chosen by bylaw, and should adhere to parameters set by bylaw and the trainer.
- Owners need to keep them away from public that doesn't want them - stick to dog areas and private property. Muzzled when in public or under control because the dog needs to be socialized to move past their vicious tendencies.
- No specific breed should be deemed vicious. Owners contribute to what makes vicious dogs. If the owner cannot control the animals they should not have them.
- The type of people who have vicious dogs are not likely to follow rules. A vicious dog license and proof of insurance.
- Most animals, especially dogs are reactive rather than actually vicious. So I guess having the owners work with a trainer on reactivity
- Most animals are vicious because of their owners, proper training with a behavior expert should be required
- They have training to control them. I see owners struggling to control large aggressive dogs daily
- Vicious dogs should not be in the city at all. Once an investigation is done that shows the animal was not antagonized in any way but attacked randomly the owner should be required to put the dog down.
- I think the owner must abide by the law or the animal needs to be removed.
- Owners need to be educated about how to handle their vicious dogs. As an owner of an aggressive dog, I see it as MY responsibility to keep him and others safe by always having control over him and never putting him in a situation where he could harm others or be harmed.
- All too often a dog pays for being "vicious" with its life, while not looking at the idiots who raised it or the environment it comes from. Increase the fines 10 fold and put bans in place for animal ownership.
- That they avoid crowded places and situations that cause any distress to their pets.
- Mandatory training for them and their dog.
- I love dogs and have owned them all of my life, but if I owned a dog who was involved in a serious and unprovoked attack on a person or another dog I would have to seriously consider euthanizing the dog. I don't believe that vicious dogs have a place in an urban setting.
- That they are legally responsible for their animals. And damage to property or persons falls LEGALLY on their shoulders.
- Must attend city approved training for responsible ownership and management of their dog's behavior. Consider removing pet from home where children are present if the aggression is towards humans.
- Significant fines for repeat offenders
- They should never bring their dog into a situation where it could harm anything else and should be muzzled whenever it leaves the house.
- Fines and loss of the right to own pets



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The secure structure must be set back from public property lines, and sightlines from the public property to the animal blocked.
- There needs to be better understanding among such owners of their personal responsibility regarding the potential injury such animals can cause to other citizens.
- The owners are the ones responsible for the actions of their pet. If a pet is declared vicious they must undergo city mandated training for aggressive and fearful dogs. They also cannot enter off leash areas within city limits.
- There should be a sign placed so any visitor to the property is aware of the dog situation.
- There is no reason to have a vicious dog. They should be banned. There are plenty of friendly dog breeds.
- The owners of a 'vicious' animal should be required to properly train and habituate/socialize their animal so that it's behaviour is modified and stops being vicious. Failure to do so should result in the owner being charged and the animal being fostered until the required steps are complete.
- They should be required to take behavioral training classes for their dog, undergo a psychiatric assessment to see if they are mental stable enough to be responsible for an animal, potentially banned from owning animals for life if they are found to be vicious in their intent themselves.
- the owners need to be trained!!! mandatory dog lessons is a must and if they are unable to provide the necessary steps to help the animal then they should be made to release ownership of the animal
- That they have training to deal with a vicious animal and that they have sufficient liability insurance.
- One strike your out. Any animal attacking a human should be put down.
- I think these are fine
- There should be criminal charges for owners of dogs deemed vicious and involved in an incident. An owner creates a vicious animal and I think they should be prevented from having that type of animal again ever or at least for a period of time. Perhaps a 'watch' program where the city checks in.
- No one should be able to own a vicious animal.
- Mandatory professional training with an approved dog trainer yo see what can be improved.
- They should only be allowed one infraction, after that the animal should be destroyed and the person should not be allowed to own a dog (or at least breeds that tend to be large and vicious)
- I am not in favour of vicious animals being pets. If a normal animal becomes vicious then it needs to be taken out of the home and if possible retrained or given the space, training and human interaction needed so it may be reintroduced as a pet. If not then it may have to be put down.
- Since the owners are usually the problem, they should have mandatory training and heavy fees to keep a vicious animal. Honestly though, why keep them in the city at all, if they can't be rehabilitated they should be destroyed, and ban repeat offender owners from having pets.
- As long as the owners are taking the adequate precautions/handling of the animal, they already know the trials of dealing with the animal. Its the ones otherwise that need to be educated on proper procedures.
- To take steps to learn more about training their animal to calm aggressive behaviours.
- Mandatory animal behaviour education. A vicious dog is so because of human behaviour. Period.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Vicious animals have NO place in an urban setting. One little mistake and a child can be killed. Having one the other side of a fence is a constant source of threat. If reported for any reason and officer feels threat, remove it.
- The owners should take canine behaviour training(breed specific if applicable) as well as participate in behaviour training with their pet. Education is key to solving most problems.
- educated to the by-laws, restrictions etc... people tend to ignore their responsibilities.
- Attempt rehabilitation of the animal with licensed professionals that can help reduce the aggressive behaviour
- Rule now sounds good.
- Agree with above
- Pet owner/ dog must attend intense training provide by a skilled trainer in this field. Follow up exams q 6 mths based on findings at that time duration could be extend 1 yr then proof of continuous training proper interaction is being completed by owner and dog.
- Haven't been bitten by a repeat offender animal that was being hidden at a relatives by the owner due to previous incidents, there needs to be a maximum one offense limit. Multiple people were attacked by this dog after previous violations. It has to stop
- loss of right to have pets
- Must seek advice from a force free, educated, science-based trainer.
- They should be executed, the owners. The dogs placed into rehabilitation using the funds left over in the estate after the execution.
- Having a known vicious animal is like carrying an open weapon. Ban vicious animals from public areas and give no second chance if a human has been harmed.
- Special training for both the human and the animal to deal with aggression, reactivity, etc., increased licensing fees, pre-determined consequences for owners who have vicious animals that offend again.
- I think if there is a dog attack on another dog in a dog park then there should be some exceptions if this is a one time thing, otherwise the present laws seem good. If a dog is injured then owner must pay vet bill.
- That they keep their animal leashed and muzzled or destroy it.
- In addition to the current rules, listed above, The City of Calgary should check in with the owners on a regular basis to make sure that these rules are being adhered to strictly.
- None.
- People should not keep vicious animals, period! Hospitalized as a child due to a mauling.
- As an owner of an aggressive dog, I must attest to the fact that part of the problem is off-leash dogs who are not vicious but also not in control. We've had so many off-leash dogs run up to us while on a leashed walk, which puts my dog on edge and is a major risk factor for all involved.
- Vicious animals should be kept away from off-leash dog parks (should be in the bylaw). If an owner is aware that their animal is vicious, they should register them with the city and be subject to a different set of rules and regulations. The risk of owning vicious animals is entirely theirs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That they control their animals for the safety of people and pets.
- LEASHES, LEASHES AND LEASHES. I had a very reactive dog, he was never OFF leash in the city and yet I had several close calls with unleashed dogs that didn't obey they handlers. Penalties need to be swift and just - and it is NOT breed specific
- That they are always under control.
- Expectation is the same for any pet owner, vicious or not. Keep control of the pet.
- These regulations seem fair.
- I expect owners to be in control of their animals. Many dog owners in my area have dogs that are quite aggressive. The owners do little to control them. There isn't enough consideration for non pet owners.
- Follow the rules, ensure person "in control" actually physically capable of restraining dog, avoid other dogs/ people deliberately. Be prepared to euthanize animal if they have injured either owner or others.
- Take the full necessary precautions of your rules and obey by them, if not a heavy fine will take place and I mean heavy fine, not a slap on the wrist type fine.
- Shouldn't be in public
- Work with a trainer to try to correct the behaviour.
- I had a lot of issues with a vicious dog in my condo building. I filed 3 complaints with the city regarding this dog. The third time this dog attacked my dog, my dog sustained injuries to his neck, requiring sutures and drains. I wish there were bylaws in place that would have allowed the (see#2)
- I would add that they would be required to take a training course dealing with these issues even though it might not totally curb they're aggression, at least the owner has some tools to help. It's much better than having to put a dog down.
- I would like to see owners of vicious animals required to take an animal behaviour course and be assessed on their ability to manage their animal (usually a dog).
- training course
- That they follow all of the rules and ensure everyone's safety.
- I want a requirement that the OWNER and dog undergo a class or work with a professional trainer to address the issue (likely a fearful dog). A muzzle and leash are just band aids to the real problem and helping actually solve that problem with a proper trainer is a much better solution.
- Muzzles actually make things worse. How does one define vicious?
- It is baffling why anyone would want a vicious animal as a pet but I think the current rules are adequate so long as they are actually enforced.
- They should have to take mandatory dog obedience lessons (imposed by the City) or be fined very heavily. It is irresponsible pet ownership to have "vicious" dogs - dogs just need to be properly trained, they are very seldom ever born "bad". Owners of such pets must also muzzle their pets on walks



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No breeding allowed for dogs and breeds determined to be vicious. Only one vicious dog/household. No vicious dogs in homes with children under age 12. No vicious dogs allowed near any child or baby under age 6. One violation only - after that the dog(s) must be seized and euthanized.
- Red bandana or other recognized warning sign visible on animal
- That the animals are safe and well-treated.
- Who labels the dog vicious. I have been bitten by small/ toy dogs and they are not labeled vicious - perception of breeds is not fair to label
- That they don't own vicious animals?
- Vicious animal should not be pets.
My dog was attacked by a German Shepard that wasn't on a leash.
- I believe that owners of vicious animals are 100% responsible for the animal's behaviour. If an animal is found to be vicious, the owner should be required to and have to provide evidence that he/she is actively working to change the animals behaviour through training.
- That the animal be receiving behaviour training to overcome its issues.
- People should not allow them to be left outside barking for any extended length of time. Not more than a few minutes.
- Regulations regarding how high and strong their fences must be, in case the animal breaks the leash/chain.
- how about someone who also has the ability size wise to control a vicious animal.
and barking does not mean vicious!!!
- Be fined if owner is not following the rules above. Not be allowed at off leash areas ever. Owner should pay for any damages and/or medical treatment required for animals and/or humans as a result of vicious animal attack.
- Viscous animals should be put down. While it is not the animals fault, it is the owner's mis-management that is at fault. Aggressive dogs require training and management. If the owner hasn't done the work, after a certain point that dog is unlikely to be salvageable.
- I have an expectation that all dog owners are responsible. We live near an offleash area in Silver Springs. People seem to view the entire neighborhood as an offleash area. We see people with their dogs offleash outside the defined area everyday and the are hostile when this is pointed out
- Training courses and structure classes to provide dog with a different new way of dealing with stress and fear.
- muzzle and control, containment. Education on how to modify the behavior.
- None.
- should be killed
- Once an animal is deemed vicious, it should be humanely euthanized.
- I live in a 300 family apartment which is respectable and clean and I can tell you one day 4 unexpected tenants we're kept hostage on the elevator in a corner because the dog owner had no control over his large dog we were frightened and the owner didn't care that somebody could seriously be hurt



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Nope.
- Be under control at all times
- those are my expectations
- These are good bylaws
- It would be wise to carry insurance. Be aware their dog is a potential risk.
- Proof of vaccination with licensing. Existing rules look fine.
- The existing rules seem adequate.
- To provide proper care and training to mitigate any further issues with the animal.
- I think the rules specified above, if followed, are sufficient. Most vicious dog attacks happen because these dogs have gotten loose. An owner must ensure that this cannot happen, otherwise a hefty fine would be implemented.
- That they keep themselves, their pet, and other around them safe.
- There should be no owners of vicious animals ... owners should turn them over to authorities ...
- They have a special license and have proper training.
- Current regulations seem sufficient.
- I don't believe animals are vicious as a rule, and often are the product of bad owners. Having said that, if an animal is vicious, I believe it is the owner's responsibility to ensure they animal is kept confined and people and other animals are safe from it.
- Do owners of a pet that was deemed vicious have the ability to have it put down?
- Undertake urgent rehabilitation training with their animal within a defined period. Vicious animals outdoors impose upon neighbours in that they are highly vocal/disruptive, and compromise the comfort and safety of others in the area. You cannot often not pass by the property without fear of attack.
- Obtain insurance.
- Extra training for the owner and the dog. Help the owner to understand dog behavior and triggers. Property assessment to make sure the dog can be safely housed and not escape.
- Depending on the circumstances - consider putting the animal down, re-homing to a rural environment.
- These are lovely rules, for those who will obey. Sometimes vicious animals have idiot owners.
- I think all animals classified as vicious should be put down. Or else fine and/or jail the owners.
- Not sure that this pertains to vicious animals but we have a real problem in our area with people allowing their dogs to run all over our private lawn areas, urinating and defecating and when approached they get angry and feel they have the right to allow their dogs on others' property.
- Fine their owners or prevent them from ever owning another dog, the dog was not born vicious
- Vicious dogs are a terrible nuisance in apartments, condos and at public gatherings. Owners do not properly perceive that these are public areas and do not properly secure their animals. I have been bit twice by dogs in my condo building. Owner responsibility is sorely lacking!
- Behavioural training for the dog. Perhaps for the owner also.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They should not be allowed to keep them. The City needs to take a serious stance and enforce removal of that animal.
- Serious mandatory education and realizing that sometimes euthanasia is the kindest option.
- They not be allowed to live in Calgary.
- Letting others (guests, passerby, vet staff or groomers) know if their dog is vicious, and are responsible in the event their animal attacks others. These owner(s) of the vicious animal should also be held liable in the event that this animal causes damages to another person or animal.
- I feel leash and muzzle requirements are adequate
- Financial responsibility for any physical damage done to others or others property
- They should put the animal down.
- I expect them to provide good care for their animal in a way that prevents any potential for injury to the animal itself or to other humans/animals. Their property should clearly display there is a vicious animal on the premise.
- Owners of vicious animals should be required to attend training, both with and without the dog.
- - Mandatory courses for handling, training, and reducing their animal's vicious behaviors.
- - Owners should be completely responsible for their dogs and liable for any damages (physical, emotional, or otherwise) caused by their animal.
- The owners should get additional training to understand their dog better, learn how to handle the dog and which situations to avoid to prevent triggers of aggressive behavior. Also dog to wear a do-not-pet vest to prevent people petting the dog and triggering the behaviour.
- Get educated. If you cannot handle the dog. Take it away. Not fair to euthanase dog that is not trained by an owner
- Insurance
- Mandated animal training for owners (not necessarily the dogs).
- mandatory owner training.
- many little dogs are viscous, however people don't keep them muzzled. However a larger breed is assumed it is vicious, yet may be very passive. how many big dogs are provoked because someone let their little dog run free?
- Engage in force-free, positive training with their owner - at least 4 classes
- Keep them away from humans and other dogs.
- They should not be permitted in off leash parks even when on a leash
- Take responsibilities for their animal's behavior including jail time and heavy fine.
- In addition to all above mentioned, I think owners of vicious animals should have to take mandatory courses, attend seminars or have mandatory training for their animals or similar activities. Uneducated person shouldn't own a vicious animal.
- dogs deemed vicious shouldn't frequent public dog off-leash parks. Even if they are muzzled etc. it's not fair to them and the other dogs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Owners are responsible for their animals and the damage it may make at all times. They should not be allowed close to people (less than 2 meters) unless invited. They should not smell people as many get very nervous.
- 1. They not be let off a leash and that they are not on a retractable leash.
- 2. They take appropriate training classes to help both the owner and especially the dog - he wasn't born vicious!
- 3. And if necessary muzzled with a cage type muzzle so he can't hurt another dog, or person.
- Owners who have had a vicious dog should be flagged as dogs do not become spontaneously vicious. More than one incident per owner should result in no dogs for 1-3 years minimum
- - Special licensing
 - Requirement to notify City if animal is rehomed (whether in the City or not)
 - Require that a vicious animal be spayed or neutered (unless deemed unsafe by a veterinarian)
- Owners should be fined for all incidents and required to cover the cost of all fees associated with the incident (vet, healthcare, property damage).
- The owner should proactively avoid any possible confrontation or interaction. Even if the dog is muzzled and leashed, aggressive behaviour is not acceptable.
- Fines
- That people actually follow the rules and regulations that are outlined by the city.
- I expect the people to be strong enough to control their dogs. There are too many strong dogs pulling owners and not under control. being 18 isn't enough. being able to stop a dog from pulling & running is required. I agree with the other current rules but vicious dogs shouldn't be allowed at all
- I think the definition needs work.
- I think this is reasonable.
- After a reported and investigated incident in 1995 with my child, me and a Mastif, I'm of the opinion ALL vicious dogs should be put down. I've still terrible reoccurring memories of this awful day.
- Bylaw needs to be able to implement conditions without court orders. An example would be if a person was charged with their dog causing damage to another animal , they cannot take it off leash anymore. If a dog bites a person twice, it should be declared vicious without a court order.
- Training and education on how to manage vicious animals.
- The focus should be on the owner not the dog. There are no problem dogs, only problem people.
- Perhaps the owner is the cause of this animal being vicious and needs to be investigated before the dog does.!!!
- That the owners must take specific training for their dog.
- To know what their animal is capable of. All dogs will bite if the right circumstances are present. Fear, poor treatment, poor socialization, poor training of owner/animal can and does cause problems. I've been bitten more than once by a vicious animal. People need to learn dog body language.
- Ensuring they are not in situations where their or others safety is at risk



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't believe in vicious animals just bad owners. I think the owners should be required to get training to be a better owner or should have to give up the animal.
- Vicious animal should not be tolerated in our city. Owner's should be more responsible with animals that are vicious - away from children/activities/parks. Mandatory muzzles even in yards.
- Be kept on lead at all times & muzzled in public places. Too often animal is far more powerful than owner
- I think that the rules in place are adequate.
- If a dog is declared vicious, owners should have to provide a substantial amount of money to be held until the animal dies. If there is another attack, the money is forfeited. I have had a dog killed by other dogs and there were no consequences for the owner of the attacking pack.
- I think they should need a bond to cover damages that their dog does to another animal or person
- The dog should be removed from their owner with an attempt to rehabilitate. Dogs don't randomly attack and owners should be investigated for neglect and improper treatment of the animal. It's not fair for breeds to be labeled due to ignorant owners.
- None
- A repeat offender must be put down without delay or appeal. The owner of a repeat offender must face a negative consequence that will actually mean something - not just a slap on the wrist.
- Not allowed to bring these pets in vicinity of children.
- Consistent steps being taken to get help such as training or consider rehoming. I believe any vicious animal is that way for a reason and can be helped.
- There should be large visible signage on the private property that houses vicious dogs. The owners should be required to take training with the animal until deemed reformed. Animals should be deemed vicious only by behavior, not by breed.
- Punish the owners. Not the animals. Don't put the animal down because someone refused to train the animal properly.
Do not allow these dogs at dog parks. Very often people's innocent dogs get attacked from these animals.
- Mandatory training classes with a training facility that is broadly accepted as having appropriate protocols and has proven success with rehabilitating vicious animals.
- I feel there should be some kind of marking to indicate it is a problem animal. I.e. A coloured vest.
- Any dog can become vicious. Dogs are animals and not totally predictable. Dogs protect their owners. They do not know me. Owners say oh my dog never does that. After it jumps up and/or bites me. [personally identifiable information removed] Dogs want to dominate and find their spot in the hierarchy. City dogs leashed
- While some breeds are potentially more dangerous than others, any breed can be dangerous. The problem is not the dog, it is the owner. To own a potentially dangerous dog, the owner must prove that the dog is well trained and disciplined by a certified trainer before it can be licenced.
- On going dog training and financial assistance for people who have fostered pets or adopted pets for the humane society and who need assistance.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Owners must be held accountable to ensuring that the bylaws regarding their vicious dogs are upheld and maintained.
- When in public vicious dogs cannot be on a extendable leash.
Restricted access to certain high (people) traffic such as 17th Ave SW.
- None
- Criminal liability if repeat offences occur.
- Proof of animal training in a dog school, vet records, behaviour records and if animal doesn't improve, an acknowledgement that it will be surrendered. If animal hurts someone, it's surrendered or removed - full stop.
- That they take them to special classes to address the problem.
- Repeated offences should result in permanent surrender of animal to bylaw. Further behavioural testing to assess animal for rehab or euthanasia
- After an incident owners should be fined and expected to have training. This enforcement should be followed up by by-law officers that specialize in dog training
- Animals must be licenced and neutered.
- The owners that live with the dog & pet must attend & pass a training course to have better control of the dog
- What options are there for owners to provide proper training to their dogs afterwards to work on improving behaviour? Owners also need training, muzzles are helpful but doesnt help the dog in rehabilitation in the long run.
- Intense private remedial training/treatment should be a requirement. If the animal cannot be rehabilitated it should be put down.
- That vicious animals must be under owner. Control at all times and not be allowed in public places. Once they have shown harm to humans they should be put down
- Must take their animal to training sessions to improve owners understanding and ability to control the animal. If they can not get control of vicious behavior within the year of the animal declared vicious, the animal should be removed from the owner possession and owner should not have any animals.
- They do not leave them outside to bark incessantly. They are not allowed to come within 1 foot of a public sidewalk if they are kept unleashed in a yard because a chain link fence that runs right up to the edge of a public sidewalk is not a sufficient barrier to prevent contact with them.
- Owners pay all court and animal housing fees. Many dogs should be euthanized for their own mental health. Any additional infractions with the dogs caused by owners mistakes result in lifetime ban on owning dogs.
- To be aware and educated on aggression and how to handle it around others. A lot of people overlook aggression (especially in small dogs/animals).
- Take some kind of training for them and the pet



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- In the case of a dog attack, same process as driving while driving. Fines alone will not work. Both the dog and owner should be made to attend dog training to ensure they're capable of being responsible.
- The animal to be under control and the owner to be knowledgeable about their animal and how to diffuse the situation.
- They have PROPER control over their animal. They should attend animal control and handling classes to give them skills needed.
- Owners should be mandated to take animal behavioural classes to ensure they can read their dog to try and prevent new situations from occurring. Also, most dogs are vicious for a reason. Owners need to be investigated unless the attack was provoked.
- Education and knowledge of breed. Mandatory training for the dog and the owner.
- See a trainer to aid in curbing the animals behaviour
- Training to help the animal that is specific to its needs/ fears. On leash at dog parks.
- If non-compliance with the rules the vicious animal must be put down and the owner is forbidden to have another animal until a set period of time, maybe five years, and a training course is successfully passed.
- I expect they will keep their viscoius dogs away from people and other animals and muzzled if deemed necessary.
- They should complete an obedience course with a certified trainer experienced in handling aggressive dogs.
- Have animal under control in off leash areas.
- I personally believe that if a dog is viscous for some reason it has something to do with the owner not the dog. The way dogs are treated at home is how they will react to strange people. If the dog is naturally timid & can be cross it is up to the own to CLEARLY communicate that their dog is cross
- No complaints with this model. I seen Vancouver is looking at a rehab clause in their Dangerous Animal legislation. That seems worth looking into. So if an animal deamed dangerous is rehabilitated it can be reevaluated and potentially have the the designation changed.
- Person in control of dog should be required to demonstrate ability to control the dog, and to notify public when they encounter the animal
- Owner and pet need to take mandatory training with a professional. I don't believe in auto euthanizing a dog...Also - the city DOESN'T follow the protocol above! I know of a dog that was seized and euthanized because the owner sicked the dog on his gf! Dog should've been rehabilitated & rehomed.
- To have to attend training classes with this dog and for as long as it takes to understand the needs of the dog and why it has become vicious. Vicious dogs are not born, they are created. Locking a vicious dog up in a structure perpetuates the behavior.
- Fines to hold them accountable
- Perhaps a coloured leash system to warn other people the dog is vicious
- Take the animals away from irresponsible owners and place with responsibility pet lovers



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The bylaw to allow the removal of the dog for any non-compliance of the bylaw.
- If an animal is proven vicious the dog and registered owner should have to show proof of training for the animal. Second offense is mandatory euthanasia.
- Owners who have dogs that are aggressive to other dogs should have to have them muzzled off property as well. Not just vicious towards people.
- I believe vicious animals that pose a threat to others must be contained in a private property. They must be registered as vicious and need to have warnings on their property.
- Mandatory training course for owners.
- Consider quality of life of your Animal.
- Regular inspections to ensure they are following the cond'ns, significant fines / animal removal if not. Mandatory training and testing of animal behaviour (ability to follow commands, etc.). If owner cannot meet these, removal and euthanasia of the animal.
- Vicious animals are the product of their owners. Owners should be made to go to some sort of training before being allowed any animals. They should be financially responsible for any damage done by their vicious dog.
- They should be required to work with a qualified behaviourist specializing in aggression to deal with their animal's behaviour.
- Require training courses
- I think owners should have to take course or something. I hate when the owners don't do a good job and the animal gets destroyed because of it.
- I think the vicious dog policy is excellent. The bylaw and courts are fair. As a CBCC-KA certificant I've worked with several cases that have come through with mandatory training conditions and I am always impressed with how the situations have been dealt with.
- The owner should prove they have spent the time training their dog and register in classes to help the dog
- Then to be cautious of other approaching dogs or little kids. Be responsible for taking their dog to obedience and behavioral courses.
- Vicious dogs are usually the result of chaining, neglect, abuse by humans. Check out the owner - if its a rescue the new owner has inherited the problem from the previous owner. Ban the previous owner from ever owning another animal.
- Muzzle, on leash, fenced in yard, training. Zero tolerance for savage attacks that cause hospitalisation.
- There should be NO vicious dogs in Calgary!
- Keep them on a leash
- They should not be permitted at off leash parks and owners should be fined for doing so. I have a pit bull and if he was attacked by a vicious dog not a pit bull in the eyes of many it would still be my dogs fault.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think they should work with them to get some basic training and control. Never, never off leash. And control them from disturbing the neighbours.
- Dogs need to be muzzled and not let off leash. Dogs need to be in control of a person at all times.
- the above rules seem comprehensive and fair perhaps restricting the re-homing of vicious animals?
- That they have access to behavior specialists and training to best understand the management strategies they need to use. That they abide by those individual animal-specific strategies. Your rules above could very well exacerbate problems they are supposedly meant to address.
- Meaningful charges to the owner. In a case of multiple incidents the owner not being able to own a pet.
- Mandatory training courses. Sometimes it's more about the owner than it is about the dog.
- No one follows these rules
- Financial reimbursement in the event one dog attacks another, legal ramifications if the owner of a vicious dog flees or fails to provide identification if their dog seriously harms another. more support for those who have had their pets attacked without being able to identify the indivs responsible
- To be able to decide if the animal is showing more aggressive behavior and reach out for professional assistance
- Nothing.
- They are aware their pet is vicious and are made to take steps to help control these behavioral issues, whether that be through city approved training/obedience courses or pharmaceuticals prescribed by their veterinarian. Also do NOT take vicious pets into offleash areas, even if on a leash.
- That they are required to seek further training or education to understand their reactive dog.
- I thing that Calgary's current regulations are fine. Progressive & doesn't single out any specific breed or type. This is good.
- The current rules seem sufficient.
- I think our bylaws for this are very good
- Owners of vicious dogs should not be allowed in off leash enclosed parks. If pets cause injuries to other dogs - pet should be removed from owner and fined a minimum of \$1000.00. Pet owners also needs to pay vet bills.
- Attend corrective training and learn how to build their dogs confidence. The majority of bite cases happen out of fear. As well, if the dog has a history of aggression clearly the owner is not capable of correction and it should be seized to be in the care of an experienced owner.
- Owners must be forced to give up their vicious animal.. Animal must then be put down. No exceptions. Also that owner must be banned for life to have any dogs.
- Vicious animals are very rarely vicious for no reason. It's often a learned behaviour and is usually reversible with time, consistency and training. These owners need to do what is best for the animal, not what is more convenient for them.
- Keep them under control.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- To take all possible measures available to them to keep the dog contained and the general public safe.
- I wonder if there is a way to support these owners in learning more about how to train/manage a dog with aggressive tendencies? Dog trainers are expensive and may be a prohibitive cost for some citizens.
- None
- They should know their dogs needs and behaviour to other dogs and people
- Sign up for training classes. It's not really the dogs fault - that's how it is communicating that it is scared. It is the owner's responsibility to create a safer environment for the dogs to reduce future incidents
- TRAIN THEIR PETS!!! It is not the animals fault they are not trained
- Dogs are not vicious, they can learn behaviours that cause aggressive behaviour. These animals need training that should be performed by accredited trainers at the owners' expense.
- I find that many dog owners are not responsible and I do not have faith that owners of vicious animals will comply. The dogs should be removed from the owners.
- They need to go through dog training and work to retrain the dog of unwanted behavior.
- Proper equipment used in a humane way. Vicious dogs don't need to be harmed, they need to be rehabilitated properly.
- They must undertake mandatory training, at their expense, on how to train and control a vicious animal. They must also carry insurance in the event the vicious animal causes harm to other people/animals. The city euthanized the vicious animal if training and insurance are not up kept.
- Dog should either be muzzled at all times or euthen³:
- Owners must give up vicious animals if not following bylaws on first occurrence. Any type of injury caused by such animal should be dealt by the courts.
- I think what's in place is probably enough.
- It should be made clear to these owners that they are financially responsible for ANY damage or injury their dog may cause.
- Weigh the options and the quality of life this dog is going to have when it is deemed a vicious animal. I have zero issues with euthanasia especially when it comes to dogs with multiple bites/attacks and especially when it's directed towards children.
- To understand their dog. Attend training and to show progress or surrender dog
- Dont take aggressive dogs to offleash areas, even if on leash
- To stay away from dog parks, even if muzzled.
- Pursue behaviour modification with a certified positive reinforcement trainer
- Must receive training on all aspects of dog ownership. Poorly managed vicious dogs should not remain in ownership. Vicious dogs could be the result of poor ownership and/or specific breed. They should not be allowed to keep the animal if an ongoing threat.
- To follow guidelines set out by the city of Calgary and to seek help from and follow the advice from certified, educated, professional behavioural help



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Lessons for the OWNER regarding dog behaviour. I do not believe dogs are born vicious owners need to understand their dogs and how to handle them if they have bad tendencies.
- When on public property if a vicious dog has a muzzle and is harnessed/leashed and an irresponsible dog owner doesn't control their own dog around this 'vicious' dog, the owner of the vicious dog should be empowered to report the irresponsible dog owner
- They should be required to take the dog through training and pass whatever level the City of Calgary deems appropriate
- Dogs that are deemed vicious due to an attack on a person or another animal should be destroyed.
- As above. They should be able to control the animal. There are no bad dogs, they may need training & there are bad owners that should not have them. Too many rumours of dogs being stolen for dog rings.
- These work.
- Have the owner and dog go through behavioural therapy. Sometimes the dog doesn't mean to be vicious and it's reacting to minor cues an owner is giving, whether directly or not. This will also give an opportunity to analyze the owner-dog relationship and help identify the cause of viciousness.
- they be vaccinated especially for rabies
- To take responsibility for their animal's behavior. If their animal is aggressive or attacks then they need to make sure others involved are okay and give their contact information.
- no extendi leashes, current rabies vaccines
- that they should be barred from public dog parks. My dog was attacked by them unprovoked and the owners just ran away while my dog is left with a half-torn ear. It was an un-neutered dalmatian and my dog is a neutered golden retriever. Also check if their dogs are neutered.
- Take lessons with trainer and bylaw course
- That they take appropriate steps to ensure they deal with it such as using a muzzle and appropriate lead/leash. Supervise appropriately
- Accredited rehabilitation program for offenders.
- To participate in training with their animal, keep on leash and away from dog parks/highly populated paths
- Leashed up, if they do attack be responsible, check on welfare of dog that your dog has been vicious with. What can we do when we are party to a vicious dog attack?
- 3 strikes of vicious behaviour against HUMANS and the dog gets put down.
- They seek training to modify vicious behaviors
- Stay out of off leash areas, even when on leash. Stay out of playground areas even when on leash.
- Proper training - locking them inside and muzzling them will not change behaviour
- BOTH owners Must take reactive dog courses and more training. It will help both owners and their dogs to learn that they each have contributed to said behaviours. If a dog needs medical care, the owner should pay for injuries caused by their pet.
- Owners of identified vicious dogs should also be required to carry extra insurance or liability in the case of an attack.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- These expectations seem to be sufficient. The problem is enforcement. People and other animals have been attacked by dogs and the owners have left the scene without providing any identification.
- People should not be permitted to keep dogs outside, regardless of behaviour.
- Why are people allowed to own VICIOUS animals? Both my sister and my dog were attacked by vicious dogs - both incidents were reported but no consequences for the owners. Owners are responsible-they don't know how to handle dogs. Owners train vicious or they don't know how to handle dogs.
- Dog owners should be made to take obedience classes for themselves and their dog. Owners need to know how to take care of their pets and properly control them. Education!
- Mandatory dog training including participation and completion by owner and all adults and caregivers of animal.
- Vicious animals should be put down without exception if they have attacked a person
- They go to behavior training and understand that they need to be the pack leader and teach correct behaviors especially in off leash parks
- Owners of vicious animals should never have them in a situation (eg. offleash parks, even on leash) where they can create a problem with other animals through chance encounter. They should never be allowed anywhere near children
- mandatory training
- Ensure dogs are secure. Incidents always stem from a dog escaping an area that is not secure
- They should have to undergo training! At least a month! Any Vicious or deemed vicious animal can be rehabilitated. These issues are 100% always owner fault. Lack of training in socialization or in obedience
- I expect that an owner of the vicious animal that has gotten loose be prevented from any pet ownership in the future with regular checks by bylaw.
- Not to frequently bring there animals into public areas
- It's bad ownership not bad dogs. People also need to be trained not to approach any dog and scare them. They protect their homes and families. Dog breed get bad raps and people are not educated about them. Their is a reason why that dog bit or chased someone. Not because of the bree
- Keep contained at all times, ie make sure yard is secure, doors closed ect. Muzzles in public at all times, leash in public at all times
- As a former owner of a dog who had reactive anxiety, MANY times I had to ask people to leash their dogs in bylawed leash areas. Most say "it's ok, he's friendly." As a smart animal owner, I would remove my pet from the area. The issue often IS NOT the vicious pet or their owner.
- Owners should be outright responsible for any incidents involving vicious animals.
- Unfortunately, most if not all vicious dogs are the fault of the owner. Not enough or poor training, abuse and neglect. Anyone who has a dog should be responsible for its behavior. There are many private trainers available in the city, there is no excuse for a vicious dog. Blame the owner, not dog



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They should need to use a leash that clearly alerts others of the dogs behaviour. Two leash system that attaches the dog to the owner so fewer accidents can happen. Also, home visit to ensure the yard can not be escaped. No fence, or contained 8 foot enclosure, no aggressive dog may reside.
- They need to be spayed or neutered. And the owner must provide proof to the court that they are working with a trained behaviourist to alter the behaviours.
- How about some mandatory responsible dog owner training, and professional obedience training for the dog. Second offences should have higher penalties and perhaps a ban on owning pets period.
- They should be put down, it is o my a matter of time before someone gets hurt
- That they keep their animal and the public safe
- They need to keep their dogs from barking, keep them indoors or whatever it takes but neighbours should feel safe and have the right to peacefully enjoy their backyards
- Vicious animals should always be euthanized. The risk of escape and injury to innocent people and/or animals is too great. There is no excuse for owning a vicious animal.
- Sadly, the people who tend to "own" vicious animals are--as much of a stereotype as it may be--pretty vicious themselves. As such, I have basically ZERO expectations of these people. They are the problem, more than the animals.
- That they take part in training(mandatory)
Owners be fined heavy for not following laws
- Vicious dogs are caused by negligent ownership. If a dog is a threat, it should be removed from the owner and the owner lose the priviledge of owning animals.
- Is the dog actually vicious. This should not be a term given by anyone but animal behavioural specialists and should be mandatory to bring the dogs for training with a professional. Half your "vicious" animals are just the results of people not respecting the animals.
- None
- All animals deemed vivacious and their owners should be properly evaluated and depending on circumstances they should be fined and had their animal under go training till rehabilitated and maybe even rehomed afterwards
- There should be some type of simple symbol to describe or show the public that the dog has tendencies to be aggressive. And example of this could be a green bow tied to the collar
- I think that looks good.
- Notify others if someone is trying to approach the animal.
- I agree with above. But on second attack public property as determined by courts automatic euthanization. on first and second atracks oprn the civil damages.
- That they be held liable for an negative impact of their animal. There should be significant penalties imposed on owners of vicious animals (e.g. fines in the \$1-10K range).
- Liability insurance in case of injury and a "dangerous dog license number" that has to be worn on a bright harness at all times. Too many instances of a vicious dog attacking someone and the owner simply taking it & leaving so no way to track them down.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- take extra precautions when taking the animal in public places - ie; take dog for a walk during non peak hours, or go to an area that is generally not as busy.
- All dogs no matter the size need to be included. we stopped using off leash areas due to small dogs biting our very dog friendly German shepherds-because they are small many people don't see them as vicious- if my dog was to snarl and snap at a person or animal it would be vicious-not for small dogs
- Training for owner and dog. No entry to areas like dog parks or kid playgrounds.
- Ownership training. Some owners need to learn how to communicate with their dog. I feel owners should have to take training classes
- Owners must attend classes to train their animals. It's absolutely unreasonable that people can buy animals without having experience with them. Vicious dogs are a particularly rampant issue in this city. Dogs trained to be vicious should be outlawed.
- Not able to go to dog parks
- Owners should be forced to pay for evaluation and treatment by a certified dog trainer or veterinary behaviourist in order to attempt to rehabilitate a vicious dog. If they refuse to pay or are unable to pay they should be restricted from obtaining another dog for 5 years.
- A training program that owners can work through and potentially decrease limitations in the future of training goes well. Education for owners on how to ensure their dog is properly muzzle trained to decrease stress
- I've had a friend recently bitten in the face by a dog. A very serious bite. As far as I know the dog is still with the owner and nothing has been done. She will need to take legal action on her own to cover corrective actions for her face. The owner should be held responsible from the start!
- To have to take mandated dog behaviour classes to learn about how to read their dog and how to handle reactive dogs.
- I think if a dog is vicious the owners need to be investigated to see if they were abusive to the dog or did anything to aggravate the dog to the point of lashing out.
- Ensure that they have control of their animals and to inform others if they think their animal will pose a threat or be a problem in a certain situation. If possible, provide training to try to correct the behaviour, be it leash aggression, fearful response to a stimulant, or something else.
- They should be required to have a bond of at least \$ 5,000. posted to cover any costs that occur as a result of them attacking.
- If an animal is declared vicious, they should rehabilitate the dog and rehome it. Also the people who owned the vicious dog should be reviewed by the court and may potentially have an animal ownership restrictions placed upon them.
- Licence the pets. Neuter them. Don't train them to be vicious.
- the current expectations are good if followed
- Full attention on their pet, I often see people walking a vicious dog with their phone and headphones. Also, size matters!! Little dogs have attacked my big dog so many times but no one cares
- To keep them on leash and take proper steps to ensure safety of others.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 100% accountability
- None, leave dogs alone
- Owners be held accountable and NOT BREEDS!
- To train their dogs and to work with their dog to calm it down
- Proper safety measures should be met, no exceptions
- They shouldn't be allowed and if a breed is deemed vicious owners should have to prove the animal has been properly trained for obedience
- Owner must recognize that their pet is vicious and take the proper precautions. Heavy fines should be imposed when incidents occur.
- Advise other households on the block that they have a vicious animal on premise.
- After any incident, the owner should invest in professional training to address the behavior that caused the incident in the first place. Further, secure structure outdoors should be further defined (kennelled outside, fenced yard?)
- To go through training
- Depending on the offense they should be put down.
- train to change behavior, noise control
- It shouldn't just be age related. I've seen many older people than 18 who don't physically have the strength to control their dog. I expected the owner to be physically able to control their pet & to keep pet to the right hand side & away from people or animals when passing. People are self absorbed
- Safety
- I have a problem with the vicious declaration. I think one umbrella term is difficult to use. Obviously there are vicious dogs, but there are also circumstances where dogs fight, but are not vicious. I think case by case evaluation is required and should not be applied to all.
- Limit number of animals someone can own if one is a vicious animal.
- I agree with the current laws.
- Securely contained around visitors.
- I think the private property laws seem a bit intense. It's no life for a dog and they will increase likelihood of aggression living in these fearful and restrictive conditions. It's a self fulfilling prophesy.
- Owners KNOW their animals and if they know that their animal is temperamental/easily antagonized then be responsible and muzzle your dog for everyone's safety. Your aggressive animal MUST be kept inside (unless on a leash with the owner) as many animals seem to escape their yards and attack.
- That it be reviewed if the owners are appropriate for keeping a vicious animal. That this animal absolutely be spayed or neutered to prevent future breeding. And for suggestions on using behaviourist or trainer to manage reactivity
- The existing rules are ridiculous and, unenforceable, especially those dealing with the private property expectations. We NEED to get back to treating other species as just that, NOT dressing up dogs and cats in 'cutesy little outfits' while having NO idea what 'normal' is for these poor creatures
- Humans needs to be trained. Dogs are reflections of their owners!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- owner forced to take dog training classes, with accused dog. Most dogs are aggressive due to bad ownership.
- If a dog is declared vicious, then the owners must be forced to take a court on proper dog management. It's probably not the dog but the crazy owner. If they don't want to pay for the course, take the dog.
- It should be required that the owner and dog complete training. Dogs are not born vicious.
- My dog was attacked by a unattended dog that had been loosely tied outside a convenience store. Didn't know what steps to take called 311 to report, owner wouldn't give his name. Didn't know what we should do.
- Any dog that is deemed to be vicious should be put down. At the end of the day these are animals, and it is not worth the risk to human life, nor the expense to our health care system.
- They need to have training on why that dog behaves that way and how to deal with the animal's problem - which unfortunately 9 time out of 10 is the OWNER.
- Very few dogs are vicious. Show me a vicious dog and I'll show you an idiot guardian. Don't punish the dog - deal with the guardian. The dog can be trained by qualified canine behaviouralists; the guardian should be punished to the fullest extent of the new laws oriented around guardianship of dogs.
- Owner needs training on how to lead the dog. Dogs react to owner energy and training.
- These owners need to attend mandatory education and training. The dogs are vicious/ill-behaved because of the owner's inability to understand dogs and dog behaviour. If they do not complete mandatory education they should be banned from owning a dog. I don't think the dog should be returned to them.
- They report to the city with actions they re taking to train their pet
- I think that if they own a "vicious dog" they clearly don't have the skills to control that particular breed and should be sent to a trainer to address the behaviour. No bad dogs. Only bad owners
- Training. Dogs are vicious due to their treatment or training.
- I would suggest they not take their dog to dog parks/off-leash areas.
- education classes on how to train or work with your dog to try to educate the owner and train the dog
- None
- To understand the meaning of "secure structure" outdoors and how it may be different than a fenced yard.
- I need to ask why is there animal so vicious. Need training before being released if not put down.
- Maybe that signs be placed on the property as a warning just in case and that there is a peice they can Velcro on their leash to warn people on walks in public to not approach.
- Those are fine.
- There should be a financial bond in place to compensated for any physical or destruction that has occurred due to the vicious animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I have concerns regarding an aggressive dog being outside and barking excessively and feel there should be noise requirements for dogs to be outdoors. Having a dog barking aggressively though a fence does not help someone feel safe.
 - It's unfortunate that this continues to be a problem. I would like to see proof or validation that the owner has completed a Behavior course with a certified Canine Behaviorist.
 - I think the animal at large must undergo behaviour training - or perhaps the owner should be under review instead of the animal. Clearly there is lack of judgement call by them and it's unfortunate it comes weighing down on the animal. animals need boundaries & discipline to understand we alpha.
 - Personally, I cannot think of any reason why someone would keep a vicious animal except as a watchdog at a commercial property and then I would expect them to be properly confined and appropriate signage posted.
 - When they move into a neighbourhood with children next door to warn parents if children try to approach the dog.
 - The owners need to go through a mandatory educational process which helps them understand what they have done/not done that has contributed to an animal being defined as 'vicious.'
 - No-one in Calgary should possess a _vicious_ animal. Owners should be forced to have them euthanized.
 - Perhaps some sort of registry if an owner has multiple complaints against them? Maybe you could look online and see Person A at Residence B (in your neighbourhood) has 10 prior vicious animal complaints. As someone with small children you may choose to buy elsewhere.
 - Provide clarity on what a secure structure is and is not. Further there are people over 18 years of age that cannot control a large vicious animal. Must be over 18 years of age and have the ability to maintain control of the animal at all times.
 - I'd like the owner to be required to take a dog behaviour/handle aggressive dogs course
 - That they comply with the above. I think the problem is not with the law but rather with people who will not comply. I think people should be expected to take their dog to a dog trainer and mandated to complete additional training.
 - Do not allow citizens to own any vicious animals on the vicious animal list. Of the top five or at least top three vicious dogs, not allow people to have Pitbulls, Mastiffs or Rottweilers in the city.
 - Owners must have control
 - The owner had some type of dog training
 - Mandatory training, probation, and monitoring of the owner and the animal. I am absolutely opposed to breed specific legislation that bans a breed, however, it would be appropriate for an owner to be required to have training in order to own a dog that is considered a vicious breed
 - It shouldn't just be "bitten" there should be varying degrees. If a dog has bitten another dog, like a nip, that should be differently treated than if it mauls or kills another dog. Also, dog owners should have a phone number to call if this happens at a dog park. And the phone # should be posted
 - Put it down if it is the aggressor.
 - The owner should go through a psych test.
- Dogs are just the way the owners made them



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Go through a training course to improve dog control
- To have their dog on a leash at all times or in a fenced back yard that they can't get out of. My dogs and I get attacked regularly by off leash dogs walking in our neighborhood and the owners don't care at all. There needs to be more enforcement of leash laws. There are 5 aggressive dogs in my area
- I don't have any answers for this at the current time. I think owners of animals deemed vicious should be investigated for why this has occurred, educated so that future animals do not become vicious or they should be registered and banned from owning animals dependent on the outcome of an invest.
- The problem is that some owners do not think that their animal is vicious. If an animal has injured or bitten any other animal or human, it should not be allowed out in public.
- They have taken a training course to understand how to handle their pet and to attempt to make positive changes to reduce chance of incidents.
- Have their dog assessed and search for ways of rehabilitation. Avoidance of the community when known behaviours have already been identified
- It all comes back to responsible pet ownership. If you have a dog that is not friendly with other dogs or with people, it is 100% their responsibility to keep that dog under control at all times. No exceptions
- A neighbour's Rottweiler is often left unattended in their backyard. A chain link fence separates it from the public walkway. When I walk my dogs there it growls, snarls and runs back and forth, trying to get to us. Just a matter of time before it jumps/gets out. Do I/we need to carry bear spray?!?!
- Owners should be required to take a training course on how to handle their dog.
- Put the animals do own for everyone's safety. There are no bad dogs just really bad owners.
- Owner must attend positive behaviour training for supporting and working with their dog
- Owners should be fine for having vicious animals. Too many are using them to protect their property and it is the innocent people who are getting hurt and innocent animals as well. Make the owners responsible
- Attend a city run class
- Are the owners in a training program to learn how to best manage the animals needs?
- They should be required to take courses in responsible pet ownership. Unfortunately most of them are low lifes who couldn't care less.
- By the time the dogs declared vicious it is likely too late. Dog owners must recognize the potential their breed has for injury if or when the dog attacks. Certain breeds that are bred for aggression it was a higher risk. This is not reflected I. The current wording.
- Strict and thorough owner training/education, restrictions about future ownership or restrictions about breed that could be owned.
- I think they should take their pets to reactive training so they can better their relationship with their pet
- Owner should have 2 point of contact with the dog, meaning leashed on two separate parts. For example, having one leash connected to a collar and one to a harness.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cross street, communicate clearly, no off leash, maintain control at all times
- No other expectations.
- Actively training the animals.
- All of those conditions seem fine.
- Signage or decal prominently placed at entry points to clearly identify high risk animal is on site.
- Maybe should have to take a “reactive dog” training g class.
- It seems weird to me that an animal deemed vicious by the courts would be returned to the owner in the first place. Isn't that like handing a loaded gun to a toddler? The dog should be destroyed.
- Dog owners with a lack of control using off leash dog parks to display the confidence of their pet in relation to more submissive dogs who use the park for what is intended. Aggressive breeds should be confined to a smaller section of the offleash park
- Responsibility for their Own actions
Educate and holding them legally responsible
monitoring
To ensure safety of community
- To have control of them - whether a muzzle or locked up. Also as a dog owner & a mom, I appreciate when owners warn that their dog is vicious and then we can avoid going right past them while walking or switch sidewalks.
- Not allowed where other animals or children are likely to congregate ie. Parks with playgrounds.
- There should be something to let other people know they are vicious. And people should be educated on what that means so they do not approach the dog and put the dog and owner in danger as well as themselves
- That they actually follow the rules. My dogs were attacked a few months ago by a loose vicious dog. No idea who the owner was, no reprisals can be made. Negligent owners get away with being negligent. A lifetime ban on dog ownership if their dog injures another animal (dog, cat, child, etc)
- They should be educated and they should also take steps with private training sessions so that the animal and owners can live a happy, stress-free life.
- Keep the vicious animal out of public areas.
- Owners should not take their pet to public off leash parks, despite the use of a muzzle and a leash. These owners should be obliged to engage in behaviour modification classes and the dog should be removed from the home if they cannot attend and make progress in them.
- None
- Ensure they have homeowner or rental insurance.
- Vicious animals indicate a poor level of care on the part of the owners. Either the animals are abused, or unsocialized and untrained. If the owners are not willing to take socialization and training programs, their animals should be confiscated, rehabilitated, and rehomed.
- They should have to attend dog behaviour classes. It's not usually the dogs fault it's the owners lack of time spent to minimize that behaviour.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They must surrender the animal if a secondary offence happens. There should only be one second chance.
- Ensure control at all times
- To keep the dog under control
- Requirements for retraining.
- That they know their animal's limits and act accordingly (ie, not bringing a dog to a dog park when it doesn't like other dogs)
- To ensure the physical and mental welfare of the animal is maintained even if deemed a vicious animal
- Identification that they are a vicious animal especially when at dog parks. Take them to fences in areas at dog parks. Participate in training to help curb dogs behavior.
- Reach out to volunteers/organizations who can help them
- That the person over 18 is physically able to handle the animal . These animals should not be allowed on public property like playgrounds, school grounds. Also, are they really pets if they are declared vicious??
- I expect that they take the appropriate measures to keep people, other pets and themselves safe.
- To be actively training the animal to become more comfortable with humans and animals.
- Mandatory obedience classes and training for owners and pet after incidences occur.
- Fine the owner if the dog has bitten a person or another dog. If severely bitten a person, it might need to be removed from the owner and even be put down if it is deemed to be not trainable.
- Be responsible period but it isn't happening now so more rules are not going to do a thing when the people disregarding them know they will never be charged
- Should have to go to mandatory dog training classes if they want the animal back at all, and fined if not compliant
- I see no reason for people to keep vicious animals.
- Vicious dogs should be put down.
- They should have to prove the completion of an appropriate dog behaviour course.
- Depending on the severity of the mauling attack, the owner must pay the city's costs to put it down, just like the rest of us have to pay the city for not shoveling it's sidewalks after a storm.
- mandatory training of the owner/pet
- The animal is controlled at all times, there is a clear indicator the animal is vicious and the animal is vaccinated.
- I don't think owners of vicious animals should take them anywhere public, other than the veterinarian, muzzled or leashed. If they are vicious enough to cause a human hospitalization, they should be euthanized.
- They need to take dog training classes, to learn how to handle/treat dogs. Any dog, even a chihuahua, can be vicious. It's not just the big dogs, they just do more damage.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Fines should apply if a dog hurts a person or another animal. Owner of vicious dogs should be responsible for vet bill of other animal they attacked....Compensation to humans for any trauma treatment...physical and emotional trauma caused by vicious dog.
- I believe that the owner should not be allowed to take the animal to an off leash park. Also believe that the owner and dog should take training as deemed fit.
- Training courses
- These rules seem reasonable.
- Vicious dogs, and irresponsible owners should not be allowed to run amok in the city. We aren't convinced that any specific breed is always a threat but some irresponsible people who own dogs seem to own dogs with a penchant for trouble.
- Vicious dogs don't change. Think about that when you let it back into the community
- Owners of vicious dogs should be expected to ensure their dog has been properly trained they receive training in proper handling and should ensure the dog is on leash and under control at all times when in public.
- Have visible signs identifying the home of having a vicious dog.
- no need to have a vicious animal in any circumstance .owners should be trained and then they can train their dogs....etc. properly. too high a danger to public.
- They must be fine and it would depend how much on the severity of the bite. The owners must be held accountable it is not the animal
- training/rehabilitation to reduce viciousness, owner held legally accountable for further attacks/injuries caused by dogs, limit vicious animals contact with children/other animals
- Do your do diligence. Make extra sure you don't put your pets life in danger because you slipped up.
- Keep the secure structure a minimum distance away from the property line
- Proper training for both owner and dog to minimize viciousness.
- As covered above.
- One attack on any person or animal should equal automatic euthanasia - no discussion. All dogs out on leash or in off leash areas must be muzzled. Too many innocent walkers marred for life because of a dog attack (even ones owners say have never been like that - hence ALL dogs muzzled).
- Is there a level under this? For dogs that attack others at dog parks and there are no repercussions? I have concerns about other dog owners and dogs at dog parks. That not all owners take responsibility for their pet or don't take reasonable action to ensure their pet doesn't viciously attack another
- It's unnatural to declare a dog "vicious" when it attacks another animal. I expect that owners know their dog and know their dogs triggers but the dog should not be punished for natural behaviour. Dogs are animals, they don't need to behave like obedient children.
- That they stop dealing drugs. Because that's who teaches their dogs to be vicious.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The owners should go to a mandatory training class .. 99% of all incidents could be prevented with proper handling/training .. not all dog bite because they're vicious.. they feel threatened Or scared and the owner is oblivious to the signs
- I think some basic training classes may be of value. Dogs like humans can react in a bad moment and generally never act aggressively unless they're poorly trained, abused, scared or feeling threatened. And taking them away to evaluate just puts them in a unfamiliar place where they cant be themself
- Vicious animals should not be returned to their owners. Period. The owners should have a lifetime ban from owning any other animals.
- Muzzle and containment
- A truly vicious and aggressive dog, which represents an ongoing threat to other dogs or people, should be destroyed and owner fined. The rules as they are seem fair.
- Since it is often about the owner, the owner should be mandated to attend classes (maybe a partnership with Calgary Humane) on dog training/management, behaviour management. There should be a requirement that dogs with such designation be muzzled when in the presence of children age 10 or less
- More accountability. No one is enforcing the muzzle in public law.
- Must complete two hours of education on managing a vicious dog provided by a certified dog trainer with their yearly licensing.
- A funded program people could apply for that provides a licensed behavioral specialist has potential to greatly reduce the frequency and severity of aggressive dog encounters
- second vicious attack offence, heavy fines.
- Animals to be muzzled when in public followed by removal of animal after first offence
- Remove them from the city. Why do we allow a known vicious animal of any kind within the city?
- Should not be left in private property where someone under the age of 8 lives, should not be left unsupervised with someone under 18 years old (even if someone over 18 is present and is in "control")
- None. Dogs are not born violent, poor parenting creates this. Like humans, dogs can be rehabilitated
- I think the private property rules are too strict.
- Owners should be required to take several animal behavioural classes and consult with a behaviourist.
- It depends on the assessment of which dog is vicious and if it is properly assessed and is truly vicious then it has no place in the city and should be put down.
- I think the owners should be expected to have courses on how to handle these animals
- Mandatory for owner to seek professional Behavior modification training and provide proof.
- Have control of their pet.
- None
- They are kept out of the city. Doors and fences are usually not sufficient.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Background checks on owners. Home visits to ensure dog is in secure location. Enforce owners taking dog reactivity classes to have dog returned to them. Euthanize dogs who are repeat offenders, I love dogs but there are plenty of nice ones looking for homes
- Kept muzzled and leashed in public areas!
- Double leash one attached to waist so they cannot get loose
- Maybe a special leash or collar that identifies the dog as vicious so passersby are aware. Care and caution from the owner while out in public with the dog.
- keep vicious animals away from children and away from other pets
- They should have to attend a training session and assessment of the dog
- No dog is vicious for no reason. It is always the dog owner who either is doing something wrong or not doing something right. Once a dog is deemed vicious, the owners should be expected to pass a mandatory course on responsible dog ownership.
- If a dog attacks a person it should be put down. Vicious dogs are typically the result of bad owners. If you beat and chain your dog it will go crazy. I love and own dogs... but none of them would ever harm a person.
- I expect that owners of vicious animals will adhere to the existing rules. This is not currently happening.
- having a clean police background check: no violence actions, no theft
- They should not be allowed to continue to exist.
Have them put down
- Do not allow them on private property
- Something more than a muzzle to identify them. Like a collar or harness with blatantly obvious color/wording for warning. Muzzles don't necessarily signify vicious to me.
- Owners need to be taking obedience courses to learn how to train dogs and handle them. There are no vicious dogs, there are owners who do not know how to handle dogs.
- more insurance for damages, requirement for training for owner and animal. mandatory neutering for unneutered dogs
- They are doing the best they can.
- They should be required to take a training session with expert dog handlers (ex. at the humane society), to help rehabilitate the dog, or increase the dogs quality of life in a manner safe for all involved, while following the above listed rules. This should be provided at low to no cost to them.
- Most vicious and misbehaved dogs are because the owners are irresponsible. Dogs learn their behavior. Obedience schools for dogs are very expensive. And the dogs end up being punished for the owners negligence. Owners of vicious dogs should face fines, dogs should be confiscated and rehabilitated
- There should be a mandatory class taught to educate the human on how best to handle the animal or to learn about how their handling and or environment may have contributed to the dog's aggression. A dog is usually only as good as it's training. The human has to take some onus.
- Owners to be personally liable for their dogs behavior.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Owners with viscous animals should ensure the safety of others and others pets. They should always ensure a safe distance from others when in public and give a warning to other owners and pets if they are being approached. Providing a color coded harness/collar with visible wording is ideal
- That they don't put their dogs in any situations where they can harm people or other animals. That they get help/training to help their dog overcome the aggression issues.
- None, Calgary has done a wonderful job with vicious dogs.
- To seek professional help for their dog to try to find the reason for the viscous behaviour so it can be treated
- Dog parks and populated places should be avoided. When on walks, muzzles are a must for sure. Perhaps the dogs should be required to wear something on them that says "Do Not Approach", to avoid contact.
- I expect that they do everything they can to help positively train and socialize their animals, to overcome behaviour problems, and work with an expert in animal behaviour on the dog's issues. Locking the dog up and muzzling it is cruel, not helpful, and requiring the owner to do so is ridiculous.
- To ensure they are properly handled when outside and inside of the home. muzzled if necessary.
- No access to off leash parks
- None. I feel the restrictions on vicious dogs are enough.
- "They be in control of their animal in most scenarios. If an unleashed animal comes up to one on a leash it is NOT the responsibility of the leashed animal owner if something happens, now it's up to the person who had animal off-leash.
I don't think the age 18 rule is appropriate or needed.
- They seek obedience training and/or behaviour modification courses. They take steps to prevent the dog from coming into contact with other people and pets.
- I used to have to use a muzzle on a previous dog. It was adequate to ensure my dog was safe to be around other dogs.
- I do not support breed specific conditions or rules. I believe that any animal has an ability to be a problem if the owner is not responsible.
- There are no vicious dogs, only vicious owners.
Perhaps the underlying cause is the owner and how they are treating or training the dog. The owner should be penalized, not the dog.
- I think the above protocols are enough
- Owners should be tested to prove their dog is controllable before receiving a dog license. they do this in Germany & the number of attacks on people has decreased. If the dog fails the test the owner has 6 months to take an obedience course & try again. Upon failure the 2nd time the dog is removed
- Safe confinement.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There is often no way of knowing if a dog is vicious! The most "tame" dog may react differently when under a (perceived) threat. I have been nipped on a bike path by a loose dog that the owner said was "usually friendly". ALL dogs should be under control at all times! Not just "vicious" ones.
- Mandatory for the owner and dog to attend a training course or specific number of sessions. The city could make relationships with Calgary based trainers who might be interested in being apart of this if needed. It'll be situational so there should be more then one option for trainers.
- They must carry a minimum insistance policy in case the dog injures a person. Must show proof yearly paid in full.
- Proper training and safety precautions
- I would expect that above are actually and followed and that it be assured that the person with the dog is actually able to physically restrain it.
- That they take classes to correct the behaviour. If they are vicious there is no reason they have to stay vicious.
- I think if a vicious animal has attacked a human or other pet the court should be able to decide to destroy that animal where it deems this as necessary for public safety.
- To provide a safe environment which does not put the animal in a position where it may react
- City should do visits to make sure the home is not abusive towards the dog. Random check ins
- why are we allowing people to keep vicious animals. that seems like a failure of both the owner and the city
- Limit of one animal at a time within a public property.
- To keep them under control, muzzle when out in public, training
- They likely won't abide by these rules. I would never feel safe if a neighbor had a vicious dog.
- I don't see any reason for anyone to own an animal that has been labelled vicious. This is a one-strike sort of offense.
- Include cats in this one. They do all the same things, except cat owners let their pests roam free! Vicious animals are only vicious because of the owner. Owners of "vicious" animals should suffer the consequences should their pet harm another individual.
- Keep away from other dogs and people when walking. Do not go to off leash areas.
- I think that it is the owners fault not the animal fault the animal should be rehabilitated instead of being put down
- Provide one i one training with a certified animal trainer. Dogs in general are not vicious it is the was e are care for at home and trained.
- I expect owners to recognize behaviours and protect the public
- To comply with the rules by always keeping their animals harnessed and muzzled in public. By ensuring their pet doesn't accidentally get out eg through an open garage door.
- Training. Owners of vicious animals should be expected to go through training on how to handle that animal Also vicious dogs should not be allowed at dog parks
- None



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Vicious animals need to be under control at all times. I feel a lot of “vicious animals” are the owner’s responsibility
- Seek professional assistance to help rehabilitate animal. A list of reputable trainers and resources should be available along with affordable options as our economy is not great and training is not cheap.
- Must surrender to the city
- Maybe consultation and check in with a certified trainer who can further assess the issue
- Not to expose them to situations where they could hurt someone or another animal. Also to ensure safety of the vicious dog.
- Nothing else.
- Training with a certified behaviourist
- Do not frequent off leash parks or have your dog unleashed for a situation to occur. Know how to handle people who choose not to respect your boundaries or specific training or management of your animal as this is one of the biggest frustrations that will occur repeatedly.
- Any animal that has been commercially imported needs to have a special licence in case that animal is lost or abandoned
- Stay out of dog parks. Use a muzzle. Seek out a professional trainer
- First, I will say a vicious animal is only vicious because of mistreatment, lack of training, or training it to be vicious. I believe that on private property, if the animal is unknown to an individual, follow those rules to a tee. If known, the rules can be less severe. In public, rules apply.
- No control! Education for dogs and people. Rules are clear. Have something that will identify them as vicious. Control of their dog. What to do with vicious people. Us and who make expectation clear.
- - Bylaw officers need to understand behaviour before they lay charges.
 - Sometimes wrong dog gets charged
 - Owner can only control so much
- - Expectations should also be on unleashed dogs
 - Need care and controlx
 - Muzzles can be a deterrent
 - Face to face on leash is the worst
 - On leash when area is on leash
- - Rules are pretty clear
 - wear a muzzle
 - dog needs to be under control even off leash
 - issue is also vicious people you respond badly when you try to educate them
 - People think dogs should do whatever they want
 - Need other dog owner
- just know their pet and protect others
- Due care and awareness of the environment they will be taking their dog/animal to
- The city should seize the animal from the owner and keep it until you are certain it is safe to be returned to the owner



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They try to socialize them. Vicious dogs help keep coyotes away. Need proper place to keep them.
- Train the dog by a certified trainer
- Mandatory dog training after a change. Increase knowledge to improve ability to be more responsible
- Always keep the dog with you. Don't let other friends walk it. Give good food. Take care of it.
- To take their dogs to get rehabilitated to be more friendly
- - Training
 - Investigate the owner as well
 - Take the dog to dog school
 - keep away from people & other animals
 - always under supervision
- - Sign warning of vicious dog
 - Should be put into some kind of training
 - Depending on the seriousness of the attack give one chance then put down if happened again
- Beware of dog signs on private property
- Must wear tags
 - What if they get off leash by accident
- That owners are aware of these rules. They should be fined heavily if they do not abide.
- Should be required that owners attend training for aggressive dogs.
- That the dog must attend behavioural classes yearly.
- Financial liability for damage caused to others without the need for a tort-based suit. The bylaw should provide automatic damages. Consequences teach ignorant owners. Mandatory training for owner and dog failing which Animal is surrendered. Differential licensing costs.
- Most of the issues stem from owners who's dogs are fine and they assume them that all dogs don't have issues. Their dogs are off leash and running up to dogs who are reactive (on leash with responsible dog owners). Our last dog was not aggressive at all but would react when other dogs came close.
- The animal is never the issue. It is how the animal is handled and protected when in public. The owner is fully responsible for any action of the animal and should be held accountable. Killing dogs that bite does not solve any problems with the humans that can't handle them. They just go get another
- Must undergo training with a positive reinforcement trainer to ensure they are adequately knowledgeable and able to work on the behaviours.
- Why do they have vicious dogs? Should be illegal!
- I think this is a good policy
- That they are required to take mandatory training classes with their dog to keep the dog in their possession. With regular follow up from bylaw. Failure to go to classes removed the dog from their possession.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- More than 1 vicious incident (especially if it is due to negligence of owner) should result in the dog being put down. If guidelines are not followed people should be banned from owning pets.
- Proper and well maintained fences.
- Being caged for an entire animal's life is not a very good quality of life. However aggressive animals should be required to be in a program to assist in behavioral recovery, or responsibly euthanized if unable to have the animal signed off as not a danger to them or others.
- Proof of obedience training, and exercise needs being met
- Owners need to take responsibility of their pets behavior and take action to minimize danger to the public
- Undergo evaluation of suitability for ownership. Is the attack something that could have been prevented with proper training and ownership.
- Current bylaws and rules are satisfactory.
- People should not be allowed to own vicious animals.
- Vicious animals should NOT be permitted on public property.
- Under control means that the person is also strong enough to restrain their dog.
- I do not think that vicious animals should be allowed. If after training, an animal is still a threat, I feel it is the safest for everyone to put the animal down.
- Rules in place are good
- Give them a good home / care for them properly. Take great care to avoid any negative encounters with other animals or humans.
- Signage at the residence where the animal lives to indicate that the animal might have wild instincts.
- Behavioral education, they should learn how to read dog body language so they can avoid escalating to dangerous situations. Accidents are avoidable with proper education, unfortunately not everyone will be able to learn but owners should be required to have this knowledge.
- People have to realize that small dogs are vicious.& provoke altercations,
- It's the owners fault, not the animal. The owner **SHOULD BE REQUIRED** to attend animal behaviour training classes, should also be monitored to ensure the dogs are not being abused, mistreated or involved in animal fighting.
- The dog is always the one to pay the ultimate price. Dogs should be evaluated & if at all possible given a second chance, with one of the many groups available that can retrain the animals. Very few dogs are born vicious, owners are responsible for training and care of the dog making it dangerous
- They must be kept on leash, have a secure yard, be mandated to take a positive reinforcement behaviour course, and **NEVER** go to an off leash park. I refuse to take my dogs too off leash parks-way too many inappropriate dogs and owners who have no clue on what is proper behaviour
- take a sanity test
- They should keep their dogs on a leash and make sure to tell other dog owners that their dog is not friendly so other dogs don't approach them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I would also expect that they would be working with a trainer, and possibly using medication if indicated
- I don't think we should consider breed specific bans. All dogs can be vicious depending on upbringing. I think a colored bandana or muzzle (say red) should be worn.
- I think we need to look at why the animal is that way. most of the time we will find human error is the cause for the vicious dog "owner or victim". then the human should have to deal with outcome and the animal either relocated or rehabilitated or other action as required.
- None
- To be properly educated on how to properly manage a reactive animal, attend training sessions if not knowledgeable. How to properly fit and use a muzzle, always allowing room for panting.
- Insurance if you have a recognized breed used for fighting. Pit bull, Diogo canario etc
- That they maintain the safety of those around them. This should be done through the above , but I believe people who have these dogs must be required to have insurance to pay for any damage that they do. Certain breeds are known to have a higher tendency and owners should hold insurance
- Participate in some mandatory training of the animal. Does a secure structure include a fenced yard? If not, I don't think a "vicious animal" should be muzzled in its own yard as long as the animal cannot reasonably escape from the yard.
- Do not agree with known vicious animals being kept.
- I think if they are the problem then they should be forced to take classes to understand and control their pets better.
- That they are capable of controlling and containing their pet. Vicious animals are not typically owned by responsible individuals, and are more of a status symbol for some - these are the cases where someone get hurt by one of these animals.
- All dogs should be muzzled when outside in the city or parks. This protects innocent dogs and owners from attack. Owners may not know their dogs are vicious until an attack occurs and should receive a warning, after that if the dog is outside and not muzzled then they should face a fine.
- Mandatory animal training courses to train the owners and rehabilitate vicious dogs!
- I expect owners to consistently and adequately ensure their pet cannot harm any person.
- Owners should be responsible and be able to show they have taken the proper precautions when handling a vicious animal.
- I think those people should not own the dog. There is some reason why the dog is vicious. They should have to give up the dog and if need be the dog should be put to sleep.
- Vicious animals should be permitted in public at all whether they are muzzled and harnessed or not. They have been deemed to be dangerous and I should not feel threatened when out in public with my children.
- Stay away from small children



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Their yards MUST be fenced. I dealt with a St Bernard that attacked me and my little dog, and Bylaw said it was ok that the yard only had Post-and-Cable fencing (it bordered a public pathway), as long as dog was tied up outside. Owner cried, so she only had to pay 1/3 of her fine. No deterrent there
- More responsibility to be placed on owners. Majority of vicious dogs have experienced some sort of neglect or lack of training by owners. Owners should be required to pass courses in owning specific breeds so that the accountability lies with the human, not the dog.
- Disclose to others that animal is vicious. Not allowed in dog parks
- They should be mandated to take specialized training (for the dog AND for them) from a certified animal behaviourist.
- To have control over your animal and not be in off leash areas.
- Greater duty of care to monitor the dog's behavior, ensure a yard is secured so the dog cannot escape.
- If you have a reactive dog then I think you should be aware of your dogs behavior and ensure that you are taking all precautions to make sure your dog and other dogs or people are safe at all times. A basket muzzle is a way to protect your dog out in public and also seeking out proper training
- Muzzles when in public. Compulsory training for the owners
- Severe penalties if the above is violated. Public registry.
- Warning on the property
- I would also limit the locations vicious dogs are allowed to be in for example children's parks or off leash dog parks
- I think a warning sign should be mandatory & posted for anyone delivering to the address, etc., either in the vicious dog's window or yard.
- Based on experience, I do not think vicious dogs should be allowed at off-leash parks. I had my dog at an off-leash park and he was attacked by a muzzled dog. Although the dog was muzzled it was still able to get a good chunk of hair out of my dog. The owner stood by and did nothing.
- Owners are usually the problem.
- Should be mandatory to receive training and rehabilitation
- It is somewhat implied but I am not sure it is followed, but they should not be permitted in off-leash parks or left outside businesses (e.g. tied to a post while someone enters a business). I think there should be a way for members of the public to know where the dogs are living in the city.
- To seek out positive reward based training, if possible.
- Mandatory to inform neighbors to be aware. Follow rules regulations, be respectful of others' fears and concerns.
- That they abide by the rules and if they do not, there are serious consequences for them.
- Higher fines. There's no reason anyone should own a vicious animal.
- That they receive proper training with a qualified behaviorist you assist with modifying the behavior.
- They take ongoing training, such as annual workshops or live training.
- Don't bring vicious dogs to dog parks. Dogs should require clear warning harness/leash/jacket stating "Not Friendly" when in public.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I'm actually not sure I understand the secure structure outdoors. Why not just mandate that if they are to be outside there must be a fence X high and have warning signs? Otherwise guard dogs can't do their job.
- Mandatory completion of dog behaviour course and dog handling courses that have been approved by the City.
- That they be responsible and not ignore the situation. Often the animal has got loose and nobody is supervising. Or just don't care.
- They should be put down if they attack a person or another animal.
- Owners should take a course on how to handle animals, as this type of behaviour is often rooted in the owner not knowing how to treat the animal properly or knowing what the animal needs to feel safe enough not to feel threatened and react as if they are threatened.
- None, though the rationale for owning a habitually vicious dog in the first place escapes me.
- I'd like the owners to have to participate in mandatory pet behaviour/obedience training.
- No extendable leashes for vicious animals.
- Be under control of someone who is stronger than or is able to fully control the dog, not someone who is unable to pull the dog back, require all dogs to have strong leashes and put in place a time where dangerous dogs can not be walked during certain times like after school before 7 PM.
- Person walking them, or in so-called control, actually be physically capable of restraining their dog, also I have heard of owners of these dogs fleeing the scene...leaving the person with the injured or dead dog to deal with it AND pay for it. If their dog does damage, there should be a bylaw th
- Owners of vicious animals should keep them indoors when they are not home. The dogs should not be allowed to bark and bark and jump threateningly all day. They are kept as guard dogs but should not make neighbours' lives unpleasant.
- Adoption organisations working with abused, abandoned or feral dogs should have to disclose that there is an increased risk of having behavioural issues w/ these dogs, provide training and follow up support.
- If deemed possible, the owner might be required to take the dog to a trainer that helps decrease reactivity.
- Even if the person is over 18, they need to demonstrate they are able to control the dog.
- I think these are reasonable restrictions. However, I have witnessed people intentionally loitering and aggravating a dog they don't like from the sidewalk, and the owner should have the ability to enforce that those people move away from the property.
- Investigate the owner
- Attend an obedience or training class or facility would be great. Many of these dogs have an incident because the owners were careless or unable to see the signs of danger. There are no bad dogs, only bad owners. Labeling dogs vicious is not fair if the owners are not being responsible
- Anyone with a dog that has been deemed vicious must have a lot of training to keep that dog. There are very few truly vicious dogs most of it comes from lack of training lack of socialization and people mistreating their animal so they become that way there's also a huge factor in fear aggression

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- License required and shots up to date.
- I feel the current requirements are adequate.
- they need to work on training with their dog
- Jail time for owners after investigation - one and done! No more slaps on the wrist.... PROTECT the dogs from owners that are at fault. Dogs are NOT inherently vicious. Dogs that are taken care of in all aspects don't get vicious!
- That every effort has been made to determine the root cause of the aggression, and that they have worked with trained individuals to try and correct the behaviour.
- Muzzled, do not have the dog off leash, warn people as they pass if they are stopping to pet dog.
- Do NOT take out in Public where the Animal could injure someone or another animal!
- Why is the dog vicious? If out in public it must be muzzled and on a leash at all time. If it attacks another animal or person it should be euthanized.
- The owner must be physically capable of controlling their dog. I had an experience last year in River Park while on my bike. A very large bull mastiff wearing a muzzle attacked me. The muzzle did its job and I wasn't hurt. The elderly female owner was yelling at the dog ineffectually.
- That they not be bred.
- Owners need to recognize that their animals may need extra training and ensure that the animals are on leash and wear muzzles when in public spaces. There is always a reason for the aggression. I think ALL dogs need to be under the control of a person over the age of 16 and aggressive >18
- No other.
- Vicious animals have no place in the city. Bann them.
- A financial liability if their animal harms another dog, to cover costs. 2 strikes they're put down.
- Dogs who are territorial of their owners, should not be allowed at off leash dog parks. My small dog was attacked twice by the same dog as the child of the owner kept trying to pet my dog.
- Obedience training, dogs who are properly trained are more well behaved. Mandatory exercising to keep the dog stimulated and enrichment activities to keep their minds on fun instead of attacking
- The above regulations are not being followed by some owners. There should not be any vicious animals in an urban setting.
- Enforce those bylaws
- Signage on their properties, notification to service providers, registry with the City of Calgary
- These regulations seem reasonable.
- When there is harm caused by a dog the dog must be euthanized and the owner fined heavily and responsible for all costs associated with said harm
- The above methods seem to do the trick already.
- As noted is adequate.
- Maybe start with "why" is the animal vicious. That's generally the problem: people think it is the animal that is vicious when in fact it is the person. Investigate the person first. Maybe they are working for a rescue/rehab org (for animals), that's okay then. But when they are not, go after them!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A woman was walking her small poodle by our house when 2 large dogs came bolting out the front door of a home with the owner and attacked the little dog. Owner of large dog claimed it had never happened before, ya right!
- they should be identified by wearing a red bandana so you know to put your dog on leash. Stay away from off leash parks
- Could they have a special tag or something that flags a dog isn't friendly or has behavioural issues. Dogs are like people and they may not like someone or another dog. It does mean they are vicious.
- To do the minimum & more. There should also be identification on the dog that explains that the dog is not to be approached. Something similar to the yellow leash campaign from several years ago. This could be organized and controlled by the City of Calgary for consistency wording and equipment wise
- Muzzled and registered and licensed. Visits from bylaw to ensure parameters (fence or dog run) are maintained to prevent escape. Rescues to register all vicious dogs with bylaw sling with owner. Not allowed to roam and must be on leash and muzzled when walking.
- they do their best to control their pets
- Repeat offenses by a vicious animal should be treated seriously, as if the owner committed the vicious act themselves, since it is through their negligence that a vicious animal attacks a person or other animal.
- Common sense should prevail if the animal has serious attack on a person, it should be euthanised.
- Where is the section on dogs who bark all the time? The owner who refuses to train. Force owners to train their dog to a standard such as responding to voice commands, not barking etc. I am tired of a neighbour, who as soon as he puts his dogs outside in the back they bark. I cannot sit on my deck.
- I think that if they do not follow through there should be fines, etc.
- Unless the dogs are trained for a specific job, security for example, NO vicious dogs should be kept in family homes as pets.
- That they educate themselves on humane ways to rehabilitate their dogs, avoid situations that escalate their dog's stress, and not bring their dogs to off-leash parks until they have found a program that works for them. They should pay for all medical expenses caused by their inability to control.
- Keep them chained up and go to specific dog parks.
- There are far too many attacks in Calgary. Owners of vicious animals should be heavily regulated and monitored. Vicious dogs are a live weapon and the owners should be treated as if they own a dangerous weapon. Period.
- Vicious animals aren't safe at all but are they ok to keep if they have a license? They should be removed from an owner if they live in the city. The better question is why is the animal vicious? Has it been mistreated?
- Mandatory dog training
- An owner of a vicious animal should not be allowed to keep more than one such animal and should lose the right to having such animals if a subsequent animal is determined to be vicious.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They should be using the help of a specific behavioral trainer, and must get thru annual testing of the animal that is deemed vicious. If it doesn't pass then other measures need to be looked at. I feel that homes with vicious dogs should not be permitted to have children.
- Just that they carry the proper knowledge on how to handle their pet and how to keep everyone safe, including their pet and others.
- I would like there to be training available, and subsidized if necessary, so that the owners and the dogs can learn more appropriate behaviours.
- Owners of vicious animals should prevent exposure to small animals and children. Owners of vicious animals should not use off leash parks. Owners should take classes that focus on teaching and managing aggressive behaviours before the animal becomes vicious.
- If they don't comply with the conditions, they can be banned from owning any animals. They should have to take and pass educational courses on proper dog ownership and training.
- The animals can not be left unattended with other animals in the household, even when muzzled. There should be an indicator, such as a vest or a leash indicating not to pet.
- I feel that if vicious dogs that have bitten a person should be euthanized. Once they've bitten a person, they'll do it again.
- They should train their dogs and themselves.
- vicious animals should not a taken to off-leash areas and under control at all times.
- full responsibility for their dogs actions
- Follow the above laws and warn people of the aggression either verbally or with a dog tag/leash
- Owners of vicious dogs should undergo training to give them additional tools of how to cope with their dogs, especially when in public. "Person over 18" is not enough - the person must have the physical,ability to control the dog.
- Nothing
- should not be breed specific (more bites by small breed than larger "targeted breeds)
- Not to train their dog to be vicious.
- None.
- For their own well being and quality of life they may need to be euthanized.
- When in public, communicate to others of the vicious behaviours of their animals
- Stiffer penalties for non-compliance.
- People shouldn't keep vicious animals in the first place. They do not belong in an urban environment.
- "Be under control" needs to be better defined. Lots of people believe they have things under control, but are unable to recognize what that means.
- Animal behavior and training classes for the owner and ban from owning animals. Vicious dogs are not born, they are a result of terrible dog owners.
- That they do not allow them off leash and have them secured away from anyone or other animal they could harm



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Keep your dog on a leash, get a private run in a dog park or at your home, make sure the animal is muzzled, animal handled by older/stronger human.
 - Owners who aren't experienced, as in, they haven't done research or haven't had another pet, I recommend they try getting a smaller dog or pet, or do lots of research, and to do a little test or quiz to see if they can have a big dog.
 - Owners must actively try to reduce the risk of the animal by training or other measures. Complete a test of risk with an animal professional. If they cannot prove that the dog has been rehabilitated, the vicious dog should be seized and euthanized.
 - Some pet owners are not physically able to control or restrain their dogs, i.e. BIG dog, small human. I would expect the owners to know their limitations and exercise appropriate measures.
 - I expect them not to own vicious dogs. They show no respect for individuals who may be attacked by their dogs.
 - I expect that they take proactive measures in regards to training to reduce reactive behaviours, and that they always prepare and act to prevent their animal from harming another being.
 - Get help from a behaviorist. And follow through with the training.
 - They should be forced to take training on how to improve the pets, and, the City should ensure that these animals are not being mistreated in any way that could lead to them being vicious.
 - Owners should be able to control their animals, and be aware of the context of their viciousness. If the animal is a threat to others, muzzling and those type of precautions should be taken. Also, commitment to training and understanding their pet.
 - Get additional training for them and their pet, consider not owning other pets now or in the future
 - The animal and owner should have to attend dog training.
 - Not to be in off leash park
 - Seek regular training and complete (at their expense) yearly testing to ensure the problem is not escalating.
- A fenced back yard with only a single layer wood or vinyl fence is not secure.
- When a dog is declared vicious, it should undergo evaluation by qualified trainers and other qualified personnel as to why aggression occurred and pending results, should be dealt with accordingly.
 - Always handle them as if they are indeed vicious. Muzzled, leashed and in control at all time when off their property
 - They must attend canine behavioural courses and get and MAINTAIN Information and have regular reports given regarding the vicious dogs. They must be very responsible, accountable and understanding of these type of dogs. Give a viable reason as to why they must keep such a dog
 - this needs to be re addressed. while on the owner's private property, no animal should have to be muzzled. owners should be educated, and both should attend obedience and behavioural training for the dog. I agree that the owner should have control....without education this is not possible.
 - Our neighbour and unsuspecting dog were viciously attacked by a pitbull ON leash. Left them both in stitches while the pitbull and owner took off. By their reaction, wasn't the first time. Dogs like that should be put down and owners restricted from getting licences. Should be zero tolerance.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be a sign posted at the entrance of the home and they should be required to use a RED leash and collar that can be identified from further away
- Spay/neuter, mandatory training, if it attacks again it gets euthanized
- To ensure they cannot leave the owners property unattended.
- Both the owner and dog should take obedience training from a trainer certified by the city.
- Extensive and on-going non-aversive training.
- Any injuries that are inflicted by the animal whether on humans or other animals are completely the responsibility of the offending dog owner. There should be mandatory intensive training paid for by the offending dog owner for the offending dog before the dog is allowed to return to the home.
- None. However, there are many people under 18 who are responsible and many over 18 who are not. Age should not be a factor, experience should.
- To attend training sessions with their dog- rehabilitation is required and not the animals fault if this is not provided. I think this should be mandatory (ie. through the humane society).
- Owners should take responsibility for their animal's behavior.
- none
- they should be muzzled
- The use of a solid nylon or leather leash. No retractable leashes.
- Vicious or aggressive Dogs should be muzzled any time they are outdoors, ie. before they are permitted to step outside, even if to be locked in a secure structure outside! Too many times, dogs escape these so-called "secure" structures and end up running loose!!
- coloured label on harness/leash. knowledge of how to properly care for a dog/animal.
- Maybe they should have dogliability insurance. As a cyclist, I've been chased by vicious dogs, terrifying ordeal. Am sure of bad outcome if I didn't escape or get off my bike and use my bike as a guard. also scared to get knocked down and injured by dogs cos broken hip or legs will be deadly.
- Muzzling is not a solution to a vicious dog. Owners must seek out professional trainers to help them rehabilitate their dog through behavior modification techniques. Calgary has many trainers that work specifically with reactive dogs.
- That the owner of a vicious animal be responsible for any veterinarian or medical bills for injuries their vicious animal inflicted on others.
- Deemed vicious or not, a dog that bites a human at a dog park should be removed immediately from the area by its owner. Same for dogs that aggressively attack another dog. The onus is on the owner; common sense is lacking in some dog owners.
- If your dog has severely bitten, mauled (Ian Dunbar bite scale) a human or killed another's pet dog then the dog needs to be humanely euthanized.
- Should be caged, muzzled when outside, under control of responsible strong enough adult.
- They should be held responsible to any attacks on people or other animals, and in severe cases the dogs should be euthanized. The owners should be heavily fined and not be allowed to own another dog again and if caught doing so the fine should be extremely severe.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- To ensure the animal is the owner's first priority and that first and foremost the animals are kept safe. I would also like to see the city take steps as to why the animals are behaving in a vicious manner seeks to do harm, The animals are never to blame only the owner.
- That they get specific, meaningful and adequate information that they understand that their dog is a 'problem'. Too many dog owners still consider their dog a 'perfect angel capable of doing no wrong' even after an incident or many. Always laying blame elsewhere.
- Mandatory training for reactive dogs.
- Current expectations are OK
- Notorious vicious dog breeds should receive extra scrutiny.
- Owners of vicious animals should probably not own animals. They likely had something to do with its conditioning and are obviously unable to control the animal.
- Owners should go through education/training on animal care and behaviour training. Owners should bring their dogs to trainers to prevent further inappropriate behaviour. The owners should be investigated for potential abuse.
- All of the above "manage" the problem, but do not solve it. These animals deemed vicious are the result of either abuse, poor conditions, or lack of education. I think owners should be assessed to make sure that they don't abuse their animals and the dogs are placed in courses to rehabilitate them.
- Primarily I expect the city to follow its own rules. The vicious dog should be required to have professional training and the city should enforce steep penalties with pet owners who do not comply.
- They should be heavily fined and/or taxed. There is no need and should be no privilege to have a vicious dog in any community
- Effective control over said animal, within their property or outside. Mandatory obedience training. Provide adequate mental and physical stimulation to animal. Adequate fencing to house animal (tall enough and strong enough).
- If applicable, get dog training
- Make decisions on whether the animal needs to be put down.
- Behind a six foot locked fence.
- I think a huge part of this regulation is related to the definition of "control", and as long as the expectations related to it then I think this is adequate. My concern is related to the vagueness of the wording.
- I think that when a dog is declared to be vicious there should be a mandatory behavioural class, that the owner and any other people with direct care of the dog should have to attend.
- The safety of children in the home. For example, when a dog is deemed dangerous, they still pose a risk to children within the home. I feel as though all dogs deemed vicious should be visually identified when out in the community to signal to other owners not to approach the dog.
- Keep them on leash in public
- I agree they must adhere to the specific rules outlines above



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education of the owner and a refresher obedience course yearly would be helpful. Muzzled for walks is good for both exercise and the public
- Animal should be taken from owner. Owner not allowed more dogs for a 5 year period. Then probation. Most animals are (taught) to be aggressive.
- Keep the animals safe, as well as the neighbors, seek out behavior training/socialization training.
- The dog must be locked in a room, basement or garage when answering/opening the door to avoid it escaping. A warning near the front door. Must disclose to anyone coming inside their home, especially anyone with children.
- they should not be allowed to be in off leash parks, ever if they are muzzled and on leash. They are a danger to other dogs and children at the park
- **THEY SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED TO EXIST IN URBAN AREAS.**
- to post a notice that they have a vicious dog, have no children under 18 yr old in the household, cannot own any other animals (dog, cat, ferret, bird, etc)
- training the animal to be non-vicious.
- Mandatory training about fear and distress etc. in animals - too many vicious animals are simply fearful and incidents are related to this. All dog owners must keep their pets from interfering with other animals/people.
- That they be financially responsible for the veterinary bills of the dogs that their dog injures.
- EDUCATION. Owners of vicious animals need to have proper education on their responsibility as an owner, the impact on the community, and how to properly care for and train their animal.
- I think this rule is a bit too much if a dog simply "chases" another dog. How do you know the circumstances of the chasing? Many dogs want to play and are not aggressive.
- Owners of vicious animals should have signage around their private property to ensure passers know that the dog on premises is vicious (which may prevent further incidents with door-to-door salespeople, etc).
- Do not take them to the off leash park & maintain control of them while walking on sidewalks (even if it means crossing a road to avoid others).
- If dog attacks, bites or kills people or animals the dog must be immediately destroyed and the owner fined mandatory \$250,000 with no option for a lesser fine. Zero tolerance if owners cannot secure and control vicious animals. Public should not be afraid to walk/play in communities.
- I dont think they should be allowed to own them. These dogs should be put down. This is a danger to children and vulnerable people who are exercising their right to mobility. In addition, negligence is always a possibility so these dogs should NOT be allowed to be kept on citizens property
- Should always be on leash, special registration with 5 million liability insurance
- Post a cash surety of at least \$5,000 to be forfeited, together with the animal, if any further attack incidents are reported against people or other pets.
- Work with a behaviour trainer using postive methods to rehab. Do a full vet screening to make aure their is no under lying cause to the problem.
- None, laws are acceptable in my opinion.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None
- The animal should be treated humanely, ie not trained to be vicious by maltreatment.
- public warnings, responsible owners..
- Positive reinforcement training resources should be available through the city for the public. Reactive animals are a safety concern for children & other animals. Mandatory harnesses & banning of prong & choke collars would reduce fear & bites.
- Take an approved behaviour course with a certified trainer.
- Held 200% accountable! For injury and welfare of their animals
- Restrictions on animal ownership. Participation in animal training classes
- I expect them to have a sign on their fence if the dog is placed outside. I expect them to give verbal warnings to those they walk by, or have the dog wear a vest issuing caution.
- Welfare of dog is balanced with restrictions of bylaw
Training/mitigation action
Obligation to disclose status upon change of ownership
- All pet owners with a vicious dog should be required to seek training from a qualified dog behaviourist. Dogs are not born vicious, usually it is a lack of socializing/training/boundaries which is a pet owner's responsibility.
- Proper training for the owners!!!!
- to follow above stated regulations. Avoid common populated areas if pet uncontrollable.
- Proof of insurance to cover any liability
- 1, Owners should put solid yellow bandanas around their pets necks, to make others aware to use caution. In my opinion it would help both sides stay safe.
2, Owners, should be professionally advised from a qualified dog trainer that specializes in aggression.
- All the above makes sense, I would also expect a professional to be brought in to help educate the owner on rehabbing and managing the dog.
- I don't think animals that have been deemed "vicious" should be given back to the owner. The potential for harm to innocent people is too great. They should be destroyed.
- welfare of dog is balanced with restrictions of bylaw
training/mitigation action
obligation to disclose status upon change of ownership
- That they actually follow these rules. I've seen too many dogs running loose in the green space (not a designated off leash area) behind our house. If owners choose not to follow the ruling then what can the public do?
- That they work on their animal's behaviour with a qualified expert and keep the public safe.
- Training to owners of vicious animals (at the cost of the owners).
- A dog that has attacked a person must be put down. Kill the dog. It is the only solution. Obviously the person who has a dog who attacks someone is not a worthy pet owner. The dog endangers children in the community and will attack again.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Mandatory behaving lessons for both owner and dog
- The owner should be required to take their dog to a professional dog trainer. There could also be an underlying ailment and could be ruled out by a vet. The dog should be altered as this could be the reason for its aggressive behaviour.
- In addition to the above that the owners be fined and/or help to pay vet bills. Owners and their dog must attend mandatory training
- Muzzled when in public and outdoors. If bite level is over 3 on Dunbar's bite scale euthanasia be an option
- Euthanize them. There is no way to safely handle huge and vicious animals. Owners of these animals do not follow laws, and laws are not enforced. I have been in parks where pit bulls have been off leash and have come dangerously close to my child, the owners do this on purpose.
- Many dogs can quickly become vicious if you approach them or their owner or they approach you. Some just attack from distance. The owners ALWAYS dismisses this attack and tell you it is because you are a male or you're wearing a baseball cap etc, etc. Owners should admit the truth about their dogs
- Welfare & quality of life of the dog is balanced with restrictions from Bylaw.
Owner must provide proof of training from a CPDT certified trainer.
Obligation to disclose vicious animals status upon change of ownership.
- Dog (and owner) training with a view to socializing the dog, educating the owner, and perhaps giving the dog and owner a reprieve if a bylaw officer is persuaded that they have both "smartened up". There are many businesses that deal with dog training around the city.
- Owner must receive training/counselling so they not only understand how to undo the damage they did to raise a vicious dog but won't do it again. I truly believe it's all down to whoever raised it whether they are vicious or not. Owners who weaponize a dog should be jailed.
- Owners should have to post a sign on their property indicating that a vicious dog lives there.
- Certain breeds should not be sold by pet stores in the first place
- They should kill the beast before it kills a kid or, when it comes to larger dogs, kills a person. I expect the City to protect me from vicious animals. They should not be allowed in the City under any circumstances.
- All vicious animals, declared such by the courts, should be euthanized. People over pets.
- Post a bond against attacks resulting in personal or property damage
- Generally, dogs are not vicious unless they are under stress or anxiety. Owner shall do their part to reduce the stress & anxiety and have behavior training. Also, wear comfortable muzzle when walking dogs.
- Owners must attend behavioural courses with the animal.
- Welfare of dog is balanced with restrictions of bylaw; training/mitigation action of vicious animal - mandatory aggressive dog consult with certified dog behaviourist, etc; obligation of owner to disclose vicious animal status upon change of ownership (ie: on surrender, on re-homing, etc)
- Animals categorized as vicious should be euthanized, not released back to owners. If released back to owners, they should not be allowed on public property.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Perhaps a double gate to the yard, front and back, that is, four gates. To try to ensure the animal does not get out to roam in the alley or on the streets.
- These laws seem reasonable. The penalties for losing control of a vicious dog should be very stiff.
- Be restricted from places where people and animals congregate when with their animal.
- Are you joking???? I expect them, unless there is overwhelming reason (law enforcement, etc) not to have vicious dogs. It's a little late for regret after some notorious breed has ripped off a child's face, wouldn't you say?
- A fine needs to be paid, and then owner and house occupants should be required to attend obedience classes. If classes are not attended or lessons are failed, the dog may be seized. This also gives more opportunity to see the dogs character
- Notify all guests and neighbours. I don't think it's realistic or kind to require it to be muzzled AND on a leash on private property.
- These people must be in complete control of their animal at all times.

Expectations of City

- I think they do a good job at present, so keep up the good work but continued heavy fines for people who own vicious animals and bans on them owning more animals.
- To look outside of our local learning and culture worldwid to see how progressive countries cope. Abusive owners should be prosecuted, not the dog. You can muzzle but ultimately, a calm, great behaviour place can aid change for the dog who's often in fear.
- I feel the city does a good job in punishing owners of aggressive dogs.
- Respond to complaints quickly. Don't allow calgarians to own vicious breeds!
- Occasional follow-ups on these properties. Welfare checks on the animals and the surrounding neighbourhoods.
- Provide training classes and socialization
- severe fines for any violations of the bylaw.
- I expect bylaw to have training on what is and isn't a vicious animal. Very rarely do animals want to bite as it is biologically taxing. More often than not an aggressive display is utilized in an attempt to gain distance. It is only when that is not respected that bites occur. Education is key.
- if the owner has more then 2 pervious records of owning vicious dogs they should not be allowed dogs. dogs arent naturally aggressive its all in the household situations they are going threw that tend to turn the dog! #1 problem people are at home training there dogs in protection!
- Raise financial penalties for the owners and educate each owner in the city with a pamphlet of rules and guidelines, once they licence their pet. You would get a tag and an education sheet attached. Dogs are not the problem - owners are and their ignorance and denial.
- They get a shiny metal sign that says: vicious dog.
- If a dog is vicious or attacks it is 100% the responsibility of the owner NOT the dog. The dog can be muzzled, leashed, or TRAINED and the owner obviously failed to provide the care this dog requires. I would like to see the dogs not be blamed, and put down, for the irresponsibility of the owner.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think more attention needs to be spent on why the animals acted out and if it was because a person was teasing or abusing it they should not be considered for this list as it was the person's fault. The people need to be charged instead.
- Seize and euthanize a vicious animal if it attacks, injures, or kills a person or other pet (dog, cat, etc).
- The City should ban deadly animals like Pit Bulls. They're beautiful breeds but we can't trust humans to properly raise them. We need harsher penalties for delinquent owners.
- To hear both sides of the story.
- The city should enforce that owners and dogs are evaluated on why the dog is vicious, and provide training to both owners and dogs to mitigate further incidents. If the owner is found at fault for training the dog to be vicious, there should be a lifetime ban on owning any dogs.
- I wish there was a faster response time to aggressive animal complaints. There was a lady that walked her dog in front of our house off-leash and it would rush up to me and bark and growl, corner me on my deck and she would do nothing regardless of what I said to her. It took too long to catch her.
- Never ever seize and euthanize the animal. Declare them vicious as per the bylaw. If the animal attacks again, criminally charge the owner and introduce stiffer penalties.
- If the animal hurts or destroys people or other pets, it should be put down.
- I STRONGLY think the circumstances surrounding each "vicious dog" case should be looked at individually, and not have a blanket set of rules for every situation.
- A second offense should be cause for euthanasia.
- There is nothing more tragic to me than when an animal has to be euthanized, however, where a dog has shown that it is vicious and will attack other animals or humans, I see little other choice.
- Zero tolerance for re-offenders. Euthanize as necessary.
- City of Calgary needs to employ people that understand dog behaviour. I've had discussions with your officers and they know NOTHING in that regard. Dogs are most likely being labelled vicious when they are not.
- I expect higher fines that will actually have a financial impact and can act as a deterrent, and I expect those fines to be levied against offenders, not just finger-wag warnings.
- I think any dogs that are declared vicious should be put down. They have already been involved in an aggressive incident so why are you giving them another opportunity to be out in the public.
- There are too many uneducated owners out there. There should be 0 tolerance for vicious animals, and I've always thought owners should have to have some sort of free/cheap online course training before registering an animal to help prevent vicious dogs.
- These dogs should not be allowed to go to dog parks or off-leash areas.
- Perhaps mandatory training with a Balanced trainer NOT a force-free class.
- As part of the investigation, awareness of factors that contributed to aggression (e.g., someone had their dog off-leash in an area designated as on-leash, which resulted in a fight and the on-leash dog being labeled aggressive).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- City of Calgary must take complaints seriously and deal with vicious animals to ensure safety of people. Especially children. The city should keep CALGARY and safe from animals that threaten their safety.
- Perhaps a different metal dog tag could be issued to explicitly announce viciousness.
- I have reported vicious dogs in the past & after visiting the home nothing was done. I would like more investigation before an incident rather than after. I was told while the dogs lunged at the fence they were still in their yard & nothing could be done unless they broke the fence & attacked.
- None onus must fall on owners
- Ban pit bulls and other purposely-bred vicious dogs.
- Provide enforcement. Where are the bylaw officers when dogs are running offleash and attacking other dogs? More investigation into alleged incidents.
- Enforcement
- Have professional dog trainers assess ALL dogs who have reports filed against them.
- Three strikes rule: animal is no longer allowed to remain within city limits after a third attack. When on public property, the vicious animal needs to be visual identifiable from a safe distance as having been classified as vicious (for instance, issue bright red or orange tags for vicious animals)
- define classification of vicious animal
- I would appreciate vicious animals being banned.
- Do not go down the road of banning any particular breed. I've worked with all sorts of dogs all my life. Even little dogs can be vicious and most pits I've met are gentle and sweet.
- Follow up and ensure that enclosures are secure, and that owners have fulfilled mandatory training requirements.
- Should allow training and behaviour modification as a goal of the city instead of fines when dealing with this.
- I would consider it acceptable for animals to be seized and rehabilitated. If it is truly an animal issue, not one caused by the owner and the animal can't be rehabilitated, then the animal should be destroyed
- Get them out of the hands of irresponsible owners.
- I wish that it didn't take an attack to label a dog vicious. I've met aggressive dogs in the off-leash doggy park... ones that have jumped up on me, growling aggressively & nipping. There should be frequent assessments of dog behaviour/obedience & owner competence before they are allowed off-leash.
- Vicious animals should be euthanized.
- Put them down. Too many animals. Why keep ones who are causing harm and probably have bad owners who let them poop everywhere without cleaning it up or bark endlessly, and could possibly be being abused?
- Use policies to increase use of leashes in public spaces.
- The City to hold the animal away from the owner until the owner is educated on how to work with their animal and when the commit to animal behavior classes



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A dog (that unprovoked) harms, maims or kills another animal should at the very least be deemed vicious and have the above restrictions imposed (and enforced).
- For the safety of the community, the animals should be put down. It's a shame, because it's really about the owners. Owners should have a lifetime ban on pet ownership if this happens.
- None
- Any dog that causes injury to a human is put down. Owners should be barred from owning any more dogs. Zero tolerance.
- I feel the way they handle it now is adequate
- Fines to owners for non-compliance, potential seizure of the animal
- They need to be assessed..the people and their practices with animals assessed...expectations if they are rehabilitatable that they get help for the animal and if they won't that tells you of their character and it should be taken away. The person should be flagged and prevented from keeping animals
- The city shouldn't just specify dogs as vicious, other animals can cause damage as well
- I feel like mandatory training should be put in place.
- None
- ensuring the above is completed
- There is no place for vicious animals. They should be put down.
- I think there should be more wildlife cameras in the parks all over Calgary. Owners need to be fined if they are in a park they shouldn't be in. The City needs to take action. The response is always the 'education' of the owner. Make the fines steeper and actually fine people.
- Higher fines for infractions or incidents involving these animals. Bans on owning pets, etc.
- For vicious animals in public - would be nice if they could have some sort of identification so other pet owners could know of a vicious dog.
- first time offender(s) MUST be fined..there shouldn't be any rules stating it's a first time offense therefore we'll give you a break..the fines and/or confiscation should reflect the amount of times the dog has been a problem..again responsible owners are usually not the problem(s)..
- If they are big enough to seriously harm a child they should be put down.
- If a dog bites another animal or person they owner should be fined. Then maybe people with vicious dogs would take things more seriously. If they are repeat offenders, euthanasia.
- Dog and owner should be required to go for behavioural training and reviewed on a regular basis. Most aggressive behaviour in a dog is the owner's fault.
- Vicious animals, in a clear case of severe injury to a human or another animal, should be euthanized. Public safety is at risk when these animals remain alive. Again, vicious animals have a very low quality of life, and that is reason enough to euthanize.
- Euthanize at 2nd offence
- Not sure
- Vicious animals should only be allowed in specific locations, and have a warning leash/vest



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I believe that the owner should be punished in case of a serious attack - they should know how their animals will react in certain situations and avoid situations in which this would happen.
- Recognize that a vicious dog did not get that way on it's own. Training and socialization, or lack thereof, or intentionally aggressive training and socialization, play more part than size or breed in terms of behavior. Owners need mandated education and support when a dog is declared vicious.
- Not allowed at off leash areas
- Thorough Investigation. Some owners are reactive about a breed that is vocal but will not harm any person or animal.
- I believe that the City needs to assess each case on an individual basis. Any animal can turn vicious in certain circumstances. We need to stay away from blanket judgments on breeds.
- Ensuring that they are evaluated by an expert prior to the designation of vicious animal given.
- Remove vicious animals and destroy and ban the owners from owning another
- I am a professional dog trainer and This laws do not protect us or our dogs.It is always hard to train owners and cops on how to handle their animals.
- To put that vicious animal down and forbid the owner from ever owning another dangerous type dog (ie: pitbulls). It is better to prevent injuries/fear/death by having a ban instead of that one event that destroys or impacts one's life forever.
- Capture & disposal.
- To do their best not to euthanize. Generally this is a product of ownership. Taking an animal away from irresponsible or unfit owners often makes all the difference
- Heavy and increasing fines for incidents. Enough at a minimum to recoup city costs in dealing with the incidents
- It depends on what has happened, what the dog has done. A dog that has got loose and attacked a second time needs to be put down.
- It is not the dog, it is the owner. If an owner raises a viscous animal they should have the right to own animals taken away
- Enforcing the above.
- Make sure the animal is thoroughly tested before being labeled as vicious. Some dog haters or dog-aphobics think a dog barking at them is vicious behavior. Not usually the case - dogs can sense when people are scared
- I think there needs to be more investigation into what prompted the animal to be vicious. There are more and more instances where people/kids are tormenting animals through fences. I had kids in my back alley throwing rocks and yelling at my dogs wile they were in the yard.
- Dogs can be unpredictable but owners must ensure the dog is under control at all times. Although situations do happen. Enforcement. Investigation and follow up including seizing the dog are necessary steps. However give owners a chance to do right so the dog doesn't suffer.
- One bite/ attack is all you get. The animal gets put down after that.
- That the city destroys any vicious animal that is not on the owners property. The city must license owners to keep vicious animas



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- To FINE and hold ACCOUNTABILITY to the irresponsible owners of these animals. To NOT allow these animal owners from EVER owning again or they have to enroll in programs through CofC about responsibility of owners and what it means to be a responsible pet owner
- Ensuring the owner is accurately capable of handling a vicious dog.
- Enforce the bylaws. Higher fines for repeat offenders.
- I don't think the city should euthanize them.
- To ensure they do not endanger the public, and that they are properly cared for.
- The city should be able to seize and evaluate viscous animals without court intervention, and the courts should be required at least after an appeal, and appeals only allowed under reasonable circumstances. As a dog owner and lover, public safety still comes first — this is an owner problem.
- That the City hold owners accountable w/ mandatory court appearances & fines that will hit them where it counts.
- People who own vicious dogs should be evaluated to determine why their dog is vicious and educated to ensure they provide adequate care and training for all pets in their care. Dogs aren't born vicious and not every person is suitable to be a pet owner.
- None.
- The owners of vicious dogs are ultimately responsible for their dogs, and should be held criminally liable by way of fines and criminal charges if their animal inflicts injury to people or other animals like people's pets. The City of Calgary can raise the fines even more for vicious dog attacks.
- I believe the City should take the dogs away from the owner and fine the owner nor allow the owner ever owning animals again.
- Immediate removal from home and put down
- I expect them to ensure those dogs are not allowed in public, to enforce the rules and require owners to get help for their dogs.
- Any dog which is a repeat offender is put down or removed from city. No toleranc3 for vicious dog or potentially vicious dog breeds
- Review by case individually. Don't stereotype breeds. End of the day owners should be held accountable vs the animal.
- If a viscous dog is from a pure breed that had these traits the breeder should be held accountable also.
- I'm concerned that it takes too long to be deemed vicious. One unprovoked nite and it should be evaluated at owners cost.
- Muzzling should be enforced once a pet owner has more than one charge. I have first hand experience with this and I'm not happy with current regulations. There's a vicious dog in my neighborhood that has attacked my dog twice. I do not feel safe for myself or my dog.
- Timely response and detailed follow up.
- One strike rule, higher licence cost
- Proper assessment done by someone not in the city's back pocket.
- None.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Public should be notified
- I think the city should enforce the laws and do their due diligence in conducting investigations.
- should be higher fines, training and or putting them down (death), dogs/ owners should be dealt with depending on the severity /problem.
- Remove them from the owner and humanly put them down if cannot be rehabilitated and rehomed.
- Vicious animals should not be allowed in the city, and if there is one who is accused of biting another person or another animal, it should be put down. No questions asked!
- Repeat offenders should be euthanized.
- ask animal owner to remove dog from environment, if there are multiple complaints - talk to owner(s) and advise behavioral training of animal before a fine is given. If refuse training, give a fine. Follow up in couple weeks time.
- If they bite a person ...the owner and dog should go to mandatory training to see both of them can be retrained
- Be registered, regulated with spot checks on animal.
- Quit focusing on breed bans - they don't work!
- Must be registered. Rescue groups must register vicious animals before allowing to be adopted.
- I think deeming an animal as vicious is done too easily. Dogs can have mental problems like anxiety that cause them to lash out. They could be ok and then see somebodys shoes that remind them of the guy that used to beat them every day. I think the city needs to do more thorough evaluations.
- They should not be allowed in off leach areas. They should be put down. Too often they are just locked up and beaten by poor owners, making them more vicious and suffering further neglect.
- IF THERE IS INJURY TO A HUMAN OR ANIMAL THE VICIOUS ANIMAL OWNER SHOULD BE LEVIED A HEAVY FINE AND RECIEVE JAIL TIME FOR ASSAULT PLUS PAY FOR ANY AND ALL MEDICAL EXPENSES AND ANY AND ALL VET FEES. THE VICIOUS ANIMAL SHOULD ALSO BE PUT DOWN.
- ALL costs and expenses associated with a call, vet, police, rescue staff etc. Should be charged back to the owner! I can't afford to have a pet why should I / tax payer be required to foot the bill for a pet owner??!!
- No second chances! The animal should be put down. The owner should have to compensate the victim/family (trip for shots, worry about rabies/other disease), missed work, etc). Owners should be banned from having another pet for a year. If they ever have a second incident, ban them for life
- To never attempt breed specific legislation.
- None.
- Don't allow them, once identified and confirmed. Make owners responsible for any costs incurred as a result of injury to people and pets.
- None



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I'm a bit concerned with the process of seizing an animal and having it assessed. That sounds like a very stressful situation for the animal and would likely cause aggression in any dog. Maybe it's the case already but having the guardian there might allow for a more reliable assessment.
- No breed-specific bans. Perhaps the City could check up on the "vicious" dogs and make sure the owners are following the rules.
- I believe our City has very well structured vicious animal by laws and that these situations are currently being addressed adequately. I do believe that training of a dog deemed as vicious should be mandatory.
- Restrain, capture and impose fines or put the animal down if found vicious and attacking other animals or humans
- Heavier fines for irresponsible owners who allow pets to run wild.
- None.
- The owners should be held responsible and accountable. The animal should be removed and evaluated as to whether it can be retrained but should never be returned to the original owner.
- Aggressive animals should be banned from off-leash areas and should be enforced. Too many attacks happen due to owners not abiding by that rule.
- Sporadic checks to ensure owner is following specific rules given to them. Ensure compliance
- Should have to attend rigorous training and get a certificate that the dog can be obedient. It's one thing to muzzle but control is primary.
- I think that Calgary Animal Services does an excellent job most of the time. Bill Bruce worked hard to put in a livable service for pet owners and non pet owners in Calgary. Since his retirement, the Service has continued to be professional and offer good value for dollar. Well done!
- The strictest policy possible
- yards should be inspected yearly and city licenses should be increased to accommodate the inspections. If the dogs pass training and become more docile, fees could be reduced. Just as if you get your pet spayed or neutered
- City should have ability to ban the owner from further dog ownership should their dog need to be euthanized for an attack
- The rules need to apply to small dogs, as well as larger breeds.
- That they be rehabilitated if possible or that they are put down.
- Better way for those attacked or have an incident to report. When an owner chooses to leave there's isn't much one can do. Too many off leash pets not under control. Be more present and fine
- Mandatory training classes.
No off leash.
- The city should have power to deal with the animal and owner.
- Follow up with resources to owners such as recommendation of behaviour vets or trainers. Property inspections for compliance.
- 1) Set up cameras at the entrances - free run areas
2) a "patrol" drop in to show police presence.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

3) Have large signs at Every entrance with: Absolutely NO Vicious dogs allowed, Dogs that have attacked people or dogs in the past also not allowed! Dogs must be under control and must recall!

- Respond promptly to complaints, monitor ongoing situations.
- Fines and stronger expectations of training for owners.
- They City should off public education, via their website, and encourage those who have had dealings with dog aggression to report the incidents to the City.
- Aggressive breeds should not be allowed
- Paying more attention to small dogs that should be labeled as vicious, but aren't because of their size. They are often "allowed" to be aggressive because they are small
- Any city fines collected from owners within incidents should go directly to the victims of any damage, and fines should be equivalent to the cost of damages caused by the animal.
- Dont be so quick to judge. Work more with the owners prior to making a decision.
- Zero tolerance. Period. These are essentially weaponized animals.
- Take them away
- A very thorough investigation is expected. Dogs have been deemed as vicious when it wasn't the dog but the human who was in the wrong. Dogs are not bad humans are bad
- Educate the owner on good pet care
- I think you also have to look at the larger picture. A lot of people with reactive dogs handle them extremely well. It's others with extendable leashes, aggressive smaller dogs, dogs off leash in leash areas, etc that are the problem.
- None
- If they kill or maim they should be put down immediately
- Dive into the cause of the incident. Some dogs are protecting their owners/property and people file false claims
- warnings and fines.
- Ensure behavioral conditions surrounding the incident (most dogs are fearful rather than vicious). Look more closely at the owners. With proper training, "vicious" dog breeds are not all vicious! Do NOT do breed discrimination!!!!
- 1 warning then the animal should be seized and put down. The city should ban dogs on Stephen ave. It seems the type of people that thinks it's a good dog walking area all seem to pitbull owners.
- More case studies and legal outcomes of certain vicious dog cases (rightly and wrongly accused cases would help I think)
- I think the rules are clear.
- I wish that pit bulls needed to be muzzled and leashed while in public.
- Ban the owner from having animals and enforce it. If owner is found with animal, escalating fines are incurred.
- Policing, welfare checks (often vicious animals are products of a bad situation - not always the animals fault but rather how they are treated that causes aggression).
- Ban vicious breeds entirely!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A report of a vicious animals needs to fully investigated before considering putting the animal down. Circumstances need to be taken into account and animals should be tested by an animal behaviour specialist.
- Certain breeds of dogs have been created for the aggressivity and combat capabilities, eg. pitbulls, mastiffs. These dogs should not be allowed in public spaces without be muzzled. This to be done without waiting for a serious attack before starting a judicial process of declaring the dog vicious.
- Would love to see more bylaw officers at the dog parks.
- When a complaint is made, it shouldn't be a Ridiculous process. It should be an immediate bylaw presence to deal with the situation. Their should be a bylaw for dogs on property that are aggressive towards neighbours, not just on public property.
- Realistic temperment assessments by qualified animal behaviorists on the risk to the public are absolutely necessary.
- Behavior assessment than put animal down
- Investigate the circumstances that caused the animal to be vicious in the first place
- follow up, education, support
- Mandatory training for dog owners in an attempt to make the dog less vicious.
- There should be higher fines if a dog hurts another dog or person
- Remove from owner if they are unwilling or unable to deal with them. Rehab where possible. Sometimes, a dog does have a bad day/is provokes/[removed] happens - do have compassion in such cases.
A dog that bites a trespasser - even with a history of bad behavior - should get a free pass, no exceptions.
- Enforcing training.
- If a vicious dog has committed a serious attack against a human it should be destroyed. These dogs pose a serious risk to other, especially young children where an attack could be fatal.
- Education on vicious dogs - help owners and provide resources so they can try to help their pet. If not able to be helped, information should be provide on behaviour euthanasia. Sometimes that is what is best for the community to keep everyone safe. Discourage "no kill" shelters and rehoming meandog
- Owners need to take full responsibility. If they won't then heavy fines or even jail
- Animals should be seized and rehabilitated and/or adopted. Or worse case put to sleep
- Maybe look into the owner...a vicious dog will most likely have a bad owner. Maybe they would do well with mandatory classes of some kind.
- FOLLOWTHROUGH. Have direct consequences if something has happened that was TRULY unprovoked - then have clear, concise action. If a person is bitten BUT was actually the instigator—leave the animal alone. In all things there must be a 'but for' clause (but for the person instigating...)
- Change the bylaw to have these animals put down. They have already proven themselves dangerous,, and their are no safeguards that it won't happen again.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Make sure we have trainers in the city who know how to handle vicious dogs of all kinds.
- 3 strikes is unacceptable. It's is unsafe. It is terrifying to be living next to an animal that you know has been vicious and with an irresponsible owner and yet you are helpless until an attack happen not one more time but twice. I have been the second attack.
- Calgary's vicious animal bylaw has worked well. Owner & animal get one chance. 2nd infraction, animal must be euthanized & owner not permitted to own another vicious animal. Coyotes - cannot be permitted to terrorize people. Relocate, haze, worst case, euthanize if no other option can be found.
- None. The city should stay out of it, it's not their job to babysit dogs or dog owners.
- Do not kill these animals instead invest in rehabilitation and training programs for these vicious dogs Often dogs are vicious due to poor training and can be trained properly
- If the animal commits one offence the animal needs to be put down
- Repeat offenders should loose the right to have a dog. Have been dealing with the same people with different vicious dogs for years.
- Animals deemed vicious should be put down. Provide the owner with an assessment of what may have contributed to the vicious dog so the experience can be learned from. Tweak animal by laws as necessary based on learnings (poor breeding, under socialized)
- If more than 2 incidents there are no exceptions euthanasia is required
- owners have to take classes to help them deal with their pets aggression issues or surrender them
- Immediate eradication.
- They should ensure that it was the animal's fault and that it was not provoked. They should pay a higher license fee if their animal has been declared vicious.
- Catch and destroy them if on public property and, if they have attacked someone, destroy them and jail the owner or heavy fines at the very least. By heavy, I mean \$5,000 or more.
- They should be removed from the home and if nothing can be done to rehabilitate them, then unfortunately they should be put down. The public safety should trump everything.
- Control of constant barking.
- I am against any new bylaws that would categorize specific breeds as dangerous or vicious
- That all involved with animals have the proper training to assess animals correctly and determine if was human inappropriateness and not the animal.
- I think the city should bring in a certified veterinary behaviourist. Most vicious dogs are fear driven. With the right education for the owner and behaviour adjustment and often medication for the dog we can mitigate issues.
- Perhaps having a professional evaluate the owners would be good. This way you would know whether the owner is willing to do what needs to be done to ensure others safety
- Never look at breed specific policies or bans as those are based on bias and are unfair.
- Be more viable. And give fines.
- None
- Give your bylaw officers more power and increase consequences for irresponsible pet owners



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ensure training at adequate facilities is repeated once a year. Reactive dogs need socialization in a controlled setting, instead of isolation. Create events where reactive dogs can have opportunities to socialize. Muzzles are good ideas to prevent fights from breaking out.
- Take into consideration the circumstances for the reason the dog acted viciously. If it's a small dog being the aggressor, and then the big dog responds, consideration into how the other party acted is a must.
Listen to, and act accordingly when small dogs act viciously. It's not just the big dogs.
- one bite and the dog should be put down
- Stricter regulations.
- Option to avoid Euthanizing, steep fines against the humans and restrictions on future ownership of animals. I think humans who engage in canine fighting or abuse their animals to create aggressive behavior should do jail time and face very severe sanctions and monetary damages to victims and public
- Animals are not property that should be discarded if a problem. We are responsible for their lives and must make every attempt to rehabilitate the. Deal more harshly with owners and breeders that disregard training.
- I think they should be removed from the residence and rehabilitated if possible.
- I do not want to see the City apply some kind of breed specific legislation. It is discriminatory and does not look at dogs as individuals.
- Ban them.
- That veterinarians make the decision based on the facts of the situation and the dogs's temperament, it shouldn't be left up to lay people's uneducated opinions or emotional reactions. Dog do chase, bite and sometimes destroy things - it doesn't make them vicious or a danger to the public at large.
- Fine owners who do not follow regulations
- Impound and destroy if any issue.
- Really bad cases should have the animals seized.
- I don't really know what to say, since Bylaw already seems too busy to deal with the files they have now... I guess just to do their best to ensure vicious animal calls are dealt with in a timely manner and that complainants know what they need to do on their end for documentation, etc.
- Education to everyone. Signage at dog parks. I am not sure if the color coded bandana is still a thing but my idea would be to issues the color coded bandanas if requested for free when licensing dogs.
- If the dog is declared vicious, there should be a limit on the # of dogs that owner can have.
- Rescue, train, and re-home.
- Simply put rules and bylaws need to be enforced otherwise they are useless
- I would like the City to check in on the care of vicious animals, as they rarely exist in a vacuum. I feel that owners of vicious dogs should be subject to regular check-ins to see how progress is coming with their dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Make owners more accountable to their dogs behaviours. Implement a colour coding for leashes that can tell other owners whether it's okay to approach, be cautious or avoid. Everyone should be held responsible in an attack or fight. Not always the big dog
- None other, I feel this is already very well handled by the city due to the very low number of incidents.
- If ownership is not found, animal should be destroyed.
- Rather than just putting them down, the dog should go through a rigorous training program to see what the issues it has. And only then decide if it's something that cannot be fixed have the euthanization as the last resort.
- If the animal is declared vicious -- put it down.
- None really - the specific rules cover it. Ultimately the person controlling the animal should be able to control the animal.
- Mandatory reporting of incidents in off leash parks, ban from being in offleash parks even if leashed.
- To insist that owners receive positive reinforcement education
- I expect the City of Calgary to apply unbiased treatment to all "vicious" animals, regardless of breed or size. I also expect the City of Calgary to prioritize the animal when addressing concerns, and to understand that all behaviour is product of the owner.
- Support for the victims of vicious animals.
- By laws should be in place to prevent the teasing of dogs. I have had several cases where children and teenagers have poked sticks through my fence to tease my dog. This will result in the dog being vicious and is the fault of others.
- First of all change your definition. Chasing? That's a bit far fetched considering chasing is a part of the play sequence of canids and not always with malicious intent. Education on proper socialization and it's importance. More supervision in off leash parks.
- Enforcement and follow-up to be sure that owners comply with the rules when their dog's status is changed. It shouldn't be up to neighbours to badger the City and report on issues - if the neighbour is even aware of the ruling.
- DO NOT discriminate against "bullied breed" dogs just because of their size or public opinion. Every dog is its own creature just like humans. I've been bit by many chihuahuas.
- I expect more bylaw enforcement and presence, especially at dog parks and public parks, to ensure that the owners are following the bylaws in regards to vicious animals.
- Regular evaluations / home visits to assess that the above expectations are being followed.
- That animals the city deem vicious are required to be spayed and neutered to ensure they are not being bred.
- I think reports of vicious dogs should be taken more seriously, heavier fines for owners, and further responsibility for the future of vicious dogs.
- I believe the city should be making routine inspections of any home where a vicious animal is residing to make sure the animal is being properly cared for. I also think there should be a restriction about vicious animals not being permitted near schools/playgrounds/etc. even while muzzled



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Be more strict and don't issue warnings. Have a quicker response time than 3 weeks.
- Dogs should not be permitted to be tethered outdoors or indoors no matter what.
- None
- not to allow them in the city.
- Provide more support to owners to address why their animal is vicious. Require course on basic species energy, nutritional, behavioural, socialization needs as part of licensing for pets in this city will be a preventative measure.
- Euthanize vicious animals or in some instances assess a dog and if it can be trained to stop vicious behaviour, require that of the owner and follow up multiple times to make sure that occurred. Do not ban any breeds.
- If the animal is proven vicious and the owner failing to provide professional training/socialization, or the breeder failing to ensure positive temperament of animals prior to breeding, the animal must be humanely euthanized the and owner/breeder banned for life from having/breeding animals.
- to be constant with education and dealing with incidents.
- Investigate the possibility that the pet was raised to be vicious. If so, removal and rehoming of the dog as well as the owner not being allowed to have pets.
- If they mutilate someone, they should be put down
- why should I bother? animal & bylaw will declare any dog as vicious that was in any attack. They'd rather avoid any chance of litigation than taking a real look at what the issue might be.
- Have a way to report incidences with dog aggression/biting of dogs not yet deemed vicious. I have heard of instances where an attack has occurred and the owner just leaves, and a victim has no recourse if they don't know who the owner is.
- That they are monitored and provided with resources to prevent future incidents.
- To assist owners in becoming educated on canine behaviour and body language and/or professional training.
- Be fair in their decisions. Uphold the law to ensure the safety of the public
- Heavily fine the owners of these dogs if they attack. If they choose to own a viscous dog they should also be prepared to pay the price! They should pay way more to license a viscous dog!!
- More monitoring of the off leash parks. Ability for dog owners to submit proof of attack to by-law and taken seriously. Educate dogs owners of what information they need to make a report to by-law
- more action if a complaint has been filed a fine maybe
- Should not be allowed on public property. Get rid of the risk of dealing with a situation.
- Uphold punishment, if there are fines then ensuring the individual who is responsible will pay and have a record of their actions to avoid future incidents.
- None
- I expect The City of Calgary to enforce and provide a mandatory rehabilitation program. This program should take 1-2 weeks and and train the pet to be less of a threat to other dogs and people. The goal is to get the animal to a point where the courts can decide to remove the title of 'vicious pet'.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The owners should have to adequately demonstrate they have full control of the animal.
- Active monitoring of the owner to ensure compliance. A ban on keeping pets (by the household not the person) if the dog has more than 2 incidences. If the dog is people aggressive and truly cannot be re-trained and re-homed to a responsible owner, humane euthanasia.
- Please do not band certain breeds, but instead work to educate owners
- Most of the time the problem is with the owner not the dog, if they have multiple offences then the dog should be taken away and if the animals behavior can be correct they should be given that option and be rehomed. A dog that can be helped should not be put down for an issue cause by the owner
- To not be stupid also or try to make money.
- to make them top priority to be picked up if they ever get loose
- Take a harder line.
- The possibility of having the title removed if proof of training and improvement in behaviour can be demonstrated. Policies enforced by people with knowledge of dog behaviour. Everybody in the “attack” held accountable for actions. Many members of the public approach dogs in inappropriate ways
- There should be a mandatory animal behaviour/body language course that needs to be taken before you can own an animal. There should be public education on how to prevent dog bites what to do if you see a strange dog etc. Children under 12 should not be allowed in off leash parks
- unsafe dog-parks need to be regulated and monitored
- Usually it is the fault of the owner and NOT the animal. The owner is responsible for the actions of the animal. Fines should be higher depending on the degree of the attack ie: blood drawn, killing of another animal
- That the city looks at the entire situation surrounding the event. All dogs have the potential to bite, it doesn't mean they are all aggressive or vicious. The city can't violate rights and have bylaw enter any property without a warrant.
- Dont. Euthanize all the time .
- by-laws state it well - but need to be reinforced
- I think the person should have an opportunity to seek training and undergo testing to potentially have the vicious dog status removed when possible.
- The fines should be high and the dog removed if the fine and training are not completed In specified time. If people can't afford to look after a dog and be responsible the dog should be removed and rehomed
- An effort should be made to re-socialize the animal. If they don't change, euthanize.
- Current bylaws do not account for provocation which provides an incomplete picture. Bylaw employees should be educated in behaviour, handling and training. Decipher between citizens who are simply uneducated vs chronically irresponsible.
- Removal of animal from home if second attack or incident.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That they put the best interest of the dog and the children in the community first. The desires of the owners, while important, should not supersede what is best for the community and the animal.
- Keep track of cases, but also communicate with owners and work toward solutions. I think incidents don't get reported because people (both owners and victims) are afraid that the animal will be destroyed, and are reluctant to see that happen with non-major incidents.
- I would actually like to see the animal put down, but sadly, I don't think the city will do that.
- Same as above
- One strike, your out. Vicious animals should be euthanized.
- All should be licensed, and after any incidents the license fee goes way up. This will offset some of the costs for an annual inspections, that should be done to insure the property is suitable for a dangerous animal. Dangerous designation only gets 2 strikes then animal must be surrendered.
- Please make the process for anyone victimized by an aggressive or vicious animal easier for the victim. My personal experience was that it was long and drawn out. I was threatened by the owner when I took my complaint to the city.
- City needs better enforcement, limit to one warning only.
- If the City licenses a Pit Bull and it attacks someone and the owner doesn't have insurance, then maybe the City should be liable for licensing them? A Ban would be easier and us not be frightened and have to carry around dog spray! I have witnessed 3 absolute nightmare unprovoked pit bull attacks.
- Owner needs to be fined for attacks to people/other dogs etc. Should have a record attached to owner to determine responsibility of owner and identify repeat offences by either owner or animal
- If they are a hazard they should be banned
- Respond to complaints of vicious animals and require the owner to provide PROOF that they have corrected the issue within a specific time period or remove the animal from them.
- While some dog bites may be expected, the city needs to do more, impose harsher penalties to owners of dogs with serious aggression problems
- Should the animal attack a child or severely harm another pet, the animal needs to be put down.
- Two strikes, and the dog must be put down, owner prohibited from owning further pets.
- Responsible action when the animal and owner has offended.
- Force owners to post a sign on the outside of a premises approved by the city.
- I would like to see the city give warnings in mild cases, but also be able to give training orders as described above. The city should work with the Humane Society to rehabilitate and rehome aggressive dogs if the owner does not comply and show success.
- I am mainly concerned about dogs accused of being vicious when the complainant does not understand dog behaviour. eg. a dog jumping up on a stranger is not necessarily vicious. If a dog behaves in a vicious way, the situation must be assessed fairly. eg. Did an unsupervised child provoke a bite?
- Enforcement



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If they are vicious they may need to be put down if biting people or killing pets. Is the animal vicious from being treated in an inhumane way? Is rehabilitation possible?
- Mandatory fines for any transgressions
- To ensure that no child is allowed to be in a household with a vicious animal.
- Fine repeat offender owners. Rehome animals of repeat offenders, and ban them from owning animals.
- Mind their own business.
- Continue with current legislation
- Owner training
 - Limit licensing of other animals in the same household. ie, can't get another dog until this one is rehabilitated.
- The rules above are good.
- Rehabilitation first. Avoiding the death of the animal as much as possible.
- Vicious animals should be euthanized.
- For the most part, I think the City handles this appropriately. Some consideration of circumstances needs to be taken when declaring a dog vicious. All dogs will bite given the right circumstances.
- The above listed rules and procedures seem acceptable
- To screen each case and decide if certain person can or can not have such a dog.
- Vicious should not be breed specific, but determined on a case by case basis. Then the above restrictions can be implemented and ENFORCED.
- Proper consequences for violations.
- An element of grace and understanding, knowing that vicious animals are largely the result of human interference, poor socialization, mistreatment, abuse etc.
- I 100% do not believe in euthanizing an animal for being vicious. However, if the pet owner can not control their pet, they should be either required to do more pet training with professionals or hand their pet over to someone who can care for it properly.
- I like that our city emphasizes responsible pet ownership. But I don't see it being enforced and the focus here specific to aggressive dogs instead of basic responsible ownership is disappointing.
- To ensure the animal gets proper care for rehabilitation versus putting them down.
- People should not be simply able to own a vicious dog and take no further responsibility for training it. If they are allowed to keep it, they be mandated to take it and themselves to specialized training.
- Assessment of the owner's household and lifestyle to deem whether the home is fit to care for the animal as many aggressive behaviours from dogs are a product of the environment the dog is subject to. The city should take greater measures to ensure that animals are in the proper homes.
- If dog attacks someone - euthanize. Assess dog to dog.
- If a dog guardian demonstrates they cannot be responsible for a vicious animal, they should not be allowed to keep the animal. The City should err on the side of caution, have large fines for non-compliance, consider euthanasia in extreme cases.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Make it law that the owners should be required to attend classes with the animal as it is rarely the animal that is innately vicious. Investigation into the owners treatment of the animal as it can be the case they have been mistreated and this is why they are aggressive.
- That you actually respond.
- After first offence, require the owner (s) and pet to go through training. Must pass to be allowed to keep the animal. Strong fines if break rules. Second offence, either turn animal over to rehabilitation organization willing to take them on, or euthanize.
- These dogs should not be allowed out in the public if they're not put down.
- Nothing. Legal system should punish owners if they do not properly follow the vicious animal rules, but that is not the City's jurisdiction.
- they must be sterilized at owner expense if not already.
- Define more clearly what constitutes a vicious animal. This evaluation should be done by an experienced veterinary behaviourist or animal trainer, not animal control/CHS. Dog's history and context of said attack must be taken into account (ie provocation or lack of control/knowledge of the owner).
- No breed specific legislation. More prevention and consequences for owners
- A proper assessment. There are various circumstances a dog could be seen as vicious (e.g. you pull a dogs tail it might bite vs a dog getting out of the yard and going on a biting spree)
- those animals that have viciously attacked other animals or people should not be allowed in public areas/streets.
- City should require that vicious dogs be clearly labeled when outside
- I commend the City's excellent programs to work with pet owners to train/rehab their animals to prevent further incidents.
- If there is an incident that isn't considered serious, I still expect the city to follow up on that since I believe a serious incident only occurs after many less serious ones.
I don't support breed specific legislation
- Again, just enforcing the rules consistently.
- Can't think of anything, when I hear about a vicious dog attack the City of Calgary bylaw response seems adequate.
- That the public be educated on how to approach and act around dogs. A lot of bites are triggered because the victim has no idea how to act around an animal.
- The city should euthanize animals that have already been deemed vicious. Dogs that have attacked before will also attack again.
- All of the existing rules seem good. I expect the city not to discriminate based on breed.
- Both people and other pets need to be safe and protected from vicious animals
- Immediate removal of these animals if the proper care and safety is not provided.
- Dealt with quickly for safety of people and animals in the neighborhood.
- Warning Signs must be posted at all entry points to property (gates, doors etc). If not, animal will be apprehended



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None.
- Should be taken from owners. If they had dealt with aggression before, it might not have crossed over to vicious.
- I expect a vicious animal to be destroyed or moved to a rural area
- Deal with them in an effective way to ensure safety of people
- Nothing further.
- Nothing at this time.
- What is 'deemed a vicious animal?' If it is based on breed, could we not ensure the folks that get that type of breed, also get some sort of additional mandatory training for that?
- Would like to see a defined process in order to declare a dog vicious, and also a way to lift the label again and "redeem" the dog. Am absolutely against breed specific legislation, since it has proven to not work anywhere it was implemented, while taking up resources and punishing the wrong people.
- Have educated and experience personnel to run the temperament testing. Being aggressive is not the same as reactive.
- If there are children living in a house that has a dog that has been deemed vicious, that dog should be removed.
- None
- City to license and monitor. If repeat offences, then owner fined and dog put down if cant be controlled by owner.
- The City of Calgary should ban breeds that have a history of vicious behaviour- ie. pit bulls.
- Would like clear guidelines what defines a vicious dog, e.g. by behavioral assessment by a specialised veterinarian. Would also like to see a way to "redeem" a dog. I am absolutely not in favor of breed specific legislation, since it is superficial and has shown not to work in any other jurisdiction
- the owners should received really hefty fines and the dogs destroyed.
- Awareness of animals that have been deemed vicious, enforce rules in place to protect people from the pet, and also to ensure that that pet - vicious or not - is being cared for properly and treated humanely in spite of their reactivity.
- I don't believe vicious animals should be allowed in the city. Even with the rules noted above, the reality is there are breaches and these dogs are extremely dangerous to the public. There is no good reason to have such an animal as a pet in the city, too many risks for the owners and citizens.
- Give the animals a chance to calm down and get used to their surroundings, and make sure that people who are dealing with them are professional and have LOTS OF EXPEINCES as newbie people can cause more harm than good to these guys. As well to understand the are not vicious by choice, but trauma etc
- Making behaviour training mandatory. And judgment should NOT be based on breed.
- I think the current process is great, but I think it is unfortunate that training programs, especially for reactive or 'vicious' animals are so expensive. I think it would be worth it for the city to make a training program mandatory and provide aid to those who might not be able to afford this.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- regulate the space they are allowed to minimize and isolate any accidents or tragic encounters with any un-experienced individual
- Unless it can be proven that the dog was protecting itself or its family, the dog's owner should be charged and held liable for any damage.
- Remember that it's not the animals fault
- If a vicious animal does not imply with the bylaws then it should be removed from the owner. That owner cannot have that breed of dog again.
- Way, way more enforcement. Shouldn't take serious injury to bring out a bylaw officer.
- Education on breeds, ability to refer owners to resources to assist in behaviours, analyze home environment to see if behaviour is resulting for bigger issues at home.
- More onus on the owners. Most of the time the fault of a vicious dog is the owner and not the dog. Remove the dog if appropriate, and flag the owner. Repeat incidents should result in a ban of owning a dog
- Make every effort to rehab the dog and get it in a home with someone who is competent at training and handling reactive dogs.
- I expect that any animal that has proven to be vicious by an unprovoked attack on another animal or a person is no longer allowed within city limits. There must be zero tolerance, heavy fines, and possible jail time for the owners.
- Repeat offenders may have to be euthanized. If that happens, owners should be banned from owning dogs for two years.
- Enforce the current bylaws and any animal that does harm to others, either human or animal is immediately put down..... no exceptions.
- To ensure the animals are kept under control, I'd not they must be euthanized.
- How do the courts determine that an animal is vicious? I hope that the circumstances of the event are considered and that the animal is evaluated by at least two trained behaviorists.
- I think each case needs to be handled on it's own scenario of what happened. Education that vicious animals are not all "pitbull types". People seem to think that a chihuahua that bites is "okay" because they are small.
- None
- Repeat offending dogs should be put down when owners let them off leash to attack and bite children.
- None
- Don't immediately euthanize the dog. That's not a fair option. Like I said, a lot of the time it come down to training. Give the dog and owner a chance by makin them take training courses.
- none
- Deal with cases individually and understand aggression in dogs can be caused by a variety of factors and does not necessarily mean the dog always behaves in such a manner.
- I'm happy with the current rules



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That any dog bred or trained to be biscuits by its owner will result in a very high fine and the animal surrendered and the person not allowed to Keep them
- Huge fines that get passed to victim. Animal must be killed.
- Education programs to enhance owner training and perhaps dog training consultant programs. It's NEVER the dog, but how it has been trained or taken care of. Most good trainers say almost all dogs are redeemable. Some may have to be given to more responsible caretakers if needed with more experience
- How has the owner trained it
Why is it viscous
- Compassion and assistance with corrective behaviour. Absolutely never kill the dog. Never.
- Most incidents wouldn't happen if these pets were on a leash. Most cases I have heard on the news have been pets off leash in leashed areas including roaming freely in a front yard. People simply don't follow onleash rules in this city, it needs to be enforced, signed and part of this REVIEW
- The animal and owner must take a reactive behaviour class before allowed out of there yard.
- Setting a definition that doesn't classify my dog as vicious by the simple fact he's a large breed and people freak out when he breaths.
- Ensure the public safety. Fines for people who ignored bylaws. If damage is it her that pets owner should be responsible for all the damages.
- Letting the neighborhood know so parents can talk to their children about the house/dog and why to be aware of that danger
- Vicious animals not being declared due to their bred. People can control, and train, their animals to NOT be vicious.
- Make sure the animal that is deemed vicious is a actually in fact a vicious animal and it was not just an unfortunate isolated incident. Most likely impossible but possibly have a system to keep track of animals deemed vicious and make sure the owners are following all rules.
- They should be taken away from the owners as they certainly do not know how to train or keep a dog.
- Tracking them and educating the humans..making sure they make the best decisions for the public.
- More investigation into the home life of the animal. Higher fines and penalties to the owner, especially if there has been more than one incident. Any owner that has an aggressive animal should have to have training and repeat problems should cause the loss of the animal and banned from ownership.
- Be fair. Listen and see between the lines. What is this dogs past, is there any hope for this dog, what is the real story here and possibly have the people caused this dog to react that way through improper training methods.
- Don't be breed-specific, judge on case by case and hold humans accountable if their pet is not treated with kindness.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Definitions of what is classified as a vicious animal. (pit bull, doberman pinscher, etc.) Certain animals will require special licenses and permits to own. Education regarding it is not the animal at fault, but the lack of owner education and responsibility. Periodic checks on animals.
- To fine the owner of the dog was not on leash
- Don't label good dogs vicious, especially based on breed. Your bylaw officer informed my vet clinic staff "the only good chow is a dead chow." Absolutely unprofessional. It is essentially racism.
- None
- If animals are deemed to be vicious they should be put down.
- None
- These dogs need to be humanely euthanized
- Hold the owner completely accountable. Don't only impose fines but also require interventions to the presenting concerns and mandate follow up that they have been addressed.
- Protecting the public. Enduring laws are being followed.
- The dog that bites a human should be put down after a 2nd bite.
- again, it depends on the circumstances. if its clearly irresponsible people, then penalties maybe and forced training, but if its circumstances sometimes beyond control, then the city should simply show some compassion.
- We shouldn't be enabling vicious animals escapillt when accident happen and they have the ability to escape and run free.
- Blame the owners and not the animal.
- Holding people accountable. They choose to keep these animals- if it harms someone there should be no leniency. Encourage responsible euthanasia if people are not willing to work on the animals issues (not just dumping them at shelters)
- They need to step in and seize animals where needed
- Continue with this policy and not ban/assume certain breeds are vicious. Calgary is a great example of sound scientifically based dog behaviour policy.
- That the people responsible for the pet are thoroughly investigated to ensure that they are neither abusive nor causing the animal to be vicious by some other method. That the animal only be killed if rehabilitation and/or re-training is impossible.
- Accountability of owners
- Appropriate animal ownership is very important. Animals that suffer enough distress to become vicious may not be in the right homes. The city should assess if these dogs should be rehomed with knowledgeable animal owners/trainers/behaviourists to help them overcome their distress.
- Ensure they owners are continuing to be vigilant with their animal and monitoring public safety near the animal
- Better enforcement. Vicious dogs need a proper registry for those with prior attack incidents
- Simply not permit them.
- This is difficult. Most vicious animals are due to poor ownership. I believe that the owners need to be held more responsible.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- More control over who is allowed to adopt dogs that present vicious tendencies
- You are doing a great job.
- Dogs should be removed from homes if a serious bite occurs more than once and if the owners are willingly allowing the animal to interact with the community without safety measures.
- I'll assume you're not talking about humans (though if you'd like my thoughts on that please release a more specific survey). First and foremost try non violent methods, rehabilitation when possible. Education of all parties is a must, and as always stand strong to decent pragmatic principles.
- Education about management of vicious dogs and policing vicious dog incidents
- victims of dog bites/injuries should be awarded compensation which at minimum, covers medical costs, without having to proceed to civil court to receive it. This should be paid by the offending dog's owner.
- Work with rescue groups and trainers to try to rehabilitate the animal. If in 6-12 months that animal has not made progress, then maybe euthenization. Or an area for them to live but not be around anyone, but I know that would be a hard and expensive task.
- Be less harsh!
- Find a better solution than isolating the dog and putting it in a stressful situation then testing it. Animal behaviorist should attend at the residence on different occasions and make the decision that way. J
- Ensuring investigation and enforcement of standing bylaws and laws.
- Same
- Follow the rules and definitely know how to humanely handle the dogs!!
- Actually follow up with any complaints
- Perhaps more resources provided for where training can be found or recommendations for animal behaviour specialists
- Chasing another dog, animal or human does not mean a dog is vicious. Dogs chase each other and even get into fights sometimes, causing small puncture wounds. This is normal dog behaviour. Responsible owners break up the fight and remove the dog from the area. You need to revise the definition.
- Put more focus on the owner. Do they have knowledge? What steps are they taking? Is there any neglect or abuse? Animal ownership is a privilege.
- I don't have the answer, but something needs to be done about the people who know their dogs can be unpredictable, yet they let them off leash at the park anyway. My dog has been bitten in the past (unprovoked) and the owner was across the park without a care in the world about what was happening.
- To have the dogs taken to the shelter, fine the owner.
- None
- Keep your employees safe as they are working to keep our communities safe
- To assess the animal fairly.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think the city should take complaint calls more seriously, especially for pitbulls, & Rottweilers. From personal experience, they didn't do much about a pitbull that was very threatening, stating that unless it physically had bitten me, there was nothing they could do!
- 2 strikes they're gone
- vicious. That is an opinion.
A chihuahua can be vicious, would someone report that dog for actually acting vicious?
Or would they rather report a big dog that is defensively barking/growling on a private property?
If a Pomeranian bites someone it won't be put down, However a big dog would
- Ensure that there is no underlying abusive situation in the animal's home!
- Calgary should start holding owners more responsible for vicious animals (excluding self defence or no history of vicious behaviour). Stop euthanizing animals for bad owners. Start punishing the owners for allowing this behaviour to happen or they will continue.
- Either banning dogs that are known to be aggressive or making mandatory training for these dogs, paid by owners.
- Enforce on leash more in general.
- Owners need to be taught that there is no need for violence dogs.
- None
- really, why even keep them? there's no shortage of other animals looking for a home. a vicious dog is a training failure by the owner, and vicious dogs should be euthanized. how many children need to be mauled before we learn this? one? five? fifty?
- Enforce the bylaws. I've seen many vicious dogs and their owners in non compliance
- A complete and total ban of vicious dog breeds is required. And a punitive fine and a required court appearance where the idiot with a vicious dog can be told about being a civil member of society. Vicious dogs are not needed in a city of Calgary's size. They serve no productive purpose.
- Re #1 judge fairly if dog breaks loose, chases roaming cat. Biting humans unacceptable if no provocation, if dog bites/snaps in self defense (being beaten or is terrified) then be fair, use common sense. No issue if pet is under adequate control. But curb the darn roaming cat problem!
- If they bite unprovoked, get put down. If they bite with provocation, charge the provoker.
- Put them asleep
- Ensure people are responsibly managing their pet and protecting citizens.
- Fairness. There seems to be a breed bias and also little transparency in assessment. For example, there have been cases of teenagers and other persons teasing dogs & promoting an attack. But the dog gets blamed. Independent animal behaviorists to assess and not bylaw.
- Have a way to track or monitor vicious animals. Patrol off leash parks more often to ensure owners are being responsible. Educate not fine owners.
- One strike, animal is euthanized
- The city should implement a mandatory course in conjunction with the humane society to provide education. People don't decide to own a vicious animal; it is usually irresponsible pet owners. We have a responsibility to minimize the number of vicious animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be routine check-ins with the owners of vicious animals; in my mind at this point the owner has already failed to be responsible
- Frankly, the City needs to work on the interaction with the owners. The owners should be required to take reactive dog training through an accredited force free training program.
- Like humans, dog rehabilitation is possible. The process of classifying a dog as vicious should include a review process if requested by the vicious dog owner.
- Treating the situation fairly - i.e. do not punish for isolated incidents and owners who are trying to cooperate. Do not just based on breed!!!
- Vicious animals must be euthanized after first offence. They should not be allowed in the city.
- To ensure that these animals are being appropriately managed.
- Follow appropriate legislation.
- Set strict rules with consequences for non-compliance, monitor compliance, quickly respond to concerns.
Offer affordable tailored training courses for these owners.
- One strike and you're out. Owner should have to either move or get rid of their animal after one complaint.
- When a dog is declared vicious it should immediately be put down.
- To hold owners responsible and trying to rehome strays
- Rehabilitation, not euthanization. Any dog can be saved
- Effective and timely enforcement of non controlling owners
- At some point it probably needs to be turned over to the province.
- I don't believe a vicious dog should be returned to an owner. It should be euthanized. The owner has already proven to be irresponsible if the animal had an opportunity to be vicious.
- - see above. Without rigorous enforcement of existing regulations, unfortunate consequences become inevitable: some innocent individual is hurt or killed, the city gets a ton of bad press for not doing enough, and the pet pays the ultimate price
- Known dangerous breeds should require further training for the owner before being allowed to own the breed. Too many young "tough guys" want to have a pit bull, but have no idea what the dog is capable of.
- Keep it off public places
- The only message that sticks with irresponsible dog owners is when they're financially punished. Large fines for reoffenders or owners that let their vicious dogs off leash would be a good start.
- Maybe a fine. Or a warning.
- No second chances for Pet owners for any incidents
- If a vicious animal is dangerous to the public, then eliminate the risk.
- I think they're doing a good job already. I like that animals are given a second chance, and that owners are held accountable.
- On private property I don't think the city of calgary can have a say. As long as the dog stays on the public property they aren't doing anything wrong.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be more services available for people who have pets that act out due to past trauma. This can prevent them from being vicious.
- A vicious dog licence and background check to see if they are likely to follow rules.
- None
- See answer above, it is 98% the fault of the owner
- I believe certain breeds should be banned- they are very dangerous and at best intimidating. Specifically, pit bulls and Staffordshire terriers etc
- Ensure truly vicious dogs are put down
- They need to be able to quarantine the animal if a serious incident occurs.
- Hold the owner accountable instead of the dog. I would like to see the city of Calgary try to rehabilitate vicious dogs more often as opposed to euthanizing them.
- I expect the city to exhaust all avenues before killing a dog they deem to be vicious. Locking it in a cell for 10 days and doing an evaluation on a stressed animal is not doing your best.
- Possibilities for rehabilitating the vicious dog. Chance for re-assessment.
- Vicious dogs should have a tracking device and the city should obligate owners to keep all vaccines up to date.
- It's a tough one but I think more training and awareness.
- Do not accept and re-home dogs that have been deemed vicious in another town or county. Vicious dogs do not have a place in an urban setting.
- Using a reasonable and robust definition of "vicious", that once an animal proves vicious the owner must obtain training for the animal or surrender it to a group who can undertake responsibility. If they animal kills or grievously harms someone, the animal must be removed from the owners care and a
- Remove vicious animals from homes where children are present. Be strict and remove animals when owners do not comply with rules.
- As stated in above
- If a bite happens the dog should be removed from the owner and destroyed.
- Put them down
- ALL Licensing costs for the owner of a viscous animal must be higher to reflect the additional cost that the city is forced to take on to ensure bylaws are being followed.
- Do a better job of advertising the consequences to pet owners of vicious animals and ensure that stiff fines and perhaps jail time are the result of an uncontrolled animal attacking and seriously injuring another citizen.
- The city needs to better asses dogs. Currently you hold them for several days with no access to the outside or people. If you want to bring out the worst in an animal, that's how you do it! The city should require owners to attend training and allow for behavioural reassessment after training
- The above signs should be mandatory.
- Ban them. Destroy those that are here now.
- The City needs to understand that there are no innately vicious breeds of domesticated animals. Like humans, animals learn their behaviour from how they are raised and treated. A reputation



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

should not damn an entire species to condemnation e.g. pit-bull terriers which are demonized as vicious.

- DO NOT BAN BULLY BREEDS. Poorly behaved dogs are a direct indicator of their owners NOT an inherent trait. Public education reminder people to be smart around animals (don't pet a strange dog without the express permission from the owner), especially focused on parents educating their children.
- the city of calgary needs to create relationships with other animal organizations who could possibly help with these animals
- Zero tolerance for people not following rules regarding vicious animals, they need to be removed & re-homed or put down. Any vicious animal that harms somebody needs to be put down.
- One strike your out. Any animal attacking a human should be put down.
- I don't think rules need to change per say, but more strict enforcement should be looked into
- Perhaps a 'watch' program where the city checks in on owners and the animals to see if the animal is being abused or properly cared for and whether the animal is controlled.
- No should be allowed to own a vicious animal.
- THE current situation seems to be working.
- If a vicious animal causes an incident then the owner(s) is/are responsible for 100% of damages and the owner(s) must undergo training in pet ownership & responsibilities prior to owning any pets (vicious or not).
- Take legitimate complaints seriously and don't return vicious animals to morons.
- None,
- Ensure that all reports of a vicious animal are investigated and dealt with in accordance with the bylaws. Perhaps suggest training methods or local training services available.
- Leniency of circumstance. Most vicious behaviour can be avoided if circumstances are favourable. Context is everything. Owners of non-vicious dogs have a due diligence in preventing altercations. Poorly behaved dogs should not be permitted off leash, regardless of temperament.
- If reported for any reason and officer feels threat, remove it.
- It should be mandatory for ALL canine caregivers to take canine behaviour classes and attend training classes with their pet. Education is key to solving most problems.
- higher fees for having a vicious dog.
- Make sure there are clear guidelines that wouldn't put at risk other dogs that have been biased as vicious eg pitbulls and Rottweilers so as to make sure that these dogs have a fair chance in life and aren't being put down for unfair reasons
- If dog is too vicious put it down.
- Case by case. Usually it's not the dogs fault lack of ability on the owner part. Dogs should be identified by a collar or vest as to their training level understanding.
- One strike rule.
- put them down



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The City desperately needs to have updated information on training practices and animal behaviour - whether it is someone on staff or a group of trainers that staff can contact and take advice from. I'd also expect followup with owners of these dogs to ensure that rules are followed.
- Animals are typically better than people, what does the city plan to do about vicious people?
- Investigate and prosecute.
- Please consider a pitbull ban in Calgary. The majority of attacks causing harm last year in Calgary were pitbull attacks. My family had two pitbull attacks on children in front of our house within a month of last summer. The second pitbull still lives in my neighborhood...
- Do NOT make this a breed specific issue. Require special licenses for owners that are issued upon completion of X hours of aggression/reactivity specific training. Vicious animals required to wear a vest or identifying item that would tell others that this animal is vicious and not to approach.
- None
- Removing them from the community.
- The City of Calgary needs to be proactive with these cases and not rely on the public to report. And reports by the public need to be taken seriously.
- None.
- Vicious animals should be euthanized.
- None. I think the policies are good.
- My expectation is that the city actively pursues vicious animals prior to an incident rather than in response to one. The city should set out clear definitions of what is considered a vicious animal and require registration by the owner. Failure to do so should result in a substantial penalty.
- That applicable bylaws are enforced.
- I believe all designated OFF leash areas should have cameras, or be by law enforced more often. A stronger presence would make people think twice.
- unsure
- If the City has to confine an animal, it must be done with respect and keeping the animal healthy and safe. There should be support for owners of vicious animals as no one wants to go through this process. Perception should be animal owners don't wish this on anyone.
- Heavy fines for violations. Too dangerous.
- No other expectations. What is in place seems reasonable.
- Be prepared to euthanize animals who have injured their owners and/or other people/animals (in my experience a dog who killed another dog was not euthanized as the only human he'd injured was his owner).
- Take all necessary info from both parties as it is always the small dogs that attack and initiate it. Bigger dogs get the reputation of attacking, get put down just because but when it is a smaller breed, they don't get complaints when it is always the small dogs who are vicious and initiate.
- Identify them with special licenses or just make them go away
- Enforce the bylaws.
- city to have dealt with this more severely much sooner.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- What provisions are there for emergency service workers (police, fire, ambulance) who might have to go to a house where there is a vicious animal?
- I think The City is on the right track.
- I would like to see the opportunity for a dog to go through testing/behavior analysis after a certain amount of time to be removed from the vicious animal list. This would give the owner incentive to try and help solve the behavior issue which is good for the dog, the owner, and the public.
- Removal
- Add the requirement for those with vicious animals to post signage on all access points on their property to alert the public to this potential danger.
- when they attack people and draw blood they are euthanized. such animals to be insured by owners to cover claims by victims of attacks.
- Very heavy fines. I mean \$2,500.00 and more for a first incident. People never take the small fines seriously so they have to "hurt" the pocket. Then mandatory dog training. If incident is repeated, consider putting dog down and not allowing the owners to own another pet. Pet registry?
- Swift and immediate action and investigation into the household. Possible intervention by FCSS where children live in the home with vicious dogs. Mandatory sterilization of all vicious dogs and vicious dog breeds. BIG fines/penalties for infractions involving vicious dogs - owners get charged.
- Don't just worry about the animal, look into the owner and if adequate care was being provided
- Do not engage any type of breed specific legislation (BSL).
That all animals are treated fairly and humanely; that euthanizing an animal is the absolute last resort.
- One strike rule.
- Timely investigation of animal attacks, and potential consequences for both owner AND animal.
- Thorough, objective investigation into the circumstances of the event to be put in front of the court for their consideration.
- Remove the animal triple the fine
- I think the City of Calgary should have more stringent requirements for ownership of vicious animals and require proof that owners are working with animals to improve their behaviour.
- DO NOT PUT DOWN AN ANIMAL OUT OF CONVENIENCE! ANIMALS SHOULD BE GIVEN EVERY CHANCE TO RECOVER AND CHANGE AS HUMANS SHOULD!
- Vicious animals should not be allowed within city limits.
- It's not fair to label a dog vicious for a bite on private property. dogs are territorial. Maybe require a beware of dog sign
- I would like to see breed bans in Calgary. I see no reason to allow big aggressive dogs to mingle with the public and put people at risk. In no particular order: Pit Bull, Fila Brasileiro, Doberman Pinscher, German Shepherd, Dogo Canario, Rottweiler,
- fines and maybe community service at S.P.C.A. for all offences by owners of vicious animals.
- To enforce fines and collection of expenses (damages and/or medical treatment required to animal or human) as a result of vicious animal attack.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I would prefer stricter guidelines.
- Deal with each case and not a breed specific mentality
- Imply they must take training and behavioural courses so these problems don't have a reoccurrence
-
- None.
- should be killed
- Once an animal is deemed vicious, it should be humanely euthanized.
- Have to be taken off the street or nobody learns a lesson
- If reported they deal with it
- after one offence, the second offence the animal should be put down
- Enforce the laws we have. Breed specific legislation should be avoided.
- Fair process in determining a vicious dog. Dogs are territorial by nature. Was the dog provoked or antagonized? I do not think a dog should be branded vicious if this is the case. Irresponsible owners with multiple unprovoked infractions (bites/attacks) dog should be euthanized.
- Stop putting "off leash areas" in the middle of popular walking paths. Off leash dogs parks should be separate ENCLOSED areas. Not randomly along a path that leashed dogs may be walking. A dog on leash meeting a dog off leash is commonly problematic.
- With any repeat violations, perhaps banning or limiting licenses at the same address as the repeat offender.
- 1) Re-do the bylaw to work in the real world. Not all animal bites are as cut and dried as the bylaw pretends they are.
- 2) Properly train bylaw officers to do an actual investigation. There is no proper investigations.
- 3) Train city lawyers to not use the bait and switch tactics they employ.
- Big fines for these animals getting lose.
- Euthanizing should not be an acceptable option.
- When an animal is seized the city needs to and has a legal obligation to ensure the animals health in their care. This does not always happen and the city should be held liable. Bylaw officers do not investigate properly as the bylaw as written, is a death sentence to an animal regardless of cause.
- Vicious animals should not be tolerated ... pickup and terminate ...
- Understanding of specific situations. Periodic monitoring to ensure rules are followed.
- Animals should be treated as humanely as possible. Otherwise, current regulations seem sufficient.
- I believe if an animal attacks a human or other domestic animal under its owner's control that it should be put down.
- The city should deem the owner responsible for the animal and if there is another incident, charge the owner with the crime.
- None. I think the laws are very reasonable.
- Provide a mandatory identification system for easy identification when animal is out in public such as brightly coloured tag so that persons and pet owners know to avoid the animal. Mandate corrective rehabilitation training of both owner and animal within defined period. Otherwise eliminate animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Confirmation of insurance
- Owner assessment for fitness to own the dog. Make sure that the owner is responsible for all aspects of dog ownership, physical, medical and safety of both the dog and people. Some people shouldn't own dogs - ban on dogs if owner is unfit. Home assessment for safety of public, yard security.
- Charge an extra annual fee as responding to these calls requires resources that cost \$. Mandatory training for dog and owner either indefinitely or recurring at owners expense. Muzzling and caging these dogs may provide control but it doesn't lend to a long term solution or quality of life for both.
- Don't allow them. One complaint should result in removal of the animal.
- They should be shot on site.
- As per the above I think the CoC should hand out fines to people who allow their dogs on others' private property.
- All dogs need to be leashed in public areas! I am sick and tired of dogs approaching me and my children in parks and at public gatherings, not being called back by their owners or warned off by us. Owner responsibility of dogs is sorely lacking!
- A fair and objective investigation process that excludes breed prejudice.
- I expect the City of Calgary to intervene and remove that vicious animal from the property and destroyed. The City already has problems with enforcing strict fines on owners who allow their dogs to bark persistently to disturb those around them. We need much stronger enforcement all around.
- Firm enforcement and zero tolerance, one strike rule. A bylaw that if an animal is declared a vicious animal that neighbors and local schools must be notified. In writing with photos of the animal.
- That one offense results in massive fines and the dog being put down immediately. That certain breeds be banned completely.
- The City of Calgary should more strongly enforce laws when animals deemed vicious are involved in an attack.
- More cooperation with owners of dogs deems aggressive to recognize that not all dog attacks are because a dog is aggressive. Working with the owner, their trainers, and veterinarians to provide support for a dog who has attacked can help facilitate more success and help prevent repeat incidents
- Repeat offenders should be euthanized
- The animal should be put down.
- The City should require additional, separate licensing to keep a vicious animal. The owner should be educated in their responsibilities and have the license/certification to prove it.
- If there is a pattern of vicious animals associated with specific individuals, their ability to own pets should be restricted.
- - Owners who demonstrate that they create vicious dogs (as in, several animals in series are deemed vicious) should be prohibited from having dogs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- understand that it is the owners responsibility to control and train the dog. Dogs don't become aggressive for no reason. Training to both the dog and owner is essential to avoid aggressive behaviours
- A dog deemed vicious should be put down. Calgary should consider banning dangerous breeds like pitbulls.
- Limit dogs for every one. No more than two.
- Limit
- all breeds are treated equally. a Vicious small dog is still vicious
- see 1
- That the city looks at the best interest of the dog
- Ban them
- Owners should be fined if they hurt anyone or other animals
- Too lenient. If a dog has a pattern of attack, it needs to be put down and the owner has to be punished.
- place responsibility on the owner for the pets behaviour and investigate if abuse is suspected.
- Vicious animals should be allowed to play with other similar animals, however, they should not be allowed to bully another animal.
- If the owner refuses to take responsibility and refuses to take training classes then the dog should be removed from the home.
- They should tighten regulations and vicious dogs should be put down. Immediately. The current rules are too lax. I love my dog, but I'm smart enough to put the safety of my family and community first.
- - Ability to conduct regular inspections of properties containing vicious animal(s)
- On first offences, their should be varying repercussions on the dog based on severity of the incident. i expect that re-offending dogs should be destroyed.
- Although it can be traumatic for a dog owner, there should be zero tolerance if there are further violations. Once a dog is deemed vicious, no mistakes should be tolerated. The potential consequences are too serious to be ignored.
- euthanasia
- Attend to cases in a timely manner.
- I expect vicious dogs to be removed and not returned to owners. those owners should be banned from having dogs. if it is possible to retrain the dog to be docile then maybe they could be adopted to new responsible owner but I think that would be rare and the dogs would have to be put down.
- Nothing regarding vicious animals but when letters are sent out to owners about their pets, more info on the letters is required. The letters sent are so vague, it's frustrating.
- It should be investigated. Should look at the owner to see whether they are not the problem. You have some owners who think they no how to handle dogs and they haven't a clue.
- See above. If your animal is declared vicious, it should be put down.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be more education about this, and encourage the safe use of muzzles for dogs whom people "aren't sure" about. Better safe than sorry!
- Continue strong enforcement and education
- I expect the City of Calgary to enforce leash laws for ALL dogs. It should not only be a priority for animals that have already been involved in a dangerous incident. My children are afraid to go to the park because SO MANY people allow their dogs to roam free near playgrounds.
- A willingness to make difficult decisions around surrender and euthanasia for vicious animals.
- I would prefer to see the owner be put down before the dog is touched.
- To NEVER put down a dog due to an aggressive behavior or violent act. Blame the owner, not the animal. Vicious dogs are able to be rehabilitated if their owner cares enough does proper training, or surrenders their dog to someone who has the skill to do it.
- Teach people and do outreach in the off leash parks. I see a lot of people who say their dogs are 'fine' but the dog's body language clearly says they are not fine. Teach owners to watch other owners with his/her dog to know what to look for to avoid situations where dogs become a problem.
- That the city doesn't allow vicious animals with anyone not providing specialized care
- Fine the owners. And better yet offer programs for owners to learn how to be good pet owners and rehab and training programs for owners to work with their vicious dogs.
- Manditory mussel law for vicious dogs walking or in yards.
- Expect to prohibit specific breeds, enforce bylaw & protect people
- I think that the City of Calgary does a good job.
- I would like the City to make frequent checks so that vicious animals are restrained properly. The City should also monitor off-leash parks and deal with dogs that are not under the owners' control. People often do not even have their dog in sight and are not cleaning up after it.
- The City needs to ensure that the owner of a vicious dog covers the vet costs of the injured animal. A fine is not adequate.
- None
- Enforcement
- Enforcement of proper help and rehab for the dog and owner(or shelter) before having it euthanized. I believe the owner should be 100% responsible and liable for an injuries
- Close monitoring and visits to these animals to ensure they are taken care of properly and are humanely treated.
- If thwir dog attacks someone they get heavily fined and pay any vet or hospital bills. Again punish the owner not the dog
- Vicious dogs should be euthanized for a second bite incident. No waivers!
- I think the city of Calgary currently does a good-ish job in dealing with vicious animals. I would like to see by-law officers receive more training in how to handle deemed vicious animals in a less aggressive manner and be trained in de-escalation if they aren't already.
- Ensure that the animal does not cause any future issues. Either physically or emotionally.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- One offence. Put them down. This is a safe city. We do not need guard or vicious dogs at all in the city. Go to the country on your own fenced land.
- Follow up with the animals progress, and vaccinations to ensure that no diseases are spread to other dogs and/or humans.
- Making sure that reviews of vicious dogs behaviours are being conducted by Bylaw Enforcement agents.
- Required participate in positive reinforcement training.
- None
- Continue to remove animals and consider not allowing owner to have animals in future.
- A second offence would mean surrendering the dog for rehab and then, hopefully, rehoming.
- Current policy works
- Owners should have to post a large sign at their front door to warn people of the dog. And a small sign posted on the lawn to warn kids going into the yard after a stray ball
- There is great potential to provide education and training to both the owners and dogs. Sometimes dogs are vicious because the owners are not aware of how to handle or train their dogs. Offering regular sessions and mandatory sessions after an incident occurs could be vital.
- That they step in, assess the animal and make recommendations for how it should be handled with the public interest in mind
- Must take their animal to training sessions to improve owners understanding and ability to control the animal. If they can not get control of vicious behavior within the year of the animal declared vicious, the animal should be removed from the owner possession and owner should not have any animals.
- Have pet training courses for pets and animals to take together to learn better socialization habits and ways of being.
- Faster court dates so dogs aren't stuck in the shelter for long periods of time. All dog must be sterilized.
- I don't always think putting the animal down should be the answer. A lot of the time, these aggressions can be caused by the owner and it would be better if the city could seize the animal and have someone work with the animal and try to find other options before euthanizing.
- If the person or animal is a repeat offender remove the animal and ban the person from owning another.
- I think COC does an excellent job given restraints. The dog parks we enjoy have a vibrant and dedicated audience so perhaps empowering them to report, follow up and be vigilant with increased marketing around reporting to authorities.
- Hold the owner responsible. Many animals that are vicious are the product of their owners and the way they were raised.
- To treat each case and animal as individual incidents and not paint a broad stroke by making bad assumptions.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education before euthanasia. Depending on severity of attack, two strikes before the dog is removed. Mandatory education. Minimum space requirement bylaw.
- Treat them fairly and acknowledge that when there are incidents, many times the human is at fault for putting them in a bad situation or failing to take precautions. These animals deserve a second chance and should be rehabilitated and placed into a home where they will be properly cared for.
- Not to euthanize if there are options to rehome
- Enforce the rules. Provide consequences such as: If non-compliance with the rules the vicious animal must be put down and the owner is forbidden to have another animal until a set period of time, maybe five years, and a training course is successfully passed.
- I would expect that if a dog is deemed vicious the city does regular checks on the dog and its owners unannounced to ensure they are not a danger.
- Regular check ins with a specialist to monitor the status of the dog. Not to punish the dog but I am a strong believer that dogs are a product of their upbringing and environment and it should be on the owners to try and rehabilitate the animal
- Vicious animals do not belong in urban settings as it is too easy for them to get loose and endanger the public.
- Take them from their owner and attempt to retrain them again. Then pass to a possibly better owner.
- I think before a dog is deemed viscous it is important to investigate the owners. Most times it is because of the owners dogs can be cross. This goes for ALL BREEDS, any dog can be cross, so with that in mind I believe that there shouldn't be labels on certain breeds of dogs
- The harness thing seems really weird. Harnesses give owners/handlers LESS control of their dogs. Harnesses were created to allow dogs to pull... comfortably. I could never see why you would want an animal with questionable behavior on a harness?
- Monitoring of animals designated as vicious
- The city should not be able to seize and euthanize a dog without first giving the owner and the dog a chance to rehabilitate. Dogs bite for a reason and training both dog and owner by an expert is key! Like I said - mandatory professional training by specific experts - not pet smart for example.
- Ensuring the owner of a vicious dog is caring for the dog properly not just adequately. Random checks on the address and accommodation of dog and owner and verification of continued training for owner and dog. Bad dogs are reflective of bad owners.
- Removal of the animal..fines to the owner
- Retraining the pet owner
- Be sure to communicate when dogs are removed from the city by court order. They just end up in other communities and cause issues. Ban certain breeds.
- I firmly believe that an animal with any history of vicious behaviour should be euthanized. There will never be enough enforcement of 'conditions', and not one more child should be maimed or killed because of irresponsible pet owners.
- Tighten the laws. Increase the fines. Make it so vicious animals first offense is mandatory training. With moderate fine. Second offense comes with a massive fine to pay or you put the animal down. Owners choice.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be harsher repercussions for owners of dogs who attack other dogs. We should be able to walk our dogs in public without being in fear of a vicious dog attacking our dogs.
- Vicious animals should not be allowed in the near proximity to schools or playgrounds as children are especially vulnerable. I support euthanizing animals that have bitten people.
- No large vicious dogs in condos.
- Be kind and empathetic. Some dogs have never had an incident and have just spent their lives loving everybody and everything. Then one day, when they are 12, something happens that no one understands. How can you work with the owners and the animal in a kind and appropriate way?
- As above, enforcement and regular monitoring of these animals. Rapid response & decision after incidents, but prevention is key - my daughter was jumped on & bitten by 6 or 7 unleashed, uncontrolled puppies when she was young - all of the above should be required of ANY dog owner BEFORE an incident
- Spot checks at the home to ensure the "rules" are being followed.
- Rehabilitation should be looked into before destroying them
- I am happy with the current bylaws.
- Have classes for the owner to enroll. Animals can improve with focus.
- No more euthanization of vicious dogs. We don't kill criminals for their misguided ways why are we still killing animals.
- Ban the chaining and isolation of dogs and the use of "industrial guard dogs" ... do not allow chaining and isolation of dogs and do not allow any business to keep dogs on their property to provide "security". It's 2020.
- Education, fines and termination.
- Put them down!
- Making sure they are in control
- I was recently attacked by a dog on leash that overpowered its owner. I filed a 311 complaint and was told the bylaw officer couldn't do anything because the dog was on leash. The dog I was walking was bitten. It seems ridiculous that nothing can be done when it wasn't controlled.
- Vicious animals should be taken away from their owners when the animal attacks a person or another animal.
- Follow-up with owners on any mandated management first from a support, second from an enforcement perspective. That context is considered; was an animal provoked? Or reported as a neighbour spat not an authentic concern? Can third-party assessments be done that remove the label when/if appropriate?
- If they're bad dogs, do as you need to do to eliminate the problem.
- Extreme fines for irresponsible dog owners, it's never the dog's fault, it's the owners.
- Actual support instead of shrugging off an event and the impacts of said event.
- Nothing.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Keep a detailed report of any and all offenses, including specific reasons as to why the animal lashed out. Was it their fault? Or was it provoked by a human? Many dogs are blamed unfairly for attacks when they were provoked and gave multiple warning signs. Finally, NO breed specific bans!
- Public posting of areas where vicious animals live (not specific addresses).
- They provide financial assistance where needed for owners to seek training or education on dog behaviour
- Should not single out any specific breed.
Add mandatory training with a licences trainer as a condition of ownership.
- None I can think of at this time.
- Vicious dogs should be assessed. If more than 2 incidences pet needs to be removed and if behavior continues euthanized.
- Those who attend off leash parks should understand how to approach dogs and how to read a dogs body language. Too many times I have seen people charge at dogs assuming every dog is friendly - this is inappropriate and the dog will be blamed. Respect of space is is the utmost importance.
- Do not racial profile certain breeds as vicious. It's the human that can teach a dog to be vicious.
- I believe it should be legally mandatory for owners of aggressive dogs to be assessed by a board certified veterinary behaviouralist to ensure that the dogs mental needs are being met and that the owners have the resources available to them to deal with these difficult animals.
- Try to rehabilitate and maybe rehome- euthanasia as a last resort.
- Fine the owner and remove the dog from the home. Zero tolerance.
- Is there any sort of appeal process if a dog has been involved in an incident and has since improved through training or behaviour management? I understand wanting to protect the public if a dog has harmed someone seriously but I also worry about how easy/difficult it is to have a dog deemed vicious
- None
- Guaranteeing that both the owner and the dog are good citizens
- The City of Calgary should limit the use of euthanization as the solution. Again, a “vicious” dog is usually a scared dog or a dog that has had a rough past and needs training. Owners who refuse to treat their pets properly & that includes investing in time/training should have to surrender the dog
- Perhaps proof of training when licensing
- Be cautious not to blame an innocent animal for the irresponsible actions of a human. Bans on animal ownership for people with repeated issues should be applied and enforced.
- Removing the animals from the owners.
- If the owners are found to be at fault for the dog the dog should be removed and put up for adoption with a responsible person. No bad dogs only bad owners.
- Making sure these dogs are in proper care of the owner.
- Regular audits the homeowner is following the proper procedures, euthanize vicious animals.
- The city should actually do something. We have a vicious dog on our street and the city did nothing when he attacked another dog and his owner.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Special mandatory registration of location where such animal is being kept, with an openly visible sign at location warning the public of possible hazard.
- The owners of these dogs need to be held more responsible. They seem to get off easy when their dog causes injury or damage.
- None that I can think of.
- Not all dogs are vicious and we shouldn't punish a dog for being themselves. Typically humans are the cause. We need to blame them. Stressing a dog out is counterproductive to dealing with vicious dogs. Why not make mandatory training for both owners and so called victims.
- I don't believe the above bylaws are enforced. We spend a lot of time at Southland and there are dust ups almost every day. I often tell people they have a dog that should not be at a public off leash park. Education, big signs and big fines.
- To hold people accountable to following the rules.
- Ensure that certified positive reinforcement trainers are being used.
- The owners should be required to be trained (at their cost) on how to care for their animal if they wish to keep it. Very often vicious dogs are the result of violence and poor ownership. It is not the animals fault usually. If they cannot be rehabilitated then the dog should be put down.
- The practice of seizing and isolating dogs who have been involved in serious incidents should be taken under advisement. While I respect the need to be mindful of safety, social isolation can be extremely detrimental to the behavioural well-being of a dog. In this day and age, we can do better
- be more proactive. there are an incredible amount of irresponsible dog owners that cause other dogs to react negatively. some sort of education campaign maybe i dunno
- There are different "levels" of injuries that are caused by dogs. Dogs that attack a human and 'cause puncture wounds with no provocation should be euthanized.
- Making sure dogs are treated fairly and not based on breed. Rehoming or training if possible before considering euthanasia in the event of an incident
- Certain breeds that have a tendency toward vicious behaviour should have to pay a higher licensing fee that could then go toward victims for medical care as well as bylaw enforcement.
- As above. Should help monitor dogs & behavioural assessment are good. Follow up on abuse, dog rings, training to attack (unless appropriate ie. police)
- Rehabilitation before death. All animals deserve a second chance. Sometimes it's not the dogs fault and is actually the environment they live in or were raised in. The dog can be rehabilitated through training and socialization in a controlled setting.
- fine owners appropriately and require owners to take training classes with their animals
- That they look into the animal's past behaviors and the behaviors of the owners before deciding what to do.
- fine people
- Education and providing resources for those living with vicious animals, nothing will change unless the owners are educated, it's not the fault of the animal themselves.
- Must be spayed

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Sterilization, euthanasia
- The City should not be able to decide what a 'vicious' animal is - how does the city know which animal is vicious? This cannot be determined by an umbrella ban on any specific type of dog (ie all pit bulls are vicious)
- I believe if info is given on vicious attack it be followed up and dog owner must be banned from dog parks
- Cats must have the same rights and responsibilities as dogs. Same rules.
- Enforce leash bylaws strictly. Require additional training for dog and handler where appropriate.
- Thank you for not responding out of fear by using euthanasia, instead looking for better options
- Dogs are reflection of ownership - remove them from poor owners and put them in the hands Of capable people that can train them
- I was bit by my friend's 123 pound giant breed dog who was after my 33 pound dog but I stepped in between them. I did not want to report this incident when I went for medical care for my injury. I don't think they need to get anymore involved as the two of us have been working together with pros.
- No other expectations.
- Better enforcement. implement a better solution to identify the animals. Right now if an owner is not nearby or doesn't choose to provide identification, it's virtually impossible to track them down. Instead of a license tag, vicious dogs should be required to have a scannable rfid
- There should be more monitoring and fining of calgarians who have their dogs offleash in an area that is not designated as offleash, regardless of dog behaviour. I am NOT supportive of any breed-specific legislation as it is not science-based.
- I expected, in both cases of attacks that the City Animal bylaws would have at the very least fined the owners, and had the owners take training to the satisfaction of the bylaws department to ensure this would never happen again. Instead there were no consequences for the owners in either case.
- None
- Understanding that vicious animals can be traumatized by little, bad-mannered dogs.
- STOP PUTTING THEM DOWN JERKS!! It's not their fault hold their Owners responsible and give them the needle and take the animal way rehabilitation is the key
- Vicious animals should be required to wear an identification of some sort so anyone in the vicinity knows of the designation - something similiar to a service animal harness.
- limit the number of vicious animals
- The owner of The vicious dog should be checked to ensure law is upheld.
- Vicious dog offenders must undergo training with their pet
- After a serious attack, because there is always a risk that a vicious dog will have another aggressive incident, the dog should be put down. The City is much too lenient on this subject.
- be
More educated as well.
- Fines and definite education on the use of muzzles



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I expect the city of Calgary to ALSO look into how people approach ALL animals. Many times, the issue is NOT a “viscous” dog. It is ignorant people not watching or controlling their own pets or allowing them to be off leash. Likewise, many people are not being mindful of their children around pets.
- If there are incidents involving harm to people, the animal should outright be removed as it has shown to be a danger to the community.
- A registered, public list of homes containing aggressive dogs. I’d check it before I bought a house next door or delivered something/picked up something purchased on a public site such as Craigslist.
- Actually investigate claims. False claims do happen. It is fraud to file a false report, yet you treat it as fact, and do not investigate further, just punish an innocent animal.
It is not only fraudulent but also animal abuse to file a false report against an animal and its owner.
- Fines. Make them steep. And have a process the owners must follow for training/rehabilitation.
- Euthanasia should be an absolute last resort, as this situation is usually the result of a bad owner/home situation. I feel many dogs can be brought under control with proper training and management.
- Put them down
- Following up with owners of vicious animals to ensure they’re following the law
- Need to implement higher penalties for owners that are not responsible, protect children and people from these animals better
- Seizure, evaluation of animal, and euthanasia if determined to be vicious. Owners who do not cooperate should be fined and forbidden from owning animals in the future.
- Here I have huge expectations. Deal with the animals--AND the owners--as forcefully as possible.
- Hold owners responsible...not always punishing the dog
- Confiscate them, fine owners and ban animal ownership.
- Is the dog actually vicious. This should not be a term given by anyone but animal behavioural specialists and should be mandatory to bring the dogs for training with a professional. Half your “vicious” animals are just the results of people not respecting the animals.
- Keep track and complete random checks
- To ensure they safety of the public by making sure this animal is not going to reoffend
- I think that the city should implement a law that all vicious dogs be mandated to attend behaviour classes to correct any issues
- No other expectations
- None
- Safety of public first. Bylaw officer to determine if animal might be hostile and risk to public. Dog to be held in kennel at owners expense until determined by court in redonable timeline. Attacks by dogs on individuals showing jostile intent to other people or priv property, as determined exempt
- I would like to see the City having more enforcement levers to use. In particular levers that allow the city to impose immediate sanctions on owners, not just the animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Special license numbers that must be displayed on dog so it can be identified if it attacks and then runs away / owner removes it without exchanging information
- Owner should be required to have a separate license to own a vicious animal. If multiple offences occur, mandatory training is required.
- Fines and mandatory training
- Keep up the good work.
- Outlawing viscous dogs, guard dogs. Dog breeders. People who have viscous dogs should be reported& fined based on length of time their dog was viscous. Higher fines for dog owners whos dogs have caused distress or harm and forced training sessions.
- None
- The city should provide options to owners of vicious dogs so that they may keep their dog in the family. They should not be forced to euthanize. An exception is if the owner has been cruel to the dog, then it should be seized and rehomed or euthanized if no option is available for rehoming.
- Any vicious animal needs to be dealt with as soon as possible. First strike, your out. Sorry harse. Why wait for a second occurance?
- To hold the owners accountable. It's often not the dog's fault but due to poor ownership.
- I would hope that any cases of vicious dogs are fully investigated before a decision is made to put down the dog, which I think should be the last resort and only done if the dog was not provoked and if relocating the dog to a new home would not help it.
- Ensure that each animal is given a fair trial/both sides of the situation are considered and analyzed. Animals have natural instincts and in certain situations, will act on them when provoked. In unprovoked instances/severe cases (the animal poses a threat to public safety) restrict pet freedoms.
- 2nd striike and the animal is euthanized.
- Offer free dog training courses so that people may have the opportunity to raise responsible pets who know the difference between right and wrong and know not to bite.
- Taking calls more seriously.
My landlord made a call about the vicious dog at large that is unregistered at our place and nothing can be done unless he attacks us or we actually catch him in the act of killing another cat.
- harsh punishment if expectations aren't followed
- Take little dog attacks and even bad behaviour seriously.
- I expect people who are walking in on leash areas with their pets off leash to be fined as it puts vicious dogs on leash in a dangerous situation.
- N/a
- None, leave dogs alone
- Don't force them to put it down except in severe circumstances
- The owners of Vicious animals should be dealt with meaningfully.
- Enforce breed training before licence granted
- Stronger and more active enforcement.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Complete a full investigation and do not pass judgement until objective evidence is given. Provide resources for rehabilitation for such declared animals.
- Having mandatory training buy a reputable dog trainer
- Depending on the offense they should be put down. Vicious animals should not be in public, period.
- na
- Maybe have a coloured collar or leash that allows people to see from afar that the owners doesn't want their dog interacting due to behavioural issues. Usually it's the owners fault dogs become aggressive by not walking them or letting them off leash to terrorise other dogs or people walking.
- Safety
- I think if you provided breed education and made behavioural classes available for dogs that could be more "problematic" and also affirming that smaller dogs need behavioural training too, as i've seen aggressive small dogs instigate problems with larger dogs and only the larger dog is blamed.
- Less chances/strikes, after one unprovoked attack/serious bite should be automatically deemed vicious and owner can seek to remove the vicious title through court vs using court to fight for the vicious title.
- None
- Required training with the dog and owner to be completed. These current expectations feel like incarceration instead of rehabilitation. Fix the problem of reactivity. Don't hide it away and expect it won't happen again.
- When an animal attacks any individual /or another animal they should be put down. By attack I mean an animal bites a perfect stranger or goes after a person's dog while anywhere in public. If ones dog tends to snarl/growl at strangers then muzzle it for everyone's safety. Responsible ownership!!!
- Same as above!
- The City of CALGARY does not have the resources to even begin to address the issue. There needs to be a MASSIVE reset in the HUMAN psyche, not just regarding animals. People pay 'trainers' (aka 'know nothings' HUGE money to 'make the dog behave nicely'. \$1800 to a guy who 'watched ALL the Cesar vids
- Make sure after investigating what made the dog be vicious? Again, it's not the animal,s fault it's the owners responsibility they should go thru proper training
- I presume the City has a professional animal behaviourist assess the dog.
- Hopefully when reported they are able to locate, unfortunately in my case too many dogs matching the description so the dog wasn't found. Not sure they could do more.
- Certain breeds of dog should be made illegal, ie: pitbull. The statistics clearly show a relationship between these animals and violent attacks. The argument of whether it is the fault of the dogs or their owners is ultimately irrelevant, as the result is the same.
- It would be nice to provide rehabilitation for the dogs that can be rehabilitated. Death should be a last resort.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Pet ownership must be redefined in law as pet guardianship. Pets must be redefined in law as sentient beings not property. All pet management legislation needs to be defined in terms of guardianship. Rehabilitate the pet and punish the guardian in vicious situations.
- Capture, and don't release until the owner has had training.
- We have been attacked with our 30pound dog multiple times, on-leash and off-leash at the park. It's too easy for people to have dogs and have them be ill-behaved. Almost like off-leash parks need to be swipe access and those deemed vicious/charged can't enter. Also 100words is a silly limit.
- Follow up with owners
- Address the training of the animal and the quality of training the owner provides. If the owner cannot provide training to control his/her pet, That pet shouldn't belong to them
- That they are attempted to be rehabilitated and taken from the owner
- Non breed specific rules because any dog can be vicious if not treated well. Fair trial of animal in an incident - wave penalties/sentences if animal is provoked
- This is a waste of money. Everyone involved. Not taking being human seriously
- I think the above stuff I read seems appropriate minus the additions I added above. Animals are animals and people need to never forget that they can get vicious at times for many reasons
- There need to be officers in the park during peak hours or a phone to call and report them. Or even security cameras! So many dog attacks in dog parks.
- There should be further investigation as to why the animal became or is vicious. Is it due to the owners or the environment the animal resides, or an unusual situation that escalated and caused the animal to attack. Most of these situations are caused by humans not the pet.
- Limit / restrict ownership of certain potentially vicious breeds of dogs
- I have concerns regarding an aggressive dog being outside and barking excessively and feel there should be noise requirements for dogs to be outdoors. Having a dog barking aggressively though a fence does not help someone feel safe.
- the owners and animals must be tracked and harsher punishments must occur.
- I think there should be better investigations. Not just "he said, she said". I once was wrongly accused & forced to take the fine and a record. I had an alibi from work and volunteered for bylaw's to come and meet my dog- they were hesitant and frankly didn't care since a fine was already set.
- Let's be very strict about enforcing whatever bylaws are in place or about to be put in place.
- If there are complaints without injuries being incurred then mandatory training should be required. If injuries occur then it becomes a legal matter.
- monitoring of the owner for a set time frame to ensure that the requirements placed on them/their animal are met.
- If there is a serious incident, the animal should be _immediately euthanized_. There should be zero tolerance for vicious animals. Why are we so weak about this?
Dangerous breeds (pitbulls etc) should be _banned_ in Calgary.
- Higher fines for owners that fail to meet all requirements. Owners are the problem not the animals.
- To take possession of and humanely put to sleep dogs that cannot be retrained.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Fine the owner and ensure the owner pays to euthanize the animal. Sentence the owner to volunteer at an animal shelter for 80 hours too.
- Owners should take some ownership of the dogs actions. Training is part of the problem often
- Visit the dog parks during busy times, 4pm week nights. Most dog owners don't have control of their dog.
- Provide programs/training for owners of vicious breeds paid for through licensing and fees paid by the owners of vicious breeds.
- Be reasonable and fair.
- If it's maimed or killed another pet or person it should be put down. Exception is for an animal proven to have acted in self defence.
- I think what you have in place is pretty reasonable
- I feel that even if a dog has not attacked...yet repeatedly shown aggressive behaviour...the city should assess. Why wait until someone has been mauled!?
- Better leash enforcement laws to deal with the owners who don't care about their dogs behavior knowing there aren't any repercussions or consequences that are worth taking notice of. Maybe hefty fines would better keep communities safe from dog attacks or being chased. The victim right now suffers.
- I think the owner and home should be investigated to try and uncover why the dog has become vicious. I don't think the dog should be returned to the owner until a full investigation and an answer if found. We shouldn't have vicious dogs in urban centres, or anywhere for that matter, at all.
- The City should consider banning certain breeds of animals that tend to be vicious in nature or make the owner take training and have insurance if they want to own a vicious breed.
- Heavy fines if there is an incident and exponential more if there is a repeat offense.
- This is the owners responsible, the only thing the city needs to do is advise the owner of complaints and perhaps provide them with information on how to resolve behaviour issues.
- Again, it is responsible pet ownership. Licensed and chipped dogs (and cats) should have serious consequences and fines, if they are not able to control their dog.
- I think the city is doing the best it can. Short of requiring all dogs to be muzzled when in public I'm not sure what else can be done. This is common practice in many European countries. The muzzle is seen as a tool, not a punishment
- If someone calls for help actually show up within minutes not 2 weeks later. They need to actually answer the calls and do their job
- Owner training expectations
- Vicious animals should be seized, homeowners find, and the owner forced to go to a training course the city should offer and the animals should not be left outside unattended they should be put in side or in a proper enclosure in the yard where they cannot escape
- Put on city run class
- None
- Penalty should be much higher for dogs who attack. By the way I am a dog owner and dog lover



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Larger fines, pet ownership restrictions and jail time that actually deter poor pet ownership. I believe this will require more resources and partnership with the Provincial Government to update laws.
- I think there should be more investigation into what provokes animals to bite/attack. I think large breeds are often mislabeled vicious and punished for reacting as animals do in stressful situations.
- Education for bylaw officers on dog behaviour and body language.
- More public education on identify and approaching potentially vicious animals.
- None.
- Require owners to receive education on managing both the triggers and needs of high risk animals. Encourage owners to work with qualified trainers on risk reduction strategies.
- Perhaps a way for a dog to have their "vicious dog" label pardoned, following training and improved behaviour - tester by a trainer. Not all dog bit situations are genuinely "vicious".
- Destroy them. I know it sounds harsh, but I'm trying to think how I'd feel if my daughter was maimed or killed by an animal that had already done something bad enough to come to the court's attention.
- None
- Make them accountable for their actions
Increase. Fines for non compliance monitoring to ensure safety
- Maybe have a repetitive behaviour clause; issue 1 - assessment of the dog and training for the owner (both at the owners expense) - this would then result in a decision tree type structure as to how to proceed next. Issue 2 - more training. Issue 3 - fine the owner and possible seize the pet.
- Surprise Follow up checks to ensure they are following the rules.
- I would like to see more education out there about vicious dogs and what it means to be vicious and how to deal with the dogs and owners and how to coexist with them
- More strict. One chance, I've had enough of my small dogs hurt by bigger dogs. A lifetime ban on dog ownership if their dog injures another animal (dog, cat, child, etc)
- The city needs to formalize what they mean by "vicious". Reactivity in dogs and vicious behaviour in dogs are not the same thing and do not come from the same place. Additionally, the city needs to ensure that owners with "friendly" dogs are keeping them under control. Problems are very avoidable.
- Not allowing vicious animals in public areas. These animals are highly unpredictable and should never be allowed in public areas.
- The City should ensure actions are taken to mediate the aggression in the dog, by requiring the owner and dog to attend classes and if this cannot be done then the dog should be removed from the home.
- I believe more training needs to be put in place, when a dog is under distress after an incident - being collected by strangers and put under a stress test - most dogs will likely fail. I also believe if the dog has more than one incident, the owner needs to be held responsible in a more serious way
- Ensure the owner is actually able to control the dog even if over the age of 18. A 110 lb person can not control a large aggressive dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Policing the care of animals deemed vicious. If it's merely ignorance on the part of otherwise caring owners, mandated socialization/training should be issued. If it appears to do with abuse, neglect, or dog-fighting, the animals should be confiscated and the owners charged and fined.
- Could the city provide at a discounted rate training classes at the humane society?
- Just prompt response to complaints.
- Remove from owner and assess for the likelihood of a re-occurrence/attack
- Owners who let dogs escape knowing they are vicious should be fined
- Ensuring that it is not a one off situation caused by an external factor.
- Fines for the owners, opportunities for rehabilitation and training programs, confiscation after multiple offences
- No breed profiling should ever be undertaken or considered
- Mandate dog training and or offer it low cost/affordable to allow owners to take advantage and try reshape the behavior.
- Accessible, affordable training/behavior intervention. Well-natured dogs with responsible owners can easily pick up violent behaviors. It is heartbreaking for an owner to go through this. SUPPORT not PUNISHMENT
- Zero tolerance for violation of the guidelines and more regulation with people taking these kinds of animals on public property
- Following up after an incident
- To offer training, either through the humane society or through an alternate program. I feel that the city does a good job with vicious animals following an incident.
- I have retired racing greyhounds, high prey drives. I They chase the roaming cats that come in my yard. I expect the city of calgary to stop setting my dogs up for failure and make it illegal for my neighbours to have their cats outside off leash. My dogs don't chase other dogs or people. Just cats
- The city must get involved.
- You dont do anything now about dogs off leash in leashed areas or dogs being attacked in leashed areas by unleashed dogs. More laws do nothing if basics aren't enforced and the people violating are fully aware they will never be charged
- Take every case individually and look at the owners responsibility
- Vicious animals should be prohibited.
- There must be follow up if the animal is returned to the owner to ensure restrictions are being followed
- Dogs that are reacting out of self defense due to being hurt, injured, or provoked by humans such as when kicked, stepped on, ran into, should be exempt from a vicious designation.
- The City should offer the availability of keeping an animal for assessment within the home. The conditions in which seized dogs are kept is inappropriate for testing to occur.
- If an assessment returns where a dog is found to have no aggressive qualities the city of calgary should not be able to request a vicious designation. Animal behaviour experts should review what conditions from the bylaw are appropriate for a particular dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Give concealed carry permits to those feeling endangered when walking past one's kennel!
- I think the City of Calgary has been responsible as I have understood in dealing with vicious animals.
- If an animal attacks, and is deemed vicious, they should be taken away from their owners. 9 times out of 10, it's the owners fault that it has become this way (or taught).
- Policy should be dogs with behaviour issues should be muzzled and on leash, not allowed in off leash areas and be with adult 18 and older. After one incident, owner must prove they and their dog have completed a dog behavioural class of x number of hours before they can go out in public with muzzle.
- Supply training courses
- This seems to cover the necessities.
- BYLAW OFFICERS PRESENT AT OFF LEASH AREAS. FIRST WARNING TICKET OF A LARGE AMOUNT, NO SECOND WARNING, IF ANOTHER INCIDENT HAPPENS THE DOG IS PUT DOWN. TIRED OF INNOCENT PEOPLE AND THIER WELL BEHAVED PETS GETTING HURT, USUALLY BY A DOG OWNER WHO IS IRRESPONSIBLE AND WILL NOT PAY HEALTH CARE BILL
- If dogs are aggressive toward or attacking other animals and /or people they have no business in the city.
- Stop being nice
- To ensure animals who addre repeatedly violent are not released back to a home that cannot control them.
- again no vicious animals should be excepted in Calgary city limits. no excuses. granted they had to learn that behavior from humans in the first place. But inhumane to have them continue to live with out rehabilitation by experts who know when it possible and when a better decision should be made
- Put a sign in the window and on the lawn of the residence where the biting dog lives to remind others that it is not okay and also a public shaming
- hold owner legally accountable for further attacks/injuries caused by dogs, remove animal from owner after multiple vicious incidents
- Having had a situation. The City was completely heartless in how it dealt with the situation. I would like to see the City show compassion, nobody wants their animal to hurt someone. Don't rip it from family and out it in a disgusting cold hole, then cut its loving family out. Let them choose vet
- Same as above
- Very high fines for any infractions. Euthanasia for a repeat offender.
- No chances - hurt anyone or thing - euthanasia. Vicious animals always caged or chained up, even when outdoors because fences do not always stop them from escaping. No vicious animals should be allowed period, but if deemed some sort of breed then I am guessing we are calling it vicious.
- I'd like to see the City enforce mandatory training for vicious animals and their owners to reduce the risk of the animal attacking anyone again.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not to jump the gun and declare dogs “vicious” after only 1 or 2 attacks. Look at the circumstances. Also, the City of Calgary shouldn’t be profiting off of handing out vicious dog tickets.
- Raid the drug houses and take fighting dogs and dogs trained to be vicious for drug house protection from other dealers away.
- I think the city had the right depending on the situation to take the animal.. but the city never disciplines the owner and takes it out on the dog
- There are not vicious dogs, there are vicious owners who traumatize the animals to make them vicious, and antisocial. Those owners should be heavily penalized and deprived of the privilege of having the pets in the future.
- Heavy fines for vicious animals involved in an attack.
- Ensuring all dogs are evaluated and with the owner/families. Segregated they cannot be themselves and behavioural problems often stem from the owners themselves.
- Vicious animals should be destroyed and not returned to their owners.
- High fines. Ban pitbulls
- Issues and charges need to be addressed quickly.
- Automatic euthanasia in the event of pack attack, roaming uncontrolled (escape from property) attack, and fines for owners
- Follow up. A friend has a dog deemed vicious and given instructions: muzzled off their property, on leash only (no off leash parks) and attend training for vicious dogs at humane society. They NEVER took classes, continued to take the dog to off leash park early in the morning, no muzzle.
- Require euthanasia (of dog) in event of attack
- Provide a program for owners that provides them with behavioral support from a professional
- second vicious attack offence, destroy the animal. I'm not a vet, but castration after the first offence might be effective.
- Remove after first occurrence without muzzle
- Once a vicious animal is identified through whatever means the city uses for such determination the animal is then required to be removed from the city
- The current regulations sound reasonable, perhaps a mandatory red leash - or marker to identify dogs in public that have been deemed "vicious animals" as a warning to other users and pet owners.
I am mostly concerned that the vicious label is properly used and dogs tested/identified.
- The animal should be assessed by an animal behaviorist. A lot of these so called aggressive dogs have been raised by aggressive humans and sometimes have been provoked by another human. Fine the owners and if possible rehab the animal, don't put it down.
- Have a certified animal behaviourist have input as to the required training for both dog and guardian.
- As above



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I expect the City to work with the Humane Society to determine if this is truly a dog problem, or if this is an owner problem. If the owner isn't a responsible pet owner,, the dog should be removed, rehabilitated and adopted out to someone who will take care of them properly.
- Not allowed at off leash areas, regardless of whether dog is leashed\muzzled.
Some sort of "3-strike"-like rule for repeat offenders.
Some sort of check-in process for owners of vicious dogs w/ authorities. If deemed vicious, maybe an every 6-month check in to assess owner actions, dog behavior
- Unsure, each case would be unique
- Better enforcement. An impossove task. At off leash park we go to there is a dog with a muzzle and owner lets it attack anything close and justifies it by saying her dog can not bite it just sounds bad
- Deal with them firmly and keep our community safe.
- Having owners tracked, if they happen to have multiple vicious dogs they should not be allowed to own any
- Honestly they should be put down. Sometimes you cannot train out poor genetics.
- following up with these animals.
I DO NOT support a breed ban
- They should do proper testing on the dog both temperament ,and medical as they can both be an issue. Also the situation of aggression should be taken into account. If a dog is protecting its enclosed living space or if it attacks an animal at large while in its own yard etc
- None, as above.
- Innocent until proven guilty... but if they harm a human, don't take a chance on the owner following the rules. Put the poor dog down.
- I expect that vicious animals that are not properly controlled, will be seized by the city and destroyed if necessary.
- controlling more
- Have them put down
Do not allow on public property at all.
- Should be put down
- Harsher punishments to owners. They get a slap on the wrist if their dog does domething harmful to other dogs when they shouldnt have been out in the first place.
- Animals should never be euthanized . It's humans, not animals. Repeated offenders should be forced to surrender the animal and it needs to be rehomed, and humans not allowed to own another, unless there is a legit reason why it wasn't animal's or owner's fault
- **ABSOLUTELY NO BREED BAN!**
- I would like to see access to mediation for neighbors who are in a dispute regarding animals.
- None
- They should be required to take a training session with expert dog handlers (ex. at the humane society), to help rehabilitate the dog, or increase the dogs quality of life in a manner safe for all involved, while following the above listed rules. This should be provided at low to no cost to them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be more consequences to the owners for not properly training and caring for their dog. A dog's poor behaviour is a reflection of a neglectful owner. There should be fines and consequences for the owner. Harsher punishments for back yard breeders and animal neglect/abuse.
- Assuming a class was taken (as mentioned above in #1), there should be some follow-up to ensure that what was taught, is being put to practice and that the human is working with the dog, to better the dog and the situation. If someone is going to have a pet, they need to put in the work.
- Quick response to reported vicious animal attacks.
- depending on the degree of the animal, I feel they should be assessed by a professional to determine if they are containable and safe to be around others or if they are too much of a risk and need to be put down
- Public Education and Information on animal behaviour so that people recognize different animals body language and how to properly/safely approach and handle animal. Also so that people learn when an animal is telling them to back off that people listen.
- More follow up would be wonderful.
- Proper assessment from all parties to assess if the animal was triggered, abused, has health issues that could lead to their aggression etc.
- I expect and urge the City to reassess what they consider to be a 'viscous' animal! If a dog shows that it is responsive to positive training and socialization to overcome problematic behaviour, rehabilitation is the answer. I'd urge the City to rely on the expertise of animal behaviour experts
- Train and not kill. Most dogs are able to learn and change. Remove the animal from the home if their behaviour is due to abuse or circumstance.
- In all possible cases I would expect that the decision to deem a dog is vicious would be determined by a educated behavioral specialist and unless requested by the owner allowed to live.
- Giving as much benefit as possible to owner. Ensuring there is no bias in review if animal is considered to be put down. Ensure ALL other options are exhausted before euthanasia.
- The city needs to keep better track of vicious animals to ensure owners follow-through with conditions and remain committed to rehabilitating the dog. If owners don't have the capacity or desire to work with the dog and it remains a danger, the city should intervene to prevent additional incidents.
- Education for owners (especially owners with small children) and the general public. Make sure someone who is adopting a dog is matched up with the right breed. Children should not be left alone with a dog the parents are not familiar with.
- follow up on vicious dog owners if they are not in compliance the dog should be removed from the owner assessed to see if it is possible to control the dog and if not then put down.
- **NO BREED SPECIFIC LAWS**
- More and better patrolling. I have NEVER seen a bylaw officer up on Nose Hill in all the times I have been there. I have had a dog run at me many times. I have no way of knowing if they are vicious or not; I just don't want ANY dog running at me. Bylaws without patrols are useless.
- Ban fighting dog breeds



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not just pointing fingers at the dog. Unfortunately a lot of incidents are situational. If you seize and possibly euthanize a dog, are you teaching the owner anything?! Education is SO important and I think it's very undermined when it comes to "vicious" animals.
- An animal that has been found not under control should be not allowed to be off leash in public. Shouldn't need the vicious experience to add additional controls on them.
- They should be able to apprehend if any of the criteria is not met.
- Rehabilitation
- They should have to go through, and pass, mandatory obedience training, paid for by the animals owners. Though in general I do not think that vicious animals should be allowed as pets.
- They can provide information to the owner for classes to correct the animals behaviour.
- None.
- Animals are not vicious by nature. They learn it from their humans. If a dog attacks, yes it should be kept under closer watch but as should the owners.
- that they be euthanize and the owner banned from owning pets for at least a year
- Provide a higher fine for no compliance of the licensing agreement.
- Removal of the animal from irresponsible owner, allow adoption to rescue groups, proven adopters when possible
- Do more to ensure safety of people and pets. Not sure a dog deserves a second chance.
- I couldn't believe it when a dog had hurt several children on my street and I finally got it contained in my yard, and then it took an officer over an hour to come get it. I have a short fence and didn't want to risk leaving it to escape and injure more kids. More decisive action should be mandated.
- Required training and certification that they are responsible to own a "vicious" animal!
- If a dog attacks unprovoked once, circumstances should be reviewed and pet monitored and dealt with accordingly.
If it attacks unprovoked again it should be put down as it cannot be trusted.
- Education
- Provide training opportunities to rehabilitate the animals.
- More positive info on different breeds. Ie the Pitt bulls and rottwilers. More info on the general public how to handle being around dogs in public. Especially kids..
- I would recommend mandatory dog training for an owner and vicious dog, or potential rehoming to a well trained owner. **NEVER SHOULD AN ANIMAL BE PUT TO DEATH AS IT CAN BE WORKED ON WITH PROFESSIONAL TRAINING**
- More support for owners of vicious animals. Their pet does need to be exercised too. Create some off-leash fenced off areas that can be booked (google "My Walkies"). Reassess validity of viciousness after a while - eg. was it a wrong time/wrong place event when the pup was young and is now trained?
- Owners of any breed considered or appear to be vicious should have to take that dog to training
- None



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Provide resources to owners. ensure the animal in question is not reviewed or tested in stressful unfair, unfamiliar circumstances.
- Euthanized
- For repeat offenders, vicious dogs should be confiscated for reforming if possible in the case of abusive owners especially.
- Licensing of vicious animals. And city checking that rules are being obeyed?
- If the animal has done serious injury, I expect them to be put down, not rehomed or put under the restrictions stated above. It should be a fairly quick process.
- Investigation and understanding of the circumstances- I.e. was the dog provoked, injured, did the person not listen to the owner's instructions
- Helping owners manage behaviors/behavioral training. Enforcing law of dog being leashed - for walks, in front yard, in parks, running free next to bikes or skateboards. Educating the public about space and respect needed with anxious/reactive dogs. Teaching common sense of not coming up from back
- Any animal that has been commercially imported needs to have a special licence in case that animal is lost or abandoned
- Before putting an animal down, work with him/her! It won't take a week or two, it may be more or less...give the animal a chance! He/she may have been abused, had lack of training, been in several homes...find out their history. If you can't, call in a professional first!!!!
- - mediation group
 - dogs are property, treat them as property
 - other party - what they did should be consistent -> bylaw
- Educate bylaw officers
 - off leash dogs should be at fault when attacking on leash dogs
 - Definitions of care and control
 - Level of discretion
 - Normal for a dog to bark at someone
 - Review what should be for a charge based on normal dog behaviour
 - Any incidents should be reviewed
 - should be an investigation
 - spaying dogs before it goes to courts
 - was breeding
- - Teach people how to get built in muzzles. Muzzles are important, but only give you a bit more time.
 - More education
 - How get message out
 - fill something out when getting license applications
 - tool serves as education as well
 - link to more info
 - More enforcement especially at off leash areas
 - communicate that dogs must be leashed going into an off leash area



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- More tickets
- Tiered offense - ie. 1st ticket \$25 then increases
- people know the rules, but don't care if not enforced
- construction areas double the fine
- pay for enforcement through tickets
- Enforcement slaps laziness
- Different beliefs of professionals and pet people
- target education to different groups
- Dog walkers have developed skills - if dog limit is brought down, won't be worth it, so uneducated people would be the ones walking dogs
- - Education about dog behaviour
- Mediation group instead of going straight to enforcement
- Rights for people to protect themselves
- I think the city is doing an adequate job
- If the dog is very dangerous, do not allow it to interact with the public
- Provide proper warning at the property for visitors
- If dog has any previous experiences in violence, they should not be allowed outside on public property
- Rehabilitation & treat them with care because they don't know any better
- - Inform the public of any vicious animals
- Vicious dogs living with young children any rules around that?
- The city should enforce the bylaws strictly.
- Stiffer penalties and removal of dog for owners that do not follow the rules. Dog should go to a shelter that can try to see if behaviors can be alleviated.
- That the city revisit their vicious status yearly.
- Prioritize public harm over irresponsible ownership. Protect people and non aggressive pets. Owners with previous issues should pay more.
- Education to dog owners of "my dog is fine" people who walk their dogs off leash in non off leash areas. They're just as much at fault for not controlling their dogs.
- Again, not the animals. Deal with the humans that are not equipped to have an animal they cannot protect others from.
- To work with certified behaviourists to determine if this really is a vicious dog or if there was a justifiable reason (based on scientifically known dog behaviour) for the attack and to aid in rehabilitation and management. Is the dog in the right home.
- There are too many warnings to the owners of vicious dogs. After the first incident(attack) the dog should be removed & owner fined. Our dog was attacked by 2 dogs & no consequences for the owners.
- none
- Second offence dog is removed from owner.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Put down animals that have owners who do not comply to court orders.
- -Required to be involved in a recovery program to assist in behavior correction.
- -removal of the animal for non-compliance/repeat offender
- -euthanasia for dangerous animals.
- -Prohibiting owning of animals to persons who have past reported animal abuse (making it illegal)
- Harsher penalties for the humans, more crack down on untrained small breeds, more leniency for so called 'vicious breeds' - a trained rottie, doberman, pitbull or german shepard is less of a danger than an under stimulated siberian husky or an un-trained toy poodle, bichon frise, or shit tzu dog
- Investigate all incidences and respond appropriately to victims
- Assessment of incident leading up to the attack. Was the dog being pestered or abused by attackee. Consider allowing re-assessment of the animals aggressive tendencies after a period of time. Assess owners to see if the dog could live without restrictions in a more appropriate home.
- To trap and hold vicious animals, and to euthanize if necessary.
- Dogs should be removed from the home and provide proper training. Owners need to go to "how to treat/raise a non-violent pet" before being allowed to own again.
- Prohibit vicious animals on public property in Calgary.
- Do not ban specific breeds: We are terrible at identifying mixed breeds so all med to large mixed breeds are then killed.
- Education and training to see if the animal responds. If not, the animal should be euthanized.
- Ensure compliance
- Enforcement of the rules when reported / maintain a list of viscous animals. Removal of animals from owners who are not willing to / able to follow the rules.
- None
- Helping owners find resources to help, educate and keep everyone safe. Respecting the dogs space is important and should be considered if bylaw is required to visit or check on a dog labeled as aggressive.
- I feel that rescue societies should not be bringing in dogs from out of province . I have nothing against pit bulls etc .except if they have a bad background you can not change that ,at least not most people
- Coordinate with animal welfare orgs and dog behavioural specialists. Recognize that BIG DOGS get a bad rep, even when small dogs like chihuahuas also have terrible behaviour and often instigate problems, but it's generally the big dogs that take the blame.
- Do not blame the dog or animal. it is the owners that are responsible. More attempts should be made to rehabilitate the animal after an incident
- Any dealings with these animals is done humanely and that the owner takes full responsibility. Second chances (not with the same owner) should always be tried with the help of a trainer.
- More follow up. Euthanize 'repeat offenders'
- ban and remove them from city
- Education for the dog owners. Often it is poor treatment of the dog by the humans.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I would like to see training mandated, with a qualified Behavior consultant. Education to help prevent dogs from developing these issues would also be very helpful
- there is a stigma when it comes to dogs. the most cases that we hear about seem to be spun in favor ratings and such things like that. i think a real investigation should be done by bylaw that's not bias towards the "victim". and animals should be given equal right as humans we live in shared space
- That any incidents are dealt with appropriately - the owner should be charged if the public is injured as a result.
- Promoting programs (preferably affordable) that educate people on how to properly socialize to avoid reactivity as much as possible and how to manage it if it does arise
- A more proactive approach to identify high risk breeds and stronger controls around them. i.e. required liability insurance, required dog training and restrictions from high use parks.
- Give the opportunity for the animal to have the vicious animal label removed with the appropriate training and review of their behavior. Removal of animals from unsuitable/unfit owners (only in extreme cases, like dogfighting, etc.)
- Enforce removal of known vicious animals.
- It is more the owner then the pet. Most dog owners are good and reasonable to take care. Those that don't should have to take classes and if they can not control their pet take them away and ban them from owning another animal for a period of time or never.
- There can be no leniency with a vicious animal (it should be put down). Fines must be significant to deter owners from even owning a vicious pet.
- Don't see it as a cash cow and jump on the owner with a huge fine the first time, maybe there should be a programme they should attend or a test they should take to see if they understand the implications of owning a dog that is vicious, maybe they have to take out an insurance policy to protect vic
- Mandatory obedience training for owners and their dogs.
- I expect that the city should act immediately and take possession of pets that have been in an altercation with a person or their owner. And NOT leave it up to the owner! Several times I've been in a situation where my family or myself have had trouble getting support to deal with a dangerous dog.
- There should be more proper analysis of whether an animal is "vicious" or not. Putting animals in a strange new place, such as the pound, and then "testing" the animal by waving sticks and approaching it while eating is not a good measure of whether a dog is "vicious" or not. Have actual experts.
- Animal control needs to be very involved. As I have said before there is usually a human reason for a dog becoming viscous.
- Vicious animals should be put down, and owners should not be permitted to continue to maintain the animals in their home. IF the animal has been deemed to be dangerous and has caused harm then there is a very high chance this will continue to happen. People should be able to feel safe.
- Put them down



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That the owners are actually held accountable, to their victims, not just the City. It's a joke the way it is now.
- That care and consideration be given to dogs which have been neglected, abused, poorly raised or trained to be vicious. City should try rehabilitations before sentencing the dog to be put down.
- Considering vicious animals are frequently a result of poor training and bad owners, perhaps better education and more opportunities to take positive training classes for inexperienced owners would help.
- They Are appointed a training class to attend and that the owners handling is evaluated to assure they can manage the dog safely
- Provide assistance in locating appropriate training for vicious dogs and creating a process to potentially declare a dog rehabilitated.
- There could be a training program created to assist people who do not have the means to take training when they are dealing with a reactive dog. Also more bylaw officers attending dog parks to ensure safety of all dogs and people
- I believe that the city has an obligation to provide information of the dog and it's owners to any victim of an attack.
- Make sure the owner is actually a responsible owner - it's usually the owner not the dog - don't return the dog to a bad situation
- I would charge more for licensing fees to own an aggressive dog
- Ban pit bulls, please.
- Should also be mandatory counselling/education/follow up with the owners if the dog is returned after there has been an incident with the dog.
- A vicious dog is always the result of poor dog ownership. The city should require all vicious dogs receive rehabilitation
- Is there a way to follow up to see if the owners are following the restrictions or to check with adjacent neighbours to address any concerns?
- Mandatory spay/neuter programs.. Access to affordable programs. Education.
- Mandatory training session, signage, submission of character letters from neighbors to renew license yearly or a city provided questionnaire. City inspection of containment on property every few years.
- That they follow through with the consequences when owners do not abide they rules.
- Vicious animals should be euthanized.
- Be fair and ensure good behavior assessments are conducted. Reassess the animal if the owner gets it training with a qualified behavioral trainer to determine if this has modified their behavior and they could have the vicious animal designation removed
- Provide annual workshops or live training to ensure that pet owners continue to be responsible. It's another way for city workers to check in with pet owners that they are doing the right thing.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No previous bite history=owner works with a trainer specializing in aggression. Owner MUST be held accountable; 98% of vicious-dog incidents are caused by the human owners misreading or missing clear cues.
- None
- If the vicious animal is being encouraged or not actively being rehabilitated (ie. completing behaviour and training that is approved by the City), the City should be able to remove animals from the home and prevent the owners from acquiring new animals.
- They need to be monitored and removed. Why do we need vicious dogs unless they are working guard dogs? Do they need a special license?
- Take control of this. Consider banning certain breeds of dogs in Alberta
- Do not "make allowances" for attacks on people or other pets. The first step should be a fine and education, the second should be "jail time" for the dog and a bigger fine, and third, confiscation and euthanasia
- Better enforcement of the existing rules
- Require the owner of the vicious animal to help pay for some of the injuries obtained by the animal and/ or individual.
- No dogs be allowed near school, old homes, parks, daycares or any place that has anything to do with weak, vulnerable or places where dogs may pose some harm.
- Ensure dogs that are dangerous breeds are restricted in the first place. We license cars that can kill but not pit bulls? Also, educate these owners...all dogs can attack. Only my 15 lb won't kill anybody or any dog without a lot of effort...educate owners of responsibilities
- Subsidised training with trainers/behaviorists for owners to create a behaviour management plan and learn techniques on managing and rehabilitating their dog.
- I appreciate that the city takes a more reasonable approach and does NOT immediately issue a kill-order. Changing the name "vicious" to "highly reactive." Perhaps providing safe areas for owners caring for dogs struggling with reactivity.
- A user-friendly way to report incidents
- I expect that the court look into mitigating factors, such as was the dog being tormented or teased by the victim or bystander leading to the aggression, or was it truly a random event.
- none
- After 1-year, and attending training, the dogs should be able to be re-tested so they can reduce their sentence or punishment. Dogs can be rehabilitated and should not be permanently labeled without the ability to appeal or rehabilitate.
- If a responsible individual or rescue is willing to take some of these dogs it would be nice to see some rehabilitated instead of euthanization
- None
- None
- be aware of where the dogs are - and ensure that they are in training, and under control

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- PROPER investigation into circumstances leading up to a dog apparently becoming vicious. Dogs protect their pack(family), their territory and aren't able to speak. Dogs react more when they are in pain. Dogs give warnings prior to attacking.
Have assessment done by balanced bark before put down
- I would like the city to take the time to determine if an animal is vicious due to its current environment, rather than destroying the animal. Many of these animals can be rehomed and rehabilitated.
- I think that the by-laws in place are good.
- If animal has Viciously attacked a human the dog should be euthanized with the exception of a Police dog of course.
- Mandatory assessment of the animal's behavior. Why is it vicious? Is the owner abusing the animal or encouraging the behavior. Mandatory rehabilitation training or the dog is re-homed.
- None. It sounds like a reasonable policy.
- That there be a clearer definition of vicious animals so that animals who were provoked, startled, or defending themselves are not unduly labelled.
- I would examine the root of the behaviour of the "vicious" animal. An animal is not born vicious. Most animals are loving and just want to be loved. The City of Calgary needs to focus on rehoming or retraining the animals. They are made vicious by their people.
- No other.
- Any vicious animals should be euthanized.
- Encourage people to take themselves & their animals for obedience training.
- Additional education to children and adults around asking to pet animals. Also understanding that someone who pets a dog without asking are responsible for their actions and the outcome.
- the city doesn't communicate any cases, ways to prevent incidents or report any serious incidents. I assume many people with vicious dogs are not aware of prevention, or what the process includes until they are involved in it
- If deemed by courts a viscous dog, mandatory obedience training, mandatory owner training on how to stimulate dogs
- Regular property checks of vicious dog locations to ensure compliance with court orders
- Please ban pitbull ownership and especially rescue agencies rehoming dangerous pitbulls here. These animals are bred to kill. It is not their fault but that doesn't mean we should allow more of them in the city. I think the breed should be banned altogether.
- Vicious dogs have no place in the City and should not be allowed.
- Maybe there might be an issue of weight of the dog to owners weight issue more than age. A 120 lb dog will do as it pleases with someone who is 160-180 even if they are 18.
- Vicious is a challenging word. Unfortunately, animals can get labelled as such when the animal is provoked, or the pet owner is negligent. This goes back to defining rules on pet care and ownership, and enforcing regulations on animals adopted, sold, and imported.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Please tell me we are smarter than blaming an animal. If it was vicious, it was either bred to be that way or abused or etc., because the person likely was too (not that I am excusing the person). Deal with the human. Counselling might help but also need fines, jail... And ENFORCE whatever you do.
- Many people at dog park unable to control their animals.
- The city bylaw officer should assess the dog in person before making a judgement. Have a park where aggressive dogs can go off leash but only have individual parties go one at a time. Even charge the owner 10.00 for 1 hour of walking there dogs in this specialized off leash park.
neuter them
- Notify neighbours/community so that people can take precautions. But the biggest thing would be to support a consistent visual marker or piece of equipment so people know not to approach the Handler and dog. Most people have no idea how to approach dogs and are extremely dangerous unintentionally
- Mandate all rescues to license their animals and transfer ownership. Rescues to have correct skilled and trained volunteers to be able to take in aggressive rescues.
- Increase fines for neighbors that taunt dogs
- Repeat offenses from a vicious animal should not be tolerated, and in such cases the animal should be destroyed.
- As soon as I move on my deck they start barking at me and do not stop. His response is they are protecting his property. So piss off.
- That seems reasonable.
- Removing the dog and enforcing appropriate action.
- High fines for repeat offenders in addition to special requirements on licenses for repeat offenders (cage muzzles when off property) and very high fines if those are not adhered to. Perhaps a partnership with Humane to create a course for owner to attend to reapply for license.
- Very high fines for owners if the animals hurt another animal or person(s).
- If an animal attacks or bites ANYONE, they should be immediately put down, the owners heavily penalized and stopped from owning vicious animals. Pit Bulls should be illegal. We have an appalling attack record that needs to be stopped.
- They need to be removed from the owners. It's a terrible thing to deal with but the risk is too great. A child could be seriously injured or killed by a vicious dog. Not good enough that they are on private property or muzzled or leashed. A vicious animal was made that way by a person.
- monitoring of vicious animals
- I agree with those who want to prohibit ownership of select breeds that are commonly associated with viciousness.
- I feel that the City of Calgary should be doing frequent home checks, announced and unannounced to make sure that the rules are being adhered to. Also, I think that if owners did not follow the rules then perhaps the dog needs to be removed from home.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Don't automatically think an animal is considered vicious based on one offence. Don't euthanize the animals. Give them the proper training as it CAN be fixed (coming from a professional here). You don't know what happened to that animal for it to react that way, especially when it comes to kids.
- I trust the City of Calgary staff to respond to information about problem animals, and I think that they are doing a good job.
- Confiscate vicious animals that cannot be rehabilitated. Mandate classes to control aggressive behaviour in some cases where rehabilitation is possible.
- The City should not allow Pit Bulls within city limits. They are threatening to most citizens.
- They must be able to respond quickly to complaints and ensure the dog is secured and gets a fair evaluation.
- They should have special licensing and ensure address is up to date.
- A no tolerance, for a vicious attack of a person. They need to be euthanized.
- Enforce training for the pets and their owners.
- any animal causing significant injury to a person or pet should be evaluated and put down if necessary. Safety is a paramount.
- responsiveness to reports about these animals if they have violated the requirements
- None
- Respond with detail, not just an upset neighbor
- That they charge the owner if a vicious animal is out unharnessed and isn't muzzled.
- case by case basis - not breed specific
- That more responsibility must be put on the owner. Harsher punishments must be given out.
- First, effectively monitor/enforce the above rules. Second, put in place legislation/procedures that will allow the destruction of dogs involved in unprovoked attacks. Third, licensing requirements that exclude the new registration of breeds prone to vicious behaviour.
- Also a check into the owners who may be the cause of the viciousness. And if found to be responsible, they should be banned from future ownership.
- Eliminate the risks to humans, children and other animals by seizing and destroying dangerous animals.
- encourage training for owners prior to ownership of breeds that are more likely to be aggressive
- Evaluation by an animal behavior specialist to determine if retraining is possible. Removal from owner. Euthanasia if cannot be rehabilitated. The dog, not the owner that is.
- Understand that little dogs are often more vicious than large breeds, it just never gets reported.
- If a vicious animal attacks a dog or person, I think it would be appropriate that there are laws in place saying that the owner is responsible for vet or medical costs.
- Certain breeds should not be allowed within city limits. There is no more reason to own a vicious dog than there is to own an assault rifle
- If involved in a more serious attack or multiple offences the animal should be put down.
- To ensure these animals owners are following the rules
- I



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Zero tolerance of risk to public.
- Determine that owners are actually capable of physically controlling their pet; levy higher fees for "dangerous dog" registration. Provide proof of dog obedience training.
- Ban ownership of breeds that are know to be vicious. It is important to protect innocent people from vicious dog attacks.
- The current system for classifying and requirements for owner and animal behaviour are extremely flawed. The processes in place currently do not have a dog's best interest in mind and allow for negligence on the part of a complainant to result in unfair sentencing for dogs.
- Be fair, as should be the case with a court decision. Follow through with the expectations from the courts that the owners to keep their dog and others safe.
- Ensure they have a humane, comfortable home first and that they are not being mistreated. Assess these animals and if there is no hope, then humanely put them to sleep.
- I expect the city to ban pitbull related breeds.
- Need to understand the context of the aggression and what steps the owner is making to work with their behavioral issues.
- Same as mentioned.
- If there is a second incident or the owners don't comply then the animal should be seized.
- Keep them out of the park
- City shouldn't only wait for a serious attack for seizure. They are dogs which even on leash can drag their owner and attack public. Such adults shouldn't be responsible for having these dogs.
- Sedation. Limited holding time. Euthanasia.
- A dog that unprovoked breaks free of it's owner and harms another person or another animal should have a two strikes and you are out. In sever cases maybe one strike and out! Like the dog that snatched a yorkie from it's owner arms and mangled it so badly it nearly lost it's life and did lose a leg!
- Need to be evaluated by an animal behaviorist before they decide on how to classify the dog.
- This bothers me. All dogs will react given the right circumstances. People have to be educated properly both dog owners and non dog owners. I think some behavioural education is warranted. It also should be that all animals should have some obedience training.
- Create well communicated zero tolerance policy. Weak policy allows harm to humans and pets by irresponsible owners . Locking up a dog at home is not going to make its behaviour better. Have steep fines on first offense, and if serious harm, put the dog down. so there are consequences. Otherwise no
- They should not be allowed in off leash areas, even if on leash.
- Leave breed out of it
- Track the location of the animal and allow this information to be available to the public so that neighbours are aware of the dangers and can avoid or prevent any further issues. Require mandatory registration and continual monitoring of the animal at the owners expense

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A dog that has killed another animal (ie: pitbull attacks and kills another dog at a dog park or in their community) they should be removed from the home and not permitted back to the owner and should not be permitted in a home with minor children.
- Consider training the dog and owner by a professional who knows and works with difficult dogs.
- To do due diligence prior to putting these dogs down
- I strongly believe our current bylaws amply cover this issue
- none
- Huge fines,
- investigate owners to make sure dog is not being treated poorly or being neglected.
- like to see more bylaw enforcement..
- Seek professional trainers with the credentials to aid in such cases.
- None
- If a dog has severely bitten, mauled (Ian Dunbar bite scale) a human or killed another's pet dog then the dog needs to be euthanized (humanely).
- Mandate obedience classes
Investigate the level of care of the animal
- If multiple offences committed, animal should be destroyed.
- The City should hold the pet owners completely responsible for the behavior of their dogs, and they should have to pay for any damages caused by their dog
- To ensure all supports are put in place to keep the animals safe and prevent any abuse of the animal.
The city should never be able to put an animal down unless the animals are suffering from an untreatable illness. We are human beings and we do not have the right to choose who lives or dies.
- None, as long as the dog owner is educated and clear on what it means to keep a vicious dog - then that is fine. I also think fines need to be WAY amped up for vicious dogs so owners get the reality of another issue.
- Enforcement of mandatory training.
- I think if there are multiple incidents then ownership may need to be reassessed
- I am confused why a dog that was deemed to be vicious (i.e. attacks aggressively and not defensively, is or likely to be a repeat offender and which it was thought training would not help) would not be put down? At the very least some serious mandatory dog training with a certified org or trainer.
- The city should investigate the owners for abuse or neglect of the animal. The city should investigate as to why the animal acted violently. The city should encourage behaviour training for owners and pets to prevent these habits from forming or change those that exist.
- My perception of how the city deals with pets that have shown aggression frightens me. I am a dog owner and I do my best to ensure my dog is docile, but I am scared that the city would take away my precious dog and "destroy" it. I think there should be a chance for rehabilitation.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- With vicious breeds the City should take a look at the pet owner. An 85 year old man with a young, Unexercised and Un-neutered aggressive breed dog should not be permitted
- Owner should be made to take a training course at their own expense in order to keep a vicious dog
- Put them down. Children's safety should come first! Usually viscous dogs are a mix of the breed and poor ownership - so having them still on property is too risky.
- More stringent enforcement of owners of known viscous animal provocation or attacks. Bylaw should do periodic checks on these animals and their owners, to ensure that rules are being followed. For ex: checking to ensure they have adequte fencing. Mandate obedience training.
- No second offense allowed
- Make decisions on whether the animal needs to be put down.
- A dog declared to be vicious should be put down.
- Fairness. If someone is trespassing, the dog should get the benefit of the doubt. Also, it's not always the big dogs that are aggressive. I've been bit plenty by small dogs, but no one takes that as seriously, which is wrong.
- I expect that the City has the necessary staff to ensure that there is sufficient oversight to enforce these restrictions on vicious dogs. It's one thing to make the regulation, but it's an entirely different matter to see that it's adequately carried out.
- Neighbours should be informed if there is a vicious dog in the area. I think there should also be a little more information provided to the general public about what constitutes a vicious dog.
- Additional supports for owners before dangerous designations. For example, when a dog is aggressive, providing supports to the owners to ensure the dog doesn't escalate. Also. when a dog bites a human, that should become part of the hospital record that is shared with officers.
- Put down dogs that harm people or other animals
- I agree with the specific rules relating to a vicious animal
- none its well managed thank you
- I think they should be put down if there is EVER biting of anyone. Unless it is deliberately invoked.
- Educate owners/ offer training
- I think they do a good job.
- there should be a way to report these instances at off leash parks, we have had many altercations with vicious dogs but no way to report them
- SWIFT, PERMANENT REMOVAL
- Letting the public know, inspecting owners home for compliance
- same as above.
- Training and understanding for officers to understand that many animals are in an unhealthy environment (not their fault, like kids they are victims unable to change where they live) that environment is often responsible for that unwanted behavioral responses.
- That they have the authority to monitor other dogs that the owners of dogs declared vicious purchase or adopt. Dogs are seldom vicious for no reason, and those people whose dogs are vicious are more likely to have other dogs who are also vicious.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The animal (dog) should not have to be kept in isolation in the shelter's impound while waiting for a court ruling. The burden on the shelter and the negative impact on the dog itself is too great and is really counterproductive.
- I think this is tough to determine. Some dogs like to play rougher and some dogs like to run away. Owners with overly timid dogs typically view these rougher dogs as a threat when they really aren't. I think a warning given to overly timid dog owners that they have a right to keep their dogs leashed
- Dogs labelled vicious should not be allowed in dog parks. There should be some system of reporting vicious animals without requiring their City tag numbers (which owners are obviously reluctant to provide, and which would be difficult to get from an aggressive dog).
- Fully understanding the cause of the attack - if provoked by another animal, small child, person - the dog should not be punished for it.
- No future licensing for owners of vicious dogs who have had dogs who have previously attacked or bitten people or other animals.
- After a dog has bitten a human, it should be removed from the home, rehabilitated or destroyed.
- The will euthanize them immediately. Cruel to hold them at the pound for months only to be euthanized later
- Monitor the dog to see if progress has been made to improve behaviour.
- To uphold these laws with more seriousness in terms of dogs requiring muzzles.
- None
- Any vicious animal that kills another person's pet, or causes harm or death to a lawful person (ie not breaking into your house) should be humanely euthanized and tested for rabies. The owner should face heavy fines and prohibitions.
- City should make sure calls are responded to appropriately
- If a vicious animals injures another, owned animal, the owner of the vicious animal should be subjected to fines, scaled on the basis of the injury inflicted and costs to the other pet owner. Further, the owner of the vicious animal should be required to submit a plan on preventing future incidents
- Bylaw should enforce courses to people with animals in public with obvious behavioural and body language concerns and if not filled the animal should be siezed
- Review of the circumstances and consideration to dogs reacting out of fear and people/other animals not following the direction of the owner or cues from the dog. Exploring every avenue including surrender before euthanasia. Never implementing breed bans and encouraging education/obedience!
- Charging owners and leading to criminal charge if unmotivated attack
- Understanding. Owners always try their best to soothe and train their dogs to behave. Offer resources on how to take a dog who may have been previously abused
- Escalated fines for at large/chase/bite
Take aggression relinquishments/surrenders
Dog handling training for officers



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Consultation with neighbours

Fines for taking dog with known history to public areas: dog parks

- More education for pet owners, in particular with breeds with a genetic disposition to be more aggressive.
- Higher fines for those individuals who are not responsible pet owners. Each case would have to be assessed individually.
- Harsher punishments for owners who do not have the training to handle a dog and harsher punishments for owners whose neglect has contributed to the behavior of their dog.
- Very tough. Situations come up suddenly, there are no visual email markers to identify them. Cannot read their license...if they have one. Owners usually defensive. Can take a pic but how would you know where to begin? Need by-law enforcement officers on sight...
- A harder line on protecting innocent citizens
- To place conditions on the owners to get professional help for a period of six months or more. To place restrictions on where the owner is allowed to take their dog within the city limits.
- None. The current bylaw is fair and reasonable.
- I expect that animals deemed 'vicious' should be destroyed by the city of Calgary. No second chances. Potential too great for harm. Here is a link to recent dog attack on people <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/3-people-injured-dog-attack-winnipeg-1.5481138>. FYI pit bulls banned in Winnipeg
- escalated fines for at large/chase/bite
take aggression relinquishment/surrenders
dog handling training for officers
consultation with neighbours
- Helping owners find help for their animal's behaviour, making sure the public is safe.
- Please DON'T initiate breed specific legislation or bans. This would be a step backwards. Maybe more public informative sessions to educate others about vicious animals.
- Vicious animals get no warning. They must be put down immediately. Out for a run with my 6 year old and a dog attacks and bites off a chunk of the mail lady's leg. That dog needs to be put down.
- Confiscation if the dog if the owner appears to not understand or wish to help the dog and learn proper responsible ownership.
- Fines do not correct a dog's behaviour, and a bylaw passed that requires the owner be required to take the dog to a professional dog trainer. Correcting a dog's behaviour & altering the dog would reduce complaints to animal control.
- The city of Calgary must ban pit bulls and rottweilers. These animals are bred for fighting and have attacked many children over the years in many parts of the world. The evidence is clear. Ontario has banned them and Calgary has received many of these dangerous animals. Why are we at risk?
- When an attack happened to me, from one owner with three large dogs in an off leash park, I was unable to see their license plate number so I don't know what the City would have done.
- Escalated fines for vicious animals, whether at large, chasing, lunging or biting.
If City issued the vicious dog license, they should be responsible for relinquishments & surrenders.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Neighbours should be consulted before issuing a vicious dog license.

Dog handling training for City Bylaw Officers.

- Follow up by an animal bylaw officer on how the dog and owner are doing. I believe that a "vicious" dog can generally be socialized if it's in the "right" hands for long enough. If it can't be socialized then having it put down is a reasonable option.
- If animal can be rehabilitated it gets that option. shoot the owner, not the dog. Also over age 18 does not ensure proper treatment/handling of the dog. Some criteria should be established as that alleged adult may be the problem and the dog maybe should not be returned if that is the case.
- City of Calgary should adopt the stringent penalties that City of Surrey adopted for dog bites. In June 2017, a dog next door attacked & seriously bit (4 bites) our adult daughter on our own property without provocation. The 3 fines were inadequate; the dog should be muzzled & a sign posted.
- Better understanding to explain to owners that just because you think your big dog is just playing and not being vicious, the little dog it is chasing out the park is scared stiff, you need to be able to recall.
- Protect us from vicious dogs by not allowing them. Ban pitbulls and any other type of dog that has a history of being vicious toward humans. One or 2 may be upset but hundreds of thousands will applaud your actions. Keep us safe. The risk from some species is too high.
- Prompt response. Dogs who bite should be retrained at the cost of the owner or put down.
- Separate licensing for vicious animals at much higher cost
- Create programs to educate publics. to provide a life animals deserve & regulate that the vicious prone animals must wear comfortable muzzle in public areas.
- Better assessments of the owner. I believe animal behavioural issues are created by a poor environment.
- Escalated fines for at large chase or bite; Take aggression relinquishments/surrenders; Dog handling training for officers; Consultation with neighbors of vicious animal - are they okay with that animal living next door given measures are put into place?
- The definition of vicious is too broad. Most every dog will 'chase' another dog in play. Damaging public and private property is also something that nearly every dog will do if left alone - this is a nuisance behavior, not a dangerous one. City should euthanize any dog declared vicious by the court
- I expect the City to have significant fines in place. I also expect that a dog that bites a person will be confiscated, checked for rabies, have an investigation into the details and euthanized or put on a restriction pending whether the dog was "egged" into biting or if "un-solicited" biting.
- Enforce restrictions on whereabouts.
- Since there are "no bad dogs only bad dog owners" animal transgressions causing bodily harm should be charged against the owner as if the owner had personally committed the offence. Current practices are a joke.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- People need to be punished. Dogs are not bad by nature, people make them that way. The owners need to be held more accountable. Even to the extent of possible jail time for multiple infractions. People must be in control of their dog at all times. Either through training or leashes.
- Mandatory owner/dog training. Must have solid 4-6 ft fence around entire property. Cannot use off-leash areas. Not sure City can this but: Cannot have children in the home. Cannot live near a school.
- The current determination of vicious animals by the court seems reasonable.

Urban Agriculture

Beekeeping

- To be informed, know what the rules are, and how to report violations.
- I am allergic to bees.
- Maybe a standard sign in the front yard that this property contains an apiary. That would provide warning for those who have bee sting allergies, in particular.
- no concerns
- Allow it!
- Some minimum standards in terms of location and number of bee hives on a property. Afford the owner the ability to site them in a way that makes sense, but not to overrun a property.
- Netting, proper hives. Limitations on bee types (ie: don't bring foreign, dangerous Bees to our ecosystem) Bees are important and I really believe this should be done. They're also not overly dangerous, so I don't think a ton needs to be done really.
- Lots of space and education. I feel it is responsible to notify the neighbours as well if you plan on having an apiary as so many are allergic to bee stings.
- Protected areas for bees (e.g. East Village project in 2019) and many many maaaany beautiful urban boulevards where bees would gather and mind their business.
- I am not concerned about urban bee keeping
- signage
- I have no issues with this at all. Just education is needed - To leave them alone and ensure people know their value. And maybe alert neighbours of what do to in the event of a swarm, not using poison in their gardens etc.
- Would love to see more of this.
- Contact information for the Beekeeper (in case of the odd swarming).
- More of it, I have zero safety concerns
- Training and rules
- Bees should not only be allowed but supported and encouraged. We particularly need to encourage a variety of bee species. Perhaps a bee keeping course or ticket should be encouraged but that could be costly and maybe not necessary.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Bees are natural, even in Calgary. Though there should be a limit of beehives per backyard or space, we should not regulate beyond that.
- nothing - i think this is a great idea
- Yes, however the neighbours must formally consent first.
- Encourage as much bee keeping as possible
- 1 million % agree. Let's be innovative as a city and lead the rest of the world with our urban bee keeping.
- Does not bother me at all if doing it responsibly. Not sure about the folks with severe allergies but bees are around naturally and are good for gardens.
- Beekeepers should have to keep unexpired EpiPens handy and be trained in their use, and signage should be required.
- I am all for beekeeping, but there should be a limit on the number of hives allowed. Four should be more than adequate.
- Bee's are a natural part of the environment and ecosystem. I have no safety concerns with bees.
- Mandatory training for beekeepers offered by Bee Keeper Association. Mandatory licensing and inspections.
- The City needs to relax rules related to beekeeping.
- Anyone should be able to set up a bee hive.
- I'm not bothered by urban beekeeping. The practice does not make me feel unsafe.
- I don't think that any urban beekeeping should be on residential property or in the city limits on commercial property. If you want to have bees, then live on an acreage or farm.
- If keepers were to take a simple online permit test before being able to have them, I would be quite happy about this. It should state clearly the needs for the bees, as well as perhaps distance from neighbors and maybe something regarding potential deadly allergies for direct neighbors.
- Support but would like more regulation. People should have to register their hives with the city/pay a small fee, take/pass a test on basic essential beekeeping regs/practices. Limit number of hives per property. Setup disease surveillance program. Please work with Calgary&District Beekeepers Assoc
- A sign indicating there are large numbers of bees in the area.
- Opportunities to work / improve road rights of way or other public spaces. Knowledge on the differences between honey bees and native species.
- Signage
- flowers, plants and trees.
- nothing additional
- The homeowner MUST have a large yard AND plenty of trees,shrubs,flowers,water source.My neighbour has bees,but none of the trees/shrubs/flowers/water the bees are attracted to. So my fully landscaped yard is constantly full of bees to the point that I cannot enjoy my yard barefoot! Need site inspect
- Regulations, ethical treatment of bees, liscencing and education for keepers - in urban areas.
- Signage



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The hives must be a certain minimum distance from all public lands and other land privately owned by others. I do not have adequate knowledge to suggest an appropriate radius. Signage should be provided to those entering the radius at any point that beekeeping is active in this area.
- Bees are friends! They help plants grow and keep our green spaces lush. Absolutely. No protections needed in any capacity.
- I am pro urban beekeeping. Bees are vital to our ecosystem. We make our own yard as bee friendly as possible.
- As long as they can safely raise the bees I would be very happy to see Urban Beekeeping.
- I don't think Urban beekeeping should be allowed.
- I am all for urban beekeeping.
- Nothing
- As long as the bees are not posing a threat, great idea. WE are losing bee populations.
- I believe this should be encouraged and information and support available by the city.
- Nothing, but I'm concerned about those who attempt urban beekeeping without proper knowledge or training.
- It's great, should be encouraged to keep indigenous species. Make sure neighbours are aware in case they have severe allergies to beestings though.
- Should not be allowed. This is silly and unnecessary. Buy an acreage. This is so difficult to make reasonable for everyone surrounding the owners home. This kind of idea just causes wars between neighbours
- That your aware of hive is near by. see next door neighbour has them, you are aware not to disturb them. Including something similar to what the pigeon owners in urban setting have. an Urban Bee Keeping association.
- I think this is wonderful and should be an available option to those that would like to keep bees. Bees are in decline and are a necessary for gardening and fruits/vegetable growing.
- I don't think there is any issues with urban beekeeping for personal use. Commercial beekeeping within city limits should not be allowed.
- Licensing. Then public posting that bees are being considered at a residence. There may be someone living next door or quite nearby who is anaphylactic to beestings.
- I think this would be great for the environment! But because some people have allergies, I think if it's in a public area there should be signs, like for off-leash areas.
- Great for bee population which is suffering. question whether they would swarm and make neighbours lives miserable?? I think this should not be allowed in the city just outside city limits
- Bees are lovely and I have no concerns.
- Bees are clean and the city can determine what needs to be placed to keep the public safe. Having said that nothing is 100% safe.
- Appropriate signage for areas with bees, due to allergies (which can be severe). Special licensing.
- Limit on beehive numbers ie) 1 or 2 colonies
- a proper beehive enclosure



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- must have a limit of (bee) hives so one doesn't have honey to sell at a commercial level and must keep in mind people with allergies to insects and stings..perhaps neighbors in a 1 blk radius should be given a letter in case anyone objects, otherwise bees are the best for agricultural & human life..
- Don't have a problem as long as they aren't bugging me while enjoying a meal outside. Bees seem to be better than wasps in regards to this.
- Nothing
- Let it happen. Make sure folks are licenced (formally educated in safety) for the safety and proper care of the bees, and for neighbours. If they're cared for and treated well, there should be little to no conflict about their presence.
- 1)Just let the neighbors know, then I could plant more flowers!
2)Maybe limit how many hives in any given community.
- No. Bees are harmless creatures and essential to the eco-system. Any opportunity to have beekeeping should be valid, even in urban areas.
- Nothing, bees are docile and friendly and will not sting you out of spite. Leave the hive alone and you wont get stung
- The honeybee has adapted to humans, and is generally non-threatening. Persons with allergies would have such anywhere, and are self-managing. Keep hives from being disturbed and everyone can be safe.
- It would be nice to have access to knowledge of where there are urban bee keepers. Incase we come across a swarm of bees. Nothing about safety for these wonderful creatures.
- should not be allowed in residential communities. Period.
- I think that as long as they are kept on private property, or in a controlled area, and are of a controlled population, I have no problem with urban beekeeping.
- Avoid areas where people could be easily stung. Limit number of hives on property. Issues with people that have bee allergies and safety.
- Maybe 1 box is enough ?
- Appropriate signage, and annual safety inspection. Example: a bee structure went up in East Village last summer, with a large sign to indicate what it was. Appropriate signage gives people with allergies or phobias the opportunity to avoid the area. A prominent sign on a fence for urban yard hives.
- I would want beekeepers to undergo a certificate course of basic beekeeping. I would also want to see properties with bees have some signage on front & back fences, so those who are dangerously allergic can be aware of what's present. A limit on max number of hives allowed.
- Notification of it in the area.
- I think this is a great idea. SAIT has bee hives, and this could really help the bee population. Plus, if people keep honey bees, the homemade honey would be a great by product. It would be a positive thing.
- Whole-heartedly support beekeeping. Owners should have proper training to care and maintain hives. Beekeepers should have enough space for bees to find food. Beekeepers should be able to request that areas adjacent to their property not be sprayed with chemicals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I feel completely safe, I just think that it should be monitored to ensure that the wild bees aren't faced with competition. This could be done by having a limit on hive density and registering hive locations. I have noticed that there are significantly more honeybees last summer than previously.
- True beekeeping improves plant pollination and honey harvest. But think of surrounding, anyone allergic to bees, is area large enough to accommodate hives without interfering with surrounding area to be able to enjoy their own outdoor living.
- Education. I grew up around beekeeping in Manitoba. They are a gentle species and really important to the ecosystem. Ppl need to understand they behave very differently from wasps, hornets and bumble bees. Training should be mandatory for new beekeepers to help them get it right.
- A limit on the size of the hive and mandatory beekeeping training. No hives within a certain distance of a school. Training for animal services officers in relocating a hive.
- I think warning signs should be posted to let people know of beekeeping if they are located in areas accessible to the public. I think urban beekeeping is a great idea.
- Nothing. They're just honeybees.
- I would love to see more bees in my yard and around the city as it means we have a healthy, thriving ecosystem. If bylaws around personal pesticide usage do not exist, I would like to see this be a focus to ensure the insects are protected.
- I don't want my neighbours to have an unreasonable number of beehives just because they can. Limit the number of hives a home is allowed to have.
- Disease prevention and safety for the hives.
- Ensure correct needs for bees
- No beekeeping.
- Basic rules about distance from neighbour yards and maintaining food/water supply so bees don't swarm neighbours. Current neighbours should get a veto if they have deadly allergy.
- This should not be allowed as the hive owners / beekeepers can not control the bees on others' property.
- Signs. So that those with allergies (not me) are forewarned.
- Should be restricted to the tops of buildings where there is less chance of them coming in contact with people and stinging them and killing them if they are allergic to them.
- As is seems to work fine. Maximum 4 hives per residential yard seems fine.
- I don't want to be inadvertently walking into a beehive. I do plant wildflowers for the bees. Set up hives in large green spaces where they can be given some space.
- People should have certification of some kind that proves that they know how to care for bees
- Unfortunately bees can sting and kill people and cannot be confined to a particular property by nature. Urban bee keeping should not be allowed. However the city should promote bee healthy gardening as they are critically important. However they can swarm and if you get a nest there is not city help
- Signage. That's about it!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I believe they need to be registered and inspected by city or rep for diseases on a regular basis. And to check to make sure neighbors dont have allergies and limit hive numbers
- I would like to be warned if my neighbors have bees, but otherwise I am all for them. I think we should have them in more of our parks and matural areas
- I would want the person to be licensed to ensure they know what they are doing.
- Registering and if neighbours have severe allergies than no.
- I wish more people would do bee keeping they date super important to our agriculture
- That the persons doing this have knowledge are educated in the well being of these animals/wildlife. That there is some form of licensing and insurance should their wildlife hurt a citizen/neighbour due to their pet/wildlife under their care and ownership
- There needs to be restrictions on how many hives are allowed, what the bee houses look like and how close they are to your neighbours.
- I think there should be urban bee keeping to enhance our bee population as they are essential to pollination.
- Limits on how many per site and how many within a specific region/area of the city would be required
- We are having problems in summer time with bees allowed in back yard hives in Calgary, coming over to adjoining properties in large numbers, creating a safety hazard and a nuisance, for people trying to relax on their back yard decks and patios. I live in Ward 10 N.E. district of Calgary.
- Good idea! More of it.
- I feel safe with beekeeping. The bees need our help and we need bees
- I believe there needs to be guidelines to ensure the bees are able to exist safely for both the bees and neighbours. I don't know enough about what other cities are doing - there are lessons to be learned. Perhaps limiting the number or size of beekeeping facilities and proximity to doorways.
- I already feel safe around urban beekeeping.
- Love it!
- Simple signage, advising of bees if in an area accessible to others
- As long as the owners have the education and know how to do it, yes.
- I'm really scared of bees and wasps so I can't answer this objectively.
- Community associations should be more involved. Older neighbourhoods are great places for bees but more should be done to plant with biodiversity in mind and a lot more native plants. Native bees must also be promoted.
- Bees are limited to a small number and are not allowed to roam freely, must be securely keot
- People not have an informed opinion
- Depends if neighbors have bee allergies which can be severe
- An EpiPen in my pocket. I think urban bee keeping is fantastic and we need more of it. I feel totally safe with it even though I have a severe allergy to bees.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- - Limit hives on properties by land area (ex 1 per 250m2)
- - Require properties with bees to also have 50m2 of flowering plants per hive, minimum. Otherwise domestic bees outcompete native types for scarce food.
- Otherwise no problems.
- Good for the environment
- Yes, there are no health concerns and are beneficial to the ecosystem.
- don't see a problem if the hive is properly maintained.
- Urban bees are not a safety hazard. People have the right to produce their own food.
- This is amazing! To feel safe I feel like it should be licensed in order to have bees in the city.
- None
- Minimum yard space and restricted number of hives
- Something informational regarding the presence of a beehive and information about how they are not dangerous.
- I don't have a problem with it
- Yes, bees are necessary to help pollinate plants and honey is an added benefit to the beekeeper. I can see no safety concerns as long as the bees are enclosed in a proper beehive.
- Yes, however I think it must be done ethically and closely monitored by responsible beekeepers
- Responsible ppl, constant care and upkeep
- Yes please but I think each person must have some type of proper training and certificates so everyone knows how to properly care for our bees.
- I would want to be sure that I will not be swarmed by bees when I am near the beekeeping boxes, that I won't get stung and my children will be safe
- Training and then license
- SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED...GET SERIOUS. GO LIVE IN THE COUNTRY IF YOU WANT TO FARM.
- Sufficient signage of beekeeping on a property.
- Distance to neighbors and where the bees may travel. My family (adults and children) have severe allergies to bees and I do not want an incredibly increased population near me and my yard.
- I think this needs to be monitored
- This would be great to see ! However, there does need to be inspection to make sure folks KNOW how to be bee keepers and how to keep the bees healthy and safe and away from causing problems for other citizens.
- I require nothing to feel safe. Bees exist in the environment regardless. As with all neighbour disputes or property concerns complaints can be made via existing processes.
- Definitely a positive thing. We need to save the bees! They aren't a danger to people unless provoked. Educate more on bee safety and raise more bees. Do field trips to bee farms so kids can see how not dangerous they are!
- as long as it doesn't hurt or interfere with neighbors it is acceptable



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Nothing could make me feel safe living near bees!! No guarantee of our safety. Way more allergic people than previous years. We are not educated/ trained to deal with bees, nor should we have to be! someone messes with the bees, anyone in proximity would be attacked! Do not belong in city!
- I am against it because bylaw really doesn't have any authority to deal with problem pet owners, so if someone isn't following guidelines it will be a problem for neighbours.
- With proper training course put on by professional beekeepers
- A permit system where education or certification is required for responsible beekeeping practice.
- I don't think bee keeping in urban areas is a good idea but I think people should plant more flowers and hang bee nesting tubes but no hives.
- I'm ok with it.
- Licensing, only after verification that the licensee is educated about beekeeping, aware of the requirements to safely manage the bees, and a limited number of hives -- not enough for a commercial business. Annual renewal, depending on neighbourhood impact.
- Not worried.
- I'm not allergic but I think that it would be courteous and prudent to have a public consultation process (sign out front notifying neighbors and requesting input).
- Education for the beekeepers, ensure they know how to control and care for their bees.
- If an urban beekeeper has certification and a license to prove they are competent to keep bees, then no problem.
- A cap on the number of bee hives.
- Education. Bees aren't the enemy. Ppl may try to harm them even tho they are pretty small and defenseless. Perhaps if ppl had a greater comprehension of their benefits they would welcome them a little more.
- Must be in a enclosed area with proper procedures in place to protect the public
- We should encourage this but there should be an application process and an opportunity for neighbours to voice concerns and oppose if there is a neighbour allergic to bee stings.
- I wouldn't feel unsafe. I would love to see more of this.
- Beekeeping should be allowed in public spaces as part of a community program.
- Nothing really. Luckily I'm no allergic to bee stings.
- Signage on property, licensing so if immediate neighbors have severe allergies they aren't allowed to operate
- Limits on the size of hives/number of bees
- I would like to see an educational component as part of beekeeping permit so that they are responsible beekeepers.
- We need bees, totally helps out the urban environment, my only concern is to educate that they don't sting unless provoked or close to the hive. homeowners should have signs visible close to the hives.
- Keep letting people do this



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Needs permission but every other year from adjoining neighbours. My husband is severely allergic to poultry. If our neighbour was permitted to house this livestock we would've forced to move. If neighbours have allergies to bees it should NOT be permitted.
- Have a neighbour with has bees - no problem
- Yes provided they are not a nuisance to neighbouring properties
- Knowledge. Educated
- Responsible, knowledgeable bee havers who want to provide a healthy, stable environment to the bees and are concerned about the impacts that the climate, pests and possible negative interactions between the bees and the public.
- Yes, but regulate where beekeeping is happening within the city/city area.
- Open area and warning signs
- The city is no place to raise bees where our homes are very close together. Please keep your bee keeping dreams to an acreage.
- Nothing, I feel bees are a part of a neighbourhood
- Important but don't want any of it my neighbours
- Regulations on size of operations, licensing only to those who show knowledge or capability to bee-keep. Inspections of all properties pre and post licensing.
- Yes, provided they reach out to the provincial beekeepers routinely to keep the hives healthy. Also, there should be an ideal distance away that a hive must be placed when there is already an existing hive in the neighborhood (to prevent territorial disputes).
- Ensure that no one will get stung - not sure how this is possible unless someone has a lot of land.
- Not dangerous to humans nearby.
- Bees don't stay in the bee keeper's yard. It hinders other peoples right to enjoy their own yards.
- Licensing.
- Licensing and education from experienced bee keepers
- Beekeepers need to have education from a professional body.
- Nothing. I think its fairly safe.
- Nothing. Do not regulate in any way.
- Maximum hive size per acre or household should be stated.
- There is no need to regulate beekeeping in an urban setting. Does this actually make people feel unsafe?
- Should be allowed
- Nothing really
- Nothing
- Knowing at least one beekeeper in each neighbourhood that has bees knows how to safely capture swarms and has the equipment and initiative to do so safely. Knowing they are keeping calmer varieties of bees. Knowing they are trained in person, either by a mentor/relative or by an in person class.
- Nothing it is safe and amazing hobby



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Space for proper bee flight patterns without effecting others enjoyment of their property.
- Nothing
- Should be allowed unless someone residing close by is allergic. Bees generally don't sting and are vital for our ecosystem
- Limited numbers and distance from dwelling and yard areas
- That the bees are secured and no concern for bee swarming or increased bees in my outdoor living areas. Very concerning for someone with anaphylactic bee sting allergies. Small Manageable numbers of beekeeping areas might be ok.
- Not opposed but should have to get permission from neighbors as people like my mother are deathly allergic to bees and might be opposed to them.
- Hives should be no less than than 12 feet from any property line
- Peoples backyards for beekeeping is fine. No issues.
- Only small colonies and neighbours must agree as bees can be troubkesome
- Heck yes! There are wonderful companies that the city could partner with to get more people into bee keeping. A small sign to alert people there is a hive (for people who are allergic) is all that's needed
- Yes! Please let us have bees in our back yard!
- Oxygen
- The city should be encouraging as many bees as possible. Responsible ownership is important but no regulations necessary.
- Needs to be well signed with appropriate equipment. Epi pens should be on the premisis
- That the owner has gone through a training course and gets a license so we know they are taking care of the bees properly. I do not think they are a danger if they are properly taken care of.
- Nothing... People should keep bees if they want.
- Yes but a limit to # of hives
- Assurance that they actually know/understand what they are doing, proper education in maintaining, etc
- Love it, should be encouraged!
- This is a great idea, should be registered like a dog/cat licence
- Nothing.
- I think bees mind their own business and I encourage them in my garden ..limit to 2 hives per yard
- I'm all for responsible bee keeping. Bees need all of the help they can get.
- Restrictions on the number of hives that can be kept and species kept.
- Limit number of hives per acre?
- A small distance from public structures.
- It's great however you should get the agreement of neighbours
- I feel safe with urban beekeeping. Ive seen hives and never felt threatened.
- endurance of proper care and treatment of bees, limited number in areas to avoid overtaxing the resources



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I believe it should be allowed. Give one hive / x number of sq m of property.
- More flowers planted for the city bee keepers. A system in place so those who are afraid of bees know their neighbours have them.
- Nothing it will be AOK. Maybe you could develop or borrow existing guides for homeowners who wish to have bees
- No. Just No.
Too many citizens with anaphylactic allergies, and the fact that sometimes, and urban ""kept hive"" will relocate into someone's walls (As happened to the home next door to my parents recently) - unless regulations can be adjusted to allow extermination under such circumstances.
- Nothing as bees are reasonably passive. The hive should be kept on the owner's property and a reasonable distance from public walk ways. I've yet to see a hive in a location that concerned me. I like local beekeepers as my fruit trees, garden and flowers do much better because of them.
- I feel safe knowing there are beekeepers near me. Let nature take it's course.
- as long as the bees are not bothering be at my house, I'm fine with that.
- Great idea but limits
- Absolutely keep the bees, anything that encourages them to survive and to help them, lets do it.
- Would never be safe as highly allergic. Since it's not possible to confine bees not sure how you fix this
- Signage for those who have allergies so they can avoid the area/be aware.
- I don't have any concerns and think it should be encouraged.
- Signage, continual monitoring and training for those who want to keep bees to ensure they are doing what's right for the animals. Application (much like requests for development) has to go to all neighbours AND if they have true allergies THAT has to be verified before it can be denied or ok'd.
- Just limiting size of hive that accommodates the property. Sign that says that bees are in the property but they will not attack unless provoked or hive is threatened.
- Bees are naturally occurring in most urban areas, if you want to keep a hive or two for personal uses, or potentially selling then uou should be providing adequate water, and food sources in your yard (ie: gardens of all types) as well to supply them with what they need.
- Publicize beehive locations within communities so allergic people are aware and can avoid them.
- Limit on hives within a certain area; registration with a board; notices available that a hive is being kept in the area
- The surrounding neighbors should be informed, incase of allergies
- This needs to be limited to a certain number of hives, and how big each hive can be. Perhaps a small, medium and large categories. BUT... for medium and large you would have to petition your neighbors to x radius for the various sizes of hives (for allergies)
- Love this idea.
- A warning of the bee keeping area before I get near.
- Allergy issues present trouble unless safety can be guaranteed.
- Nothing wrong with it



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I need nothing to feel safe, This must be allowed.
- Not in city limits.
- I have no concerns, and would welcome beekeeping neighbours.
- I am absolutely for it, the bees are on the verge of going extinct and need all the help they can get I think encouraging beekeeping encourages bees to thrive
- It's so expensive to live here and people need to be able to feed their families. I know I do. I am 100% behind people being able to use their land for all types of food.
- Big supporter of urban beekeeping but maybe limit the amount of bees a single household can own so neighbors aren't dealing with swarms.
- Unsure
- As long as kept to honeybees that are not African or from other continents
- unless we are encouraging habitat for native bees we should not have beekeeping on urban properties unless they are of sufficient size to minimize impact on neighbors. need special licensing
- Ok as long as the individual has proper liability insurance and does not infringe on the safety or comfort of their neighbours.
- As a person with a severe, potentially life-threatening allergy to bee stings, I do not, under any circumstances, want them moving close to my yard. I have many flowers and enjoy my backyard time immensely and would no longer be able to do this.
- Fencing to protect hive and keep humans away, unless they want to come closer. Not in an open yard for children to get at.
- Being bothered by bees already from a hive a distance away, they should not be allowed
- I would need to know what knowledge/experience is required in order for a person to legally be allowed to keep bees in their yard. Have to admit this would be scary to live beside someone keeping bees especially if I had small children.
- Shouldn't be allowed.
- Absolutely a win. Honey bees are not aggressive, but if someone has hives in their yard, then a sign advising people passing by should be required.
- Anyone whom has taken the time to educate them selves (taken a course?) should be able to bee keep. Bees are not dangerous and should be encouraged in any way possible.
- On owned property of not less than 1 acre.
- Only if neighbors within 5 or 6 home radius are OK with it. Allergies???
- A knowledgeable beekeeper and respect from neighbours.
- Nothing, I have no problems with bees in the city
- I think this should be regulated.
- I have no issues feeling safe with this.
- Should not be allowed. I have an allergy to bees. Should I have to stay indoors if my neighbour decides to keep bees?
- Some reasonable limits on the number of hives
- Nothing - this is an excellent way to support bee populations & bees are generally harmless!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- DO NOT ALLOW. If someone wants to raise bees they can move to a rural area
- Limit in number of hives and distance from neighbours, especially in suburban settings.
- Locations where the hives will not be disturbed/vandalized. Maybe a notice stating there are be hives in the area?
- Hives should be set back from the property line a certain distance, and only be allowed in back yards. The permitting process should permit immediate neighbors to veto a permit application in case of allergies.
- Signage
- Bees should not be kept close to playgrounds or schoolyards. Mostly because children can be unpredictable.
- i believe this is beneficial to help the world population of bees and I do not see any negative impacts
- A notice posted. We need to encourage Urban Beekeeping it is simple and safe and very necessary.
- More bees! We need them!
- 5+ foot fence between our backyards if the hive is within 5 feet of the shared fence. I need to be informed that my neighbour is keeping bees. I need to be informed of bee behavior/safety. If a direct neighbor is anaphylactic, no bees kept at adjacent houses.
- With consultation of neighbours. However, more of this is needed and appreciated. Bee's are the basis of all agriculture and need to be well maintained.
- I am not opposed to this if it does not have negative impacts on neighbors.
- I don't see a problem with beekeeping.
- Responsible ownership. Precautions put in place, to ensure those allergic to bee stings are not put at risk.
- Training course/certification. But absolutely allowed
- Nothing. Bees will leave you alone if you leave them alone
- Only in community gardens where there is a lot of space.
- I think this is a fantastic idea, but anyone who wants to do this should have some type of training/knowledge of the practice. Not sure what that entails though.
- The people caring for the bees have knowledge and expertise in the matter. I am all for people having bees in the city as our bees in general are in danger, but just want to ensure they know what they are doing and are active in being responsible for their bees.
- Yes allow it. We need more bees and more pollinator gardens. Give incentives to people and developers to plant bee friendly gardens rather than unsustainable lawns.
- Yes!!!!
- Nothing. Bees exist without backyard hives.
- Should not be allowed.
- i feel safe about bees
- I think this should be a licensed program and you need to have some sort of certification to ensure it is done properly and safely.
- Just knowledge that they exist and location.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Limitation on the number of hives maintained in a size specified area of private property. Signage on residential or commercial property detailing the keeping of hives. Ultimately some fencing may be required if small children or non-readers could have access.
- Sure. Bees are great
- I am in favour of beekeeping
- Regulations on the number of hives permitted. Otherwise the idea is a good one.
- Absolutely not as its not fair for neighbors to have higher than average number of bees on a property
- nothing. Bees are not an aggressive insect. More public education would help reduce the publics misconception of bee and other polinators
- Limit to number and size of hives on a property. Training for individuals looking to establish hives on property.
- Yes! The bees need our help.
- Signage to warn allergy sufferers.
- Regular inspection of hives to prevent spread of diseases to other bees, prevent owners from abandoning hives, letting bees starve. Strict limits on number of hives.
- Usually development permits require feedback from the locals which I am concerned will be uneducated and unfair. My only concern has ever been those with sever allergies. I have no idea how to tackle that other than notifications?
- I would like to be aware that it's happening and that the people doing it have undergone some type of training.
- Only on rooftops of skyscrapers, or homes backing fish creek (homes that are not too close to others where the bees have open areas to enjoy)
- I don't need anything. I like the idea of beekeepers needing to be in good standing of a beekeepers association of sorts and perhaps having completed a training.
- Irban beekeeping is safe
- Education! Online information, public seminars, outreach programs. Beekeeping is fantastic and a wonderful addition to any urban space.
- Neighbors need to be notified. If one has an allergy, then this should not be allowed. Also should be mandated to join the local bee keeping club to ensure that the populations are kept healthy.
- Yay bees.
- A strict limit based upon the size of the property. While honey bees are not aggressive, there are a significant number of people who have an allergic reaction.
- Nothing, bees create a positive urban environment.
- Should be licensed and neighbours within a 5 house radius should be made aware.
- No city backyard bee keeping !!! There are places called farms for that!!
- I don't see a downside with beekeeping. There will be people who are allergic, but that goes for everything. The benefit society gains from having more bees should take precedence.
- A minimum amount of property in order to keep bees
- You dont need nothing, bees are safe. Give them space



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Bees are reasonably safe - property setbacks, and enclosure in a private / fenced area of the property would ensure that the hive is not accidentally disturbed.
- I don't know enough about Beekeeping however I would imagine if a Neighbour had anaphylactic responses to a bee sting they wouldn't want someone with bees next door ;)
- Beekeeping is welcome in urban settings. No restrictions or bylaws needed. Use existing bylaws for nuisance issues
- Must be in back yard that is septated by a fence with gate
- Urban beekeeping should be encouraged by the city and regulated only insofar as regulation is necessary for the safety of Calgarians and their bees. Bees should be explicitly allowed on rented property.
- Signage. The owner should have completed some kind of training for care and keeping of the bees themselves.
- Urban apiaries can only be had by licensed people who have undergone a course and passed a test for proper bee and hive care. Licenses should need renewal every few years with an updated test. There should be signage around the area for the public. Bee species should be restricted to native species.
- I fully support allowing bee keeping, however I can see how they can be a nuisance. This is a tricky one, allergies, stings etc. I do see the benefits outweigh the negatives.
- That the beekeeper(s) can prove to have reasonable knowledge of the practice and controlling the swarm
- Allowed in any fenced back yard, with neighbour consent.
- Honey bees can sting, notwithstanding what beekeepers may say. Their venom can be dangerous to people with allergies. Bees do not stay within an owners property - they travel and can disrupt the enjoyment of outside amenities. Neighbour consent should be mandatory. Number of hives should be limited.
- Nothing there are bees everywhere.
- There should be a limit on the number of hives allowed per yard, but there should be no prohibitions on having them. They're a safe and clean way of providing food for the family.
- Licensing and regulations to sizing and noise.
- I have no issues with urban beekeeping continuing as it is, with no bylaws needed.
- No problem just not near me as my girlfriend hates bees.
- If the bees are kept appropriately and aren't a nuisance, why not?
- Only safe, North American bee species would be allowed (ie bumble bee and honey bee). There are invasive, aggressive bees that wipe out local populations and attack humans/animals without provocation - those must be strictly prohibited. Size of colony should also be a factor.
- Limit on number of hives. Setbacks from neighbouring properties. Requirements for beekeepers to be educated in how to keep bees.
- In favour. Bee keeping is an expensive investment and beekeepers do not risk that investment by compromising health/safety. Bee keepers need protection from vandalism.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not permitted in densely populated areas. Others have a right to enjoy spending time in their yards without being surrounded by bees.
- No concern. They are not threatening in any way.
- Nothing, I would actively encourage beekeeping.
- If bees aren't native to the area, they will have a negative impact on native bees. Have we as a society learned nothing about introducing foreign species into the ecosystem?
- Common sense
- No!! I would definitely not want to live next door to a beekeeper! Dangerous for everyone, children and pets included! This is a terrible idea!!
- Yes, but I think there should be permits given in order to keep and obtain such creatures. I think residents should have to apply for the permit. Applications should include home checks and husbandry exams.
- Ensure that beekeeping does not interfere with the neighbours' enjoyment of their own property.
- In order for me to feel reasonably safe in areas where there is urban beekeeping, I would require there to be rules and regulations. Beekeepers should be licensed, occupy at least half-an-acre of land, and be required to rule out the possibility of neighbors having be allergies.
- Must keep the hives locked off at a safe distance in a way that bees and can get in and out easily but curious children cannot get in and potentially aggravate a hive and get injured. Requirement to notify neighbors and provide safety information. Keep epi-pen on hand.
- Appropriate care of the animals and signage on the property indicating there are hives present
- Limit number of hives. Homeowners with yards.
- A minimum distance from a residential building/neighbor
- I don't need anything. Bees in the area reduces wasps, yellow jackets and other nuisance pests.
- Yes. But there should be some sort of license or course required.
- Everyone is safe from bees, they're just working away making life better for everyone.
- Bees should have good sources of water in their beeyards, and be well maintained to prevent the spread of disease.
Responsible beekeepers are always welcome in my community
- I like the idea, bees are relatively harmless and provide vital pollination services. However, there should be some guidelines to the size of your property and where they are stored to be considerate of neighbors.
- nothing
- none
- Nothing.
- I have no safety concerns and would love to see more urban beekeeping.
- Guidelines on safe placement and limits on density of hives.
- Limit on hives, but otherwise a great thing



- Maybe a fence so that I cannot go close enough to the hive to be considered a threat? I think that people that do urban beekeeping might have a better idea of what is necessary. Overall I am very supportive of the idea of having urban beekeeping in Calgary. I think it is a great idea!
- I would not want any beekeeping done around my home unless I would be guaranteed they would not be a danger to us or our animals in my own yard
- Very good, should be encouraged and the city should give out materials for people to do it.
- A licence for the beekeeper for number of hives allowed appropriate for the size of the home lot. Also requiring knowledge of beekeeping.
- Limit the number of hives
- I suppose a limit on the number of hives would be necessary and expectations for keepers. Ensure the animals are properly and humane cared for.
- Education requirement for beekeepers
- A reasonable limit on number of hives (2? 3? I don't know what's appropriate).
- I have no experience with beekeeping, but I might be interested because there is a great need for pollinators, particularly in urban areas. I would hope the city would consult with experienced beekeepers to come up with regulations regarding urban beekeeping
- Nothing - I think this should be encouraged
- An annual license to ensure owners are being responsible
- I believe urban beekeeping is important to have in the city. For pollinating, and local urban gardening.
- sure by-laws about how many hives... but, sure...
- I have no issue with urban beekeeping
- city inspector to assure safe handling
- Nothing I'd be fine with bees in a neighbor's backyard no one in our household is allergic
- That they have a big enough yard so the bees aren't bothering neighbors too much.
- If kept to one hive, fine. In our neighborhood there is one property that has three. We cannot walk into our yard without the undulation of bees to enjoy it - they dont care of them. Concern is the people I know who have lethal allergies. A property who has a hive should really post a warning.
- Defined rules for beekeeping. I think as long as the owner (operating) of the beekeeping, whether it is in a backyard or on a building rooftop, is aware of the rules and responsibly taking care of their bees.
- Not comfortable on small lots or multi family housing. I don't want bees next door I'm allergic to the sting
- Bees are a natural part of our lives and are very useful to our gardens. Leave them alone and, if people want bee hives, no problem.
- This makes sense. However before a hive or hives are put in place people in the vicinity should be notified. If individuals proximal to a hive are prone to allergic reactions to stings then the hive / hives should not be put in place.
- Yes - love it - great idea.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Nothing.
- Signs
- No problem as long as the beekeeper is willing to look after a swarm. Bees are good for the environment.
- I am in favour of urban beekeeping as it greatly helps with pollination. There should be a reasonable limit placed on the number of hives allowed within a given area. Where applicable, consent of neighbours should be required.
- Limiting hives. Honey bees are not easily provoked, but for the well being of the bees, a limit of 2 hives
- Just a permit. This is beneficial to the entire ecosystem
- Nothing aside from some way to manage it so that owners are encouraged to learn and connect with best practice urban beekeepers. This is a great idea! We need bees! Maybe community gardens could also keep bees.
- Maybe a warning sign if hives are within a certain distance of public areas
- Limit to number of hives and individuals have taking a bee keeping course. Notifying neighbours of hive placement and being responsible for swarms.
- yes
- I'd like to see the caregiver take a course on safe bee keeping so the bees don't get or spread diseases They are a lot of work but I love the idea
- should not inconvenience their neighbours - safety (allergies), noise and/or smell
- Great idea, but with native bee species. Requirements for good location choices e.g. not directly adjacent to a schoolyard perhaps. Perhaps signage at a beehive location to alert passerby's of the presence of the bees
- Nothing, bees are not a safety issue and beekeeping should be encouraged. Bee populations are declining, and these most important pollinators need to be protected, and beekeeping is one way to help this crucially important species.
- Anyone who applies has permission from neighbours, and takes into consideration possible allergy reactions from stings.
- There should be enough space for the bees so that neighbours are not affected or potentially stung.
- I don't have a concern
- Beekeepers should skillfully manage their hives and ensure they don't negatively impact the surroundings.
- Love it! City can do more to understand what it means to be "safe". More rooftop urban hives in apartments, allow homes to have an amount deemed reasonable by a beekeeper
- There should be signs letting people know they are in the area. And it should be first come first served. So that there is a limit per certain area.
- Fenced area and signage to keep people from disturbing area. Otherwise have no issues with urban beekeeping and would be a big supporter of it.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I am strongly in favour of bee keeping. The hives should be within the owners yard but bees are of great benefit and very low risk.
- Urban beekeepers should require a license, a large private area that is outdoors, and maybe even have signs up so people with allergies can be aware. I think this is could have a lot of potential to increase the bee population and want to see this happen.
- NO! It is just an easy way for ppl to make money and Beekeeping is a huge detriment to wild bee populations. EDUCATE YOURSELVES!
- Education and by law codes
- Bees are fantastic, needed and occur naturally throughout the city. Hence, people should also be allowed and encouraged to have them.
- Nothing. There are bees all around anyway.
- hives in fenced area to keep them from being vandalized or targeted by wildlife, warning sign of hive in area (for people who may be allergic). May need to get approval of immediate neighbors.
- None
- Ensure that any hives are not in an area that could be easily or accidentally accessed by the public. This would work to protect both the people and the bees.
- Policies and standards about bee hive placement and maintenance. Also licensing.
- Education for beekeepers and neighbours.
- Restrictions on the number of bees and hives a single residence may have. No over-wintering of larger bee farms. Permits should be registered and available to access for anyone moving to the neighborhood so they are aware of the potential higher bee population if there was medical concerns.
- Nothing. I think it's a great idea, and there should be no/minimal restrictions on it.
- Nothing. Beekeeping is safe and should be allowed under all circumstances. Mason bees, for example, are harmless and non stinging. I would love to have a small honeybee colony.
- This is fine as long as the number of hives is kept to a small number. One to three hives.
- Yes
- Yes
- I think the number of hives must be limited depending on the lot size.
- No objection
- Minimum yard size of 50 by 100 to have bees and beekeeping area can not be withing 15 feet of neighboring fences.
- I believe any family dwelling should be able keep neeing, as long they are properly cared for.
- Signage - for people with allergies to be able to choose whether or not to approach. Yes, there are natural beehives, but these numbers are greater, and potentially in many houses on a block.
- Yes! Max. hive limit in urban areas.
- opposed
- Not concerned.

- Beekeeping should be allowed but the keeper should have some appropriate training, that includes overwintering, proper care, proper handling of hive. Perhaps a permit/license would be required. Proper signage posted, so citizens are aware of the hives being present. If honey is sold, need a license.
- I feel perfectly safe and want to see more urban bee keeping. Information and classes on bee care could help those who want to get into bee keeping have success with healthy happy bees
- Bees are so easy to keep, specially if you reside near parks, they help pollinate, and give back honey. I would like the idea for anyone thinking about having 1 or 2 beehives must complete a compulsory educational tutorial with a test, and be register with the city.
- Limit to One Hive
Ensure Owners understand the responsibilities (ie. putting water out for bees, so they don't go to other yards to obtain and become nuisances (i live next to house with 3 hives where this occurs. are in our grass/on hoses)
Occasional compliance checks, and penalties if not comply
- Nothing. Let the bees do what they do and they won't bother you. Educate people.
- Love bees! More flowers for the bees I guess
- Signs, warnings and general awareness.
maybe the beekeeper should be notifying the neighbours.
- Nothing, that seems pretty safe. Maybe regulations of number of colonies per square foot of personal property.
- Maybe a sign, but then again any kind of worker bee is relatively harmless. We have a ton of mason bees living in an old wood chopping block in our back yard in Mahogany. They should be around in the spring to help with everything, we sat right beside it in late summer watching them.
- Signage and instructions for how to stay safe. I think given the decline in the bee population we should encourage bee keeping in low density areas.
- I think this would be a good idea, to help the bee population. I'm ok with allowing this, as long as the correct infrastructure is present to house them.
- Yes, for sure!
- Education and planning for swarmings.
- Lot size/space requirements for a healthy hive.
- Not in new communities with small lots, there is the strong potential for conflict.
- Nothing, Urban beekeeping is very safe.
- Quantity. Too much, no longer for consumption purposes.
- Beekeeper must take a recognized course and pay for city inspection of their setup to ensure neighbours safety
- Proper home for the bees
- Should be encouraged.
- Brother is highly allergic and cannot use yard at all as covered in bees from neighbour hives. Unfair to neighbours to restrict their personal space. Invasion of personal space. Home owner.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I'm fine with bees. In fact, I like them pollinating flowers. I don't feel unsafe.
- That they are properly housed on the owners property
- Bees are critically important and should be encouraged. Maybe some way of letting people know where bees are would be good to help people with allergies but no place is completely bee-free. Maybe have a rule where new beekeeping can't be started if anyone with an allergy lives in a small radius
- Hives should be well out of the way so people don't get stung.
- This should be encourage. I don't understand who people would feel unsafe around urban bees.
- Could be kept in safe areas like patio roofs of tall building or open private spaces
- Knowledge that the bees are in an appropriate hive/house. Some limits preventing overcrowding. i.e not more than 2 hives in a given area. Please refer to experts in the field.
- minimise impact on native bee species or allow only native bees, make sure neighbours aren't allergic to bees, minimise possibility of swarming, make sure bee keeper is knowledgeable and educated and accountable.
- More research is needed. Non-native species (honeybees) are invasive and can lead to less plant diversity as they are not as good as pollinating as native (non-honey) bees.
- If my neighbour is keeping bees, I'd want to be sure that there would not be more bees in my yard than if my neighbour was not keeping bees
- I'm good with urban beekeeping - only thing would be a process to deal with complaints if there was an extreme issue
- Limits on how many hives are in a certain area.
- This should be encouraged.
- I theoretically support the practice, but can understand how issues could arise or neighbours may have concerns. Is this something that could be solved by following a process like the Dev Permit process, where you apply, meet certain conditions, and neighbours can give feedback?
- Nothing. Honey bees are generally harmless- they rarely sting.
- Proper bee shelters, regular inspections, registration for urban beekeepers
- That the practice is properly regulated. Beekeeping should be encouraged because of the importance of bees to the environment.
- Nothing, bees are great and we need more of them! As long as the hive is maintained and the bees don't outgrow it, there shouldn't be a need for intervention unless they swarm. All solvable problems.
- No. Calgary's back yards are far too close together. A lot of folks have bee allergies
- Nothing
- Sure we need bees
- Urban Beekeeping should continue to be permitted/unregulated. Ideally proper education (website/workshops) avail for good husbandry/responsible pet owners/ neighbours. Due to possible allergen/reactions, signage might be helpful to alert those with sensitivities to keep away/be cautious.
- -great idea. Proper bee boxes are very safe



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

-licences and inspections required

- Maybe set limits of how many boxes per area. Bigger areas or yards vs small yards. Bees need space and who wants to deal with bees and mosquitos when sitting outside?!
- signage and perhaps fences if close to areas where there may be a lot of children
- I would plant flowers for them
- Rules to ensure safety
- Nothing, bees are not vicious or purposely attack anyone.
- I am fine with beekeeping. It does not seem to be an issue but it grows and becomes a problem then we likely need some regulation around bee keeper training, clubs, where the honey is sold, licensing etc...
- Information, protection of the right to grow one's own food, while maintaining reasonable standards and regulations around it. Public information, helping the uniformed public understand beekeeping better and actively supporting community members who are keeping bees responsibly.
- Yes!! great idea
- Very cool. I have a colleague that is doing that in Bridgeland and they are working well!
- The urban beekeeper should have adequate space so the hives are out of sight and sound of neighbours so as not to disturb. Neighbours should be informed, as some people are deathly allergic. Bees don't sting out of the blue, but accidents happen and we have right to be prepared of additional risk.
- My husband is allergic to bee stings. This is an unacceptable risk to his healy
- A sign or notification that there may be a higher density of bees
- The bees should be in an isolated area away from other homes.
- My concern is more for the safety of the animals. How do we ensure hives are properly set up and maintained? Apply for licence with proof of education and or affiliation? Much like what is currently expected with pigeons?
- Reasonable limits on number of hives
- Warning signs as bees can cause allergic reactions and also just bad stings. Disagree with allowing in city
- A limited number of hives i'e not the whole backyard filled. The owner should have done a bee keeping course.
- Nothing. Pollinators are essential to our food supply and a balanced ecosystem.
- I have no issues with urban beekeeping and do not feel this should be regulated in any way.
- Nothing can fix this ridiculous notion. This should be banned. It has no place in an urban environment.
- No. Native bees are already at risk due to climate change and studies show that urban areas are biodiversity sinks for these wild bees. Introducing pollinator livestock such as honey bees is detrimental to urban biodiversity through loss of food, transmission of diseases and parasites.
- No concerns as long as the bees and beehives are being cared for and maintained.
- Great idea. We need more bees.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- have not had a problem and there are several beekeepers in my area.
- Proper signage so I can avoid disturbing them.
- Don't try to pick up bees? Bees are usually docile insects and don't attack unless provoked. I'd be thrilled if my neighbours kept bees!
- Placement away from heavily trafficked areas and yard entrance/exits.
- Being allergic to bee stings, I would want the opportunity to oppose bee keeping near my home or at least be notified that it was going to be established nearby. I don't object to bee keeping, but want to be informed.
- As long as safety protocols are met, I'm fine with safe beekeeping.
- I think this is great! As long as it is kept to a decent number like one or two hives per household. Also, initiatives for native bees should be paired as they need help too.
- I don't feel as if anything is needed in place to feel reasonable safe.
- Those who would like to beekeep must follow a regulation similar to businesses - they must publicly announce/put up a sign that says they intend to beekeep and the city must allow and recognize if community members vote no as bees leave the property.
- Beekeeping should not be allowed in the city. Those living close to the beehives may not enjoy the increased number of bees in the area.
- All the beekeepers I have met are very careful and respectful. Unless humans or pets in danger should be minimal interference
- Not within City limits
- I'm all for bee keeping. Bees don't sting unless provoked, so they don't pose a safety concern. I've been a gardener for over 40 years and am often surrounded by bees. I've only been stung once, and it was my fault. Education in Kindergarten to Grade 3 would be helpful.
- Someone has received basic training before taking care of the bees
- Maybe just some signs so people who are allergic can avoid the area?
- nothing, bees aren't a threat.
- Nothing. I feel safe wherever they are placed.
- I'm ok with that. Maybe consider an evaluation of the impacts on the ecosystem as a whole.
- No issue with this, however I believe there needs to be a limit on the amount of bees in each backyard. However overall, I think this is a great idea for every single neighbourhood in Calgary.
- If bees are not bothered, they are 100% safe. I have no issues with urban beekeeping. As a city we should be promoting every possible way to support bees.
- Notices and signage in areas where there us beekeeping. City to issue permits to all beekeepers.
- The bees should be kept safe and ensure they are not left in areas the public can access thrm
- I'd like to see signs to notify the public of the presence of bee hives, just for those with allergies. Otherwise, great idea.
- I think there should be restrictions on the amount of hives and location on their property
- Absolutely this should be encouraged. In a time when bees are in decline we should be thinking about how to reverse and protect such an important part of our ecosystem. I do feel that there



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

should be a system of basic education around this so that new bee keepers aren't contributing to the problem.

- Fine as long as it is in appropriate areas (not near playgrounds).
- Not unless it's on an acreage but not in residential backyards. Not in my neighborhood.
- Nothing
- Nothing. We NEED more bees. Obviously I wouldn't want a hive right beside my front door. They need space but we need urban beekeeping.
- How many bees? Is this like 10 bees or 100 bees? I would be very concerned if it's more than a single natural hive location would have in the wild. No one wants to live near a concentrated population of bees. Small populations would be ok. I had a ton of bees on my flowers last summer naturally.
- Owners part of a recognised beekeeping club. Perhaps a website where neighbors can see where beehives are located. Signs in the neighborhoods advising people of bees in case of allergies
- to be a long distance away. My Husband is allergic and has already been hospitalized.
- I am totally for urban beenkerping
- This could be encouraged and expanded to promote urban survival and propogation. All bees, including native and honeybees are vulnerable to extinction and are essential for our agriculture and recreation (e.g., keeping our parks and 'urban' ecosystems intact)
- I don't have an issue with this, however I am petrified of bees and would not them next door to me. So maybe neighbor approval?
- Maybe a sign up saying bee hives present I think they are perfectly fine to have
- Nothing, it should be encouraged
- Obviously there are concerns, especially near condensed housing or when your neighbour has bees and you/your child is deathly allergic. Could you look at restaurants with garden rooftops and community gardens allowing beekeeping in those areas inc designated, permitted farms, the zoo & heritage park
- Urban beekeeping should require a license and permits in place where people will have consulted with neighbours. A concentration of bees in an area could be a health hazard for some with allergies
- I think there definitely should be laws in place so this doesn't cause problems for neighbors. More people want to do this now and it should have rules to follow.
- Neighbours without neonic pesticides.
- Bees are not aggressive. Lol I have never felt unsafe in areas with bees, there are bees everywhere.
- Great idea. I have wondered about one for my yard as well.
- Yes we need more bees considering how integral they are to our ecosystem and because they're dying off.
But they should only be held in a house with an area big area or just a big area where it will not cause discomfort to the owner's surroundings.
- Great idea, bees are necessary for pollination, however people wishing to keep bees should be be educated on the proper care and harvesting the honey.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I'm not allergic to bees so I have no concerns.
- 100% but they should be bee types that dont have Queens like Mason Bees.
If citizens are wanting to make honey you would need to ensure people around dont have major allergies to bees somehow as they would be protecting the queen.
- The current policy of registering provincially is effective and safe. I have kept bees in my yard in Calgary. Our neighbours responded positively and were very curious about our bees.
- Limit of two hives per property
- Don't want to get stung if living near a city beekeeper. Also not crazy about bees being used like livestock... just let them do what they do naturally, not keep them as a commodity.
- Nothing
- Nothing. This should be allowed.
- Just to know they are there so I can inform any friends with allergies. We need more bees in the city and world.
- No concerns, simply space around the hives themselves
- This should only be allowed on larger properties, so they can ensure that the hive is well back from buildings. It should require a license and the neighborhood should be checked first to ensure that nobody nearby had a fatal sting allergy.
- The more the merrier.
- This is a good idea as bees are in steep decline.
- requirment for training for those keeping bees. Possibly limits on number of beehives in a block? (I don't know enough about how far bees travel to know). I think they would possibly benefit my garden!
- Allowing people to bee keepers if they've taken a course.
- New communities maybe but otherwise no reason for it!!
- Education before being able to proceed.
- Posted knowledge of registered hives so house purchasing decisions can be made. Both from a safety perspective and to avoid creating a garden devoted to saving native pollinators and having the garden instead dominated by some dolt's new pet bees.
- Little or no regulation should be added. At best a permit, with education course/training but limits on who or where bees can be kept.
- this one i'm a bit on the fence. ecologically bees are important. but bees have the potential to sting people or other animals, if you keep tons of them around. and there's no real way to control them. so i probably would be against urban bee keeping unless they can be contained and controlled
- Responsible individuals who know what they are doing. Should require a permit/course to verify knowledge base.
- Nothing much, bees are naturally in this area, and are a normal part of life. Should be required to notify direct neighbors, in case of severe allergies having a large population very close would not be ideal for those individuals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- One hive per property, oversight by a master beekeeper, yearly checks for health (for mites, fungal or bacterial infections, as well as husbandry and overall health), winter maintenance requirements
- Warning signs would be nice.
- Oversight to see that the bees are being handled in a way that is appropriate for their health & that no problems are being caused for the community.
- Definitely for it
They keep wasps away and are good for pollination. Older areas would be better suited for this given that they have larger properties.
- Nothing - Urban bee keeping is harmless and valuable to everyone.
- Limit the number of hives allowed per square kilometer
- People should be required to take an accredited bee keeping course prior to setting up a hive.
- I have no issue with beekeeping. They're good for the environment and populations are dwindling
- As long as the number allowed per household is regulated, bees are an important part of the ecosystem and bee farming is very beneficial.
- Not within city limits.
- Nothing! Bees are wonderful, non aggressive and welcome addition to my gardens all summer long
- Light fencing and signage.
- Sure!
- permit and course to ensure safe keeping for humans and bees (similar to Edmonton's bylaws)
- No. People are allergic to bees and this could cause more issues within the city. Outside the city would be better.
- This should be allowed provided the animals are cared for according to animal welfare laws. If needed a license and mandatory training session could be required, and succession planning.
- Signs in area
- Educating neighbours and only allowing a set up if neighbours for a two block radius allow. Bees travel and neighbours should be able to voice their concerns. As well, neighbours would want to avoid using pesticides. Are they going to be ok with that? Bees are a neighbourhood creature not singular
- Yes it would be amazing for the most important creature on earth.
- None. Bees should be protected and protection encouraged.
- Proper set up and knowledge
- A notice, like signs, the bees are in specific areas
- Nothing. Bees are harmless
- To have my EpiPen at all time because I develop an anaphylactic shock when stung. I refuse to have beehives next door. Beekeepers to find out his neighbours have any allergies to bees. They are not allowed to raise bees if neighbours are allergic to bees that could be fatal.
- There should be a limit on the number of hives allowed per sq km or something because honeybees out-compete native bees, and can harm people.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If people are trained in beekeeping and know what they're doing, then they should be allowed to do it. Perhaps a permit for beekeeping?
- Bees need food. Usually the hives are moved around agricultural sites to pollinate crops and fruit trees. There is not enough food in urban hardscape.
- Yes! I'm personally not interested in keeping bees but they are awesome to have around, especially if you have a garden.
- Bees are necessary, but I just wouldn't want to be stung by any. Maybe warning signs posted???
- Nothing ... bees are needed and not invasive.
- Hive size limit. Consultation regarding life threatening allergies next door.
- Irresponsible because you do not know how many people within the bees range could be allergic.
- Honeybees are not aggressive. I only expect some sort of signage and fencing around the hive to avoid accidentally disturbing the bees. Individuals with severe allergies should consider carrying an epi-pen.
- A garden. Flowers, vegetables, fruit trees. I completely feel safe with bees.
- Registered. Limit of hives. Otherwise awesome.
- I don't feel that this is an issue but only if regulations are set so that beekeepers would have to ensure that their neighbours had no be allergies.
- Education about bees/urban beekeeping
- we need to protect native bees, not honeybees. native bees are more efficient pollinators and are under threat of extinction - this is not the case with honeybees. The location and number of beehives should be limited to reduce the impact on native bee populations
- More of this please
- My concern is for the native bee populations that are already under tremendous pressure. This would increase competition for limited food sources and possibly disease. I am certainly not against beekeeping but I am concerned about unskilled people who do it as a fad creating problems.
- I do not feel threatened or in danger of bees. I welcome urban beekeeping with adequate regulations in place, and respect for the bees and the community by the keepers.
- An educated beekeeper (has to have done a course). A willingness to work with neighbours and not aim the bee paths at them. Someone on hand to deal with swarms (not dangerous but scary looking).
- No
- This would need to be limited to one or two hives per household, I like this idea but would not want to have multiple hives in my neighbours yard.
- I am fully supportive of urban been keeping. There are simple best practices that can be followed to make them safe and an integrated part of the urban ecology. As native and non native bees all over the world are in collapse, this should be accompanied by a herbicide and pesticide ban.
- Check-ins to ensure the bees are being properly cared for would be nice



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Yes. It's a great idea but it should be licensed and all bee keepers should have some sort of education and certification. Bees are dwindling and we need to keep them healthy and diverse. So yes.
- This should be allowed, with controls in place to protect people.
- Great idea. Get it done, no need to even discuss.
- As long as the general public is not in danger of being stung, urban bee keeping is good to have
- I don't have enough knowledge to provide an informed opinion here. Clearly, sufficient distance from a beehive to public areas. My main concern would be irresponsible bee keepers who, through negligence, allowed a hive to swarm. That could cause some alarm in an urban setting!
- Signage maybe. Otherwise nothing.
- Homes that are on an adequate size lot. Like pigeon ownership, beekeepers should be required to be a member of some association and be educated. Nailing a beehive to the "neighbour" fence should not be allowed.
- A minimum expectation of hive integrity (i.e. fit some standards) as well as some training
- Limited number of hives.
- I love and encourage urban hives! no safety concern. same needs as responsible pet ownership of a cat or dog - that Bylaw can intervene if the hive has been neglected and/or depositing waste
- Restriction on the size of colony kept.
- I live next to people with bees. It hasn't been a good experience. I believe they need to be sure the bees are being provided for and if they aren't there is someone to call to make sure they are or their bees are taken away.
- Very ok with bee keeping!
- Signage on the blocks where bees would normally fly.
- Signage, instructions for how to act appropriately, public information on how honeybees positively impact our environment.
- As long as the number of hives is limited in residential areas I am all for it
- One hive per yard maximum. No resale of honey. Beekeeping course to understand how to practice hive safety so one knows how to ensure bees never feel their hive is at risk as that can trigger aggressive behaviour.
- I feel fine about this already, I love the idea!
- Absolutely NOT!!! There are so many people who have allergies to bees- It is unkind at best and dangerous at worst to expose them. Essentially, neighbours would be stuck indoors all summer and even then could be stung just coming and going from their houses.
- Lovely. Keep working with the ABC Bees to educate keepers, public and gardeners.
- Should be allowed, but permits should be a must and only so many bees(approx) per area
- If the city uses the Calgary District Beekeepers Association guidelines as regulations I believe that urban beekeeping can be a safe activity within the city. Unfortunately there will be individuals that will go outside these guidelines so the city will have to be prepared to enforce the regulation
- Urban beekeeping is good as it improves local bee populations.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Love this idea. I'd just like to know where the hive was so I could avoid getting too close / stung!
- No hives close to thoroughfares. I have friends who raise bees and know they don't like me. We think, due to my quantity and colour of hair, that I look too much like a bear. They dive bomb me in warning but have never stung. I love that there bees in our communities and especially my garden.
- More bylaw enforcement resources
Max number limits
- No - not acceptable at all. Many people are allergic to bee stings. It can mean life or death.
- appropriate structural areas for them to be in
- This is fine, although honey bees are a non-native species that is moderately invasive.
- Proximity mechanism for non-owners to be protected; protection for bee-owner to prevent hive-poisoning. Also "who is first" mechanism so if a person who has a bee allergy moves beside a person who has urban bees must have a resolution mechanism
- I consider it very safe. And I like it.
- Fine, as long as it doesn't become a nuisance to neighbours.
- Nothing. Based on my research, bees are not a nuisance to humans even when hives are nearby.
- Nothing. Urban beekeeping is brilliant and I think the City should actually encourage this through subsidies or credits or benefits.
- I feel safe already. Maybe more education about how and when bees will sting people? If bees are present in an area, they will not sting, they sting when their hive is threatened or you accidentally step on them or crush them. They are different to wasps!!!
- Let's get started! There is nothing unsafe about bees!
- As there are some people that are allergic to bee stings, there needs to be enough "free space" for bees to be kept. As much as we need to help bees, I'm not sure within communities is a smart move.
- - as with all almost all human endeavours, it is not the majority of owners who follow the rules and show respect for their neighbours that are problems, it is the highly visible and unpleasant minority who flaunt the rules and have 20 hives, not one; 200 chickens, not 3, etc, that give people pause
- Bees are essential for pollination and keeping our global food supply healthy and thriving. I would support backyard beekeeping 100% as long as hives were well maintained and initially set up by trained professionals.
- Nothing. Bees are great.
- Simple awareness if it is in my immediate area. I think urban bee keeping is an important part of maintaining a healthy urban ecosystem. However, preservation of native species is highly important.
- There is no way for the beekeeper to prevent the bees from encroaching/disturbing neighbours. Because they can't be controlled, it should not be allowed.
- I love the idea but it shouldn't be allowed. Too risky given the odds of a neighbor having anaphylactic reactions to bee stings.
- Obvious signage, approval from neighbours



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education around beekeeping in the community and signage when a hive is on the property. - Think "beware of dog" but without the negative connotation.
- I fully support urban bee keeping, without bees we don't get food.
- One small hive per some defined area. Perhaps one per block.
- Distance from the bee boxes.
Only on properties large enough to have a reasonable distance from the next residence.
What about those people who are allergic?
- Bad idea - everyone lives too close together
- I think this is a great idea, so encourage it and keep requirements minimal! If there is a large number of bees, perhaps a sign, and if the area could be open, sufficient warning not to interfere.
- signage
- I think this is a great idea. We need to increase and protect the bee population and responsible bee keeping is a great way to do this.
- A guarantee that they will stay in owners yard and not interfere with the ability of others to enjoy their outdoor space
- I'm not worried about urban beekeeping. I think there needs to be a limit to the amount of hives you can have in a residential yard in the city. I also think beekeepers need to be registered with the Alberta Government so that the hives can be tracked.
- I have no issues with urban beekeeping and think it should be encouraged.
- Direction on size of colony/hive, acceptable placement, and material it can be built from. Hives should be intrinsically safe and are not a concern for me.
- Beekeeping is good environment and world bee populations need to stay strong. Considering most people are afraid the amount of people will remain small.
- That all beekeeping places are regulated by the city and have a minimal structure to run. All beekeepers should have some kind of training. The amount of bees should be limited in order that the bees don't cause trouble in the neighborhood.
- I would like to know that neighbours or local businesses that are keeping bees have had education or some kind of certification on how to do so properly.
- Limit the kind of bees which are raised to less-aggressive varieties.
- They must also plant flowers! That's what bees really need! So they must provide the food (flowers) for the bees
- Nothing. I feel safe.
- I support urban beekeeping, I think there needs to be more of it. There is widespread understanding that bee species are declining and we need them to sustain our agricultural system both large and small scale.
- separation from hives, notices in the area.
- I would rather not allow beekeeping, but if it goes ahead, a large buffer area which requires consent of all residents prior to keeping, for which consent can be revoked by the residents at any time and for any reason, including a new neighbor moving in.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Good if hive in a locked confined space. Very important for our gardens and ecosystem
- Hive entrances shouldn't be facing a neighbor's property.
- I am all for Urban Beekeeping in your own backyard, provided the person knows what they are doing and can come collect a stray swarm if that happens. Also, being mindful of any nearby neighbour's with allergies as you cant control where the bees will be
- Hives should not be too near public property lines and owners on either side of any private property line should agree to the hive placement.
- Just safe bee houses. I fully support urban beekeeping
- I think urban bee keepers should have to apply and take an exam that shows they know how to care for bees and have the time to do so.
- Street-visible signs indicating that bee-keeping is taking part in an area.
- I think it's a great idea! However they should apply for a special license and receive at least one home inspection to make sure the hive setup complies with city requirements and safe for the adjacent properties.
- steps to protect our native bees not the damaging invasive honey bee
- Public education that bees are helpful and critical to the health of the planet. Being scared of a sting is a pathetic excuse to regulate or stop beekeeping in urban areas.
- I feel safe now in areas of the city where residents keep bees. I actually enjoy watching these docile bees as they feed on the flowers.
- A sign front and back stating there is beekeeping going on.
- This should be encouraged. As primary pollinators, our species survival is directly tied to the survival of the bees, and their populations globally are in sharp decline. They help with balancing our ecosystems.
- This is unsafe. I have a neighbour with a large hive. I have friends who visit me who are deadly allergic to bee stings. There are bees everywhere and they can get aggressive.
- Responsible people taking up the hobby. Licencing? Maybe best left to people who know more about this particular "livestock" though I personally think that's a bit much.
- That the keepers are knowledgable in their craft to minimize chances that the bees would leave/swarm elsewhere. That there is a small buffer of land between a hive and an adjacent homeowners yard. This does not need to be a large buffer. As long as the hive is not right against a neighbour's fence.
- Essential
- is a wonderful idea. We need to keep the bees alive. People using pesticides are killing them
- I approve of urban beekeeping as long as the bees do not interfere with my safety.
- I am not very familiar with bee keeping. I would be interested in having some bees. My only concern is if there is a danger of being stung if there are too many. Should there be a limit in the number of hives per property?
- Beekeeping is governed by provincial rules and shouldn't be interfered with by municipalities. I think if people register their hives and follow density recommendations made by the beekeepers



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

association they should be allowed. Make arrangements for expert assessment for inevitable NIMBY complaints.

- Relatively little. If hive numbers / yard are kept reasonable. Access to good bees is provided. And good training provided for keepers I think it is an excellent way to introduce nature to our communities.
- Beekeeping needs no regulation. . If people leave hives alone, they will have no interaction with urban bees
- Nothing, bees are great. I tried to build a carpenter bee nest in my back yard but could not lure any of them. Being pollinators they are a great addition to any community. If anything we need a lot more.
- Enough space allowed around hives to avoid unwanted encounters
- Only one hive allowed per household. Hive should be centrally located in owner's yard.
- A maximum # of hives per household or area enforced
- I have no concerns about Urban Beekeeping. I think it is an excellent idea.
- Bee Keepers should have some training and should register like other pets that are outdoors.
- Nothing about urban beekeeping would make me feel unsafe. Calgary is behind the times in not already having a thriving urban beekeeping community.
- Responsible caregiver that is mindful of their neighbours proximity. Proactive, enforceable city bylaws and productive involvement for issues.
- Love the idea though not for me
- Absolutely, though if possible they should try to focus on native species like Bumblebees (honey bees are fine but an import from Europe)
- People and allergies?
- Educate people as to the benefit of bees and learn how to behave safely around them.
- Just regular checkups to make sure there isn't possible diseases the bees could be spreading to other bee populations it may come in contact with
- Don't allow it!
- That bees are kept away from neighbouring properties such that swarms don't cross over property lines. Our neighbour has a hive and the bees occasionally swarm into our yard due to the hive being too close to our fence. They have a large yard but we don't so we can't use our yard when this happens
- Bees certainly affect all the neighbors way of life in a negative way via allergies, fearfulness, and moreso PROPERTY RESALE values. These 3 points alone would be a highly valid reason why Bees should not be permitted in the city. In reality Bees fly out past their own yard fence to get their food
- Good idea if these bees are not a threat to our wild bees and other wild nectar collecting insects. Will there be enough food, will they interbreed, will the domestic ones take over, will they introduce illnesses? See the trout problem in rivers.
- Yes within limits - provided beekeeper can ensure safety of neighbours.
- Absolutely think this should be legal



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responsible beekeepers. Licensed and bonded. Regulated. Should have to apply to the city.
- never felt unsafe around bees. No special mechanism for me need is required. I'd like to see more than the ones I see currently.
- More information. I honestly haven't read into the pros/cons of this and would love to see some trials being done throughout the city.
- Limit to 5 hives per house.
- Limits on the number of hives, training for the people who own the hives, and signage indicating that hives are nearby.
- No additional notice, but for those with allergies I suggest they may want signage around households with beekeeping.
- Good and useful for local ecosystems.
- Would love to see beekeeping. I would feel safe where there is beekeeping as bee keepers are invested in keeping others safe as well as themselves. There will always be people afraid of bees no matter where they are. We need them for our environment.
- I feel comfortable with the current bee keeping guideline. Only suggestion is to change the guideline into a by-law.
- I would not feel safe living next to someone's beehive.
- I already have beehives in my neighbourhood and quiet enjoy the experience. they help pollenate our gardens, we have learnt so much about them as a species.
- I don't know enough about urban beekeeping but I think that accountability to a local beekeeping club or association is a good idea. Then the City of Calgary can deal with the club or association for concerns.
- Limits to the amount of bees, if you are actually going to allow beekeeping. Maybe the type of bee as my understanding is that honeybees are crowding out the bees that are actually under threat right now.
- Educated (maybe certified?) owners.
- Responsibility - I think it's a great idea, wish I had the courage to try it.
- There needs to be training to appropriately care for the bees. There is a risk of poor bee care, swarming, and disease spread without proper education. There also needs to be a limit on how many hives a person can have.
- Would not feel safe living next door to a beehive.
- To be aware of the location.
- To keep it on farm land and not in the city!!
- Keep honeybees out of calgary, in favor of more support for native bees - the honeybees are not native.
- Love it
- I am fine as is, with the natural and honey bees in my neighbourhood.
- size and location of hives. I don't want a hive located right next to my children's play area.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Nothing, these are insects and behave as such, with very little inter contact with humans or other animals & insects.
- sounds ok
- Owners of bees should have to prove they know how to care for them and to keep kids and neighbors safe.
- Should be allowed, bees are quiet and generally do not pose problems. Extra pollination is welcome.
- I don't think any regulations are required for beekeeping. I feel safe with beekeeping happening near my property. I would actually encourage more citizens to actively keep bees.
- By license only. Big colonies can push out smaller native colonies which upsets the balance.
- Lots of land - bees, like other farm animals need open space, not a small backyard.
- No issues, I think more people should keep apiaries
- I believe this is paramount in order to sustain natural environments and pollination of plants. Beekeeping should be allowed with a license. License should seek to assess the owners practice and responsibility for maintaining bees.
- Nothing in particular. Bees are everywhere as is.
- Limits on the number of hives per household in a residential area with the ability to get more through a city application which includes getting sign-off from your neighbors.
- No, urban beekeeping should not be allowed because the bees do not stay on the owner's property. This impacts their neighbours. Moreover, the bees are domesticated European honey bees that compete with our local native bees, like bumblebees. I read that there are 1400 urban beekeepers in Calgary!
- Notice for immediate neighbours that a beekeeping interest is near them. Permission from neighbours may be a consideration. A community plebiscite to ask of beginning interest.
- a limited number of beehives for each property owner. I would suggest that the lot size square footage may be a determining factor
- Not an excessive number of hives on a residential lot. Bees are not scary or a problem. I think three hives would be reasonable.
- information about the relative safety of honey bees and an indication of where they may be in your neighbourhood
guidelines about where hives should be kept (e.g. distance from property lines, neighbouring parks) to ensure safety
- flowers
- I am not in favour of urban beekeeping. In contrast to commercial beekeepers, hobby bee keepers do not manage their bees for disease. Moreover, there are not enough flower resources in the city for both these domestic bees and our native bee species. Not a good idea.
- Nothing, they're bees
- I feel safe. Many neighbours have bees and the only impact is a more beautiful garden and free honey!
- nothing, stay out of it. Should be none of the city's business unless there is a care issue.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There are way too many urban beekeepers in Calgary! This activity needs to be limited. I think that the city should restrict the number of hives per quadrant and those numbers should be about 10% of the current numbers.
- I fully support urban beekeeping and think registering your bees with The City like we licence our dogs and cats would be good. There needs to be clear guidelines and clear consequences for not following through.
- My concern is more for the bees. Bees do not injure people unless threatened and contribute to the food supply and beautification of neighborhoods. Beekeeping is not easy so I think that people should have to take a course on beekeeping and be licensed/ subject to inspection.
- Large enough area
- Yes!
- Bees are good for agriculture and bee keeping should be promoted within the city. A limit on the number of bee boxes per property would be beneficial. A limit on how close a bee keeper can keep their bees to their neighbors property would be necessary.
- The hive should be kept in a fenced in area so that it cannot be disturbed accidentally which would be bad for both the person (or animal) that disturbed it as well as the bees. Aside from that I have no concerns with urban beekeeping and am in fact a strong supporter of it.
- There are hundreds of be gives in Calgary has hundreds of beehives and I haven't had any issues with them. Issues that have come up seem to have been well taken care with the current methods of dealing.
- I feel safe with this already.
- Regulation that these need to be licensed, if they are doing this to sell, they are having an income and why aren't you regulating this. It should also be done if the property is big enough and contained so it doesn't danger others that are near by.
- I am pro beekeeping. A sign so that people with allergies can safely avoid the area
- Nothing
- respond to nuisance behavior
- I don't feel threatened in any way by urban beekeeping. At the same time, it would be reasonable to limit it to 1 hive per yard, located at the center of the yard (to minimize any possible interactions with neighbours).
- No bees, people have allergies
- The City of Toronto does not allow hives to be placed within 30 m of the property line separating the beekeeper's property from adjacent properties, parks, businesses, streets, and alleys. Thus, beekeeping is not permitted in the higher density neighbourhoods. We need some sort of guidelines.
- This is beneficial for our environment, and should be allowed, though require some sort of permit process to demonstrate proper basic knowledge of beekeeping prior to engaging in the activity.
- need to know location of bee hives in order to avoid allergy impact
- 100% for, so long as space is adiquite and not done too close to property lines (unless agreed on by neighbors)

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Bees should be kept in a manner that is not disruptive or a nuisance. Perhaps hives are kept a minimum distance from neighboring properties.
- We must limit how many beehives are being kept in Calgary! Montreal has implemented laws to put a cap on beehives in their city to reduce the impact to the native bees. Urban beekeeping is at odds with the City of Calgary's biodiversity goals and must be controlled.
- Responsible apian management, especially when the hive needs to divide, in order to reduce risk of swarming. Consent of neighbours within a set radius, in case of allergy or other objections.
- I know many beekeepers in Calgary who are committed to providing a safe environment for their bees. We need more responsible beekeepers like them!
- Appropriate space requirements for hives (ie: a backyard, vs a condo balcony). Maybe some basic training (1hr online, etc) to aid in keeping the bees alive and healthy.
- Bees cannot be contained within the area of your own property, therefor would be impinging on the safe use of your neighbours yard . Keeping bees in a residential neighbourhood is a really bad idea.
- We have a huge problem with urban beekeeping in Calgary! Some people have built their businesses around teaching people about beekeeping and selling started kits. Now we have over 1000 beekeepers in Calgary. The loudest proponents of urban beekeeping are the ones profiting from it. Huge impacts.
- Signage and education
- Notification to the neighbours before bees are introduced to the property.
- Assurances that the beekeeper has been properly educated, and a process in place to evaluate neighbor concerns. Also, hive limits.
- I grew up on a farm and I worked at a near by honey farm. I have looked into urban beekeeping and have a loose plan. I support looking into this and forming guidelines for people that are interested.
- YES! Urban bee keeping is incredibly important to our bee population and ensuring the survival of the species and of our planet. I think as long as proper hives and equipment is used people should be allowed to bee keep wherever they want (outdoors obviously).
- No keep out in suburban areas or on top of buildings. People can be very allergic.
- The current guidelines are quite adequate. There are a number of hives in the neighborhood and they've not been a problem.
- Not opposed with knowledgeable keepers.
- A certification requirement.
- Perhaps the urban bee keeper should be required to take a certified bee keeping course and consider the size of the hive.
- awareness and transparency
- Bees are nice and they don't bring any harm. The limitation could be towards how many you can have in your property.
- N/A. I think there needs to be more of this.
- This would obviously be taken to an extreme by some people and that would change the outdoor enjoyment of others. Not a fan.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- no... too many people are allergic and this is not an urban friendly project--- houses are too close together in most communities for this to not impact another person....do not allow
- I have been a beekeeper in the city for years and my neighbours didn't notice until I brought honey around in the fall. If you are a responsible beekeeper who doesn't have a hoarding issue [personal information removed] There shouldn't be an issue with neighbours. Urban bees are much healthier
- Bees are fine.
- WONDERFUL!!!
Bees are necessary for our flower and fruit pollination. Worldwide they are disappearing. I think if you know what you are doing raising and caring for the bees I see no issue.
- Nothing - I would feel safe regardless
- I feel that bees can safely be kept in the City on a residential lot but I would not want more than 3 hives on a typical lot but if you had a large corner lot or a large lot more hives would be fine. I would encourage people having hives in Calgary.
- Love it. Save the bees. We would not have food on our tables without pollinators.
- Recent research on bees, highlighting their essential role in balancing the ecosystem and encouraging healthy growth in nature, is an exciting and promising for individuals looking to get involved in beekeeping. Many cities around the world are supporting urban beekeeping
- That someone is physically going out and checking people who do this it is the only way people follow rules they know they're being watched
- no problem
- I would prefer to encourage native bee populations in the city. They are much better pollinators and are more important to our environment.
- Nothing extra.
- should be ban
- Urban beekeeping is fine and generally nuisance free. Bee experts and possibly NRCB can inform policy about this practice.
- We have enough green/public spaces (and/or could have more) where people could keep bees. I prefer that they do not have them in their yards. My concern is that neighbours should be able to enjoy their back yards without fears of being stung.
- Signage on the property to inform people in the area that bees are present.
- Notice so that I know bees are around as I am allergic to them.
- No concerns other than the bees are taken care of. Maybe belong to an association like the pigeons?
- This is an area that requires some management through bylaws. Should address sanitation, safety, and proximity to neighbours, schools.
- I have no concerns about urban beekeeping as long as they stay within the existing guidelines for hive counts. Existing nuisance bylaws seem adequate to keep it under control.
- Nothing. Public education would be helpful for those opposed



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Perhaps a limit on the number of hives per yard at 2,
- Honey bees are kept in close proximity to human habitats, all over the globe, for thousands of years. They provide products - Honey - bees wax - pollen - propolis for use at the home consumer level. They contribute to the success of garden plants requiring pollination. No noticeable feces, noise.
- I would be very nervous living next to a beekeeping operation. I do not believe this type of operation should be within the city.
- No to beekeepers ... the urban areas is last place the wild bees ... I plant my flowers for them ... not the beekeepers
- I would feel safer if I knew bees were nearby. They are essential to our ecosystem and urban beekeeping should be celebrated.
- Should be allowed. Bees our the lifeblood of our food sources.
- Educated (and maybe certified) beekeepers. Reasonable limits on numbers of hives.
- The owner has proper training on handling. They speak with their neighbours, especially those with elementary and younger kids.
- I have no issue with Urban beekeeping
- I had no idea this was even a thing, I have no problem with it.
- Honestly nothing. Bees are very docile. They have been kept in back yards and on commercial buildings and provide great pollination. Obviously don't kick the hive.
- Not to be kept within 25 feet of a public sidewalk walkway or adjacent yard/private property. Secured to prevent being knocked over accidentally.
- I am severely allergic to bee and wasp stings. If urban beekeeping were permitted in my area, all of the insects would need to be fully enclosed and contained within a greenhouse or equivalent structure for me to feel reasonably safe (which defeats the point of keeping the bees, entirely).
- This may be workable if sufficient space such that increased bee density does not pose a safety risk for persons or animals. Do not feel appropriate for areas of high density living, or in most single family dwelling communities. Consider restricting to acreages and larger geographical properties.
- All good no problem at all
- Nothing. I am severely allergic to bees.
- Active member in local organization. Educated. Proper yard space, etc.
- I have no response to this as I don't know that much about it.
- Max 5 hives per residential dwelling & fines for keepers acting irresponsibly or with messy/unethical operations. Get YYC Beekeeper Assoc. input. Bees are integral to our ecosystem & benefit both the city and neighbours of keepers (home & city gardens, flowers, trees, fruit, education, honey)
- Neighbours who keep bees should have to purchase full bee protection kits for all houses in a 3 house radius. Or erect full bee netting over their entire back yard.
- The owners have them well contained and take care of them.
- Nothing, other than reasonable limits on amount of hives or bees per property.
- Nothing.
- Upkeep of hives to prevent swarms.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think urban beekeeping is great and should continue. I do not feel there are safety concerns
- All ok with this - as long as provincial requirements are met. Ideally the city should limit the number of hives within a certain radius to ensure enough food for both native pollinators and honeybees
- Should not be allowed.
- I think ensuring that the appropriate amount of space between dwellings and the hives (whatever that distance may be) to prevent those that are afraid/allergic to bees can reasonably enjoy their property.
- I have no concerns about urban bee keeping. So long as there is basic fence around the entry area to keep kids from just running into the flight path, it should be good. (a basic flower garden fence is more than enough.)
- No. Area in city not big enough.
- I would encourage and support ownership of a modest number of bee hives (perhaps 2 per household) with the possible exception of areas where it increases predatory wildlife.
- A good relationship with the beekeeper, which includes talking about location of hive(s) in their yard to avoid issues with neighbours normal and regular backyard activities that may be disrupted by the bees flight path and possible water supply issues. And honey.
- Fine but limited
- No
- Fine limited to 1 hive per property...and only so many total in a community...allergies etc.
- Nothing, perhaps a rule about the setback distances from neighbouring properties and lanes/public areas.
- All for it
- In limited areas...away from neighbors with allergies being able to shut down application
- Good idea to ensure continued pollinations urban areas. Must be ethical and sustainable for natural bee populations.
- Absolutely
- Ok so long on a large enough property that not too many bees in neighbouring yards
- allow urban bee keeping. however limit to how many hives
- Nothing. Bees are not dangerous unless mistreated. There should be no infringement on a persons ability to keep bees in the city.
- Education. Protective clothing. Bees will swarm - not to much fun when living next door or wanting to invite others over for a bbq.
- Respectful distance to spots where neighbours walk and enter exit homes and gardens. Respectful disclosure w neighbours
- Signage at the location and a limit to the number of hives.
- This should be allowed
- Should be allowed
- I do not want this in my neighbourhood ... am allergic to bee stings
- Good



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Nothing - maybe some warning so nest isn't inadvertently disturbed.
- YES PLEASE!
- It should be allowed if the interested party has the approval of all his neighbors (at least 5 houses to his side and 5 in front).
- bylaw or guidelines regarding best practices, public education and limits to project sizing for personal bee keeping.
- Should be allowed everywhere, with the restriction that bee boxes should be more than 2 feet from property lines to avoid accidental disturbances by neighbors.
- I'm good with this. I love urban beekeeping and would love to do it myself
- I think we should allow this if bees are well kept in the yard or under control.
- I have no concerns regarding bees. They are beneficial to our gardens and natural spaces.
- Register urban hives to ensure that owners are being responsible. And have more of them! New York has hundreds of urban hives without issue, surely we could do the same
- - Registration of hives with the city
- - Zoning or parcel size restrictions on where they can be kept
- - Required standards for apiaries
- A controlled density of hives so adjacent residents do not have their outdoor activities affected.
- When I kept bees in Ontario, hives had to be registered and a bee inspector would come and check the hives to make sure they were well managed and uninfected. This prevented infections from spreading from hive to hive, whether it was other honey bee hives or the native bee hives (ie. bumble bees).
- there should be sufficient distance between bees & houses. noise & potential stings in people with allergies are a concern. generally bees don't concern me but hives can be very noisy & should not be close to houses. I think there are many park and similar spaces in the city where bees could live
- should not be allowed. can't control where bees go.
- Proper signage as to "bees present". Safe distance from my property as determined by professionals. Limit amount of hives according to space required/space available.
- A sufficient barrier so that I won't accidentally wander into the zone where the bees would feel threatened by me.
- Yes!! Beekeeping - up to 2 hives per city lot
- Signage warning people that there are bees in the area, maybe with some educational information about how to behave around bees so as to avoid getting stung. Information about the benefits of having bees as part of our environment, and also what to do if you get stung.
- Should have some regulation. Perhaps they should ensure neighbours are okay with it.
- should be allowed
- Hive limit based on square footage and minimum square footage of beekeepers property, adequate feet ht., locked gates. Hives should be in back yards only.
- I believe in trying to assist the bee population however the number of hives needs to be controlled in urban areas



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Controls in place to ensure a swarm can be contained and removed if the swarm lands on someone else's property
- A limit to the number of hives allowed per sq meter.
- Big enough back yard. Limited number of hives per neighborhood
- All for it. no issues
- Well I am allergic to bees and wasps so that is definitely an issue. If you have a large property then I would not have an issue with it, but the smaller one definitely no. There should be a cap on how many bees can be kept and not a continuous growth of the bee population.
- A limit on how many hives can be kept depending on neighbourhood density and intent (personal use vs. selling and requiring a license)
- Not sure but I like the idea
- No
- This is my third year keeping a hive and all is well thanks to a course I attended by Calgary Beekeepers Association. All is well with my bees and neighbours thanks to education and support provided by Beekeepers association.
- Limited number of hives per city lot.
- Personally can tolerate but do understand others would fear this situation- likely more of a concern of families with young children - recommend prohibiting within city
- I think it should be allowed. Perhaps posted signage on the person's property that informs others that bees are located on the property.
- Nothing - I'm not worried about honeybees.
- a responsible owner of the bees (ie ample flowers)
- Nothing. I am not afraid of bees and love seeing them in my garden.
- Yes.
- A limit on the number of bee boxes allowed.
- Bees naturally populate nature & must be encouraged & protected. I have zero concerns about bees even if a neighbor were to have a hive. I think that would be great
- A hat
- Consultation with neighbors would be essential, especially if there are people in the close vicinity that are allergic to bees.
- No
- Its not good. It is destroying the native albertan bee population !! Albertan bees dont produce honey, but they do provide the best quality pollination for native plants. Limit non-natural beekeeping to 1 hive per property. Even then, should be discouraged.
- Nothing
- Seems like a great idea. I know some people are concerns for allergies so maybe just notification or signage at the residence for people to know?
- Hive setbacks from houses, schools and playgrounds



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The bees don't smell and they are quiet, unlike barking dogs next door, Bees are great neighbours because they pollinate our gardens.
- There should be a regulation to cap the number of hives (I have no idea how many would be reasonable) and a minimum distance between the hives and any dwelling.
- Knowledgeable people being the beekeepers so a licensing program to ensure this is the case with those wishing to beekeep.
- Research has shown that Urban bees (honey bees) decrease the number of wild bees (bumblebees) due to decreased availability of pollen/nectar. Honey bees hives should not be allowed in back yards. We kill hundreds of honey bees per day in our yard....we only want wild bees!
- I have a bunch of bee hives near my place in the community garden. As long as I don't bug the bees. I don't feel scared with them around.
- Its about common sense not safety. I'm from a beekeeping family. Maximum 3 hives on a residential property is more than enough. Bees are messy. Eliminating feces as they fly from the hive. Covering neighbours property in the waxy residue. [personal information removed] Ridiculous to allow!
- Honey bees are an invasive species. There has been a significant decline in the native bee population due in fact to the reduction in their food supply caused by the invasive honey bee. Honey bee hives should not be allowed in the city.
- There should not be urban beekeeping within the City of Calgary.
- Limited to Elevated (on roof) beekeeping
- Any place. Natural bees and insects are all around us. The bees and polinators are very important to for all plants and food sources.
- You should ask your neighbours if they have concerns first and not put hive near their homes unless they consent.
- I think it should be allowed, it helps plants and the ecosystem.
- Never safe. My husband is allergic to them.
- Absolutely not. Don't forget there are plenty of us that have anaphylaxis to bees wasps and the like I don't need you adding more to the city thank you
- Some training (certification?) in hive management and beekeeping techniques.
- I think this is a WONDERFUL idea, especially considering bees are endangered. We as a city should be encouraging this practice
- To know before my neighbor installs one and knowing they've had training before bringing bees to the neighborhood and have flowers for the bees to pollinate
- Needs more to be more rules about who can and how many. And how it affects not only owner but also Neighbors
- Love the idea Of urban beekeeping. It will improve my garden and my enjoyment of the outdoors
- Size of property and distance from beekeeping housing to neighbour.
- Limit the number of hives on each property. 2-3 is sufficient. Signage on property so neighbors are aware. Avoid bees in home directly adjacent to homes with severe allergies (dry note required)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be an appropriate buffer between a hive and neighbouring property. People should demonstrate that they know how to keep bees.
- No issues with it
- Allow it. Bees need all the support they can get. It also helps create a healthier natural environment.
- Permits and signage notifying the public that there are controlled hives in the area.
- Unobtrusive signage. Occasional hive checks to watch for disease [removed]. Mandatory education sessions before picking up the hobby.
- I am happy with urban beekeeping as long as hives are safe from vandals and damage.
- Beekeepers know what they are doing
- Maximum number of hives
- Beekeepers be required to attend a competent workshop before ownership. Yearly or every 3 years certification/ licensing, so as to confirm they are within the proper number of hives.
- I do not think bees should be kept within city limits
- If my neighbour did beekeeping i would move i do not feel it is safe in city but i am also uneducated in beekeeping so who knows so long as i dont have tons of bees around.
- That the person keeping the bees has some sort of training or certification proving they are educated in the handling of bees.
- Restrictions to the number of hives each household can have. Proper notice that there are hives on the premises because of children and allergies.
- Absolutely not in areas with zero lot lines. Bee venom allergies can be life threatening. A bee hive located on the other side of the fence from a patio could be extremely dangerous to someone with allergies.
- Excellent idea
- support it, bees are critical to pollination and diversity
- Guidelines on how to properly do such. Love bees.
- there are bees in my area coming to feed on my willows in early spring and they can be seen gathering water from pond. i feel totally safe and have never been bothered or stung. they have a good purpose to offer society and the earth by pollination. if theres no bees, then there is no food to eat.
- bees are helpful in pollination and food.i feel totally safe around them and have only been stung by wasp in my yard in fall season
- As someone with a family member deathly allergic to bee stings, allowing in home yards is concerning but should be allowed, Perhaps in designated or well signed areas
- i see bees but not enough to worry about and they have a good place in community helping pollination.i dont feel unsafe in their presence as they seem to be too busy to notice us
- Yes. No restrictions including selling of products including honey, wax, bees and hives should be allowed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Bees are safe to be around. They just get busy pollinating everything then go home. Native bees and honey bees are no problem in regards to safety. Bats, birds keep insects and bees in check. Balance.
- I support this. Bees are great
- Education is essential. I think if people are going to keep bees they should follow guidelines and be able to keep them properly so the bees don't die. I also think they should know how many hives they can have for the size of their yard.
- Should not be allowed, given the very close proximity to neighbours in our tightly spaced lots.
- Maybe a limit on the amount of hives in a yard? Bees really don't bother anyone so I have zero problem with keeping bees in the city.
- I think we should have more bee keepers, not less. The amount of bees in my garden has reduced drastically in the years I've lived here. As long as the keeper has had proper instruction on how to keep them, I think that's all they need.
- Permitting and/or Licensing
- This is lovely, bees make flowers bloom
- Signage that there are urban bees at the residence. Licensing to ensure proper bee enclosures and harvesting practices
- I am supportive of urban beekeeping for educated beekeepers who are able to prevent and handle things like swarming.
- Yes but limit amount of hives.
- I feel safe already. We need more bees!
- Registration, mandatory education, hive parameters and limits on the number of hives in a square kilometre. Notification in the neighbourhood and regular inspections. There should be consideration to impacts to native bumblebees in Alberta as well - most species are at risk.
- Urban beekeepers should be licensed (modest fee).
- I have no concerns for my safety. However, bees swarm occasionally, and while docile the swarm must be dealt with by a professional apiarist within 12 hours.
- Please do not restrict beekeeping. We need to encourage bees as they are so important to our environment. There are many guidelines in place to help beekeepers ensure hives are safe. A neighbour of mine keeps bees and I have never had an issue.
- Signage, proper housing, nest kept a reasonable distance from sidewalks/paths
- Yes! Signage indicating a hive is near.
- Honeybees are pretty docile - I feel safe when I see hives. I also feel excited when I see hives! Love it!
- Nothing I think it's great.
- I guess just something in place to keep them from getting aggravated. I'd hate to see kids get stung.
- Strict licensing and enforcement in place to limit number of hives per yard, limit on number of homes within a eg. 5 block radius to have license for hive, bylaw officers able to remove any size naturalized unlicensed hive which occurs in my or my neighbours' yards.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education, teach us how to do it and let's save the bees!!!!
- I think having some seminars to teach the proper way to have and take care of bees. We need to help all animals we keep taking more and more of the wildlife are
- That the neighbor is keeping bees. My neighbor had a hive and they were travelling to my backyard fountain for water. I was ok but it concerned my visitors.
- There is no reason to feel unsafe around urban honeybees
- I am supportive of urban apiculture under a permitting process where hive owners/operators can demonstrate that their hives are located in a safe location (based on characteristics determined by an expert). Number of hives in the City should also be regulated not to outcompeted native pollinators.
- I have allergies to bees so well marked and me not who pays attention to signs isn't going to walk into a hive accidentally
- don't know enough to feel safe having large condensed masses of them close by but if it is safe and wouldn't mean I can't eat dinner in my backyard then I am all for it!
- A sign.
- Nothing; bees are not a threat unless an individual is allergic to stings, in which case it is their responsibility to care for their own health by being prepared, just as they would in any outdoor environment.
- Native bee program might be better.
- I have no problems with people maintaining urban bees. I think this is a great idea. We already have urban bees in our neighbourhood, great to see the bees. Bees do not smell, do not bark, or dig up your garden or use as a litter box. Do not steal the bird seed either!
- Educated, as in they've done a course.
- Nothing, everyone should be urban bee keeping.
- I'm all for it. They keep to themselves and the neighbours usually don't even know.
- There is nothing about urban beekeeping which makes me feel unsafe.
- That concentration of numbers of bees is manageable, that the conditions under which they are kept is sanitary, that hives don't lead to bees creating hives inside of nearby residential walls or soffits.
- I love that there are urban beekeepers. this should be encouraged and not unduly regulated
- Nothing. Urban bees are completely safe and leave people alone as they go about their business pollinating our plants.
- I think this is ok but how do you register & monitor & keep admin costs down?
- Urban beekeeping requires more visible services for people who want to pursue it but are not sure where to begin. As well, having signage to
- Not having too many of them. Bees are fine as long as you leave them alone. S
- beehives should be in citizens back yards . they should take a course, understand the complexities of having beehives.
- I am okay with urban beekeeping provided beekeepers are licensed and expected to use the proper bee boxes.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Maybe just a limit on the number of gives you can have and you must take a bee keeper course.
- Nothing. Urban beekeeping is good for our city, our planet, and the bees.
- Nothing.
- As a person with a phobia of bees and wasps, I would love to at least have signage in those areas so I can mentally prepare myself. For those with allergies this would also be helpful. However, bees are extremely crucial to the environment and I am in full support of urban beekeeping in Calgary.
- I do not have personal safety concerns with the backyard keeping of bees. Education about bees and their habits would be helpful if we had neighbours who had bees.
- Nothing. Bees are harmless when left alone. Except I would like to know where the apiary is, for knowledge sake.
- Licensing of some kind.
- No
- A maximum hive population in residential yards; bee keepers should be able to demonstrate they have at least done training.
- Visible signs - informing me that there's bees in the area
- Proper zoning, and a license to have bees, this license should be very cheap, like \$5 dollars a year and stay at that five dollars for as long as the City of Calgary exists. No bees, no humans!
- Signage: potential hazard
Communication with neighbours
- Oh god. I don't even know. Netting? Bee proof netting? Is that a thing? In all seriousness, I think the city could dedicate areas to this much like community gardens.
- Maybe take a course or read about bees and bee keeping- there's a lot of information available. And there are now smaller hives for backyard use. If it helps the bee population I'm for it.
- Would be beneficial for your flowers and plants if well pollinated. Good for the environment
Cons - if you have allergies, or get stung numerous times. Beekeepers need to collect the honey and wax and it can be time consuming. Might not always be welcomed by your neighbors.
- I am in support of urban beekeeping and think this should continue to be legal for recreational purposes. I do wonder about the impact of domestic honeybees on native pollinator populations & would be curious about environmental impact - information on this might change my answer.
- Nothing. There is nothing dangerous about urban beekeeping.
- We live next to a bee keeper and we feel powerless to address any of our concerns. There should be a way through 311 to lodge complaint or grievance. Our neighbors bees poop on our house which is hard to wash off, and if we have any water in the yard is overrun with bees, if it were a dog I'dcall311
- I am allergic to bees yet I see no issue with people raising them in their back yards. The owners need be held accountable for any and all damage to other's property.
- No problems
- I would be worried about getting stung



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Domesticated bees are of no safety concern, and this leading question is intended to stir up unfounded fears and suggests an agenda on the part of the party asking it. Leave the bees alone! That said, as with any animals, there should be reasonable limit based on property size and neighbour distance
- Proper housing and proper certified training to house, care and keep bees.
- I don't want nor support urban beekeeping and do not appreciate leading questions on these surveys.
- Beekeeping should not be allowed near daycares, schools or playgrounds or hospitals or clinics.
- Nothing
- There are several beekeepers in my neighbourhood, some keep bee hives in their backyards. Most neighbours in the area are not even aware of bees near them. Should limit number of bee hives per property. Beekeepers should belong to a local registered beekeeper's group.
- Unless someone is planning on keeping bees on an apartment balcony with close proximity to other tenants I see no risk to the general public and I feel reasonably safe.
- I am against urban beekeeping. Bees would need to be kept contained and unable to fly amongst the public.
- Yes. The bee population is dwindling. If someone wants to there should be no restrictions on bee keeping.
- Sufficient space from hives to other people's properties for them to feel safe. Management of hives to prevent other animals destroying hives and to prevent disease impacting wild bees.
- I strongly support this, we just need to make sure that there is sufficient space between hives and other property owners/users.
- Place a limit on the number of hives/bees are kept on a property so that they don't become a threat or nuisance to neighbours.
- Bees are safe
- I feel safe.
- Good idea only if bees are native species.
- Nothing. Bees help our world go around
- Urban beekeeping can be seen in my neighbourhood and I welcome the sight. However, I think we should be careful to encourage the right species that are natural to this habitat and not alien species who might upset the balance of the natural ecology.
- Nothing, really
- must have urban beekeeping course and be a member of the calgary urban beekeeping association
- Nothing
- I feel totally safe around urban bees
- Maybe a limit of 6 or fewer hives per individual property? I think urban beekeeping is a great idea for Calgary.
- Would help with maintaining and promoting green spaces and plant life in the city as well as promote native plants to flourish. There's no reason to not allow beekeeping.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think beekeeping should be encouraged in the city. It's good for our ecosystem
- I would only be in support of urban beekeeping if the City was sure there are not impacts to wild bees. Honey bees can compete with wild bees for food and spread diseases. Urban beekeeping Calgary has increased exponentially with no consideration for native bee conservation.
- could be fatal with people that are allergic, I feel like it shouldn't be done within city limits purely because of this.
- Cool with it.
- Good for environment.
- Nothing. Allow them.
- -Secure fenced yard to keep pets and children away from bees (for the bees' sake)
-Must pass beekeeping course through continuing education or from actual beekeeper trainer.
- Health and safety of bees.
- Responsible hive management
- This is a good idea and should continue. Help people do it in a way that supports the over all bee population. Encourage people in general to plant bee friendly plants in their gardens.
- Urban beekeeping provides an excellent ecological service for the city. The Calgary beekeeping association recommended practices should be followed to ensure safety. The city should not introduce any additional bylaws regarding beekeeping and leave it up to the agriculture ministry at the province.
- Yes I believe so. Perhaps ensuring a beekeeper license so there is a knowledge base to understanding swarming when queen bee needs to find another hive.
- should not be allowed. Bees require medication is they get sick and urban beekeepers are not going to get a VCPR with a veterinarian in order to take care of their 1 hive. This puts other bees, including actual commercial operations at risk of disease.
- Notification as a neighbour and larger yards or separation by a certain number of feet, but overall not a great concern.
- I don't know. I'd be concerned about getting stung.
- 1 acre or more properties.
- No problem. Bees are good for the environment and we need more. I don't see bees as a threat - of course if someone is allergic then it would be a problem having them in their community.
- I think it's a wonderful idea... extensive bylaws would need to be in place
- Not allowed
- Nothing! Bees are nice!
- Good
- I think this is a great idea, with a focus on native bees, and native flowering plants, but not limiting to this, will be greatly beneficial and we will see a more vibrant flower scene in Calgary.
- all for beekeeping in urban areas - if there is a licensing process and people are responsible
- I dont feel there would be any issue or conflict. The world always always needs more bees



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No, not enough pollination supply within city for many hives. Rocky view county won't allow bees for acreages under 2 acres. Calgary lots are too small.
- I support this, there is nothing but positivity that can come from housing non invasive honey bees. Owners should have to attend a course to properly take care of bees.
- Is it true the bees used for beekeeping are different than the bees in our environment. If so they shouldn't be allowed. Only bees for this area. My understanding the keeper bees can kill the natural bees to our ecosystem?? Is this true? I'm all for bees but the right ones that can cohabitate
- It needs to be in a place no less than 4 acres. No residential bee keeping unless they have minimum 4 acres
- Complete ban. If Rocky View County & other neighbouring regions have bylaws deeming that land less than 4 acres CANNOT house bees or chickens, how is it possible to provide the land space clearly needed by these animals within city lots? If cats have to be contained in a yard, so too will bees.
- Urban beekeeping is great for the city as long as people know what they're doing and they have someone to guide and direct them. Having some kind of registration and an inspector would be a good idea.
- I am in favour of urban beekeeping in areas where there is sufficient plant life to support it.
- As long as it doesn't affect the neighbors I don't see why not. But if it's a issue with too many bees and that people are not being stung then maybe not.
- Permit and consultation with and approval by adjacent and affected neighbours
- This should be allowed. Limit restrictions.
- It should be advertised so that people know that they are passing by. However anyone should be able to keep a beehive in their backyards as long as it's fenced, without having to declare it or have a permit.
- Anaphylactic shock... The risk is so great, that unfortunately this should not be permitted. It is a sacrifice to protect lives, not comfort.
- Bee hives are located away from public walkways etc. to minimize a chance of being stung.
- Fine with it so long as people keep their bees healthfully and safely.
- This should not be allowed
- Na
- Perhaps a licencing system to ensure the beekeeper is knowledgeable.
- Just some signage. I LOVE the bees in my "back yard". [personal information removed]
- I never felt unsafe in an area with bee hives. I understand that honey bees are not aggressive. People with an allergy to bee sting would likely be more concerned about their safety. In that case, a sign stating how far one is from a beehive should be enough.
- Responsible bee keepers, trained and training
- Quiet and no mess or bad smells that disturb the neighborhood. I might be worried about kids who have bad allergies to bee stings.
- Reduce minimum distances from neighbors or walkways to 2 meters.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I am quite comfortable with bees in the city after having a couple of hives next door one summer. The bees were very good neighbors.
- I trust my neighbors to be responsible, many hives in my neighborhood and no issues
- Sure if you have a adequate yard and are registered/licensed to do so. Also maybe not directly near schools or playgrounds
- I'm not so concerned about human safety with beekeeping, I'm more worried about the effect on native bee populations that will face increased competition and disease. Hives in Calgary should be regulated to ensure beekeepers are inoculating their bees properly to prevent the spread of mites/disease.
- As far as I know bees are quite safe, and would help urban agriculture efforts greatly. However there may need to be restrictions to avoid introducing invasive species of bees, provided there are not already provincial and/or federal regulations.
- fencing and signage to indicate bee hives are present.
- An understanding of nearby allergies
- Unsure, education in this area for the public?
- Do not wish to have beekeeping in our area as I am quite allergic.
- Nothing. I think people should be allowed to raise bees. Can be left as a courtesy to inform neighbors.
- Open information from the keeper
- There should be no issues with urban beekeeping. Alberta already requires you to register your hives with Alta Agriculture. That is sufficient.
- I want there to be guild lines for lead practice so citizens can be successful in bee keeping! A limit on hives probably makes sense too.
- Some signage around the property to notify people there is more bees around; in case of allergies
- A warning sign and a safe marked area.
- Owners to be competent. All bee farms to be licenced. Setback from housing requirements. Enclosure requirements.
- Required notification of neighbors
- Restrictions on the number of hives - no more than one or two per yard. Keepers should have to provide some proof that they are knowledgeable about bee keeping.
- Nothing! Bees are the best. In fact the city should invest in more honey bees near parks!
- Nothing. Bees are not a threatening animal so long as you don't pester them. We need to educate people on both beekeeping and how to respect our bugs.
We should also endorse MORE native beekeeping
- No issue
- Having beehives be reasonably spread out to prevent population die offs from disease (e.g. American Foul Brood).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- As a person who is allergic to bees, I would be very uncomfortable with beekeeping within my local area. Although I appreciate and support the efforts to save the bees I think this needs to be limited to specific areas that have been set up for this.
- I do not have any comments on this. Lack of knowledge on my part.
- Proper housing and management of bees, so they are cared for properly and don't invade neighbour's property.
- Nothing! Save those bees baby!
- Responsible ownership
- I think it should be allowed, it would help with pollination in the city and nice to get fresh honey. I don't think there will be a huge risk to anyone with allergies as they usually only sting if threatened.
- Honeybees should not be kept as they are negatively impacting our wild bee populations, and subsequently, our native plant species. For safety measures, however, signs should be put up so those with severe bee allergies are aware that there is a higher bee population in the area.
- Totally pro city bee keeping. I want my own hive.
- I'm ok with it
- great, helps pollination
- No problem
- Make sure they are native honey bees so that they support our eco system. Also, I'm okay if the neighbour is responsible about keeping the bees ensuring they don't get out of hand.
- Nothing, no regulation, maybe incentives to keep bees
- Ok
- I'm not opposed but would like to see some restrictions on how many could be within a neighborhood.
- Reasonable knowledge on the part of the beekeeper.
- I don't know enough
- Bees aren't aggressive. Better education is needed for neighbours of bee keepers.
- Should be allowed with rule to regulate. It is important so that we can address sustainability in our changing climate.
- Concerned about family members allergic to bee stings
- Notification that there are bees in the area and addresses of where the hives are located.
- good idea
- A limit on the amount of hives and a manageable colony.
- No concerns.
- With proper training, no problem.
- awareness and knowing proper safety measures are implemented
- Rules to protect bees and the people living around them - otherwise fine.
- That the owners are held to same license procedures and inspection checks to make sure they are being responsible beekeepers and not creating an unpleasant atmosphere for their neighbours.
- Notification that hives are on properties.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responsible beekeeper that knows how to properly manage and care for their bees. Ex a good bee keeper could see if bees are aggressive and find out why or re-queen the colony if it's just an aggressive queen. Bees are everywhere and are important for pollination and responsible beekeeping is amazing
- I think urban beekeeping is fine. Bees are not vicious like wasps and only sting when attacked. If you are respectful of the bees there shouldn't be an issue.
- I think it's a great idea.
- I love the idea of urban beekeeping. I would just hope that the beekeepers know what they're doing.
- You shouldn't need a permit! We should be encouraging more people to keep bees. We need more bees and less wasps.
- Perfect
- I am ALL FOR urban beekeeping. It helps our environment and does not hurt neighbours. The bees used are usually not aggressive like wasps and so I welcome them!
- Distance. Don't 'bug' the bees. Leave them alone and for the most part they'll not sting you. A single sting resulting in ridiculous bloated human response is an example of the silly 'power of one'. One person got stung so 'the system' recoils in horror and overreacts. We are NOT the rulers of Earth
- This is important and I agree with it to a small hobby size, not an urban industry.
- This is a big no for me. I am allergic. If someone wants to keep bees, I would potentially be open to it as long as there was a strict size limit on the hives and they have to ask the neighbors, 2 ways on each side, if they object. Should be declared on property so real estate agents can search.
- I would be interested in keeping bees! Pollinators are important. Honey is delicious. And if set up properly a hive shouldn't cause any trouble for neighbors. I think having cities that support greater biodiversity and sustainability is the way of the future!
- Yes, so long as it doesn't interfere with the neighbours' enjoyment of their property. If an adjacent neighbour has a documented life or health threatening bee allergy, that should be an automatic veto.
- Think we should encourage this but limit the number of hives.
- We already have bees in our neighborhood, doesn't bother at all. I personally like it, very cool to have pollinators in Calgary.
- Not sure
- Perhaps a licence similar to dogs/cats that requires owners to comply to a regulation- ensuring hives are tended to appropriately
- I think the more honey bees we can help to exist in the world, the better.
- Notice of the activity if there are serious allergic persons in the area.
- I have no issue with it, but assuming people with allergies do, a req to inform residents within a certain radius. If it presents any risks, there should be standards/requirements in a bylaw for beekeepers, and info provided to residents about mitigation strategies beekeepers have in place.
- As a society we must do everything to promote bee health. From beekeeping practices to herbicide use to pest control and finally to educating Calgarians on the role bees play in our overall health.
- what? I don't understand this question. How can honeybees make me unsafe?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Signs
- one hive is natural after that, it could become a danger.
- I think that people just need to be aware if there is a larger beehive nearby. Signage would help.
- Establish limits on quantity of hives.
- Absolutely. Especially if it improves local farming and sense of community
- no issues
- Yes! More bees, even with allergic family members I still thinks it's worth it.
- I always thought pigeons were part of the landscape of a city. Homing and racing pigeons are for a few not the many and maybe should be designated to specific area in town just for them.
- Ok in limited numbers
- protect the bees from people. so the hives need to be protected.
- No concerns
- I think it's a great idea and should be encouraged. There should be no or very little barriers to proceeding.
- There are several hives in my neighborhood and we haven't had any issues. In fact, we like the pollinators, and our apple trees have produced many more apples than before the hives were around. We feel very safe around the bees, and to continue to feel safe, maybe limit to three hives per property
- I think it is exciting if it is done responsibly. I think individuals would need to prove know how and that there would need to be signage warning people of any danger.
- Go for it!
- Signage about the activity, to know what to expect.
- Definitely like the idea! Let the neighbours know that there are hives. Control the number of hives possible within a given area.
- As a former bee keeper, I feel fine about bees in the area as long as they are well cared for.
- Nothing special, except maybe a sign or something?
- I have no issues with bees. I wonder if people need a certain square footage of yard in order to keep them?
- Not in the residential neighbourhoods.
- Bees are great for our environment and don't cause any issues for me. Bees leave you alone if you leave them alone
- I do understand the importance in bee keeping. I feel it is import to encourage beekeeping but maybe limit the amount allowed in the city center.
- People who want to keep bees should have to complete a course and follow guidelines to ensure they know what they are doing.
- urban farm sign
- Urban beekeeping should be allowed, full stop. Bees are rather harmless, and we need to ensure that the population grows and our food system protected.
- Allow people to do this at their discretion. No license or regulations.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ridiculous. Endangers households and should be illegal.
- Limited use of pesticides and herbicides on city managed land. Design pollinator corridors that attract bees away from high density traffic.
- I love the idea but I would limit a certain number of hives per neighbourhood. I know people have allergies if stung.
- Not sure on this one. I don't know enough about it. I know I am not a fan of a ton of bees lingering around.
- Some sort of netting or barrier to keep them contained and not harassing me while I'm enjoying the outdoors
- Ensure there is enough room for the hives in the yard and so there is enough space for bees to access their hives. Education on the benefits of honey bees in the neighbourhood. Application and education process for those who want bees in their yard.
- Nothing. I don't have an issue with beekeeping.
- Absolutely!!!!!! Without bees our food source is affected!
- Signage
- It's a good idea, perhaps limit the number of hives an individual may have
- Huge concern as my self and several members of my family are severely allergic to bee stings
- As an alternative to pesticides, look into hosting bat boxes as a method of pest control.
- Urban beekeeping is essential 2 responsible caregivers of the bees. Whoever wants to be in urban beekeepers should be allowed to
- Signage
- This would be a no from me unless they had an acreage, there are a lot of people allergic to beestings etc. they would have to be a set distance from perimeters and it should be large
- Great idea!
- Nothing. They are safe as long as they are a domestic variety.
- Regulations regarding the number of hives in one area and the size of the colony. All licences should be required if it is a business. Enforcement and fines for anyone who does not follow.
- Shouldn't be allowed. I don't want to be stung or swarmed
- That would be great, citizens would have opportunity to have home made pure honey.
- Nothing
- no issues
- No issues
- Urban beekeeping is an excellent way to increase and help stabilize the bee population. It also helps to educate and familiarize people on their habits and benefits.
- I feel safe
- Rules as they stand at present work. I fees safe with the urban bees located in our vicinity. There's no noise or odour from them. And, they pollinate the flowers and veg in the garden.
- Nothing. It is perfectly safe, although not environmentally responsible as honey bees can out compete our native bees and pollinators.



- Yes great idea
Must meet safety standards to not create conflict with other residents
- Might be a good idea to have a sign indicating that bees are on site.
- Nothing. Bees aren't aggressive. The only time I've ever been stung was when I stepped on one. I'd be fine if my next door neighbors had bees. My only concern with domestic bees is that they can outcompete native bees for pollen & nectar.
- Complaint process if there are issues, and the ability to fine owners if required. There should be some regulations in regards to the size of hives allowed based on yard size and an annual permit to have one.
- A great hobby but it should be licensed.
- All for it
- Signage warning of bee hive in the area.
- I think urban beekeeping is a great idea and way to help bees thrive
- not okay
- Scientific studies show that urban beekeeping is detrimental to the native bee population. The honey bees take food away from native species. They are also less efficient at pollinating our plants than the native species are. Honey bees have their place in agriculture, not in urban settings.
- Limited number of hives allowed
- Limiting number of hives
- I want to know about the bees in my neighbourhood, be educated about what they look like, risks and benefits. A member of my family is allergic to wasps, so education would make us feel safer.
- I would not want bee hives next door to me, concerned about me or my grandchild stung.
- I am definitely okay with this, but people should register with the city if they plan to do this. It should not interfere with the safety and well-being of neighbours, but that being said, neighbour complaints should be warranted rather than just complaining for the sake of complaining.
- No concerns other than contact information posted for neighbors should the bees start creating a hive outside of their "home hive" to have them moved back. Great initiative otherwise!
- Responsible bee keepers. That need to ensure that the bees can't get out of their area and cause potential harm to others.
- Nothing - I think beekeeping should be allowed in all spaces
- Neighbors should be informed of the beekeeping for their safety and bee safety. Otherwise no big deal.
- Ensure safe bees and control number of bees so that additional queens don't go just anywhere and set up hives in trees.
- Fully support. Bees are good for the environment.
- I fully support urban beekeeping as long as people are trained properly in how to do it. Perhaps a two day training program resulting in a certificate or license that allows a person to keep bees?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They need to have hives away from common property lines (ie: shared fences) and would need to prevent negative interactions. Hive maintenance and proper disposal would need to be considered. As well as neighbours with allergies.
- Nothing, bees are great for the environment and ecosystem
- A friendly sign that states there is an urban beehive in the yard or area. People are likely to be less scared if they see bees and hopefully supportive if they know it is there.
- I do not believe that anything needs to be in place other than registering the hives as you would a dog or cat. I hope Calgary fosters a healthy beekeeping community as it greatly increase the vibrancy of the city.
- I don't think this is a safe urban practice & is also intimidating to neighboring people and pets in the community. Imagine living next door to a city yard that is packed full of beehives! This should not be allowed in a city urban environment--the amount of regulation& policing too expensive, too!
- Education on how to deter bees from one's own proerty
- That would be a great opportunity for the residence of this city to produce their own honey.
- Should not allowed.
- I think it should be permitted.
- Bylaws as to how many hives can be on 1 property and maintenance of said hives
- I am fine with it but signs would be the biggest thing for people like me who are allergic to them like a be ware of bee sign on property fencing
- Ok. No disease allowed
- Nothing... bees do not cause issues as they are not aggressive.
- I have no concerns about urban beekeeping. We do not keep bees in our yard but a neighbor has bees that visit our yard regularly through summer. They don't cause any trouble at all, they are not aggressive in any way and we enjoy watching them visit flowers around our yard. They are wonderful!
- education and information
- That the bees will not come in my yard and compete with the native ground dwelling bees that are trying to survive on my property. I personally feel safe.
- Love it! Great idea
- Distance from fence/public land to prevent stings.
- The area surrounding the hives needs to be fenced in and the hives need to be a reasonable distance away from areas where people may pass by, so they will not be at risk of exposure to many bees.
- Keep as is
- no issues with beekeeping. It's a huge benefit for everyone, pollination of trees and plants, fruit. Its a good idea!!
- Nothing. Our neighbor has a hive & we're ok with it. He shares the honey so bonus
- Our next door neighbours have a hive co-managed with a beekeeping professional and it has been a boon to our gardens, an education for all and the hive has never been a problem. All for it!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Bees have a high potential to be a source of severe allergy and phobia for many. Hives should be kept in a space that is a considerable distance from other homes.
- Not sure
- yes by those willing to be educated by professionals . too many bees dies from lack proper care due to lack of knowledge and education on the part of the hive owners and hives not properly attended by "companies " that say they will maintain hives them on others properties
- Appropriate signage should be sufficient plus if it's in a residential neighbourhood the permission of the neighbors on the street.
- I'm worried about kids with severe allergies who wouldnt be safe playing outside if the neighbors had bees. Maybe requirements about keeping hives a certain distance from property borders.
- That bee keepers are knowledgeable of safety precautions and it is not being over done
- Should not be allowed in urban areas, rural only.
- Not really because it takes a lot of learning, most won't do the work.
- Safe amount of distance from the hive, a lot of back yards are too small. Some type of beekeeping license/class where you have to demonstrate competence, with the fees to help fund removal of abandoned or poorly kept hives
- Required distance of hives from neighbouring properties and schools/playgrounds
- Beekeepers must have some sort of license and have been trained in where they should be, how to establish a safe hive etc. Not permitted to just the average person. Also limit the amount of hives based on an expert's (not a councillor or general citizen) knowledge of what that number should be.
- I do not know a lot about bee keeping to know what would be needed to feel safe, but would support responsible citizens keeping bees
- Education/back up plan available if something happens
- In many developed European Countries urban beekeeping is highly supported and encouraged . They are considered part of city green development by pollination of flowers and by their presence indicating clean environment. Important is also the community economic benefit.
- There needs to be adequate room for bees to be kept safely. I agree wholeheartedly that bee keeping should be encouraged.
- Bees generally will not bother humans so there is no concern of being safe. But bringing in foreign bees for urban beekeeping can decimate the natural bee populations. Something should be put in place to screen and ensure the bees can interact and have access to plenty of resources.
- Ban
- Great idea. Strong and clear regulations will be required.
- I would support bee keeping, as long as the hive was not too large. There needs to be a limit.
- Signage
- More education and public awareness - is it dangerous to keep bees near people?
- I think this has to be a case by case approval. Very few bee friendly areas for pollinating without people using pesticides.
- Bees and bee hives do not make me feel unsafe. I hope to one day have a small hive in my yard.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- require membership in the Alberta Beekeepers Association; limit number of hives in urban setting. I think anyone wanting to keep bees cares for the health of the hive and will be responsible.
- Hives are located so the bees enter and exit in a fashion not disturbing neighbours. Limit to three or four hives per residence
- I see major issues if a neighbor sets up a bee hive and for instance someone next door has a bee allergy. It's not fair to allow one neighbor to have or do something that can not be kept withing their own yard. We don't want to allow roaming cats or dogs so why bees.
- Fine, does not seem to be an issue
- Nothing. What is there to be afraid of??
- yes, because bees are endangered and honey is amazing a lot of different things.
- Yes! I think this is a fantastic opportunity for hobbyists and people to supplement their income. Honey is a super food (especially in its unprocessed form).
- Some control on the numbers of hives in a given area - our neighbors have 2 hives and they have not been a problem for us.
- I am not in favor of it simply because it has the potential to be handled irresponsibly and there are a number of people with deadly allergies.
- Adequate education/training for the people keeping bees to ensure safe and humane beekeeping. Maybe a limit on how many hives based on property size?
- Hive volume limits
- Nothing zero issues with beekeeping. It is a great idea. Maybe limit the number of hives one can have
- Limit the number of hives to three.
- It's great!!!!!! Should be encouraged
- Restriction on the number of hives/bees based on acreage of the property. The smaller the property the fewer amount of bees. The exception being high rise building where the bees have more room to spread out.
- Absolutely, perhaps with a permit system to ensure the landowners are taking proper steps to secure the correct hives and have plans for extraction, swarming, winterization, etc.
- Give your neighbors notice of the hive and a chance to discuss any issues with it. If your neighbors agree i dont see there being a problem.
- Nothing
- Nothing. Bees are relatively harmless and necessary for plants.
- Proper management
- I think there should be notification of people in the area before it happens , my concern would be someone neighboring with severe bee allergies.
- I support urban bee keeping. I would support an incentive program by the city to encourage it.
- Sounds cool
- Do not allow. Too many people are allergic
- Nothing. It should be allowed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- best practice bylaws from other well governed and regulated cities
- Limits on the number of hives. Also, honeybee keeping it has a detrimental effect on native pollinators.
- Must be on private property that is fenced
- Nothing.
- Yes, one hive per household.
- Not in heavily populated areas or near schools/playgrounds. Lots of people have bad allergic reactions so no urban bee keeping close to neighbors that have this high sensitivity.
- knowing that people are knowledgeable and able to appropriately care
- Proper set up. Bees are so important to ensuring we continue to have healthy gardens.
- Safety protocols, though I'm unsure of what that is. I support beekeeping, would just want to be sure that those with severe allergies to stings are not affected.
- Maximum bee farm towers based on home owner land size. Eg 1 tower per house on a 60m² property? Just as an example.
- Nothing, love urban beekeeping! There should be more of it!
- I think reasonable numbers is important for urban beekeeping.
- Limits on the number of hives.
- This should be allowed, they can't really do much to keep the bees other than ensure their farm meets the bees needs
- Not up against a fence or garage that someone else owns. Not an 'excess' number of bees in someone's yard if they are undesirable.
- I love urban bees! I purchase urban honey, I have planted bee-friendly plants to support local hives. I know of non-profits that have hives. I think this is a beautiful way to pollinate city fruit crops, connect people back to nature and to preserve bee populations.
- None I Fully support it
- All for it! Bring it on!
- No concerns.
- I have no problem with this. Honey bees are not dangerous.
- Yes please
- Not have it in residential neighbourhoods or near public parks, netting or other containment requirements to keep them out of others property, owners of bees accountable and liable for any harm or damage the bees cause
- Applications for a permit much like secondary suite- input from neighbours
- A limit on the number of hives or bees.
Maybe one - 2 only?
- I support urban beekeeping. There are many benefits. I suppose if there are bees that sting signage or proper enclosures need to exist so people aren't accidentally disturbing the hives.
- Fencing around the bee hives



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education. I love the idea of beekeeping but don't know enough about the impacts on others, including safety.
- I agree they should be allowed. As long as they are not causing issues.
- No more than 2 cells.
- I have no concerns regarding this. Bees are endangered so anything we can do to support them should be encouraged.
- I'm in favour of bees, but I know this can be a concern for people with bee sting allergies. City lots are small, and bee presence will increase on neighboring properties, which increases the chance of a bee sting incident of a susceptible person (e.g., needs an epi-pen).
- We need bees. Yes yes yes everyone with the space and time should be keeping bees.
- Go for it!
- A limit to how many hives one can have and they need certification that shows they know how to keep them and are responsible!
- Signage alerting people of their presence. Will reduce numbers of native bees so not supportive of urban beekeeping.
- Why does this need to be urban. Bees should not be kept in places where neighbors are within 50 feet.
- This seems like a great idea given the trouble bees are in. It should be somewhat limited though, so that neighbours are not affected by large swarms of stinging insects.
- Permitted by Alberta agriculture. Density of maximum of 2 hives per yard.
Provide water source in your yard for your bees.
Maintain hives to prevent swarming. Let your neighbours know you have hives, be open, they are to let you know if there is any issue.
Address the issue if any.
- Yes this is a fantastic idea it will help the bee population and our agriculture as a whole
- Hives are not kept near shared areas like fences
- Nothing, this is safe enough.
- I am all for it. The bee population is dying off we need more keep e alive.
- Just an assurance the owner is trained to safely keep bees. Requirement to keep bees a certain distance from the property line to minimize conflict with neighbours.
- 100m away from neighbours
- Acreage...not densely populated neighborhoods
- I'm fine with this.
- No - too many people allergic to stings
- Beekeeping should be monitored and fines should be issued for any hives that swarm.
- Limit per square foot of property of how many boxes you can have.
- Signage that there is a bee farm nearby, esp for those with allergies.
- I am terrified of bees and lots of people are allergic. I don't think this would be appropriate to have in the city.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Yes. Limit number allowed. Certain homes.
Rules to protect animal when owners stops activity.
- YES, MORE BEES! I believe those that have courses/certification should be allowed to raise bees. I feel the amount of hives should be dependant on the size of the land you live on. A professional should inspect your property before starting, recommending how many hives, what type of bees, etc.
- Warning signs
- I have family that keep bees, this past time has brought our community together. The health of the natural areas around the hives have improved dramatically since getting the hives. Creating self-sufficient, sustainable households are important
- Whatever is currently in place.
- Signage that beehives on property to alert neighbours if allergies
- Bees are great. What actionj do you take if swarm moves. Inform owner?
 - Method of communication with owner should have knowledge of bees or credentials
- The issue with bees, the problem is allergies. Before you get your bees, it's reasonable to notify your neighbours & check if there are allergies. Space is an issue. You need to make sure there's enough for them, considering the size of urban lots.
Consider how many hives each person has.
Q: Whats the definition of recreational beekeeping? Whats the threshhold b/w rec and commercial?
What's hapening in the city about this is pretty cool. The city should have beehives. And manage them. I've started planting more flowers that attract more bees.
- What activities to protect
Education inline what to do on bee knowledge.
 - Communication to where city limits
 - Allergic reaction, beehive on premis
- Some form of notification of bees in the area. Mainly, to inform those people with allergies where they need to be more cautious.
- No good in backyards due allergies to stings. I have seen anaphyllactic shock. Dangerous. Put bee hives in our wild city areas, plant wild flower and herbs that strengthen bees immune systems in those areas and ditches. I would volunteer for this. Use recycling bottle money for this
- Yes
- In an unbiased answer, bees are beneficial to all, and as a beekeeper, I know they are docile and immense fun as a backyard hobby as they are, no additional intervention needed other than more people doing urban beekeeping.
- Kept in an isolated secure area.
- Permission from homeowners surrounding the hive up to 3 houses away in any direction.
- This is a concern for both allergy humans and bees subjected to pollutants in city areas
- Yes
- Notices on every property with bees, to let the community know there is a bee colony present.
- Should be allowed



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think just a limit to how many hives in a small area near neighbors. One hive in a backyard is fine. Bees are good and necessary and struggling to make it in our world.
- Nothing more than is currently in place. Bees are silent, not smelly, and benefit entire communities. Swarm management options are already in place for the rare instances of swarms. I have a hive in my yard and it has never been an issue for neighbours! Well cared for hives are essential.
- Reasonable limits on hive number and sizes that would prevent operations from becoming large / commercial in nature.
- I need to be supportive to those who keep bees. Bees are great pollinators and part of a natural ecosystem.
- Just have the space for it.
- Less herbicide and pesticide usage - Cuba is not facing a bee crisis like North America is due to the lack of harmful pesticides; more educational programs and access to start up beekeeping
- This can be an acceptable addition to the surrounding area.
 - should require an annual poll from the surrounding neighbours, this can assist to ensure there is no abuse or allergy concerns.
 - checks and reviews for those with the hives (and past hives)
- Limits to how many colonies/hives are allowed per capita of land.
- yes! Important - every community should have a bee hive. anyone wanting a bee hive should have one.
 - Nothing in place needed - bees are harmless.
- I have no issue with bees and safety.
- Nothing. Bees are essential for a healthy environment and don't fly around stinging people willy nilly.
- Having a say in any close to where I live as I have a child with bee sting concerns so should have a right to keep her safe when she is playing outdoors
- I think beekeeping is a good idea!
- I generally support urban beekeeping. Limit number of hives to a reasonable number. Review best practices in other urban settings that have extensive urban beekeeping experience.
- Signage of a hive on a property but otherwise no issues
- I do not feel that this should belong in the city.
- Consultation with neighbors prior to starting bee keeping to understand any serious allergies, etc. Limits on reasonable amount of bees in a residential neighborhood.
- Education on how to deal with urban bees that are in my area in the event that the bees need help.
- Great idea, but may need to limit hive numbers in typical residential areas. Many people are allergic to stings, and have concerns about bringing more bees into an immediate area.
- Good for the environment
- A LIMIT TO THE NUMBER OF HIVES IN A PROPERTY AND A LIMIT TO THE NUMBER OF PROPERTIES WITHIN A DESIGNATED AREA (TO BE DETERMINED). NEIGHBOURHOOD, NOT JUST ADJACENT NEIGHBOURS, APPROVAL, AS SOME PEOPLE ARE HIGHLY ALLERGIC TO BEE STINGS.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- in a yard
- An owner that provides sufficient hives to maintain them. Inform neighbours of the bees, should someone be allergic to bees.
- honey bees rarely sting
sign posting their presence so sensitive persons can avoid area
- YES YES YES! information on how to avoid getting stung, information on why this is important.
- Love the idea. Think bee neighbor should advise neighbors so there's no panic and someone trying to kill bees. no more than 2/3 hives to ensure people can still enjoy yards. more could be a problem
- Hives should be kept at a certain distance from homes and towards the centre of their yard, not to once fence or other fence as to be a nuisance to one neighbor of the other.
- I do not have safety concerns about urban beekeeping but I think we need a better understanding on the impacts on local wild bee populations.
- Educate public on benefits, limit hive size.
- A limit on the maximum number of bees that can be housed or kept within a certain area.
- Limit the number of hives in a district and in one yard. I would not like my neighbour to have a number of hives.
- Nothing bees are naturally occurring maybe 100 yards from peoples homes or something similar but wasps and bees exist already I think this is a great idea
- I don't think we need bylaws for urban beekeeping. I trust that people who are interested in this will do the necessary research before putting in the financial investment.
- Support this as long as carried out responsibly and safely.
- WE live near an urban bee keeper and there have been no issues
- People need education on most things and to understand what the reason is people are doing things. I don't think someone should have 10 bee hives and most people would just complain anyways.
- Controls on size of hives, restrictions on locations where these can be set up (certain minimum setbacks from schools, parks, businesses). The city should also inspect these on an annual basis, as a condition for licensing.
- Notice or signage. If someone has a severe allergy then they should be aware that bees are on premise. Usually bees don't sting unless provoked but best to take precautions.
- Once again people who keep bees need to treat them with respect so that they are not a problem to their neighbours.
- I am comfortable with bee keeping in urban areas. Honey bees are not aggressive and do not create any issues for surrounding home owners, if anything it can actually help gardens.
- I feel very safe. I am thrilled that this is being considered within the city of Calgary
- Encourage and educate
- Awareness that they exist and they are harmless if left alone.
- Strongly recommend urban beekeeping. Is properly managed with guidelines and inspected for safety, no concerns.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I have no safety concerns regarding urban bee keeping - but owners needs to know how to take care of the bees to prevent the spreading of diseases between hives - cleaning and disease recognition, etc.
- Information accessible for proper beekeeping practices
- I personally think urban beekeeping shouldn't be promoted as honey bees are not native and out-compete bees that are, but I don't feel unsafe about their presence in an area.
- No problem! We need bees.
- Bees are very safe and beneficial
- Limit on the number of hives and the care and control of the hives. Signage would be beneficial especially in a case of allergy
- Yes !
- I believe beekeeping should have a limit on how many hives you are allowed to have in your backyard
- Appropriate regulations around safety. For example, would all types of urban beekeeping be safe for neighbours in a small yard? Is there a space required for offset from neighbours? Is some training required?
- Absolutely nothing! I strongly encourage helping to raise the bee population, with out bees, we starve.
- Anything related to bees should be encouraged.
- DO NOT agree. Anyone living in the city in close proximity to someone else; people are allergic to stings and can die. Inside city would be irresponsible.
Sure if someone has an acreage then provide a 'temporary' license to allow; renew each year as circumstances may change or city boundary change.
- As long as the beekeeper is knowledge and can manage the hives, I have no problem with this..
- Nothing needed. Bees are generally harmless and a benefit to society in general.
- that the beekeeper is responsible and has undergone the appropriate training as well as licensing to keep bees and receives monitoring and support to ensure the safety of the animals and people in the area
- Love they idea, nothing!
- Plenty of signage to indicate proximity and location of hives and guidance on proper behaviour near bee activity.
- No honey bees, encourage citizens to plant native flowers and plants to support the native bee populations.
- Nothing. All our gardens, green spaces, parks, etc. will be much healthier ecosystems with this element. This way the hives are in proper controlled locations.
- Honestly as much as I think this is an awesome idea - our communities, especially the newer ones are too close together. houses are almost stacked on top of each other. if 5 or 6 of my neighbors have bees I am going to have issues with there being too many bees in my yard as well



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Nothing? I think it's great! I wonder if there is enough forage to support the growing numbers of hives in the city. City of Calgary should do more to promote pollinator-friendly yards, and discourage turf grass monocultures. Lawns are lame.
- Signage
- There has to be appropriate parameters for urban beekeepers - do they meet safe property standards, such to ensure whatever they are doing does not impede on the well-being of others in the area. Can neighbors enjoy their private outdoor space? Could be difficult unless they have a large property
- I can see a place in backyards for beekeeping in Calgary. It is known that bees are needed for plant growth. More is known about disease in bees, and that should be monitored.
- Notice to neighbours in a specific but small (2-3 home) radius. Bona fide medical certificates of severe allergies to support objections.
- Bee hives surely need more protection from people than the protection people need from beehives. Hives should be supported and encouraged by the city. Regulation on the species that are brought in from urban hives so there is no threat to native populations (aggressive/out compete)
- Safeguards for native bees.
- Beekeeper has taken a course from accredited training centre and is a member of a beekeeping guild. If there is an incident, like swarming, then the beekeeper and/or guild is responsible for responding.
- People engaging in this practice have to take course on how to do this safely, register with city, and have premises inspected - permit issued.
- no issues
- If you are a neighbour just let me know you have bees.
- I would encourage this, but limit number of bees/hives per owner (dependent on lot size). Perhaps a permit/inspection prior to installing hives or education requirement prior to set up?
- Nothing
- Should be allowed with a restriction on the number of hives one can have.
- Nothing... honeybees are very docile
- Allowed on properties of a specific size.
- i think that they should not be allowed residential areas...but do have a great purpose in other areas (industrial, rural areas
- I don't know.
- One of my neighbours in Victoria kept bees. I don't know much about it but my flowers and vegetables did very well with all those bees around
- Should not be allowed. Possibility of stings
- We have been living in different cities in Germany over the past 10 years, Urban beekeeping, livestock and pigeons are allowed in all cities there. There were several beekeepers close to in our neighbourhood For me no safety concerns, rather that children learn to respect and safely interact with bees.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I am fine with that. If it was in my neighborhood, I would want more information as I react strongly to stings.
- Nothing
- Would be important to have signs stating the close proximity of Bees especially for those with Bee Allergies! Otherwise the world needs BEES!
- Maybe
- People must have experience to do this and are doing it for the correct purpose.
- Limits on the number of hives to avoid overwhelming neighbours.
- Basic safety
- Just knowing someone is doing it, and has plants in their yard to encourage bees to stay around. Also would do my own research to know which were bees or if wasps were in my yard.
- Requirements for signage alerting the public to the presence of bee hives and setting a maximum number of hives at one property in the city
- Should be encouraged with input from beekeepers. There should be a way to keep people away from hives to keep both bees & people safe.
- Limit the size and amount of hives.
- Should be encouraged. Bring back the bees!
- why is this being considered in the responsible pet bylaw? Bees are not pets. I don't think beekeeping has any place in the city. it poses a risk to people with allergies
- Residents should be permitted to beekeeping under a controlled program. Notifying neighbors prior to beginning and respecting of any allergies.
- There should not be any urban beekeeping.
- Apply provincial regulations for bee keeping
- Literally nothing - bees are wonderful and mind their own beesniss (ha!)
- No chemical use.
- Love the idea but given the ever shrinking properties and growing house sizes, there would need to be minimum space requirements and education. Our backyard is too close to neighbors for us or them to safely have bees. With kids and pets and shared fences, it's a concern
- It's a great input from humans into healthy balance of nature. We can do at least beekeeping in order to help out trees and flowers around.
- There should be a limit to the number of hives per yard. Otherwise I have no concerns. We need to keep bee populations up and they need all the help they can get.
- Any non-floral patterned shirt would perhaps help in avoiding trouble with bees.
- I have kept bees and find them non aggressive and not a hindrance to others. I believe a good practice is to check in with immediate neighbours before getting bees in case there are allergies.
- How can anyone with serious allergies to bee stings ever feel safe with large numbers of bees in their neighborhood. Beekeeping cannot occur in areas where someone has a life-threatening allergy, and they must be removed or prevented if someone with that condition possesses it in an neighborhood.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- why Urban beekeeping? Have concerns of public safety. Don't know what need to be in place to feel reasonably safety.
- Notification of beekeeping close by.
- There shouldn't be any in a residential area because of allergies etc.
- Urban bees are extremely important to our community. I think it needs to be encouraged. But I also think that people should have taken mandatory minimum course so they are beekeepers not beekeepers. Numerous diseases and parasites affect bees. Education and supporting provincial inspection is a MUST!
- no, bees in close proximity to houses may cause stings
- Properly maintained hives do not pose a significant threat to nearby residences, and should be allowed within the city limits.
- I fully advocate for this and do not see a need for city involvement.
- This should only be done if it is not affecting the people that live by you;
- No problem with bees at all
- I feel no danger in a beekeeping program, and I plant flowers specifically to encourage bees so that my food plants can also thrive
- No. I am very allergic to bees and if they get in my back yard then I cannot go out and it is my property.
- Support Urban beekeeping and trust there are only one or two hives in any backyard.
- Good as is.
- a process to deal with complaints and concerns with enforcement
- Some is tolerable but control the density.
- As long as neighbours know what you have so that proper precautions can be taken if allergies to bee stings. A license and consensus by neighbours might be helpful?
- As long as it's contained and not bothering close by neighbors, don't see an issue.
- Nothing.
- Lets keep the wasps away
- I don't currently have a problem with this. I'm all for it.
- Who decides whether a person's property is large enough to accommodate beehives? What will be the criteria the beekeeper will have to follow and how many hives will they be allowed? Will they be monitored once they get a license on a yearly basis?
- Keep them in a place far enough away from public getting stung
- These insects are not native and will be competing with native species for pollen. A city environment doesn't offer enough plants for both. Beekeeping should not be allowed unless they are on an acreage. normal safety procedures where there is less chance of someone allergic getting stung.
- I already feel safe and have no issues with this.
- ok if the beekeeping is kept to a small scale.
- discussion with those nearby (ex neighbours) to ensure no harm is likely



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Interested
- Great! Should be encouraged!
- Education is key - both of the general public and the new beekeepers. Ensure there is a minimum distance between beehives and residential homes. Encourage more beehives on rooftops of commercial buildings.
- Number of bees per square footage of yard space plus the consideration of proximity of neighbouring homes. Perhaps permits should be given out and the neighbours should be allowed a say - in case there is a severe, documented allergy.
- I currently feel safe.
- There is no safety issues with urban beekeeping. Belonging to a club that helps regulate is good
- Unless it becomes an issue, I am all in for this. The more, the better.
- Licensing and a training course should totally be required. I have a friend with bees in the NW and bee keeping is a lot more work and money than people think.
- I think bees are safe and don't concern me at all.
- consideration for the impact on native bees as the species often raised in urban beekeeping are not native and can have impacts on the native species.
- Allowed with license & public notice to neighbours who can appeal. Signage (wrought iron bee) out front of home that advises beehives are kept on property.
- if the neighbors agree why not as some people have allergies to bee stings.
- Wouldn't want beehives right next to my property, where i could inadvertently be stung. I have severe allergy to bee sting.
- Simple - - education and boundaries - that's all. Lots of wildflowers - it would benefit all of us. Why not have wildflowers instead of grass that is ill kept and costly anyway.
- Urban beekeeping is great for backyard beekeepers, having one or two hives. But not for running large businesses and many gives on single properties.
- A little sign on the property that would quickly identify bees in the area (so those with allergies can be alert).
- Know that the type of bees being kept do not pose undue risk to public
- I believe bees should be kept by professionals or legitimate honey farmers or something. I'm not a big fan of the growing population of hobby/amateur beekeepers. They should be more controlled considering they compete with our native pollinators
- I'm OK with having urban beekeeping as long as the individuals are properly trained.
Bees would actually be a benefit because they are a pollinator. Bees world wide are dying off so having some in back yards would help.
- as long as they are kept properly don't think it is an issue as honey bees are not huge attackers as long as they are left alone



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Bees needs to have space and not cause excessive concern for humans worried about stings. There are many with severe bee sting allergies. They wouldn't feel safe living nearby a bee hive owner.
- Must have a large yard with only a limited number of hives.
- Where
- Nothing. Do it
- Allow
- YES PLEASE!!! Bees are so, SO important.
- Knowing that I wouldn't inadvertently put myself at risk of a sting. Maybe a sign saying 'Beekeeping in area' ?
- Notification to neighbours nearby to offer them a chance to oppose based on allergies
- Neighbours should be informed.
- Signage
- Education
- Online city registry/map available of addresses where bee keeping has been permitted. Do not allow it in multi family homes such as condos and townhouses. There needs to be reasonable distance between homes to protect those with life threatening allergies.
- Nothing! Please allow this!
- no thanks
- I am concerned with the risk to people and pets with close contact to many bees. Bee stings can be lethal to both humans and animals. I do not support this endeavor. It should remain in rural areas.
- no - dangerous to others
- A fence and 10 ft from property lines.
- i am afraid of bees and may find it difficult living close to a beekeeper.
- No, to many people have allergies and can not always carry or afford to carry Epa Pens.
- Limits on the number of hives per property.
- I believe our environment needs to aid the bee's, and if locally owned it may be beneficial.
- Definitely good thing.
- No problem with that because they don't smell, they're quiet, and they serve a purpose - plant pollination & honey.
- Yes, proper beekeeping is not a problem if the area the bee hives are kept are properly enclosed.
- Communication with neighbors.
- I need to know there is a place to contact if I have issues. That there is a person that will work with me if issues arise to help make things better and if needed being a mediator between me and the party I have an issue with.
- I think the city should, at a minimum, put limits on urban beekeeping. Honey bees can have severe negative impacts on native biodiversity and the city should put serious effort into investigating this issue at length. Native pollinators are a necessity in order to have effective pollination



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I worry about native bee populations. Urban areas have the chance to be a great refuge for native bee populations. Honey bees outcompete native bees for resources. We should protect native bees and leave honey bees in farmer's fields where they belong. Keep urban spaces available for native bees!
- Nothing needed.
- I think there should be some sort of regulation to make sure people don't hurt themselves or others. But it is important for people to raise bees and help increase pollination. So I think it should not be too difficult for one to raise bees in their own home.
- I am more worried about the bees. The +15 downtown had a space with bee hives installed, but when bad weather came the hives were not properly protected. It looked as if they were broken and most of the bees died.
I would feel safe if the hives had ample space.
- Nothing. I love the idea. Everything I plant in my yard is to attract bees.
- It's bees. I wish we had more bees in my neighborhood. I would expect, if I had a neighbour with hives, to be advised by that neighbour and provided with more information on how to help the hive thrive
- Yes great idea. Develop safe guidelines.
- Should be allowed and limit the size according to location
- A limit on the number of hives kept in one area
- I already feel safe and want more urban beekeepers
- None. We need bees - go for it!
- I do not think that beekeeping is appropriate in an urban setting. Doubtless, the bees will be attracted to the blossoms on other trees in the neighbourhood.
- Hive setback distance from property boundaries, management of over-aggressive bee colonies
- Don't really like this idea. How many bees would get killed by cars, people? Is the owner keeping the area properly clean? What happens when wasps/hornets takeover a hive?
- This activity should be carefully studied and the best evidence understood before it is permitted. Are urban honeybees hurting Alberta's native bees?
- Honey bees are an invasive species. Instead of introducing more, we should be taking steps to protect our native bees. I don't feel threatened by the bees, but rather the people who sanctimoniously feel they're doing good for the environment by having bees, when really they're just helping themselves
- Distance. For example, I would not want a hive in my neighbour's yard next to my sandbox. I feel that beekeeping should not be allowed in mixed-dwelling (condos/townhouse/etc) only single-detached, with permission from immediate neighbours.
- Hives are great but MUST have proper disease management, as I have family members who owns commercial operations I expect disease management for ALL hives. Also licensing with education if dogs and cats are to be licenced
- Beekeeper's are aware if neighbors have allergies to bees.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Limitation on the number of hives and proximity to neighbours.
- this seems very safe and good for the city/planet
- Yes should be allowed because helps plant and fruit pollination.
- I AM an urban beekeeper. I find the current guidelines perfect! I have gotten to know my neighbours and they LOVE the bees in their yards and honey and even beekeeping with me. I've done for 4 yrs and no safety issues whatsoever for myself or my neighbours. It is already regulated by the province.
- Awareness, if you live within close proximity. There could be issues that arise with anaphylactic reaction allergies and proximity to parks (including playgrounds, dog parks and school yards).
- Beekeepers have to be held to strong standards so that neighbors are not threatened in any way due to their beehives in the area. Fines and removal, if necessary?
- notification
- nothing - we should encourage more natural bee husbandry
- Yes
- There are a couple of people who do bee keeping on our block, I am allergic to stings and they are not trained in the art of bee keeping. Not sure how they can contain them Should not be in residential areas
- Simply knowing where the apiaries are so that I wouldn't cause the bees to feel the need to defend themselves would be sufficient; bees do not attack unprovoked.
- Bees are great. The city should plant more flowers and plants that help pollinators. We need more bees.
- Please love and respect
- Ensure the beeds are not going to swarm
- Bees in the city is a good. It's a good way to make honey in the city. Give it to family & neighbours.
- Not too much
 - Maybe a sign noting ""A beekeeper with hives lives here""
 - More bees the better
- Keeping a beehive would be great
- Any beekeeping seems fine
- Should be allowed to keep one give per community. Increases gardening possibilities. Run by co-op housing or a group/person. 1 per 5 mile radius
- I think we should allow bees in the city
- Should be allowed to have bees in the yard. Should be taking care of the bees
- I think the more bees the better, so we should have few restrictions on bee farming. I would appreciate little more than a bee registry, and signs/stickers that advise the public of bees on the premises. Beyond that, I feel it should be governed privately
- Leave this space
- Adequate proof that owners are appropriately educated about safety, health and cleanliness.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Hives kept away from fence lines / gates / schools and daycares / playgrounds / bus stops; limit the number of hives per square footage of lot size; implement annual fee/ license to keep urban livestock.
- No urban beekeeping allowed. Some individuals have anaphylaxis reaction to bee/wasp stings.
- A license to keep bees, proper housing facilities and safety equipment for beekeepers. Notices on homes that keep bees and on alley fences so that children are notified of their presence.
- laws to ensure the person is doing this correctly so that it benefits pollination
- Yes!
- I am very allergic, encourage parks to plant flowering trees and flower beds vs - flowering weeds and clover taking over the grass where our feet and seats conflict with there pollen gathering activities.
- The City should monitor urban beekeepers. I don't know if they need licenses, but they should. I know of an instance when bees were not cared for properly and left and built a hive in someone's foundation, thereby causing substantial damage and the home owner had no recourse.
- Think this needs to happen but how do we deal with those that may live near a hive with allergies to bee stings.
- Appropriate housing and caretaking- it would be amazing to see bee keeping accepted and welcomed into communities!
- This tends to get out of hand. The bees leave the hives and those of us who are allergic to bee stings can't go outside. Bee venom can kill someone
- People with allergies to stings need to know if they are close to urban beekeeping so they can take precautions.
- Permit + inspection
- Licences, permits
- Honestly, I'm a little scared of bees. I know they are necessary and I want to protect them, so as long as I am notified if one of my neighbours is keeping bees, and what is expected of them, I'm okay.
- signage-warnings
- A limit of the amount of hives allowed. A mandatory care course and license to keep bees will educate the public and track the amount of hives within a neighbourhood
- Yard size and limited to 1 hive
- Restrictions related to how many hives can be located in a certain area, parks supporting bees near by zoned areas.
- Appropriate storage and good management of bee hives
- Nothing. Love the idea. I mean, some reasonable regulation about beekeeping. But nothing too restrictive.
- bees are necessary to our survival. bees dont go out and look for peoples to hurt they are too busy trying to survive .bees come in my yard to see out my flowers but have never been a problem and provide me a free service by cross pollinating our yards.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Sure, Bees are endangered. But would have to be housed appropriately.
- Permit/Licensing
 - Proper housing
 - Standards of care and control
- Our family feels absolutely safe with urban beekeeping. There would be obvious exceptions where bee hives may be in high traffic areas and increased probability of conflict. Otherwise, we would encourage more urban bee keepers!
- I'm not fond of bees, however they do have an important purpose. As long as they are not disturbing me when I'm outside, no concerns.
- Should be allowed as long as it doesn't harm your neighbours
- Nothing. "Go Bee Keepers!"
- regulations that owners must follow and are monitored to make sure owners follow
- Nothing. Bees are part of nature.
- Bylaw & fines making it a self funded program
 - License
 - Training
 - Min size lot/setback
 - Insurance for damages
 - Garden/water source on site
 - Neighbor consensus
 - Max permits within area
 - Responsible for allergic reactions
 - My experience: swarm when keepers not home/activity in hazmat suit 13' away
- All for it. Consideration may be made for the number of hives in relation to size of the property.
- City website map of hives for use by persons with allergy reaction
- It is a great idea. It will help pollinate fruits and vegetables, but also help with diversification of our eco systems. It is a great hobby if done responsibly.
- I understand the importance of replenishing our bee supply but it shouldn't be allowed in an urban setting because of potential danger to people. By allowing it in an urban setting, you're more likely to get unskilled people pursuing it as a hobby vs a properly maintained operation by professionals
- permit/license
- Should be limited to one small hive.
- Urban beekeeping should only be allowed if the individual has taken a certified bee keeping course and fully understands that bees are livestock and need to be safely managed to prevent the spread of disease to native species of bees. Enhancing native pollinators habitats would be better.
- Don't have any in the area, so don't know what the impact might be.
- I'm not scared of bees and we need more of them.
- Nothing other than a permit. It's a great idea.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- This should be allowed. Stop over regulating things. Focus on annoying loud animals like dogs!!! Barking should be the priority area to focus on for the Bylaw Review.
- Should have large and secluded property that won't affect your neighbours property values. Prior to setting up beekeeping advise neighbours first because many people are very allergic to stings.
- I'm not totally opposed to it. The concern would be that they don't become a nuisance i.e. that the beekeeper is limited to how many they could keep. I get concerned that an individual beekeeper would get carried away and keep too many which could become troublesome. How would this be monitored.
- NA
- I fully support beekeeping but regulations should address some responsibility for public safety due to possible threats to certain individuals who have anaphylactic shock from a simple bee sting. However we must realize bee populations are dying due to agricultural /chemical use environment pollution.
- License/permit - should include consent from neighbours. Must be certain distance from other dwellings & public use areas.
- I am OK with urban bee keeping. Hopefully it will help out pollination and wild bee populations.
- There should be an ability for neighbors to notify authorities if the hive becomes a problem. Neighbours should be able to veto a hive (e.g. because of allergies, small children). Keepers could be asked to change the queen.
- We already have beehives in our neighbourhood and we feel safe. The bees don't smell and they are quiet, unlike barking dogs next door, Bees are great neighbours because they pollinate the gardens. Calgaryans have kept bees for years with very few concerns or incidents.
- There are 100s of beehives currently in Calgary. I feel safe because there are lots of native bees, and the evil wasp, that fly around anyways. I feel safe.
- Not more than 3 hives per household
- I believe the number of hives per property has to be limited to 2 or 3...and no more than 10 to a city block...or something like that. Maybe less than that per city block. Each hive has the potential of housing 60,000 bees.
- I don't see urban bees as a risk to the public in any way.
- I have already beehives as neighbors and never had a problem they are also quite and clean.
- Education regarding safe keeping of bees. Most domestic bees are not aggressive and people need to know this. Also, we should be educated on which chemicals could potentially harm bees so that we can protect them from those chemicals.
- Permit and/or licensing
- Nothing in particular needed for safety. Bees are not dangerous, smelly, or noisy. They are highly beneficial.
- Those looking after bees must not have more than a small number of hives on a city lot. Poorly tended bees would tend to swarm, creating anxiety where they land. Must be tended properly. Bees are a fantastic addition to the community, and if people understand them they will not feel threatened.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Really nothing. Generally the bees are harmless unless one decides to bang on the hive.
- A knowledgeable and committed beekeeper who tries to mitigate any concerns of neighbors. The beekeeper should be able to alleviate any fears through clear explanations of the habits and value of bees.
- There should be a maximum number of hives allowed per property. Beekeepers could be required to have epipen where necessary. Otherwise I encourage this activity. Pollinators are important for the ecosystem and help gardens thrive. They also ward off other more dangerous pests like wasps and hornets.
- Ability to move away.
- Control on number of hives per yard. I like bees and would even consider keeping them myself.
- Urban beekeeping is a blessing and perhaps even a necessity. Real problems only arise from negligence which could be resolved by enforcing a program that addresses complaints with a site visit from the provincial apiculturist (or other agreed upon member of CDBA) to assess the beekeeper's practices.
- As long as the bees are located on a person's property, there is no issue as I see it. Those people that fear bees are the ones that swat wildly at them and that causes the bee to get upset. Wasps/hornets are the issue here as a pest, they can attack humans and pets with little cause.

Livestock

- Again, to be informed, know what the rules are, and how to report violations. I also have health concerns about urban livestock.
- not at all- disease
- Regulations as to what species of livestock are allowed and how many and in what size space. Licencing. Regulations about waste management.
- waste removal, odours, movement controls (escaping etc) and of course noise.
- Allow it as long as there is no disturbance to neighbours
- Minimum standards in terms of cleanliness, and size of livestock-specific buildings on a property beyond what are currently outlined in the Land Use Bylaw. Max # of animals, possibly based on uncovered property size.
- I don't want livestock in my neighborhood. Not as a matter of safety but a concern for disturbances such as smell, noise and diseases
- Proper land for the type. limitations on the number of animals per square foot. Proper caging or housing where appropriate. Must maintain a proper standard of care. Must treat them humanely. If raised for slaughter, slaughter cannot be done where the public could reasonably see. Must be clean.
- Depends on the livestock. I think very few people would be capable of keeping most livestock in their yards.
- Fenced off areas so that the livestock is not attacked by coyotes.
- I am not concerned about urban bee livestock
- no thx



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think chickens should be allowed, but people have to manage the smell and noise with neighbours.
- Just no
- Not sure how I feel about this I guess if they were not too noisy and stinky I wouldn't have a problem.
- Property cages and housing, conscientious ownership.
- I think you would need to have something in place to control the noise and smell of livestock so as to not bother the neighbours. Enforcing proper shelter would also be good for the animals.
- More of it, I have zero safety concerns
- Training and rules
- I support neighbourhood chickens / geese etc.
- People have the right to provide themselves with food, therefore there should be no restrictions on livestock in Calgary beyond providing a responsible space and feed to animals.
- animals need enough room to move and live - not necessarily a good idea to have a larger animal in the back yard.
- Yes. As long as they are kept on private property. Please modify the bylaw to consider pot belly pigs as pets, not livestock.
- Kept in safe and humane conditions
- Absolutely!!! Chickens are organic pest control that makes eggs! No roosters, but a few chickens per household is fab.
- I don't want to live next to chickens or miniature horses and the like. Miniature pigs seem fine as they are like dogs but farm animals shouldn't be in the city, in small lots, it's not fair to them. I don't want my back yard smelling like a barn either.
- I think people should be allowed to keep a small number of chickens for pest control and egg production in their yards.
- I am not in favor of this, even though my grandparents kept a cow in the back yard back in the 1920's. Large animals smell, and there is no way to adequately remove their waste. About 10 years ago, my neighbors kept a sheep in their garage, and it kept getting out and into people's yards. It stunk
- As someone who is interested in keeping chickens in their backyard if the bylaws were to change. I would like to see a limit placed on the number of chickens per household/enclosure for the chickens. Also if bylaw officers should be able to check on the cleanliness/welfare of outdoor urban livestock
- Mandatory training, inspections and licensing. Must not impact neighbors with smell or noise.
- The City needs to relax rules related to livestock.
- Chickens and pot belly pigs should be allowed.
- Livestock belong on farms and ranches. They don't make me feel unsafe, it's just not fair to the animal to be in an urban setting.
- I don't think that any urban livestock should be on residential property or in the city limits on commercial property. If you want to have urban livestock, then live on an acreage or farm.
- Same as any, I believe that a simple online permit application to ensure owners are properly educated on both the health and needs of the animals and respect towards neighbors would be



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

sufficient. I also believe urban livestock should be used for eggs and other purposes that do not require slaughter

- Support but recommend working with Alberta Veterinary Medical Association, UCVM, local urban livestock clubs to establish regulations and set restrictions for number of animals in place, registering these flocks/herds, setting up disease surveillance program.
- Enforcement of proper disposal of waste so that water isn't impacted nor are there flies and diseases being spread. Enforcement of noise bylaws. A plan to address the likely influx of wild animals that will want to eat the livestock. Number of livestock per home guidelines.
- What is the danger of fire and infection?
- Clear guidelines for livestock owners including expectations regarding noise and odour and animal welfare.
- Quantity limitations.
- a maximum weight per animal, and a maximum number of those animals. Current bylaws are too restrictive
- No. I know many people would be responsible and good with their livestock, but those few who aren't would be a big problem and I know the City is equipped with near enough staff to handle problems. There would have to be a minimum yard size, minimum distance to a property line.
- Goats are handy as lawnmowers.
Also, cheese. In other words they have the sophistication to be urban. Cows... not so much.
- Limits of numbers,. For all other these we need enforcement of the rules
- Just like with pets, Calgarians should be free to keep as much livestock of whatever type as long as it does not negatively impact any other Calgarian beyond the extents of the livestock keepers property
- There shouldn't be *rural* livestock, why should there be urban livestock? There shouldn't be. No protections could make me feel comfortable about it.
- I am okay with urban livestock within reason. I don't think a full sized horse or cattle is practical. Chickens are fine.
- I would personally like to be informed if someone in my neighbourhood was planning urban agriculture as Livestock can be quite loud. Adequate enclosures would need to be built and maintained in order to avoid predators.
- Shouldn't be allowed.
- I'd be okay if people wanted a couple chickens, as long as they weren't too noisy.
- Adequate fencing
- Love the goat program. Chickens as long as the smell is contained, great. No backyard slaughters!
- I believe that homeowners should be allowed to keep chickens in their yards.
- Re: safety only? Ensure they are properly contained, can't hurt anyone or transmit disease to domestic pets/humans.
- Horrible idea. A backyard or house is not appropriate for livestock.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No. Not in the city. Neighbours should not be able to see, hear or smell the creatures. If that's possible then go for it. It will only cause issues between neighbours..
- The are contained within the owners premises.
- I don't have concerns with small livestock if the home/yard footprint is large enough to accommodate them. I would be supportive of back yard chickens or other egg laying birds.
- This would really depend on what animals we are talking about. Keeping a cow for example within the city limits is not really feasible....
- How is manure disposed of? What happens when the animals reach end-of-life/usefulness? If they are raising livestock for meat, how is that meat processed, and what happens to the by-products of slaughter? Again, I believe that licensing and regular inspection of facilities is key.
- urban chickens are great! no safety issues here :)
- I believe that people should be allowed to have chickens within city limits
- No...how to control that they are being cared for properly when the novelty wears off....chickens are noisy, smelly, bring mice??
- People need to clean after their livestock. And there must be a limit.
- I don't believe it has a place in the city. It will draw the predators to that livestock. I can't believe we are discussing this.
- Special licensing. Urban livestock being restricted to less densely populated areas (due to potential smell/mess)
- Small livestock that are housed in a run overnight, quiet. Chickens or small sheep would be okay. Just need to maintain yard so it is healthy for pets, livestock and humans.
- It would be so great if we were allowed backyard chickens or potbelly pigs. You'd just need to make sure to have appropriate enclosures/fences and be aware of how to care for such animals responsibly.
- totally against this..we can concede to no more than 2 chickens, otherwise livestock belongs on an acreage and farms..not in close living areas such as neighborhoods....
- As long as I don't hear or see the livestock, I have no problem.
- Nothing
- The owner should have to have an appropriate amount of space for the health and wellness of the animal. Ex: a horse can't be healthy living in a 600sqft backyard, same with a cow. Licences proving you've been properly educated on needs and care of that particular animal to ensure safety.
- I would love to see an urban chicken program brought in to Calgary. I think applications should be required and permits should be issued to responsible keepers. Approval would require consent from neighbouring properties as to not disturb the community.
- 1) Maybe no roosters allowed so not too noisy
- 2) Limits per communities
- 3) If they are for meat it's to be done at a butcher shop not in anyones back yard.
- I do not think Livestock thrive well in an Urban setting. For the well being of the animal they should not be in an urban setting.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Nothing. Urban fowl and small animals (pot bellied pigs, goats etc) up to a limit should be allowed to cohabitate inner city. Make little noise and with good upkeep doesnt smell. ALT : Have expanded community "garden" with an animal share
- Fences are all we need, and they are everywhere.
- Depends on house/yard size and the number of each species. Health/medical conditions of immediate neighbours needs to be considered. Ownership information must be made to potential buyers of property within a specified radius.
- I would love to have chickens and be able to produce my own food locally sourced out of the back yard. Again no safety concerns.
- should not be allowed in residential communities. Period. The smell, loud noises - we shouldn't be forced to live beside livestock in the city
- Totally fine with urban livestock, as long as there's a limit to what households can have. I'd be fully supportive of neighbors having chickens or a pig.
- Ability to ensure that no smell or sound travels from the property. Neighbour's ability to sleep and enjoy there space without smelling animals or hearing them all night is important. This isn't appropriate. Not appropriate in multi-family buildings.
- Containment. Fencing.
- It seems like you aren't asking if citizens think this is appropriate - is this a done deal?
- Urban livestock should be limited by available space and proximity to others, not limited to emotional support. For example, min XXXm sq of grassed yard per cow; or a chicken cannot be kept on apartment balcony. Numbers should be limited (no backyard herds or breeding operations) based on species.
- I would want signage front & back of the property to make visitors, city workers etc aware of what animal is present. A limit on max number of animals allowed.
- Fences maintained.
- Depending on the livestock, and the living conditions, this could be positive. We have seen the positive impact the goats have made in the natural grasses. Proper housing, and cleanup would have to be required.
- We should allow chicken - hens not roosters for egg laying. As long as owners care for the birds and keep the area /coop clean. Coop size should be appropriate for the number of birds owned.
- I support keeping urban livestock, so long as there is not a noise issue. I would love it if my neighbour had livestock.
- No city lot is large enough for cows, horses, sheep or goats. There is too much disrespect and neglect with animals within the city.
- Other than birds, I don't see a place for other livestock. But a minimum lots size to enable roaming without noise complaints would be appropriate.
- A couple of chickens are way less disturbing than a dog. I lived in Seattle and owning chickens was commonplace with little issues. No need to break new ground here. I would live to own a couple of chickens.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think smaller livestock should be allowed and regulated within the city limits. Getting permits specifically for chickens in the city would be a good idea. It has to be feasible for the land space and proximity to surrounding neighbors.
- Depends on the animal. Are they loud? Smelly? Number limits? Space requirements?
- I would love to keep backyard hens, but I think there needs to be restrictions on how many hens per household and regulations on size of coops and adequate winter protection. I would also like to see slaughtering within the city prohibited, as well as roosters prohibited.
- I would prefer livestock stay in the rural areas.
- Heavy penalties for abandoning livestock i.e. if your laying hen quits laying you do not just get to dump it at the animal Shelter.
- No problem
- No livestock.
- Space and quantity regulations where the animal has humane space to eat and live that doesn't interfere with neighbours
- Owners of livestock cannot adequately control odours or noises (especially for chickens or other birds) and should therefore not be allowed to keep them adjacent to other residential properties.
- Nothing needs to be in place as they would be on private property. Or, if need be, perhaps a sign at the front door, "sheep on premises", "bees on premises". But it's nature and we are too removed already from nature.
- Urban livestock needs to be restricted to smaller animals and no more than 3 at a time. Chickens should have no roosters as they're incredibly noisy.
- No problems if appropriately sized. No cows unless a very large lot. Chickens and ducks should be fine as their space requirements are already similar to dogs/cats.
- No concerns about the livestock themselves. It is with the ability to clean up.
- Why not allow mini pigs as acceptable pets? They live in the house, and they don't bark.
- If it is kept indoors it doesn't infringe on your neighbours use of their property and is Doctor ordered I don't see an issue. However I don't think chicken coops or pigs or ducks should be allowed. Smells. Noise the attraction of predators. People can live outside the City and raise animals
- A fenced or secured animal.
- I believe chickens/quail should be a right. I am low income and chicken eggs are a great source of B12 vitamins. As low income this provides breakfast lunch or dinner for my kids! We should be allowed to harvest our chickens for meat too. All while maintaining cleanliness and care of our own flock
- I would say chickens and other small livestock would be alright, but they need proper housing and hygienic clean up done.
- Proper pens, cleanliness and reasonably quiet.
- Pigs are smarter and cleaner than dogs. Let them be pets.
- Yes chickens only though in the city
- Same as above



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Nothing - livestock does not belong in the city. I'm not interested in dealing with the sounds or smells of livestock in my neighbour's backyard. This is a bad idea.
- If you want livestock move to a farm.
- Absolutely not. With recent history of virus spread with animals in urban settings, livestock and wildlife needs to left in rural areas where there is lots of room between animal and human interfaces.
- I am opposed to any farm animals within the City limits. The smell, noise, isn't for urban living. Nothing could be done to have my feel reasonably safe with farm animals within Calgary city limits
- We do not want urban live stock kept in back yards of residential homes in Calgary, it devalues our property values, and it also creates a problem with noise and bad odors coming from the livestock kept in these residential back yards. If people want livestock they should buy property in rural area.
- Sounds interesting.
- The city is no place for livestock.
- Same as above - I think it is fine providing The City looks at best practices from other cities, and puts limits on the number of urban livestock based on yard size and impact on neighbours.
- I already feel safe around urban livestock, too.
- Totally fine!
- I like the idea of urban livestock, other than a restriction on what animals are allowed, I think it's a great idea
- Within reason, and again though as long as the owners have the education and know how to do it, yes.
- I would LOVE to have a couple chickens for eggs!!
- Yes to chickens, if people interested in them are trained to keep them safe and well and healthy. How to dispose of poop? Keep their housing clean? If people want to keep animals for meat, more training. What to do on winter? Also end of life? How to deal with them?
- Quiet, clean, limited smell and limited disruption, well taken care of
- None
- No!
- Chickens! The city is long overdue to allow urban laying hens. I feel zero safety concerns around hens and small livestock, they pose less risk than dogs.
- Manage nuisance to neighbours (property line distance, minimum land area, etc)
Ensure ethical treatment (ex minimum land area requirements.
Allow chicken, geese, sheep, goats.
An rc2 lot should be able to have 1 residence and a small collection of animals (a dozen chickens or a couple goats)
- Okay if limited in numbers
- Restrictions on number and size of animals should be in place.
- No, No, No, Has the city heard of swine flu or bird flu? These diseases start when people and animals live in close proximity.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Small livestock such as chickens and rabbits should be permitted within city limits for food production. People have the right to produce their own food.
- Don't want them
- Should be licensed and vet checked with shots. And have appropriate knowledge about owned said livestock as well as the proper home
- None
- I had urban hens for a number of years and there should be a cap on number of birds per household again no rooster and education and a possible mentorship program for new owners
- Same as with dogs...keep the manure cleaned up. Otherwise, makes for a healthier, maybe even more accepting population.
- I don't have a problem with it as long as waste is kept clean
- Keeping chickens is a benefit to the owners since they can collect the eggs. Chickens are also great as a natural bug controller. IF the chickens are housed in a proper enclosure I can see no issues.
- Yes, backyard chickens. I think there should be a rule for no roosters and a certain number of hens.
- No
- Yes please but I think each person must have some type of proper training and certificates so everyone knows how to properly care for our livestock.
- I would want to know that the areas are kept clean, that there is not a mess of waste that causes disease and odours. I would also want to know that there is not excessive noise from the livestock.
- Restrict size of animal. Guidelines for animal space required and distance between houses
- **SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED...GET SERIOUS. GO LIVE IN THE COUNTRY IF YOU WANT TO FARM.**
- Proper coops which will contain animals to the designated property.
- No! Unless someone is living on a large lot (1 acre +) it is a disturbance to neighbors (smell, noise, predators) that is not reasonable to accept of neighbors.
- I don't think farm animals belong in the city
- Absolutely! Chickens yes, BUT there must be some laws around the Coop and number of chickens... coming from a farm, Chicken Poop STINKS and they can have lice, so it is important that owners are held accountable for keeping the area cleaned and pets well cared for to ensure no stench or disease.
- Urban livestock should be allowed within Calgary. Nearly every other major city in Canada allows chickens and seems to function fine. I have no additional concerns beyond what currently exists with dog ownership which is obviously allowed. Issues or complaints can follow existing processes.
- Livestock doesn't belong in a city. I don't see how livestock can have a good quality of life if they aren't on a solid very large piece of land. Emotional support or not .. cows belong in a field. Get a dog people.
- no there is no need.... chicken are messy and noisy constant clucking or whatever there sound is. Living next to a wildlife area will only bring the wildlife into back yards causing problems for dogs cats and people.... we cant even control these let alone chickens a HUGE NO!!!!!!!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No, no and no! Farms are called farms for a reason...livestock of ALL kinds belong on rural farms!
- Not allowed! There many people that will have more livestock than allowed. There will be feces, possible diseases, noise all day/night. It will attract bugs/flies. Perhaps the city could allocate land outside of residential areas and people could rent a space to keep the allowed # of livestock.
- With proper training from a farmer.
- It would be great to allow chickens in suburban settings. But, ownership brings responsibility not to draw in coyotes or other wild predators.
- Livestock should not be allowed in urban areas under any circumstances. The noise and smell would be extremely annoying and we already have enough noise from barking dogs that are ignored by their owners.
- City isn't a place for livestock. Will only attract predators.
- Nothing would make me feel safe enough with respect to possible transmission of disease due to livestock feces on adjoining property.
- Limits on how many you can keep so as to not smell the place up.
- I would want parameters such as which types of livestock are acceptable (no large species-not enough space), limiting number (ie max 6 chickens).
Please allow chickens!!!
- Livestock do not belong in the city.
- Nothing "unsafe" about people having a few chickens or a miniature pig! No more annoying to neighbours than a barking dog living next door.
- Adequate space.
- Reassurance that urban livestock will not disturb the surrounding communities.
- Must be a registered and licensed and in a area that permits them from roaming free
- Within reason, and a limit. Chickens should only be allowed to provide for that particular family or community. Also should have to apply for a permit and a period to allow neighbours to voice concerns.
- I think chickens should be allowed, and pigs as pets. Again, I wouldn't feel unsafe.
- Urban livestock should be allowed in numbers that do not cause odor or vermin.
- I can't really imagine feeling threatened by domestic livestock but I worry about owners not taking good care of their livestock, not giving them enough space or attention. I would not like to live next door to animals that are being mistreated.
- No livestock within city limits. The idea of chickens etc as emotional support animals is ridiculous! Get a dog or cat, much cleaner.
- Signage & enough space
- Limits on the number of each type of livestock
- Having a reasonable limit of chickens per household to limit the possibility of people abusing the ability to provide health sustainable eggs and support animals for their families.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- To me, it's more of a noise issue. Do I really want to hear a bunch of chickens/goats/pigs whatever in all hours of the day? hard to relax on my deck while I listen to animals squawking all day long....Keep it small or move to a farm!
- Allow for people to have livestock. Chickens, ducks, goats, meat rabbits, sheep and pigs should all be allowed. If people have issues things like stink bylaws can take care of that. The reason I stated the larger animals because possibly they could be allowed for a sort time for things like.....
- Approval from adjoining neighbours every other year. Due to allergies. If a neighbour dispute the 'permit' and can show just cause to have it denied then for the neighbours safety it should be denied. Please see above example of severe allergy.
- Smell and noise
- No - unfair to keep livestock in a small urban setting. Noise and smell pollution to neighbours
- Knowledge, educated
- People who are committed to provide a healthy, safe, stable environment to raise and keep chickens in their backyards. They should be inspected, licensed to be able to keep hens to provide their family with organic eggs. The chickens provide free manure, eat food scraps thus reducing the garbage.
- Small livestock in inner city areas, larger livestock in outer city areas.
- Enough land for the animal to thrive and not be a nuisance to others. Ensuring the animals are treated humanely. Maybe offer some classes in order to get a license. Education on disease control. Secure fences.
- The city is no place to raise chickens or have a chicken coop. We live in close environments, and I choose to live in the city to not wake up to a rooster, or the smell of the farm. If people feel if people feel the need to raise farm animals, they can live on a farm.
- I am fine with urban livestock, chickens and ducks keep the slugs away in the garden. Pigs are sometimes pets anyway, but larger animals need more space to roam. The main issue is how to deal with their waste. Hopefully these folks would be composting, but the green bins could help in this aspect
- Same as above
- Inspections of property, limits on proximity to neighbouring yards and nearby water drainage systems. Proof of veterinary records and visits yearly.
- No. There is not enough room and/or sanitary procedures in city limits. Livestock should be taken care of in rural settings where transmission of diseases and associated pests can be reasonably controlled.
- Regulations to make sure that livestock well cared for, reasonably quiet and clean. Eg. I think it would be good to allow hens if someone has good facilities and room for exercise, but probably not roosters because of the noise
- Not noisy/smelly/roaming.
- Urban" and "livestock" seem to be an oxymoron. A rural lifestyle should be in a rural area.
- There should NOT be any livestock kept @ residential homes in the City of Calgary.
"N/A. We don't have urban livestock.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

But if it was allowed, strict licensing and mandatory vaccinations where applicable

- Chickens must be allowed. Follow Edmonton's lead.
- Make sure they are on the persons yard and no smell around the neighborhoods.
- List only animals that are not permitted, as opposed to listing the ones that are permitted. Could further limit by known maximum size/weight, and also by maximum known sound volume typical of species. Limits on any nuisance (accumulation of feces/waste/measured noise/odour criteria/etc.).
- Allow chickens in certain size yards.
- I think that everyone should be able to provide themselves with food. I would feel safe if poultry was allowed in any yard. Egg chickens would provide people with food security.
- Should be allowed
- Chickens only
- As long as the animal has the space and care it needs
- That there are no roosters that will crow while I'm trying to sleep! That the chickens will not get territorial and attack my young children if they are in an open yard. That they are cleaned up by the owners, no smell or poop in public areas. I am really in support of urban bees and chickens!
- I believe we should be able to as long as they are clean and safe
- That the animal noise and their waste are dealt with in a proper manner.
- Back yard chickens should be allowed as long as they are kept in good health and not attracting rodents. Have a limit say for example 10.
- Limited numbers and significant distance from dwelling and yard areas. Noise and odour control.
- Livestock requires large amounts of land. A minimum size yard should be considered per animal along with all other rules related to responsible pet ownership.
- Allergies to many farm animals so it could increase my reactions if there is urban livestock next door. A concern of livestock faeces and urine leaking over into neighbouring living places. I would worry it will attract even more coyotes to our neighbourhood. concerns for noise impacting sleep
- Depends if they can be managed properly and inspected frequently for mistreatment or cleanliness
- Chickens should be allowed. We already have rules in place that would address abuse or abandonment or unclean areas
- No large livestock but chickens etc should be allowed. Calgary is trying to lower people's carbon footprints. Have a local source of eggs would help towards lowering carbon footprints.
- No. You wish a farm animal, live on a farm where they can roam free
- Depends on the livestock. Small livestock (up to the size of a small goat) would be fine. Chickens would be great! No safety issues as long as owner is responsible.
- Yes! Please let us have backyard chickens!
- 1 square metre per hen up to 6 hens. Adequate bedding/coop. For eggs only. Protect feed. Fenced in yard for free range. See CLUCK Canada specifications (COOP) for the ethical & responsible raising of hens.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The city of Calgary is behind many Alberta cities! Urban chickens would be beneficial for food sustainability and soil health. 4-5 chickens, registered, with proper housing should be allowed. (No roosters, laying hens).
- Limits on the numbers allowed and consideration of noise issues. For example I don't think I would be fair for a neighbour to have a rooster that woke everyone up at sunrise.
- A fence high enough that whatever animal it is won't get out.
- Yes but a limit to what animals and the # allowed , maybe based on backyard space. Chickens 3 or 4?
- Limits in size/scale and numbers (ie chickens vs cattle), size l'd property and appropriate storage/housing
- Unacceptable in an urban city. Do not allow it.
- Chickens!!! And ducks. These are great pest control (especially for slugs) I think chickens (5 or less) should be allowed. No roosters)
License per henhouse.
- Limits on how many in relation to area.
- Limits on numbers held on each property ..like 3 to 5 hens ..not 50 and rules of cleanliness ..permits to encourage responsible ownership ...I would like 3 hens of my own if allowed
- I would really like to be allowed to have some hens, there's no comparison to the quality of the eggs versus store bought. I wouldn't see a major problem with having one or two goats, but a cow could be a different story. Again this would have to be done responsibly.
- No roosters, limits on numbers and type of livestock. Standards of care outlined.
- Chickens, goats etc should not be aloud in the city. The feces alone is awful and they almost always carry disease and lice that's transferable to other common pets. They should have to have solid secure fencing, proper housing etc which isn't sufficient in the general size of Calgary's back yards.
- Allow a small flock of chickens for eggs in backyards. They do not make a lot of noise and are easy to keep. Limit chickens to 10 max, hens only, no roosters
- A proper coop.
- Chickens and goats are great. Noise is a concern but they're a great addition.
- I think that urban chickens are good, but larger livestock is something that a typical yard could not accommodate. I believe that with urban hens, roosters should not be allowed. Otherwise, go for it.
- NEVER, the city is not a farm
- Yes. Especially chickens. Same as above. Allow egg laying chickens based on space available.
- A way to insure disease and viruses are not spread to the surrounding community members.
- Nothing really.
- No pigs - too stinky. Anything else is fine
- NO!
[removed]
- A reasonable fence/enclosure, appropriate to the type of livestock.
- It would be nice to have this. We should all have the right to self sufficiency.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depending on what it is I don't feel most livestock should be living in back yards but if they are small and don't cause a disturbance then all is good.
- Insane
- Keep the live stock out of the city, want livestock? Live out in the country. Or support local farmers
- I think properly cared for animals that are not a nuisance should be allowed
- Proper fencing. Greater distances between homes and properties.
- No concerns
- Very tricky. 300 characters is not enough. An urban setting for most livestock is not fair to the animal nor the others around them. Some cultures believe it's ok to slaughter animals close to home and having livestock or parts thereof will encourage wildlife to stay close.
- All livestock needs to be kept humanely with adequate room to run and roam, adequate and species specific food and clean water. No slaughter within city limits. Has to be done by someone licenced to do it! No halal slaughtering!!! Once you've seen it, it's definitely not humane!!!
- Any person housing livestock should be required to obtain a P.I.D # (premises identification number) and report illnesses appropriately as well. Ensure that you providing proper housing, water and feed. And that you have the appropriate amount of space for the type and number of animals.
- Chickens ok in small numbers, with permission from adjoining neighbours.
- Limits on the number of animals allowed in an area; noise limits - I don't want to be woken at dawn!; proper fencing / cages; proper medical / vet / health knowledge.
- I would be concerned about the noise and possibly the smell
- This has to be limited based on property size.
- I don't see a problem with this so long as the facilities provided (ie coops, pens, etc) are both sufficient for the animals and unobtrusive to neighbors/the community
- I think it would be wonderful if people in Calgary could own a couple of back yard laying hens.
- None, as long as no harm comes to the animals. A sign of what is in the area is always appropriate though.
- I have no issue with this. A goat makes an ample substitute for a lawnmower, and deals with kitchen scraps well.
- Last thing we need in Calgary are livestock. The potential for virus's being passed is too great.
- Noise is the only concern. I feel it should be allowed
- Not in city limits.
- I would welcome urban livestock, with some very modest rules on noise (roosters can be a problem) or general cleanliness (to deter vermin).
- I'm in favor of things like chickens and pigs but I don't think it makes sense to have cows and horses inside city limits
I firmly believe that pugs and chickens can make great additions to the home
I'd just put a limit like no more than 4 chickens etc
- It's so expensive to live here and people need to be able to feed their families. I know I do. I am 100% behind people being able to use their land for all types of food.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The city should allow for small livestock such as hens and goats in limited quantities to be kept in backyards. Edmonton and Okotoks have such provisions in their bylaws, why is Calgary so behind.
- Love the idea of urban livestock for small livestock - maybe no large animals like bison in the city. Also, limit the total number of urban livestock per household. This is a progressive idea that can alleviate food scarcity, keep urban residents in contact with their food source, and is fun.
- Absolutely not. The smell, sounds and disease. Urban homes are too close together for livestock to not negatively impact immediate neighbors and that is very unfair.
- As long as there is no poultry enough as is dealing with magpies at 430 in the morning no need for roosters and upkeep is par to livestock on farms
- special licensing and properties of a size that have minimal impact on neighbors for noise, etc. will be legally and financially held accountable for negative impact
- Must have sufficient space for the animals and not infringe on the safety and comfort of their neighbours.
- Growing up on a farm I can't see the need for urban livestock. People have no idea what it takes to responsibly take care of livestock. Urban chickens need to be in a clean, warm place and will eat feed that attracts rodents etc. They smell. Prepare for escaped chickens once the novelty wears off
- As long as there is little or no smell, and limited noise associated with the animals, I do not have a problem with them. I do worry that they may bring wildlife into areas where they could be in danger.
- Fencing and proper animal husbandry
- Should not be allowed if it causes any issues with neighbours, sound smell or property values.
- Thinking of chickens or small animals like that, not much.
- Shouldn't be allowed at all. If you want to raise livestock, move to the country. There is no need for it in the city. Don't need the smell or noise and the livestock deserves to be in the country.
- Hard no. These animals belong on a farm.
- Hens should be allowed. Roosters should not be allowed. They are loud and I have lived beside homes with roosters and they definitely will wake up the neighbours.
- On owned property of not less than 1 acre.
- I support urban egg production but am concerned about how a humane end of life or slaughter would occur.
I support other urban livestock if bylaws enforce cleanliness and restrict noise. Also, I am concerned about animal welfare, particularly at slaughter
- Not even sure where to start. If neighbors are OK. Smell mitigation. Only in larger yards.
- Knowledgeable and responsible owners and proper space. Maybe offer a certificate to know owners have taken some training. Also should be done to dog owners. Respect and open-minded was from neighbours.
- It's all about intensity and scope. If everyone is allowed 2 backyard hens, then that's fine. But if it's a larger number, then the intensity may cause some nuisance. There should also be space for the animals to be happy.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think keeping small livestock within the city should be allowed, such as chickens. Perhaps setting limits on size and number of animals would be ideal
- It would be good to have chickens. If pigeons are allowed, why not chickens. Chickens are more useful. They are great for teaching, a more wholesome and sustainable lifestyle.
- No issues with safety here, I'd love to see urban chickens or goats.
- None permitted, including so called support animals. There simply is no need and the chance of negative impact on neighbours (noise and smell) is too great. We are an URBAN community, not a RURAL community. (The concept of "support animals" is being abused and is ridiculous.)
- Really this shouldn't be allowed unless on a large lot of say over 1 acre
- License to own, limits based on yard size & shelter.
- There is no place for this in Calgary. More and more people are moving here and living closer together. The health, noise and safety concerns of the majority should not be compromised by a few people with some off beat ideas about what a pet is. Do not succumb to the phoney need for service animals
- No pigs, chickens, goats, cows in the suburbs. If you need one of these, move to the country.
- Adequate fencing to contain livestock.
- I would love to see a program to allow urban chickens.
- Monthly inspection area is kept clean and no disease or infections
- Ensuring that noise and odor are not infringing on neighbours rights.
- chickens(not roosters) and other livestock as long as the home has a big enough yard
- A notice posted
- I know that the smell can be an issue with certain animals, but I am all for small urban livestock in the city.
- Chickens and quail are ok. 5 birds max per household. Same rules as other pets about noise and smells. No roosters.
- With a licence. As well as, an accompanying require that requires mandatory education class provided at the cost of the applicant. Much in the same manner as a hunting licence. This would also require acceptance of surrounding neighbours.
- I do not support this. If people want to raise livestock they should move out of the city.
- I worry about the smell. I also worry about the damage that could occur to neighbouring homes if any animals got loose.
- Do not agree with any kind of urban livestock being raised in the city limits. They attract predators and smell. If people want to raise farm animals they should live in a rural area.
- I would like urban chickens to be permitted. Look at Red Deer and Edmonton as examples of pilots projects.?
- Training course/certification. But absolutely allowed
- Nothing. Do not approach them.
- There should be NO urban livestock.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I definitely think people should be able to raise chickens, but only in certain neighbourhoods. Obviously high density multi-family housing is not an option, unless it was a community effort with a central, dedicated area for this.
- I am not as much of a fan on this one, only because most people wouldn't do what is needed to be responsible to adequately care for livestock.. .it takes a lot of work, money and care to ensure proper sanitation, vet care, even the noise and smell levels.
- Yes allow within reason. Ie urban chickens/ducks. Maybe don't allow roosters and limit flock size.
- Yes!!!
- Nothing. A poor pet owner is a poor pet owner whether it be a dog or a chicken. Most people who have a passion for urban hens are responsible and conscientious. It's insane that major cities like New York allow urban hens and we don't. Who does this council think they are. Power mongers.
- Should not be allowed.
- I feel safe about urban livestock, especially egg laying hens
- NO! Not necessary and caused extra noise and messes.
- No issues as long as owners keep cages clean and waste removal at hand. Communication is key.
- Limitations to size, weight, and number of animals would be critical. No large animals should be allowed, especially on residential lots. Zoning adjustments may allow some commercial properties to maintain a reasonable number of larger animals. Health inspections should be made at owners' expense.
- Sure- as long as they have the space to care for the animal
- I am in favour of livestock, no bigger than a sheep
- Just chickens, with a limit on the number allowed .
- No..because it will attract other critters like skunks..weasels and bashers..coyotees
- A limit to the number of animals on a property (likely determined by size of property)
- Chickens should be allowed. Limit number of chickens allowed on a property. Guidelines and resources for housing, access to outside areas, protection from predators. No roosters allowed.
- I'm all for chickens for eggs. Lots of low income families could benefit from this. We already have noise bylaws etc, some of my neighbours are louder than animals (smellier too)
- Regulations around containment and follow-up by city after licencing to check living conditions of animals. Perhaps a limit for size and number per square foot of yard.
- Not acceptable. Owners should face removal of poorly housed or fed or escaped livestock. Bad idea in general - noise, smell, mess.
- Good animal husbandry so they do not become a nuisance to neighbours.
- No livestock over a certain size would be nice and some rules about enclosed fencing, a basic standard of animal care knowledge, etc. would help.
- Never
- Nothing. I think allowing livestock increases safety as it allows people to be more self sufficient. Chickens, ducks and goats do not pose safety risks. In fact having these animals reduces the requirement for chemicals in gardens and chemicals make me feel unsafe.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Chickens should absolutely be allowed.... welk hens not roosters. This is also a question of sustainability
- Education and strict checks and balances. The greatest risk of urban livestock is ignorance. Nobody minds a backyard chicken coop. Everybody minds a backyard chicken coop that is messy and housing neglected animals.
- Nothing larger than a pot bellied pig should be allowed. Ok with a small number of chickens provided that they the owners get surprise inspections in order to ensure cleanliness.
- Good hygiene.
- There is no reason for urban livestock. If city limits are extended to encompass an operating farm then an exemption could be granted.
- Minimum space requirements for keeping of livestock, adequate space for them to roam and thrive.
- Not allowed
- Once again they have places called farms for that !! No city backyard other than cats and dogs!!
- The only thing I'd be concerned with is smell, and suitability of the animal to the space. Keeping a few chickens? Sure why not; just keep their pen clean. Keeping a horse or cow in the average backyard? Not suitable.
- Can be kept as pets with proper space for them
- As above
- There should be no allowances for urban livestock. We are fortunate to have many small acreages near Calgary where owning and raising livestock is possible, and would be better for both neighbours and the livestock. Livestock (including chickens) should not be allowed in the city.
- I do not feel live Livestock for the intend of food should be kept in the city. It would be hard to enforce proper husbandry and I worry about how keepers would cull their animals. In regards to public safety it would be dependent on what type of animals they were raising.
- Limit to pets. No commercial livestock operations
- Urban livestock should not exist in Calgary. **HOUSE RABBITS NEED TO BE CONSIDERED AS PETS AND NOT LIVESTOCK!!!!!!**
- Small fowl should be allowed on appropriately sized plots, with appropriate enclosures. Landlords should not be able to stop tenants who follow the bylaws from raising fowl.
- Signage. I think they should also have an appropriate amount of space for the animals to live. They should have safety measures (fencing, animals marked, etc.), hygiene rules, noise rules.
- Licensed and to get a license, a person takes a course on proper husbandry for that species. Annual licensing includes identification of local veterinarian whose practice includes that species. Restrict #s of any one particular species a household has with min space requirements for housing/animal.
- Allow urban livestock, with licensing and limits on type and number of livestock per household. Suitable bylaws controlling odour, noise, waste (fecal matter) collection. No slaughter allowed in residential locations (i.e. slaughter only at butcher, game meat shops, etc. with guts disposal)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- We live in a city not a farm. There are too many problems that are preventable if people start making their house a farm. Animals from farms smell, are loud, and again the city is just asking for more problems.
- Miniature pigs are a myth. Pigs get to be BIG. One is enough. No-one should be allowed cockerels/roosters - far too noisy. Chicken poop smells something wicked. No-one should have to put up with that sort of smell drifting through their bedroom windows.
- Small, domesticated animals (indoor pygmy pigs, outdoor chicken coops) with neighbour consent and controls in place for odour, noise, annual community-based review, etc.
- Livestock should not be allowed in urban areas at all.
- I think more people should be able to have chickens ducks ect as long as the people keep it clean I think it's great
- Backyard chickens are a fantastic source of food, and fertilizer. Being omnivores, they're also good form of pest control against mice and insects. There should be limits based on yard side, with proper housing required, but no prohibitions. Obviously, no larger animals such as sheep or cows.
- Disallow.
- I'm hugely in favour urban livestock, especially chickens. The same rules as being a responsible pet owner of cats/dogs should apply. They should have a license, proper housing in place with frequent cleaning/maintenance to reduce smells and other pests, limits on the number and no roosters.
- All for it as long as it's kept clean.
- Backyard hens have been successful in other communities. Again, as long as they are properly cared for and aren't a nuisance I think we should try it.
- Chicken hens (not roosters) and ducks (both sexes) are quiet and clean animals when taken care of properly. I highly encourage Calgary to allow these birds. Geese can be loud and aggressive, so neighbourhood density should be considered. Larger animals considered if the space required is present.
- Smell reduction somehow? Noise reduction. I think urban livestock is a bad idea. I don't want to live near farm animals.
- In favour. Must be monitored and stringent penalties enforced if animals are not sufficiently provided for both physically and psychologically.
- Not at all. This is not appropriate in an urban setting.
- No concern. They are not threatening in any way.
- For the safety of people and the livestock, adequate housing/fencing must be required. Each animal should also be microchipped so that if they do get out the owners can be quickly contacted. Owners should be fined if their livestock is not under control. A cap on the amount of animals allowed.
- No one wants chickens or pigs next door to them
- Common sense
- People slaughtering animals?? Disgusting! Unless they are living in your house and treated as a pet this is a terrible idea! They don't want to live their lives in teeny tiny cages the rest of their lives! And what happens to them when they are no longer wanted? Where do they go then? No!! No!! No!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Yes, but I think there should be permits given in order to keep and obtain such creatures. I think residents should have to apply for the permit. Applications should include home checks and husbandry exams.
- Ensure that it does not interfere with neighbours' enjoyment of their own property.
- In order for me to feel reasonably safe in areas where there are urban livestock, I would require there to be rules and regulations. Animals like horses, donkeys, roosters, buffalo, oxen, cows, llamas, alpacas, etc should be prohibited from being kept as livestock in a residential area.
- Rules around cleanliness, smell, and noise affecting neighbors. Perhaps a minimum lot size to ensure they have enough room to be healthy and to also not disturb neighbors. Must get approval of nearby neighbors.
- Proper enclosures and vet care for the animals. The animals must have a good quality of life and the property kept in good, healthy conditions ie: frequent removal of waste
- Chickens, only hens and not roosters. Limit to 2 or 3 hens. Proper housing.
- Do not want my neighbors owning livestock. This is an urban city. Livestock belong on an acreage/farm.
- No issues at all. We need more of this in a city FOUNDED ON AGRICULTURE. The supply chain is volatile. Let people support themselves more.
- This should be a no-go. There are too many irresponsible people that would ruin it. With increased density taking place, how can we ensure this will be properly looked after?
- Great idea, my only concern would be roosters, but I would love to have hens!
- Healthy, well maintained livestock should be registered and secured as pets are and protected from predators.
- Currently the only livestock I feel should be allowed within the city is chickens. They provide eggs and can be processed easily for meat and they take up minimal space. However, there should be rules for the size of your property and where on your property you can contain them.
- the Owners would have to provide proper maintained enclosures with enough space for the animals, and there must be a reasonable amount of space between properties
- keep them on the owner's property
- A license, welfare checks.
- My son's neighbour has chickens and a rooster in San Francisco. The rooster de-crowed, however still very audible early in the morning. The chicken clucking sounds are annoying, the feed is attracting rodents. Not a good idea in an urban setting.
- People should be allowed to have a small number of chickens and maybe two pigs.
- There are a number of urban livestock that would be no less problematic than many dogs. Similar to bees, guidelines on location/buffer with neighbours, appropriate shelters, and density restrictions.
- Disease control and mitigation of smell
- Again I think this is an excellent idea, I think raising chickens, goats, ducks, or whatever else people want would really be great for the city (cows seem unfeasible unless you have a big yard). My one reservation is I would be a little concerned about waste, but I am sure it could be managed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't agree with allowing any urban livestock in the city, i don't need to deal with the stink or noise
- Depending on the livestock and ability to keep em safely.
- Chickens should be allowed in the City. Licence required for number of chickens allowed appropriate for the size of the lot. Chicken house and fenced area SB required. Small Pigs under a certain size should also be allowed but be required to have a city licence.
- Enough space and ability to contain the after waste
- I suppose a limit on the number of livestock would be necessary and expectations for owners. Ensure the animals are properly and humane cared for.
- That manure is properly disposed of to avoid smell. This should also apply to domestic pets (cats and dogs) as well. Dog excrement are gross after not being cleaned up all season. Why are hens called LIVESTOCK? Are you also contemplating resident being able to keep sheep/cows/rabbits in backyards?
- Ban on larger livestock like cattle, and pigs, limit to the number of smaller animals such as goats and chickens. Requirements for appropriate chicken coops.
- The main considerations here should be smells and sounds from the urban livestock, and health concerns surrounding the disposal of waste.
- Within reason. A few chickens is reasonable as long as they are kept in humane conditions.
- Registration, the same as cats or dogs, limit on number of animals total
- I think that Calgary should allow citizens to keep live stock in the city, as long as it is regulated. Such as the number of livestock you can have, and where on your property you can keep them. As well as keeping the livestock health and safe.
- chickens, but you'd have to do up a bunch of by-laws for this... number, where the coop can be, size, allow for complaints about noise and smell (which I've heard really aren't big problems) and allow people to locally sell excess eggs.
- I don't want it
- need liscence.. also a city inspector to assure safe handling practices
- I've never felt unsafe around livestock but I'd hope that the chickens would have adequate living area
- Big enough yard to accommodate needs of the animal.
- Small livestock such as chickens (no roosters), pheasants, etc would be great.
- Defined restrictions on what is considered urban livestock. I think it would be great to have backyard chickens if you have the want and space to do so. Other cities do. It would also be important to have size restrictions (specific sized backyard or neighbour house distance?).
- I think small quiet farm animals are ok in urban areas but the situation of every animal needs to have guidelines. Pigs, small goats, small horses etc. As long as they are limited as to number, and the yard is clean . As far as chickens, limited to small number, they are noisy
- Just say no. Chickens, geese, ducks, cows, miniature horses or whatever have no place in an urban environment.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I do not support urban livestock in any form. The surface footprint of the average city lot is too small to provide for the effective management of feces and odour, generated by livestock. These activities can be pursued on acreages and farms outside of the city boundary.
- Ye - I've had backyard chickens in Australia - great for food. Great for kids to be exposed to farming and understand the food cycle. Limits on the number of chickens per size of yard is important - understanding they are social creatures with a pecking order so 3 would be my recommended minimum.
- Fencing.
- Please, please PLEASE allow urban chickens.
- Just say NO. Chickens, cows, miniature horses, ducks or whatever do not belong in an urban environment.
- I see nothing wrong with a couple of laying hens kept in a fenced enclosure. Cleanliness rules should be required. I don't see a need for pigs, cows, horses etc. (miniature or otherwise)
- It is absolutely absurd that Calgary does not allow chickens - exactly how backwards can this be?? Chickens - limit of 6 no roosters, contained in well ventilated enclosures.
- Limit size. Eg: No backyard cows/horses/goats. Chickens, small pigs, etc OK. Roosters with neighbor consultation and permit. Subject to current noise bylaws
- Chickens: for sure! No issues as long as responsibly kept.
- Proper containment/fencing, regulations on dealing with waste
- That the individuals are following set regulations (ie number of animals) and caring for them in a way that maintains the health and happiness of those animals. For example, with chickens, treating it the same as you would someone with dogs. Noise and odor complaints handled through bylaw vs a ban.
- not meant for city sized properties. Chickens, pigs, horses, goats, cows, all belong on a farm not in the city
- Backyard hens are amazing g. I had 4 hens for 5 years in se Calgary. I miss them lots. I actually was a part of the charter challenge with Nikki pike, after years of harassment from the city I gave them up, I think 5-6 per home is a great number. Same thing offer a quick course about caring for hen
- should not inconvenience their neighbours - safety (allergies), noise and/or smell
- I believe urban livestock should be allowed under specific circumstances and conditions, e.g. a small backyard flock of hens, providing there is adequate space for the animals.
- Yes to urban livestock - as long as animals are cared for and not neglected or abused, same as for any pet ownership.
- Cleanliness and smell should be considered. Neighbours should be consulted.
- No livestock within city limits. There are noises and smells associated with livestock that I shouldn't have to deal with. Chickens smell, pigs smell, horses smell, goats smell and so does their urine and feces. Live out in the country if you want to keep livestock. Support animal? Get a dog.
- Fences and waste removal
- Raising livestock in an urban setting is inappropriate for both humans and livestock.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Let people have chickens in the city. Have more of a conversation with communities that would like bigger animals on their property.
- As long as it's done safely for the animals and the community and on their own property I have no issues.
- The issue with urban livestock is possibly noise and mess. So if a neighbor wants chickens for example, I don't mind, but I also don't want a rooster crowing 6am in the morning, and livestock stinks so how do you ensure they are cleaning the areas on a regular basis?
- Secured containment within a home including good fencing around the yard. Again a big fan, especially of chickens as I have seen laying places and extremely inhumane. If there is urban livestock also you know what they eat and no transportation cost.
- Livestock do not belong in the city. Small animals like chickens might be ok but they can be loud and attract unwanted attention such as coyotes and malicious people.
- ok as long as they are properly cared for/do not bother the neighbors. Perhaps a neighbor survey/approval should be required to obtain a license?? As soon as any evidence of abuse/neglect/smell is proved, the license should be revoked. Set a strict precedent and keep it or it could become a mess.
- Education and by law codes
- Livestock is safe. Just like pets, owners should be responsible for maintaining reasonable cleanliness. The city and province already experiment with goats and pheasants. We need to open this to households.
- Nothing. We should all be allowed to have them.
- Small and quiet livestock only (no roosters, etc). Must be in pens of suitable size, not roaming free. Must be subject to inspection to ensure adequate cleanup, care (ie., no farm smells in the 'hood).
- Limited amount, certain animals in approved enclosures. Must have neighbors permission.
- Disease, smell and noise. If you want to be a farmer, move to a farm. The right to have urban livestock also carries the responsibility to ensure that your "hobby" does not negatively impact others enjoyment of living in the same area. The "emotional animal" argument is very weak.
- Policies and standards in place, including licensing, noise and smell abatement, and checks.
- Education of owners and neighbours. Health and safety checks.
- More programs for back yard chicken coops, maybe by community approved lottery?
- No roosters in the city. Chicken keeping is a great idea. Bylaws for health and cleanliness and the welfare of the livestock.
- Urban livestock should be allowed. Especially chickens.
- Only as a support pet with a letter of support from a qualified professional.
- Yes, especially if they are chickens.
- If is proper amount of space. And no loud roosters and no horrible smells. Animals are treated well.
- Must be a suitable distance for noise and odor control
- Livestock for food in urban areas No Way! I don't want to witness them being harvested next door.
- Livestock should not be allowed whatsoever in an urban setting.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Every family should be allowed to own hens or other small livestock if cared for properly, and not a nuisance to their neighbours, similarly as cats and dogs are owned within the city.
- No goats (they can escape and they chew through things)
No rabbits (also easily escape and impact the ecosystem)
Coyote-proof enclosures, to prevent coyotes, bears, etc from coming into residential neighborhoods.
Yes to chickens!!! No roosters.
- Yes! Poultry such as chickens, geese, ducks, etc should be acceptable. Max. flock size five animals? Limit of max. size
- I am opposed
- That's a misleading question. I believe people want to raise chickens in the city. I have no concerns with this. However if you are actually asking about raising beef cattle in the city I would be concerned about the lack of space for the cow. Please clarify the question.
- Chickens or other poultry should allowed. Permit required.
- A change in bylaws to embrace responsible livestock owners. Look at the concerns find solutions, not restrictions. Give calgarians the freedom to raise chickens well
- Just hens, nothing else. A similar requirement as the town of okotoks. Must be registered with the city and have regular visits from bylaw officers, also perhaps having the on front your neighbors.
- Compliance to set rules such as keeping yard clean from livestock's waste to limit smell/flies/rodents size (height) restriction on livestock so that they won't leap over fences
Noise restrictions (ie. no roosters)
Proper disposal of waste - not just thrown in alley
- They are secured on their property, pens are kept clean so they don't smell for their neighbours.
- I would love to keep chickens for eggs! I don't think it's right that that's illegal right now.
- same as previous
- Nothing, chickens aren't a nuisance if they are well kept for, we want to raise chickens in our yard mainly because the nearest home would be over 60' away and would not cause any problems.
- Proper containment, clean-up and noise management. I don't know why we wouldn't allow some number of livestock where suitable space is available.
- Should not be allowed in city limits. Smelly, dirty, just adding to the animal issues
- Depends on what species and how many animals.
- Chickens only with a limit of laying hens, and no roosters. As most yards are too small for any bigger livestock, I don't think it wise to have larger animals and assure quality grazing.
- Lot size/space requirements for healthy livestock.
- Nope, not in a city.
- There should be absolutely no urban livestock, with the exception of ESA animals. Other urban livestock keeping has too many repercussions for rescue organizations when people get tired of taking care of their "backyard chickens" etc. Only exceptions should be for rescue/sanctuary organizations.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A wholehearted yes to backyard hens. A similar program to other urban municipalities (ie. Edmonton) would be wonderful!
- Quantity. If it's too much then perhaps no longer for family consumption. If it's small enough, it should be acceptable.
- Existing bylaw should stand. Houses are built too close together to make livestock reasonable or save in this city.
- Proper containment of the livestock
- Should be allowed as long as the animal is given the appropriate room to roam. So no cows in a small backyard but a couple of chickens in a coup is reasonable.
- Livestock can carry diseases and feed and excrement issues are a problem along with noise and stench. I love horses but don't want one on my backyard.
- Licensing. I am in favour of urban livestock
- Hens! I don't know why they are not allowed.
- That they are properly housed on the owners property
- As long as they follow the same noise and nuisance bylaws as other pets this is fine. There should be rules to protect against bad owners who allow smells to get bad or noise to become difficult, but if the animals are quiet and clean (and maybe they share some eggs!) it's OK with me.
- I can't see allowing anything other than a few chickens. It would be fine if it were hens only (no loud roosters), precautions were followed to prevent spread of disease and there were limits on the number. Should also regulate cleanliness and smell and not allow large livestock.
- Thoughtful laws around what animals can be kept in a city and live happy and healthy lives. Chickens should be allowed.
- Disagree. Cities are urban centres not rural pasture areas. I do agree with the summer goat eating weed project, but oppose keeping private cows, horses, pigs, etc. in cities. Buy a farm to keep them!
- Appropriate enclosures for livestock. Some measures to minimize things like smell and overcrowding
- control numbers, control noise, control smell, control disease, control shelter, control disturbance to my property. make sure those keeping livestock are educated in livestock care and accountable for their animals
- There should be regulations as far as required land area for a species and which species should be allowed. Chickens should be ok, but larger animals are not.
- I'd want to be sure there is no smell or noise affecting my property. I don't support urban livestock.
- I'm good with urban livestock - only thing would be a process to deal with complaints if there was an extreme issue
- Reasonable living space for the animal itself. Chickens/fowl are not a problem for neighbours, no more than dogs or cats are.
- In general I think the city needs to chill out about this. I would rather my neighbor had well kept chickens than a cat they let loose all the time.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I theoretically support the practice, but can understand how issues could arise or neighbours may have concerns. Is this something that could be solved by following a process like the Dev Permit process, where you apply, meet certain conditions, and neighbours can give feedback?
- Safety isn't a concern, as long as the animal's feces aren't creating unpleasant odours for the neighbours.
- Acceptable noise, size, and cleanliness regulations, registration
- My biggest concern is space and smell. If there is a way to designate areas for urban livestock that could be a good option. Similar to community gardens perhaps.
- Nothing - I would love Calgary to allow backyard chickens with bylaws. As long as the owner is responsible I have no problems.
- NO. Livestock doesn't belong within city limits. Again, the houses are jam packed together and everyone's yards are so small.
- Safety isn't a problem, it's more of neighbour disruption with smells and noise.
- Depends where they are kept.
- I feel that urban livestock should be permitted. Ideally proper education (website/workshops) avail for good husbandry/responsible pet owners/ neighbours. Noise levels/odours/mess could be addressed/enforced similar to dogs. proper housing/space needs to be available to ensure happy/healthy animals
- -licence and inspections required
-should be no odors detected by neighbours from livestock and noise should not impact neighbours or licenses will be withdrawn
- If people want livestock, live on an acreage or farm! Our houses are too close together and yads too small to support livestock without impacting the surrounding homes. Who wants to see, smell, or hear livestock next door?! Let alone if they're kept for food!
- signage and fences
- It would bring the knowledge that meat , cheese milk etc comes from livestoke and not a plastic tray. It could also teach work ethics
- Rules to ensure safety and minimal disruption to neighbours
- Limits on numbers and ensuring proper care and cleanliness.
- not allowed in the city
- I absolutely think urban livestock, more specifically chickens and meat rabbits, should be supported. Citizens who wish to take control of their own food production should not be barred from doing so. Clear guidelines based on the animals welfare and reasonable production needs are important.
- Yes, Chickens only, the rest are just messy!
- I'm not sure if this allowed? Though very cool, but will the livestock have enough room to roam?
- Poultry, mini pigs, goats, donkeys - would need min. requirements for space, enclosures, cleanliness & quantity. Too many could be noisy, smelly, disruptive, may attract additional wildlife. I'd be concerned about quality of life for large animals, and safety of others if got out (they'd be scared).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Livestock are not suited to urban life. If they can be kept inside like our dogs and cats and odours controlled while allowing them exercise and enrichment. Maybe
- Fencing
- These should not be allowed in any areas where neighbours would be affected.
- I really would like to see the keeping of Chicken hens be fully legalized. My primary concern is more for the safety of the animals. How do we ensure the coops are properly set up and maintained? Apply for licence with proof of education and or affiliation? Much like with pigeons?
- Reasonable limits on how many.
- Don't want any livestock in the city. I grew up on a farm. Livestock should be outside of the city for sanitation and health reasons
- Noise control - shouldn't be over a certain loudness or duration. Smell should be not noticeable.
- Bylaws to ensure they are contained and properly cared for.
- Any livestock kept within City limits needs to have adequate fencing or containment so that it cannot escape and leave the owners property - zero chance of running at large.
- Nothing can fix this ridiculous notion. This should be banned. It has no place in an urban environment.
- Chickens are fantastic urban pets. I have had them myself (in another city) and when limited to a small flock of hens, they are very non-disruptive, they are educational, and very entertaining.
- Should be allowed but with the same regulations and licensing in place for dogs and cats. Limits would need to be in place and proof that an appropriate environment was in place for said livestock. If there were neighbor complaints regarding odor or noise, then a restriction of livestock
- Even better idea! It's so silly that you cannot have chickens, etc But you can have 19 dogs? Chickens are very very easy to maintain, very clean, and make far less noise than a dog. Also less mess. Dog feces and urine stain grass and smell so bad that it can affect your neighbours outdoors enjoyment!
- I do not want pigeons, goats, chickens etc being kept as livestock in the city. people keep rabbits and then when tired of them just let them loose and the domesticate rabbits do not know how to fend for themselves or defend themselves
- Signage would be helpful to create awareness of things to do or not do around such animals. Also the animals need to obey noise bylaws. No roosters crowing at 3:00 in the morning!
- I think as long as people have appropriate documentation allowing said urban livestock and have a proven history of successfully managing those animals in an urban setting, AND it is beneficial for the welfare of that animal, then it is okay.
- A limit on the numbers of livestock that a property can reasonably house. Also, simple guidelines for humane living conditions for those livestock.
- Would be concerned about noise and odors from animals.
- Safety protocols and standards - a whole yard full of chickens would be a no-no. But if they are gated etc, it would be fine.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think chickens (upto 3 hens) would be great. I think that there should be rules of course, and people should be expected to keep a standard of cleanliness and it be up to landlords to allow them. I believe that this is very progressive and an obvious necessity for moving forward in food systems.
- I think that the ban on keeping livestock discourages Calgarians from learning to farm and provide fresh meals for their families. However, I think that louder poultry, such as roosters and guineas, should only be permitted in urban areas as emotional support animals.
- Livestock must be kept on property and if noise/smell/living conditions of the animals effect surrounding houses they have a right to say it is effecting the way they live.
- If you want to raise livestock then go live on an average. Livestock has no place in an urban city.
- Not necessary in our urban environment, breeding ground for virus transmission as in Wuhan China. Should be outlawed.
- Not within City limits
- I don't have a problem with chickens in an urban setting. But, I don't think ungulates belong in the city.
- Again, proper training and accommodations to take care of the animals
- It's fine, as long as they are being kept humanely.
- People should be able to keep chickens and ducks. It's really no different than rabbits or pigeons. It's better for the environment to have local food security.
- Nothing. I feel safe wherever they are placed.
- I am in principle in favor of urban livestock, but would like to see a clear strategy on poop, guidelines on space requirements and welfare, and risk mitigation for pathogen transmission between wildlife, urban backyard livestock, commercial livestock, and humans.
- As long as the urban livestock is kept well then this is a great idea. However pet pigs need to be removed as 'livestock'. These should be treated the same as Cats or Dogs, considering in an urban setting they are the same and have the same characteristics as a dog.
- I'm completely in favour of people being allowed to keep a few hens or a small goat or a pig. Obviously animal welfare laws would apply. Many cities in Canada allow urban hens. They make excellent pets, they eat a lot of bugs, and they lay eggs.
- Not acceptable to have urban livestock at all.
- Not within the city Limits, unless it is a miniature horse.
- While I support urban livestock in theory, I am allergic to many of the common animals. Having them, fir example, in the yard next to mine would be very uncomfortable. I'm not sure how to be fair about balancing these needs.
- NO - Livestock do not belong in the city. How would the noise/smell be handled to ensure the neighbors are not affected
- Yes, the cost of keeping hens is significantly lower than keeping dogs or cats. A bag of food for a dog and be \$50+. Whereas a 50lb bag of chicken feed is \$14. It will with access to fresh organic food to families concerned about food security. Veterinary care is a must though.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Fine with it, provided there is appropriate space for the animal and suitable cleanup. Fan of chickens provided the smell and noise is kept down.
- Not allowed in residential neighborhoods. An acreage outside the city is fine but not in my neighborhood. If I had a person with chickens living next to me I'd move.
- Fences
- I feel like this could get messy and dangerous quickly. There will definitely need to be limits as to what can be kept and shelters will need to be regulated.
- Probably best not to allow this.
- No roosters and clean coops/living areas. Limit to how many hens one can have. Larger livestock needs more space
- We are too very to neighbours and if there is any smell/noise it would be very noticeable. The dog next door was thrown out of the house as soon as the owners got home from work. He barked, threw himself against the door for over an hour starting at 5. Will the livestock be better taken care of?
- With set limitations and as long as they are kept in safe, well ventilated and healthy conditions and neighbours sign a form in support it should be fine. However if noise, poor conditions, smells and Qty impacts neighbours then there should be fast repercussions and fines.
- I don't feel this should be in residential areas, but could be okay in zoning like Urban reserve or something similar.
- Only if backyard is big enough and they are kept clean
- Should be limited with good processes in place to ensure safety, hygiene, and noise control.
- It would depend how close proximity they were. I wouldn't want them right beside my house . Do we worry about a Kid's hand thru a fence or climbing over? If a neighbourhood builds around an existing farm-those new individuals have no say about that farm. Love the goats in the park, not livestock tho.
- Urban livestock is fine as long as the animals are not allowed to roam free and do not cause disturbance to neighbours. Once again a license or permit should be required so that people are forced to consult with neighbours.
- I think chickens should be allowed and also have regulations to follow
- Sufficient and secure space and shelter. Limits to noise similar to any other potential noise complaint.
- Livestock is good chickens are quiet and eggs are delicious. A goat or two can provide milk and meat and kids love them
- Livestock do not belong in the city. They are farm animals.
- Owner's should have the ability and willingness to take care of the animal and it's needs. The animal should not be mistreated in any way and should not cause discomfort to the owner's surroundings.
- Limited to no more than 3 to 5 animals as long as there is a large enough space however again education is a must oasis cleanliness.Owners will need to respect their neighbors with regards to noise and odor.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't believe that chickens or other noisy animals should be kept in the city.
- Pigs, chickens, ducks oh my!
Limit this to certain breeds for size restrictions and noise reasons.
I would like to see an emphasis put on rescue animals. Maybe we could trial this with a few pigs from the humane society etc.
- I would love to keep chickens in Calgary. I would also like for people to be able to keep other small animals like goats. Many municipalities have great rules that we could apply here such as maximum number of chickens, no roosters, possibly requiring the owner to take a class.
- 6 chickens per property
- I would just be thrilled to be able to adopt a pig or chicken or goat etc and have as a pet, don't have any safety concerns regarding livestock in the city.
- Bylaw on controlling animal but people should definitely be allowed to keep livestock to improve access to local food - chickens, ducks, goats, all reasonable animals to have in the city with no safety concerns
- Safe containment, for the livestock's sake. Please allow backyard chickens and pot bellied pigs!
- I think people need the opportunity to grow or raise their own food.
- With appropriate guidelines, all should be allowed. It is part of food sustainability.
- This should be only allowed ad emotional support and only a few. Many properties are too small, and owners too irresponsible, so it results in a nuisance to neighbors due to smell and noise. If people want livestock, move to an acreage.
- As long as they are in the proper enclosures and have enough space, this is great
- Chickens or other small animals should be allowed. Should be limited to small numbers of animals per address.
- Limits on numbers of chickens and noise
- No urban livestock at all. What a disaster that would turn out to be with the number of irresponsible pets owners that already exist
- Definite NO, people can't follow bylaws when it comes to domestic dogs and cats, this will be terrible for communities!! Drops market value to homes and communities. If they want then buy an acreage, or build in new communities, attracts coyotes, cougars, other wildlife!! NO No NO!!
- Smaller animals only. Must be kept indoors and not outdoors alone.
- Keep it locked up, no noisy livestock
- Allow small livestock, chickens and or a single goat with permit and restrictions on where, ie no to multifamily houses, high density residencies, town homes. Requirements to keep area clean. Cant be used as a source of income.
- unless its causing issues like disease or terrible smell or waste, i don't see why not. let people do what they want.
- Responsible individuals who know what they are doing. Should require a permit/course to verify knowledge base. Periodic check-ins to enforce base standards.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Should not be allowed. People don't have the appropriate accommodations, nor the knowledge to provide adequate care, either medical or husbandry. Rescues already see an enormous amount of surrendered exotics, these are just larger versions of an old issue. Who will deal with the unwanted ones?
- Limits of number of urban livestock to: four hens (zero roosters), four quail or similar, five meat rabbits, and concessions for larger properties allowing ruminants such as two mini horses, two goats, two sheep, two donkey, or similar. Yearly health check requirements, including husbandry and facility
- I believe that urban livestock is fine as long as the animals are well cared for and have enough space.
- Oversight to see that the animals are being handled in a way that is appropriate for their health & that no problems are being caused for the community. I don't see why having rabbits in a backyard is okay but having chickens is not. Larger livestock (horses, cattle) doesn't need to be in the city.
- Small animals like chickens sure.
- That the neighborhood and property values are not affected by the livestock, limit on number of animals based on property size
- Encouraging people to keep chickens, feed their families, teach children how to care for animals and where food comes from makes sense to me. Same as above people should be required to take a course and have appropriate setups for them. Roosters in the city aren't appropriate.
- There should be close monitoring of urban livestock to make sure they are healthy and not disturbing the neighbours. If anyone with livestock needed a permit to do so bylaw services would know who had livestock.
- All for chickens (again, regulation around how many per household and type of housing for them). Goats can also be very beneficial
- Not within city limits.
- Why not!! Chickens are low maintenance, quiet during the night and provide food and a fulfilling hobby for those who love them!
- Kilogram size limit determined by land area, signage and properly kept domiciles for said animals, yearly inspections for larger animals.
- Sure!
- permit and course to ensure animal safety/hygiene and community safety
Limited numbers- ex so many chickens per xx square meter //1 goat per xx square meter
- No. We have issues with people and normal pets, we don't need issues with farm animals, and most can not be controlled with noise. If someone wants a bunch of chickens or roosters, the neighbours will be the ones to get irritated and cause tensions.
- Backyard chickens should be allowed provided the birds are cared for according to animal welfare laws. If needed a mandatory training session and inexpensive license could be required, and succession planning.
- Ensure spaces are big enough for animals, cages are not close to neighbour's windows



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No roosters since they crow, but properly kept chickens are fine, an indoor pig is fine, even a smaller breed of goat or miniature donkey, etc in my mind should be allowed. If a giant Great Dane beast of a dog is allowed, why not a properly vetted and cared for livestock animal?
- Yes! Chickens, pot belly pigs and even goats as long as they are well taken care of with adequate shelters
- Should fall among pet limitations... I. E. If noise, waste or smell disturb neighbours, it must be limited. But a couple of clucking chickens in someone's yard is no more disruptive than barking dogs or noisy cats.
- Not really sure
- Ensuring extra noise and smell isn't bothersome to neighbours. Maybe having a limit on size and number of livestock based on space in yard.
- A permit or license process
- This is not clear, what kind of livestock? Cows, sheep or pigs? To make sure they have shelters and are cleaned at least weekly.
- Should be a size limit: a 300lb pig is inappropriate. Also a limit on number, depending on species.
- This could get very smelly very quickly depending on the livestock people want to keep, but keeping chickens would be a good option.
- Not fair-livestock We are trying to increase human density per acre - pigs and chickens smell, their food attracts rodents/predators. Concern over Calgarians catching diseases salmonella from chickens and SARS / COVID19 from animal to human. Ignorant of basic farming and animal husbandry practices.
- Yes! If you have the space for the animal to live in humane conditions why not. Personally I would love to trade mowing the lawn for a goat or 2.
- Urban livestock is a great idea, as long as the owner has the proper space, fencing, and shelter (sound proof), for what they are raising & they take proper care of the animals! I think chickens are great! Over 45 years ago my parents had chickens in Calgary & our neighbors were fine with it.
- None,
- 2 Chickens should be allowed
- This is the Wild West, why can't I have a backyard chicken?
Make it a license like a dog.
As long as owners are responsible, and care for their urban livestock what is the problem? This could bring new local products to communities
- Adequate fencing and safe housing for the animals. As a vegetarian, I would be extremely uncomfortable with a neighbour slaughtering livestock within hearing range or within sight.
- I completely feel safe with urban livestock.
- Is not an emotional support animal. What a joke that whole thing is. Got no problem if someone has chickens for eggs, long as they are registered and not too many.
- I have absolutely no issue with this whatsoever and encourage this to be allowed. Especially chickens.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education
- biosecurity - there is a risk of disease transmission without proper health measures in place. Noise, smell and nuisance
- As long as it's humane I'm all for it
- The SPCA is already overwhelmed with neglected animals. I can only imagine the horrible conditions some people would keep their poor chickens in. I realize there would be lots of responsible owners but I am certain there would be an enormous amount of neglect and cruelty also. Witnessed this in BC.
- The only concern I would have is that standards of cleanliness and sanitation be maintained as well as adequate habitat, care & shelter for the livestock.
- No roosters (too loud). Reasonably well kept coops. Smell and noise don't bother neighbours. If you have small animals like pigs or goats, that they follow same rules as dogs - have to be on leash when off property. Basic concepts with all animals - respect others.
- No - this is one of the stupidest and most ignorant things I have ever heard of. Animals stink, livestock -especially chickens - stink something awful in summer heat. They don't belong in a city period.
- This is not for the city, I love animals but livestock should be relegated to the farm.
- There are many areas in the city where chickens, ducks, quail and pot bellied pigs would do well. Just like any animal they need people to adhere to best practices in order to manage them well. The families/schools that take this on, can have a significant impact on compost production.
- Perhaps a restriction like Victoria has where you cannot have a rooster due to the noise.
- Depends on size and type of livestock. Also there is a health concern from persons who do not keep their chicken coops clean. Licensed, mandatory education program and bylaw visits would be key.
- Chickens in backyards absolutely should be allowed.
- Keeping hens for eggs is fine. Need to ensure noise and smell concerns are addressed beyond that.
- Definitely livestock does not belong in the city, such as pigeon, chicken or pigs, due to their mess, waste m, smell and noise. Very unsanitary.
- Please be more specific here. I'm sure that no one is imagining urban bison herds! This is restricted to chickens or livestock that could be raised in a typical backyard? Such livestock would be small and not dangerous to people. To eliminate infection risks, there should be a max number.
- Hens are fine. Cows goats horses not so much. Yards are not large enough. Just keep the area clean and smell free as much as possible.
- There must be a minimum lot size required for urban livestock. Urban Livestock license and course on animals, how to be a good neighbour should also be required.
- Housing standards, keeper training and vaccination records.
- Limited to size and number and waste disposal requirements.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- would welcome chickens in the city. # should be proportionally appropriate to the space provided and size of the yard. this should be in line with what's considered by animal experts to be safe and healthy for the animals. similar noise controls as say, a barking dog, for a noisy rooster.
- Very strict rules on allowing the animals from cages, strict cleanup measures. Regular animal welfare checks.
- No chickens! I lived beside someone with illegal chicken coop in their backyard. Huge nuisance in the mornings. They would wake me up early in the mornings and were very loud whenever being fed. With no AC in the rental unit, windows were kept open most of the summer making the noise much worse.
- This is not a reasonable safe practice for urban livestock. Each live critter is a potential disease carrier and spreader.
- I would like to see evidence-based rules on how many animals are allowed on one property, the best housing conditions, and welfare-minded practices. I think it's a great opportunity and a source of food security but just as with other pet ownership, it needs to make the animal's welfare a priority.
- There is no need for livestock in the city. They interfere with others use of their property. Attract pests such as mice, rats skunks, squirrels etc.
- Reasonable maximum number of chickens. Four is plenty to supply a household with fresh eggs. No resale of eggs allowed. Given population of Bobcats probably need rules on enclosures to avoid them getting eaten and attracting animals. Also, chickens are not allowed to roam free.
- I would love to keep some hens, I think a pilot project, and then regulations about the size, type, and number of livestock one can keep, and the property requirements.
- The problem with keeping chickens etc is that there is an assumption that everyone would be responsible and keep the pens clean etc. That would never be the case. If you want to keep livestock - you are welcome to - just move to the country where your neighbours are not a few feet away.
- Small live stock is acceptable if kept in reasonable numbers, clean and noise generation is considered. No worse than my neighbours constantly barking dogs...
- Fine as long as it's smaller live stock like chickens, goats ect. Also should be permitted with animal limits per yard and neighbourhood and with inspections.
- Perhaps small livestock will be acceptable as long as noise and odor is acceptable.
- Urban livestock should not be allowed. Livestock require acreages to roam, something an urban backyard can't provide.
- Livestock are allowed in the city where my mom lives and the chickens are loud and smell horrendous, they cannot enjoy their backyard space anymore because of the chicken coops. All livestock are loud. I feel they should remain outside the city.
- I don't find livestock remotely threatening. As long as the animals are well cared for in appropriate numbers I would love to see more local animal husbandry.
- More bylaw enforcement resources
 - Max number limits
 - Noise and odor limits



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- NOOOO! Definitely not - under zero circumstances do I want to hear chickens on a constant basis. It is bad enough with neighbours who do nothing about their dogs barking continually all day long, never mind having the noise and smell of chickens. I am far more against this idea than I am any other.
- urban livestock should not be permitted.
- This is fine. I've driven past pastured horses within City limits on a regular basis for years.
- Proximity mechanism for non-owners to be protected from noxious smells and nuisance sounds; protection for livestock owner to prevent poisoning.
- I would like to see some guidelines drawn up by owners of the specific livestock in cities. I want to have chickens, have experience raising chickens, but would like guidelines / help for a city location.
- Absolutely NOT. Do we need to look any further than the current crisis with COVID19 to say having livestock in the city is a very bad idea? If someone wants to own livestock, live on a farm or a rural setting.
You have the perfect out with the current pandemic to say no to this idea. Take it.
- As long as odour and noise is kept in check, I have no issues with urban livestock.
- I would like there to not be a rooster in my residential neighbourhood, what if my street has several roosters? Can we have a community rooster? Rooster for hire? All seriousness, noise is my concern for livestock in the city. Have we done any pilot projects?
- Totally fine. The sound of chickens (not roosters) is a calming sound, much quieter than dogs! There is no smell if composting education goes along with it.
- I would like to see chickens/poultry in Calgary.
- I am 100% against this. Livestock belongs on farms or outside of the city. The city is not a good place to create backyard farms
- - see above
- No, no, no. I've experienced roosters crowing at 4 am and can imagine the noise disturbance this would make Chickens create a ton of waste and if enclosures aren't properly maintained, the smell would be horrendous. People won't maintain their sidewalk shoveling the city won't enforce that rule. NO
- Mind the noise.
- Again, simple awareness and the knowledge that owners are to keep their livestock contained within their own property and held to a standard of ethics. I would be very interested in having chickens if it were allowed and would ensure they are kept safe and happy in my own yard.
- There is a large concern regarding noise, cleanliness, smell and attraction of predators. There is also not enough room on a typical back yard for the ethical treatment of any livestock.
- Should not be allowed. I love farm animals dearly, but people continue to prove they can barely care for domesticated animals. This would open up a whole other can of worms.
- None. Although Airdrie recently had a backyard chickens pilot program and the mice were a HUGE problem. They decided against allowing backyard hens

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- should be limited to a small number of animals and small size animals. Concern is with noise and smell. Permit and annual inspections should be mandatory for health and welfare. Livestock should be kept at least 3m away from other properties to allow for good separation from those who don't want it
- Small numbers of livestock should be allowed by any home dweller provided they can be cared for and kept humanely. They should be able to care for them, clean up after them and ensure they do no harm to other animals or humans. The numbers should be based on type of animals and on the purpose
- Not keen on this. Odors, noise.
- Love the idea of having up to four layers in the yard for fresh eggs!
- Bad idea - disruptive, will reduce property values, keep to acreages / farms
- If it was a direct neighbour, I'd like to know they have one, and I'd like there to be a plan in place to reduce odours and noises.
- This is common sense
- I agree with the keeping of chickens. they are an easy animal for people to house and care for but needs to have regulations on the humane housing and care for the animals.
- A guarantee that there will be no noise (crowing, etc) or smell that penetrates beyond owners yard
- I really don't have a problem with chickens in the city either, as long as there are rules as to the amount of chickens one person can own, plus they need a proper coup and wire pen to keep them safe.
- No, nope, never. Raising livestock in the City should be prohibited. The City can barely keep up with complaints of animal abuse and neglect when it comes to dogs/cats, adding chickens to this is irresponsible. I for one don't want to see neglected and abused chickens in my neighborhood.
- Direction on maximum number and type of animals, required minimum/maximum size of both yard and habitat (chicken coop or the like). Safety is no concern, sound levels and smell are.
- city is for people, livestock is for rural. If you want livestock, by a acreage or farm outside the cities. Majority of city livestock is either too care for ie. pets or not cared for enough ie. poor treatment, loud sqwacking, roaming
Emotional support Livestock should be banned
- I support backyard Chickens
- There should be a limit of animals per person and they should have appropriate structure to take care of the livestock.
- A limit on the numbers of animals kept. For chickens or small livestock such as a goat, owners should take some sort of certification or education on how to do so in a city in order to prevent noise, waste, or disease issues in neighbourhood and to ensure the health and well-being of the animal.
- Chickens should be a thing for sure. I don't see any problems here.
- I'm not keen on roosters waking me up in the morning...
- Nothing. I feel safe.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I am opposed to keeping hens, roosters, goats and other similar livestock on private property within city neighbourhoods. The noise and nuisance factor should outweigh any citizen's right to maintain such animals on their property within the city.
- as long as the livestock has appropriate enclosures and is properly cared for, with minimal impact on surrounding neighbours (ie. the smell isn't any worse than you would get on a normal day, the there isn't a precipitous increase in noise, etc.) then I'm fine with whatever.
- Livestock belong in the countryside. Calgary yards are not large enough for most livestock. Odours from livestock pens in a concern. In winters, access to warm indoor areas (barns) may not be available to properly care for livestock. Escapees are hard to manage and require more bylaw resources.
- Noise, smells and possibly transmission of disease (ie China's issues). Should be permitted and inspected if complaints issued. Must limit number of animals per size of yard kept in.
- How about, nothing bigger than goats in the city? Urban cows are probably a bad idea.
- You should be able to have chickens etc. in backyards. Clean up and smell management should be addressed. But if the yard can hold chickens comfortably, I see no reason why people can't
- Yardspace must be present for animal welfare, and number of animals allowed dependent on total yard space available for the animal. All must be licensed. Animals may not leave the property unless leashed (no off-leash areas). Noise controls must be stringent.
- appropriate fencing and some way to manage any smells.
- I think people should be able to keep small livestock that can be confined to their yards (no ungulates).
- - Livestock should have working barriers to prevent specimens from invading other properties.
- A hotline number for reporting loose animals should be visible on signs
- Indicator signage placed on the publicly-visible side of these barriers should indicate the animal(s) active in these properties.
- To an extent. They definitely need a special license as well as very clear husbandry rules/bylaws. Keeping livestock in urban spaces can put residents at risk for disease transmission. For example, removal of livestock waste needs to be clear and effluent cannot be allowed to run off the property.
- Limits on amount
- Permitting requiring chickens have enough space, food and care to live in an urban environment.
- I would feel completely safe with home owners having a few backyard hens. I know that there are lots of municipalities that have wonderful success with allowing this as a way of sustainability in their communities.
- Nothing.
- There should be limits on allowable species, and numbers, as well as requirements around property size, housing of the species, health maintenance, etc.
This should be subject to periodic inspections and fines for failing any inspections carried out.
- Seriously? There is no shortage of agricultural land in Alberta. There is no need for livestock in the city. Ban it.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I'm all for small-scale chicken raising - I think having a half dozen hens with appropriate shelter is reasonable.
- That owners are educated and capable of responsibly caring for their animals.
- Goats and chickens should be allowed.
- Minimum number of hens kept in coops should be safe.
- don't know enough to comment
- I do not want urban livestock in the City. Livestock belongs on acreages or farms where there is ample room for their well being. I am concerned about noise and odour.
- I have been interested in having a couple hens in my backyard. Hopefully this will be allowed by the bylaw change. I don't think chicken hens would pose any danger to people but perhaps to neighboring gardens if they escaped. I would think a noisy rooster would be a nuisance.
- I would love to own chickens. I'd agree that it's important to keep animals in clean, appropriate spaces and that numbers and noise should be regulated, just like dogs are. Absolutely no home slaughtering unless appropriate health/ use of space regulations are brought in.
- I have zero issue with chickens or even small goats kept in yards. If number/yard are kept reasonable and guidelines for coops are provided this is very simple. Tags/ID on animals is a good idea. I've seen communities in the US which allow chickens and it is fantastic.
- Livestock as a hobby or pets are OK. treat the same as dogs
- Most people would not be able to keep more than a few animals. I guess the focus should be making sure there is a reasonable amount of livestock, not over crowding.
- Mostly concerns about noise and smells. I personally would love to own a couple of alpacas for lawn maintenance, fleece and natural fertilizer
- Poultry only should be allowed, but in limited numbers (say a maximum of 3). Coops should be centrally located in owner's yard.
- A maximum # of animals allowed per household with safe enclosures
- I think urban livestock is a good idea as long as the noise and smell is not interfering with neighbours. (I'm not sure how to measure this). People will need guidelines on how to properly care for livestock. Additional funding for humane societies may be necessary to ensure proper care.
- I think that all animals that are outdoors should be registered. There should be some rules around cleanliness and smells and not being at large uncontrolled.
- As long as numbers are kept under control (no more animals than a dimension of space can handle) I would love to see this. Anyone with an emotional support cow has duped you. If emotional support livestock got a stamp of approval then anyone who wants a city goat, chicken, donkey should get one.
- Responsible farmer that does not allow smell, sound or waste to disturb their neighbours. Proactive, enforceable city bylaws and productive involvement for issues.
- If clean, not noisy, love it. The restaurant next to me stinks more than a chicken for sure
- Absolutely, as long as manure/waste is disposed of in a frequent manner and smells are kept to a minimum



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not in favor of any urban livestock. If you live on the south side of such residence, you'll get all the smell and all the noise.. Some people actually do shift work and are trying to sleep when the livestock is making all there noise. If you want livestock move out of the city.
- Educate people where food comes from and the fact that some people want to responsibly raise their own food.
- Just to do regular health checkups and have not too large of grouping of the urban livestock so as to make sure there isn't a population explosion that could cause issues with roaming wild livestock
- Don't allow it!
- Noise levels should be reasonable at all hours of the day (thinking of early in the morning or late at night).
- This is a hard no. Lets be HONEST here, the REAL farms/farmers don't even have their houses located this close to their own animals barns & pastures! These small city lots with houses in extremely close proximity to these animals is not good for any neighbors including their MENTAL HEALTH (& Resale)
- NEVER unless Canadians are starving because of war or so. noise, smell, space
- No - maybe with size limits. Must have adequate size yard
- Yes within reasonable limit! Up to 6 laying hens per house should allowed
- All animals are livestock and are meant to live outside. Cows, pigs and the like are not for the city. Not acceptable.
- I'd love to have hens myself. I loved the white noise they create, not to mention their eggs. No special mechanism need is required. perhaps some education about what to do when some potential predators and pest shows up. Coyotes, rats, mice.
- More information. I honestly haven't read into the pros/cons of this and would love to see some trials being done throughout the city.
- Limit to 20 chickens.
- Limits to the number of animals allowed, requirements on the house/cage provided for the animals, rules in place to deal with the smell and waste that can be associated with livestock.
- Let's be able to have chickens (no roosters) in backyards! This is so important for climate change and food resiliency in Calgary.
- As long as animals and their waste are kept clean, no issues. Would promote community farm markets.
- I would say no to this. Absolutely none because of easy abuse in protecting public from odours and filth.
- Follow Vancouver by-law. Why reinvent the wheel. <https://vancouver.ca/people-programs/backyard-chickens.aspx>
- Livestock belong out in the country, not in backyards.
- The welfare of the animals as well as the community can be respected as long as accountability is in place.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If you want a farm animal, go live in the country. Livestock should not be kept in the city. I don't worry about feeling "safe" around chickens so much as they are noisy and stink, so I do not want them in my neighbourhood.
- Educated (maybe certified?) owners.
- If the owner in question knows what they are doing and being responsible, it shouldn't matter what it is. I think welfare checks would be good, to ensure that the safety of the animals and public is top notch!
- Some livestock can be raised in the city, such as chickens. But there are appropriate ways to care for these animals and people need the training to do so.
- Livestock belong out in the country.
- To keep it on farm land and not in the city!!
- Backyard chickens are fine as long as they are in appropriate shelters and enclosures, which are kept clean.
- Love chickens
- Chickens should be allowed.
- Proper enclosures to ensure coyotes are not working their way into the property.
- Small amount would be ok as the smell would be the biggest distraction.
- Urban means Urban. live stock belongs to the country. it will cause health issues to the communities.
- There should be no urban livestock in the City of Calgary. It is very difficult because of the smell and cleanliness and dealing with neighbors.
- Should be limited to large enough yards, but is very situational.
- I think regulations that keep the animals themselves safe and healthy could be allowed. And I suppose a limitation placed on number of animals or volume of space used for livestock raising would be reasonable. No more than 20 chickens or something like that?
- Absolutely not. Including chickens. Living with livestock in crowded conditions leads to problems seen in China and other 3rd world countries. We don't need this.
- You're kidding, right? Maybe we should let cows roam free on the streets of Calgary and hire a bunch of City workers to clean up after them. No livestock in city limits.
- We live in such close proximity to each other in Calgary with small lots. I'm not sure this is appropriate.
- Calgary is far behind other cities in this regard. Keeping urban livestock should be allowed so families can have access to home grown food. They also support urban farming, which in turn can lower our carbon footprint. Calgary should look to Red Deer for a good template. Appropriate licensing is key
- Appropriate clean and secure enclosures. I am more concerned about the animals' safety and well-being than my own.
- Owners responsibility to address concerns of neighbors including noise or smells. Urban livestock should be permitted so long as it does not adversely impact the rights of others.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The most likely livestock would be backyard chickens for eggs. My concern is that avian flu is transferred into domestic chickens from wild birds, so if the chickens are in the backyard this increases the chance of such a transfer. I think mandatory veterinary care for urban livestock is necessary.
- That livestock owners have education certificates to be accountable for responsible care. A cap of how many animals may be on site.
- I grew up on a farm. I do not want any urban livestock such as chickens, pigs or goats in my city on residential lots. I would not feel safe because of noise and smells. The potential to attract vermin and predators and potential human pathogens.
- My biggest concern here is the health and welfare of the animals, and how that might affect humans. Issues are vaccinations, grooming, food, veterinary care and impact on neighbours (noise, smell) I would like to see a permit system and periodic unannounced inspections.
- land owners in the city should be allowed chickens for personal egg consumption.
- cast iron frying pan for eggs. it's silly chickens are not allowed. Less a nuisance than dogs or cats.
- What kind of livestock? Chickens, nothing, they're chickens
- Should be no livestock in an urban area. If you want livestock, move to a farm.
- I am not so keen on urban livestock unless it is regulated. Many people today think only of themselves, not others who live nearby. What sort of actions can be taken if people have too many chickens or a cow and things are getting out of hand with noise or smell?
- I do not agree with any livestock kept on person property for any reason, including emotional support, as livestock cannot be taken anywhere outside of the home so I can't believe that this an appropriate emotional support animal.
- Nothing
- Time for people in Calgary to have a small number of backyard chickens.
- Chickens should be allowed in urban areas. A limit of how close a chicken coop can be to a neighbouring property should be set. As well as a limit on the number of chickens per property based on the size of the property. Fines should be made if people are not properly caring for their animals.
- I have no safety concerns with urban livestock as long as they are properly/securely housed which I know if for the good of the owner as well as the public so doubt there is much issue with it.
- Essential to us as human beings and one of the most important and fundamental connections to who we are as human beings on this planet.
- I feel safe with this with permits and guidelines around how many you're allowed.
- This needs to be regulated but to a degree of what can be considered allowed. Having a cow as an emotional animal in a city is ridiculous and determining what can be an emotional animal should be set.
- I am pro-chickens. I wish the city would allow for chicken coops in yards. Owners should have a limit of how many chickens one can own, the limit should also be based on yard size.
- Smells are minimal and noise is minuscule



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- respond to nuisance - noise control for chickens
- Need controls on numbers and bylaws to protect neighbours, e.g. re. dealing with manure/odours. A small number of chickens/rabbits okay with reasonable rules, e.g. pen situated in center of yard. No goats, sheep, cattle, pigs, horses, llamas/alpacas.
- No livestock, you want livestock, buy a farm
- I am in favour of this, and feel it would be best implemented via a permit process to demonstrate proper basic knowledge of livestock keeping and care prior to engaging in the activity.
- Livestock don't belong in urban setting...keep them in rural setting
- Some smaller fowl/quail should be fine, so long as noise is kept in check. Smaller species in general like some pigs or whatever, should be permitted as well, space providing
- The livestock should be confined/restricted to the property of the individual responsible for them. Noise, smells, and nuisance should be kept to a minimum and not disturb neighbors.
- Size and number limits are essential. Control of waste, noise and odour. Control of debris, as we are a windy city. Health management of all animals within the city. Mandatory annual or more veterinarian inspections as with any farm.
- I would like to raise chickens like other municipalities allow in Canada. Just like responsible dog and cat owners follow rules, so could chicken farmers.
- Appropriate space requirements for chickens (ie: a backyard, vs a condo balcony). Maybe some basic training (1hr online, etc) to aid in keeping the chickens alive and healthy. The ability for neighbours to report legitimate complaints. Public education and encouragement.
- No, if you want to have live stock live in the country.
- Proof of education/ knowledge/ certificate etc from an accredited Canadian school
- Appropriate means of disposing their waste.
- Assurances that the beekeeper has been properly educated, and a process in place to evaluate neighbor concerns.
- I had 2 backyard hens the last two summers. My neighbors have been supportive and love to stop by. Being from the farm I always made fun of city slickers. Now I am one. This has provided me with an opportunity to teach my kids (10,8,6) about agriculture and hard work.
- Depends on the live stock. Chickens and other smaller livestock as long as they have excellent living conditions should be allowed to exist within calgary. And as long as they are kept tidy and healthy.
- No should be on a farm. Carry diseases. Avian flu and other. Not safe.
- Chickens/feed attract vermin, which are already a problem in the city. You know there will be people who think slaughtering and processing their chickens in the backyard is no problem, and I suspect bylaw officers have more than enough to do without dealing with such an issue.
- It can be source of available food but it requires proper knowledge of care and housing requirements. Most spaces require modification for safe, adequate confinement. There is a need for disposal of waste in a safe and sanitary manner. The issue of humane disposal also applies.
- A certification requirement.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Chickens: Noise and smell if the hens are not properly cared for. Also, attraction of nuisance animals a concern. If small flocks are properly housed in a secured yard, there would be less issue. I like the possibility for livestock here in Calgary.
- Depends the size of your property. Are the animals in a good space? Has to be regulated according to size of property and the type of animal the person want to have there. 10 chickens in a single family home with a nice size backyard, all fenced and chicken coop properly done all good to me.
- No roosters or animals above a certain size. Can't keep a cow on a city lot.
- This makes no sense in the small, cramped spaces between homes. Noisy, smelly. Can see this going badly.
- again...why---- get your livestock on a farm--- houses are too close together in cities as is the current trend ---thanks to Mayor Nenshi ...to have to put up with smells and noise from this trend in the city...no regard for people close by
- I have no interest in smelling chickens or other livestock. Chickens smell horrid. Bees dont smell and avoid people. I think it also depends on the population density. In bowness my yard was huge and it would have been easy to have livestock and not bother anyone
- Livestock should not be allowed within city limits. The odor would be unbearable. It is hard enough to deal with foul odors coming from city drainage.
- Dogs come in all sizes and we have no issues, so a chicken or small goats and other animals of that sort I see have no issue as long as they are maintained and cared for PROPERLY.
- Nothing - provides the livestock are kept in a yard or barn
- Not a problem provided guidelines are in place regarding cleanliness and food storage re rodents
- At the very least I would like to see Calgary support urban chicken coops, with appropriate regulations (ie. No roosters, housing regulations, amount)
- Make sure we are safe
- fenced areas
- I would be in favor if there was licencing as for cats and dogs and at a monetary level to pay for Bylaw enforcement should issues such as excess noise, cleanliness, neglect, etc. arise.
- A secure livestock pen (i.e. a fenced back yard). I may have concerns about noise.
- should be ban
- Most livestock are associated with nuisances like smell, noise, and environmental management with regards to their waste. An Agricultural officer/regulator would need to be employed to manage and license the practice. Their should be a cap on numbers informed by policy.
- If people wish to raise livestock as a pastime, they can network with one of the MANY acreages and communities that surround Calgary. These relationships could be built/enhanced. I have enough problems with my neighbours' dogs that I'd prefer not to have other livestock added to the equation.
- Fencing or containment to prevent animals from roaming loose.
- Should be none. No need at all.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No large livestock like cows. Pigs are ok. A set amount per household. One or two is ok. Chickens more but only one rooster (too disruptive w noise). Large animals licensed like dogs. Proper enclosures.
- Move to the country. There is no place in the city for livestock. Sorry.
- Guidelines for how many of what types should exist (if they don't) similar the urban keeping guidelines, and the nuisance bylaw enforcement are adequate. Cows seem ridiculous, I am open to small animals and birds at a scale that is appropriate for the location.
- Nothing
- No goats, horses, pigs or cattle. Limit of 6 chickens per yard, with a coop mandatory. No roosters allowed!
- Chickens, rabbits, and other small animals should be allowed but in limited numbers. They should have proper housing. They should not make a stink or noise that will disturb neighbours. They are valuable to provide "close" food to the owners.
- I can only see having livestock on your property if you lived on 2 acres or more on the outskirts of a city and not right in the middle of it.
- Should be on a farm ... viruses possible in urban area ... no live markets ...
- I feel this is reasonable as long as the space is maintained and odours controlled.
- Certain livestock should be allowed such as chickens in small numbers. Keeping a cow or horse in a backyard might be too much.
- Perhaps some sort of registration or even certification is reasonable.
- The size of the animals need to be restricted. There needs to be enough space for the animals. Both humans and animals are not at risk. That these are pets and not used for food (exception of eggs and honey).
- I don't believe that urban livestock should be allowed
- pet pigs or chickens (laying hens) are totally fine with me, maybe not cows.
- Yes, lets modernize. Chickens require only a few square feet each and make less noise than a dog. No roosters, hens will lay eggs without them. Mulch keeps the smell down. Goats are great along side urban farming where they will eat all of the weeds. Dairy cow? Only if you had half an acre.
- max weight size of animal to prevent city cows, Llama, alpaca etc, but allow for chickens, small goats rabbits etc. Max # of animals per size of enclosure by humane treatment act to prevent overcrowding / humane living conditions, odor /pest control. Security of animals away from adjacent property
- Mandatory licensing of urban livestock "farms", and mandatory standard vaccinations for all chickens and pigs. Novel influenza strains that affect humans typically arise from these species, so no household should be permitted to receive a license for both species at any one time.
- Absolutely opposed. Do not at all agree with the provision of livestock as 'support animals' within city limits. High risk with public health concerns, along with odour and other considerations. Restrict these animals to rural areas only.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Should be allowed with appropriate regulations. As a society we should be embracing more life in the city, more biodiversity and local food options. Animals should be housed humanely and smell and noise should be the consideration in regulating.
- My concern is about reducing noise, odours, and vermine.
- Active member in local organization. Strict bylaws on quantity, etc. No one wants to hear roosters crowing.
- I don't think this should be allowed at all. The smell alone is enough to make certain people sick.
- The ability to raise chickens or goats in the city really interests me. Suggest max of 2 goats in city limits (social animals, can't have just 1), and up to 8 chickens per residential dwelling depending on lot size. Need regulations for fencing, coops/sheds, cleanliness, and a complaint process
- Maximum 7 cows in a starter home back yard. Slaughtering must be down inside your garage or under the cover of darkness.
- I absolutely feel the bylaw should stay the same regarding livestock in an urban setting. Most people don't keep their livestock clean and under control. It just adds to noise pollution and smell to the neighbors around them. I adamantly do not want livestock raised in the city.
- People should have to complete a course before being allowed, also a reasonable number on what can be kept in 1 yard. I think a few hens is probably okay. 1 alpaca, 1 neighborhood goat to mow grass?
- I cant imagine a hypothetical concern regarding livestock I think you are referring to; goats, pigs, hens, etc.
- Care and attention to feed, cleanliness and housing of animals to ensure they do not become a nuisance to others.
- Small livestock such as backyard chicken coops should be allowed in the city of calgary.
- Do as Seattle does, then all good
- Should not be allowed.
- Animals should be registered, and potentially housing requirements should be inspected before licensing is issued. Keeping livestock is a lot of work and preparation to provide enough space for the animals. Many animals also cannot be kept alone - they need companions.
- The average goat, chicken, or other small "livestock" pose less risk to the community & environment than cats and dogs do. As such, the same restrictions as for cats & dogs should be more than sufficient. Basically, the owner must be completely responsible for their animals.
- No. Care, vaccination, feed too much work for city folk. Neighbors will complain about smell and noise. That's why they live in the city. PID numbers required in rural areas, room for animals....leave them rural.
- I would encourage and support ownership of a modest number of chickens (perhaps 1 or 2 per person in the household) with the same expectations and guidelines for responsible housing and waste management as is already in place for cats and dogs.
- Chickens (laying) are fine up to a half-dozen birds per household. Smell and noise are potential issues that should be worked out with neighbours wherever possible (complaint driven).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- NEVER...DESTROYS PEOPLES PROPERTY VALUE & WITH CORONAVVIRUS IT IS CLEAR VIRUS'S CAN MIGRATE TO HUMANS...WHY IS THIS EVEN CONSIDERED?
- No
- Never
- Limit on number allowed, shelter types allowed, types of activities (i.e. no slaughtering your chickens in the backyard). Limit on types allowed. Controls on animal health and hygiene.
- I think that it should depend on the amount of land and the size of the animal. One animal more people could keep to enhance their food landscape even on a standard city lot is chickens (no roosters).
- Why is this considered? Corona Virus proves it's not safe. THERE IS A REASON FARMS EXIST OUTSIDE CITY LIMITS.
- Small scale livestock should be available for personal use and/or micro scale sharing (2-3 families sharing chicken eggs).
- Absolutely
- No - should not be allowed
- Noisy
- allow Chickens and small livestock within city limits. Limit to how many of these animals can be kept. No obnoxious loud animals. such as rosters, however hens are good. animals would still fall under noise bylaws if requires. Same for excess smell. - just like Dog poop smells if left all winter.
- people should be allowed to keep hens in their yards
- Nothing. small live stock like chickens can be easily contained and cared for in most yards. Things like goats and pigs would require more substantial fencing etc. but shouldnt be discounted if they have the proper space available to them.
- Cleanliness and regulation to protect the health and safety of the animals and wild creatures living amongst them too
- no additional needs
- Chickens and birds should be allowed.
- Should be allowed
- Never should this be in an urban neighbourhood as people seem to have enough problems following three bylaws with their cats and dogs..... it will even worse with livestock.
- Problematic. Feces, flies, disease noise concerns.
- Nothing
- No.
- It should be allowed if the interested party has the approval of all his neighbors (at least 5 houses to his side and 5 in front).
- bylaw or guidelines regarding best practices, public education and limits to project sizing for personal livestock i.e., need a property of X size for X number of chickens etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Chickens, ducks and goats should be allowed everywhere without restriction. Roosters should require permission from neighbors within 1000 ft. I think pigs should require permission from directly adjacent neighbors. Very small breeds of sheep or cattle could be okay on very large lots.
- hens are great. Roosters need special consideration given the noise factor
- Limit hens should be allowed in the backyard. Hens noise is much less than dogs. But the owner should clean the cage regularly and keep smell minimal.
- Noise and smell are of some concern. I am not sure on any regulation regarding these issues but am open to urban livestock under the right conditions.
- A fabulous idea. Provides food security and allows people to lessen dependence on commercial food sources. Allow 2 or 3 chickens per household, require permits for roosters so no noise issues. Goats and ducks should also be allowed
- - Size/weight limitations
- - Zoning or parcel size restrictions
- - Required standards of care
- - Requirement to register with the City
- My biggest concern would be noise, particularly with chickens and pigeons can be very annoying, even though they are not that loud. Dogs can be trained not to bark but I don't think livestock is as easily controlled.
- I think urban chickens would be a wonderful thing for Calgary, with limits on the number of hens per household and potentially an inspector to ensure the health and safety of the animals and people is preserved. This would be a great way for people to reduce their carbon footprint (less shipping).
- As long as not smelly or noisy, should be allowed
- **ABSOLUTELY NOT!! LIVESTOCK SHOULD ONLY BE PERMITTED ON FARMS OR ACREAGES EXCEEDING ONE ACRE. I DO NOT WANT CHICKENS/LIVESTOCK MAKING NOISE NEAR MY CITY HOME. OUR LOTS ARE WAY TOO CLOSE FOR THAT!! NOISE, SMELL, IMPROPER CARE AND OR DISEASED ANIMALS RIGHT NEXT DOOR, NO THANK YOU!!!**
- I think this is inappropriate and shouldn't be permitted. There are a lot of noise, maintenance, cleanliness issues with livestock and they need space and a city isn't an appropriate setting.
- I want chickens! Please allow backyard hens!!
- Yes
Chickens - no more than six
Pigs - no more than 2
- Regulations outlining what types of livestock would be great. Specifications about numbers, sizes, types of enclosures, cleanliness of enclosures. Regulations that stipulate the livestock is for personal use only and not business.
- It depends. I wouldn't want a chicken coop, pig sty, goats that people use for food in my neighborhood. If someone had a pet pig or a pet goat etc. That would be okay
- should not be allowed except hens
- Nope. I'm not in agreement with this. I don't want to be woken up by chickens. I'll go to Kauai on vacation for this.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A citizen should require a certain amount of land in order to have livestock. They should not be allowed in normal residential areas.
- Limits to the size and number of animals in a back yard. (Max number/area - to prevent over crowding of pens. Noise /odour control.
- Assurance that smells will not become problematic.
- Chickens and small animals should be allowed. Most places allow chickens (for eggs) as long as they do not cause a nuisance or loud noises (reasonable amount of chickens) small goats and other livestock should be allowed
- I worry about Avian Influenza regarding chicken or any birds. I know they can benefit a home and supply eggs etc. Calgary had better have a plan with the CFIA for outbreaks of animal born illnesses like Avian Influenza.
- Again it would have to be a large property and kept clean, no odours or noise and a cap on the number of animals. For the average size property again a definite no and a cap on the numbers.
- A small chicken coop is fine, again given density.
- Not sure but I like the idea
- No
- I am interested in backyard chickens (3 or 4) for egg production. I think Beekeepers Association is good model to follow to provide education and support if there are problems. City should encourage formation of volunteer Chicken association that can set the standard for others.
- Maximum six hens (no roosters) or ducks per city lot. Geese to be discouraged due to noise.
- If at all intrusive to neighbours prohibit.
- I think 2-3 hens could be allowed, which seems like a number that would provide for the family, and nearby residents interested in buying the eggs.
- Hens pose zero danger to humans. I feel totally safe near hens. They also add greatly to human quality of life, neighborliness and community, and the education of children.
- Chickens and other birds pose no safety issue as predators such as coyotes and bobcats are already brought in due to other animals other livestock should have secured locations
- I would feel safe. I worry for the health of animals that people keep outside all the time though I would like to have some chickens.
- No.
- Don't agree with livestock in the city...I don't want to live beside farm animals!
- Urban livestock can be a nuisance to the communities they live in. Smell can attract wildlife and fowl especially have the risk of spreading disease. There is a huge risk of these animals being taken advantage of and not being cared for properly. The city does not have the resources to Manage this
- Livestock is a very broad term. I don't think it fair to horses or cows to be confined within a city lot. Chickens though would be fine provided there was a limit on how many per household.
- Fencing
- I don't believe there should be any urban livestock in Calgary.
- No

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Clean and maintained. No smell.
- There needs to be proper space and the animals requirements met.
- VERY well defined waste and cleanliness requirements including fines for first time violations. Setbacks from any nearby structures. Fencing requirements including visibility to limit children wanting to access area. Noise control. Minimum space requirements and setbacks from neighbouring property.
- I do not approve of keeping livestock in an urban setting. If someone wants to keep livestock, they should make the choice to move out of the city.
- Livestock isn't defined in this survey. I would love people (even my neighbors) to be able to have chickens (if they are cared for in the same manner expected of companion animals like dogs and cats). I don't think it's appropriate to have cows, goats, pigs, sheep in the city.
- Cows, horses, chickens, rabbits etc will all bring disease and/or mice, raccoons, skunks. We have all three of those critters on our street already!
How are you going to enforce sanitary conditions, noise (think roosters).....we don't need more bylaw officers and health inspectors.
- They are not my pets. Unless the owner says it's Ok for me to touch them I won't.
- Chicken, pigs, smelly, messy, noisy! Emotional Animal Permit? Seriously?? We need to STOP all this pandering to special interests groups, many of which are not legitimate. Registered guide dogs only, including for emotional support
- In the late 40's, my grandparents raised chickens in Bridgeland. The smell did not bother them. It sure bothered me. Smell, noise, attracting pests such as mice and rats, disease are all problems. You want to raise livestock, get an acreage. There should be none in the city.
- There should not be urban livestock within the City of Calgary.
- More goats to maintain park grass please!!!!
- Any place, with reasonable restrictions on numbers, hens should be allowed as a secondary source of protein for home owners. This is a great way to decrease the carbon footprint of a household as the eggs can be produced right in the backyard.
- They should be allowed, urban livestock are no more messy or noisy than dogs are. I especially would like to be able to have chickens in my yard.
- No!!! Chickens are dirty and noisy.
- If you're talking about keeping chickens that's a good idea but again you have to regulate cleanliness and regulations huge because I can go out of control. Have you ever cleaned a chicken coop? Do you know what you're getting into? I have it's not for everybody.
- Fencing to keep animals and public safe. Chickens would be fine e.g. in an Eggloo with a fenced area to scratch in. Possible concern over rodents being attracted but benefits outweigh negatives. City could provide poultrykeeping courses for public to pay to attend. Also maybe ban roosters.
- I would be fine with up to 3 hens (no roosters).
- To know before my neighbor installs one and knowing they've had training before bringing them to the neighborhood and have a right to reverse the approval if they're not keeping it clean to reduce local poop odours



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Should be limited to yards that have enough space so neighbours don't smell or hear the animals. There should be a limit on the number of animals a person can have and should not exceed the number of people in the home by more than 1
- In my experience chickens are loud and they stink. I would be frustrated if my neighbors were allowed chickens.
- Suitable space on property to house various livestock. Catalog of what is acceptable and largest animals not or even by numbers, more than two is a no-mess, noise and smell for neighbours.
- No large livestock, even "emotional support livestock" should not be allowed in city limits. No roosters, 2-3 chickens could be considered but owners must attend a mandatory course on proper care and housing. Infractions are treated by a lifetime ban to having more chickens.
- Animals should be kept in species appropriate quarters for their own and everybody else's safety.
- Seems unfair to the livestock
- Depending on property size certain size and number of animals should be allowed. Urban chickens that are properly maintained and cleaned should be allowed.
- Ensure that there is adequate space for the animal to live comfortably. Also ensure that the area in which the animal is clean 100% of the time to ensure they are safe, but also ensure neighbours are not bothered by the odours.
- Regular checks to make sure the living conditions are acceptable and the animals are cared for properly. Mandatory education sessions for owners. Appropriate signage.
- As long as livestock is kept in secured areas with enough space to comfortably live I am happy. And that all waste is disposed of properly and with cleanliness.
- If large animals I would worry about smell having enough space for them in a back yard as well as shelter
- Proper fencing
- So long as the noise and smell do not disturb others. Provide a clean and spacious area for the animals. All animals can be emotional support even though they have no permit.
- I do not think livestock should be kept within city limits
- Not really specific..so if my neighbour had a cow. I would not appreciate the smell of cow dung wafting around. Chickens....noise, farm animals belong on a farm not in a city
- Nothing
- I love this idea. I have always wanted chickens. There must be limitations to the amount of livestock permitted. There is a risk that urban livestock will attract wildlife into the city. Precautions must be taken. Courses available on how to clean and maintain livestock habitats to reduce the smell.
- Our neighbourhood borders on natural parkland. We had squirrel proof birdfeeders & trays underneath to catch seeds & raked any spillage up weekly. Our yard was soon infested with mice, which chewed holes in the foundation & got into the house. Mice carry hantavirus. Chicken & livestock terrible idea
- A course offered so you know how to properly take care of livestock!
- Chickens only, no roosters



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- YYC needs to allow urban chickens, like most other modern cities. We had chickens for 8 years, and it is a lot less smelly, noisy, dangerous or dirty than dogs. We and our neighbors benefit from eggs and it is a GREAT learning experience for our children and the neighbor kids. Wake up YYC!
- Let people have their chickens already. Make them get a license to have some. Then if there is issues/complaints it's chicken etc owners paying AS to mediate not the general tax mill. Can't see how living next to chickens is worse than living next to a day home LOL LOL
- i feel chickens are okay as long as they dont create a unfavorable smell for neighbours or loud excessive noise the same as a barking dog rule applies
- chickens should be okay if only 3 birds
- Concerned about waste and doors but should be allowed with limits on size (no full sized cattle, horses, swine, etc) and numbers or density.
- i think poultry in small numbers would be okay ,maybe 4 animals and as long as the owner cleans after them so neighbiurhood doesnt get stinky
- Yes but not rosters, peacocks or other noisy animals
- I think this needs to be very tightly monitored! Emotional support animal - fine but it would be disastrous and barbaric if ppl started keeping livestock to slaughter for food.
- I think of chickens when this comes up, not much else. A limit of 3-5 chickens seems reasonable. I feel it should be limited to larger, 50 ft lots, not multi residential properties and not disrupting your neighbors ability to enjoy their yards.
- I support this.chickens are great
- This is a city of many cultures. Keep agriculture in agricultural areas. There is a reason why they are separate. Too may animals. Keep the focus on responsible pet ownership, as this is a big enough issue.
- I think people should be able to keep hens in their yard if properly cared for. I also think the city should consider the use of goats instead of spraying toxic chemicals to control weeds. Those chemicals are not safe for people, pets, or wildlife.
- Please do not allow this!! Livestock belong on farms. The smell and noise cannot be contained in small city lots.
- I would love to see more of this. Chickens would be great. There would obviously need to be a limit on number and rules on cleaning up after them even in your own yard as chicken poop is stinky.
- I would LOVE to have a couple of chickens!! There are many surrounding towns that allow a few backyard chickens, and they don't seem to be having any trouble. As long as the owner is educated, and keeps the area clean and doesn't allow the feces to accumulate and smell.
- Regulations on feces and noise
- Sure, as long as it is not cruel to the livestock as the space is too small
- No livestock should be kept within city limits.
- I am very supportive of urban agriculture that regulates odor, feces and noise concerns.
- Nope.... No livestock. They carry disease and should not be allowed. With or without a permit. Emotional support animals should be defined as regular house pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Biggest concern is how safe the animals are - do they have enough space, etc.
- Yes to backyard chickens not pigs, etc w/same requirements as above. Limit the number of hens to less than 3 or 4 (should not be for commercial purposes), no roosters. Coop parameters should also be defined, hens shouldn't leave the yard unless caged or leashed. Rules for deaths, disease monitoring
- Define "livestock"? Mini horses or goats could be okay as long as they are not left outdoors all of the time. What other livestock do people want?
- As long as they are contained by adequate fencing/housing, and cleaned every day or two, there should be no issues. Animals must still be housed in adequate sized enclosures to allow enough room for each animal.
- Signage, proper housing
- Sounds great. My concern is around smell so maybe rules on size of yard or distance from neighbors?
- Would love for Calgarians to have small livestock such as chickens. For my own safety I would want rules in place limiting numbers and ensuring cleanliness / air quality.
- I think urban livestock would be good with limits on the number of animals based on your yard size.
- I don't think they should be allowed at all. They're noisy and smelly
- Strict licensing and enforcement in place to severely limit noise/strong odors/size/inevitable accompanying of wild rodents and predators which occur with bedding/outdoor feeding of livestock. Responsibility of livestock owner for any clean-up/damage inc. odors which occur.
- Proper waste management
- Education on how to do it safely.
- Again teaching seminars and then having proper fences and cleaning up people should be able to have livestock
- Just inform neighbors and depending on the size and habits of the animal
- There is no reason to feel unsafe around urban livestock
- Chickens should be allowed in the City with a permit. Permit conditions should make sure owners clean up and care for their chickens to avoid odors.
- The space to keep the animal health and happy
- as long as it doesn't impede on my quality of life-, noise, smell, safety -then I am fine with it.
- Nothing really, except a stock limit per hectare to prevent over stocking.
- Regulations regarding fecal matter clean-up.
- Hen are low impact and easy management.
- I think rabbits and chickens would be great as long as proper husbandry is followed. Chickens might be limited to a maximum of 6.
- Provided the space is large enough for the animals in question. And the keepers are once again educated
- Awesome, but maybe a limit on animals, and make sure they cant roam free.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I strongly don't agree. Livestock is messy and smelly and people don't pick up after their dogs, much less clean a chicken coop. Your neighbours shouldn't have to deal with that.
- There is nothing about urban livestock rearing which makes me feel unsafe.
- Depends on the animal. Also manageable numbers of animal, sanitary, safe living conditions. Smells (e.g. manure) are kept to a minimum. And noises are not a problem, e.g. may need to restrict roosters.
- I think a small number of chickens should be allowed for urban homeowners to provided self-sustaining food production. Roosters can be a problem (crowing) But I am all for allowing chickens and other small urban livestock.
- Nothing. Small urban livestock are quieter and safer to people than dogs are.
- I'm concerned about feces, smell and disease. What types of animals would be allowed? How would this be managed and keep admin costs down.
- Urban livestock ought to be limited to smaller species like chickens.
- Bring it on. Except they should have a place and a time to be out indoors. Thinking night to so as not to disturb the sleep of neighbours.
- chickens ok
- At no time should livestock be kept in urban setting. The exception would be the goat heard that is used to maintain weed filled areas.
- A limit on the number of animals
- Only chickens should be allowed. You need to live in a detached home with a yard. A limit on the number of chickens you can have, may depend on yard space, no roosters! Guidelines on what the hen house specs should be. An online course needs to be taken, so people actually know how to care for them.
- Need to think about feces, smell and neighbors. Depends on the livestock.
- Nothing.
- I would want to ensure the livestock is properly taken care of, I do not wish to see livestock not being treated well. Perhaps a policy where owners need to show proof of regular healthcheck Otherwise, I am all for it. Especially chickens. I would love to see more local options for purchasing eggs.
- I do not have personal safety concerns with the backyard keeping of hens, rabbits, or goats.
- No roaming livestock.
- Reasonable limits for amount. Licensing and proper care for any who have them.
- No
- Chickens (max number) and caged rabbits should be permitted. Should be expectations about odour and noise.
- Adequate shelter and maintenance
- Never. Livestock should only be on farms. How would you like your neighbor having a rooster waking you up a dawn every sunny day?!!
- Communication with neighbours
Owner education



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stringent regulations about waste and cleanliness of enclosures. Enormous fines for mistreatment or not providing a clean living environment for the animal.
- If people are going to have animals they need to know how to take care of them: proper food, lots of access to water and proper shelter and veterinary care. Take an animal husbandry course or research the animals before you commit. I would love to have three chickens.
- Shouldn't be in the city and only in rural areas. Would require a large property in the city. Might not be good for the environment as they induce greenhouse gas emissions
- I think urban chickens and small animals could be acceptable in communities with low density, however I would want there to be bylaws to ensure that coops, etc were not impacting neighbours with smell or animal waste in an untoward way. Larger livestock could be considered but not in the inner city.
- Nothing. I have no issues with people keeping urban livestock
- If chickens were allowed I would consider getting some. So long as there is no nuisance, property damage to neighbors, and ultimately the owners of the livestock were held accountable I see no issue.
- Ban all livestock. This isn't the 1800's. Chickens, beside the smell, are especially bad for attracting vermin. They belong in the country.
- I worry about diseases and smells from this. If people want to have livestock, they should live in the country, not the city. This should not be allowed in the city.
- I don't like that the City has blindly banned harmless animals such as chickens in the past, but understand that if poorly managed they could be an issue. Again, limits on numbers and noise and smell should be sensibly enacted. In this community, alternate forms of sustainability are crucial.
- Chickens should be allowed with the proper proof of care and housing.
- I don't want nor support urban livestock, and do not appreciate leading questions on these surveys. Currently the City Residents do not respect the bylaws - don't add more complexity to the mix until people can demonstrate they are responsible.
- Livestock should be allowed as long as they do not make noise after dark or cause smell or harm to any property or person.
- A fence and animal enclosure.
- Limit on the number and size of domesticated livestock. Complaints about smell and noise need to be addressed and dealt with by CofC animal control regulations. Exotic animals need to have special regulations and restrictions depending on type and health hazards. Apply Resp. Pet Ownership Regs.
- As long as noise bylaws are respected, the animal is being cared for (fresh food and water) and poop is cleaned up I'm ok with it.
- I am against urban livestock.
- Livestock (chickens, potbelly pigs, goats etc) should be aloud in the city with enough yard space
- Sufficient space from other people's property to prevent impacts to them (noise, smell, disturbances)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I strongly support this, we just need to make sure that there is sufficient space between hives and other property owners/users.
- Smaller livestock such as chickens, geese, ducks, goats, sheep, and pigs could be included in current pet bylaws: need to be registered and licensed. Place a limit as to how many of each species can live on a residential lot. Appropriate shelter should also be considered for such animals
- preferably no, maybe birds. Most livestock stinks, I don't really want to smell that
- As long as the owners are maintaining appropriate disease prevention.
- No. Stinky and noisy. Cruel.
Plant a garden instead.
- Not in the city
- No strong opinion as I haven't encountered any urban livestock. However, I might have concerns in the summer from smells, noise, attracting vermin etc. I think livestock should remain in the rural setting for all concerned.
- Adequate and sanitary living conditions for animals, housing that is secure, animal welfare regulations
- follow pigeon section 27.1
- Nothing
- As long as the animals are cared for it is fine. The city needs to have rules in place that would be similar to the cat/dog bylaws
- Livestock like hens for eggs or meat should be allowed without a permit. It's a ridiculous overreach that they aren't allowed. There is no downside to keeping livestock responsibly in the city and would increase food security.
- So long as the yard allows enough space for the animals and the owners are responsible for their livestock, urban livestock is a fantastic idea. It's great for bringing communities together and can sometimes help families with budgeting for food.
- Some livestock in the city is fine, as long as there is enough room for the animals to be healthy.
- maybe smaller animals should be allowed, but not more than 5 and should be in proportion to the landmass/backyard space homeowners have.
- Have a minimum yard size and restrictions on amounts for hens, goats, sheep, alpacas.
- Local chickens coops are good idea but no male roosters. No more than 4 chickens. Chickens for meat must be kept, culled humanely. Disposal in compost
- Nothing. Allow them. As long as the volume and smell are reasonable.
Pot bellied pigs have not been permitted since 2009. This sort of paternalism is extremely unnecessary, and its embarrassing that Calgary has banned them as pets. Modern purchasers are all aware that potbellied pigs become large.
- -Chickens - up to 6 per yard depending on area. Basic humane practices and sanitation. No roosters.
-Meat rabbits. Up to 12 per yard depending on area. Basic humane practices and sanitation.
Adequate cages to secure rabbits.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Both rabbits & chickens shall be permissible concurrently.

Beehives ok.

- Good enclosures with ample space
- If people have adequate space and facilities, I think urban livestock such as backyard chickens or even goats should be permitted. Proof of space and a good home/containment for the animals should be necessary for the permit.
- Chickens should be allowed but limited to single family homes with backyards and limited to two/three per household. Chickens are excellent for pest control as well as providing fresh eggs. Roosters should not be permitted due to noise issues.
- Chickens- no more than 4 to six. No roosters.
- Chickens should be allowed. If you're willing to buy all the necessary supplies And are limited to a certain amount of laying hens only then I would support.
- If this is concerning pigs or chickens, a limit would be reasonable. No roosters.
- Controls on the type and size if the animal so that if it gets loose it is unlikely to injure people or pets. Noise is also a concern, both volume and frequency.
- It should just not be allowed. The houses are way too close together in Calgary.
- 1 acre or more properties and no noise or smells.
- Absolutely don't agree with livestock in the city - move to the country if you want chickens and cows in your yard. If I wanted to listen to animals making noise and smell the results of these animals next door I'd also be living in the country. Absolutely No.
- Smaller livestock (goats, pigs, chickens, ducks) should be legal, again with extensive bylaws, including random health/responsible ownership checks.
- Not allowed
- I like the idea of being able to have backyard chickens. I think licensing people in order to have a coop would be a good idea.
- Nothing! Chickens are awesome!
- NO I do not agree they need to be in areas that are large enough to roam not backyards in cities
- I think that chickens in Calgary is not a good idea as the backyards are getting smaller. The smell produced from chickens can be a nuisance to neighbours who do not want chickens.
- no thanks
- I dont feel there would be issue or conflict providing proper enclosures standards are met
- No. City lots are too small. How are people going to house these animals? Rocky view county limits out buildings for a reason on acreages. Take into consideration biosecurity for animals, vet care, feed (cannot purchase in Calgary), noise, manure? Where is that going?Monitoring these animals? Who?
- I support the ideologies of having hens in yard, not roosters. Hens are quiet, clean birds, and with proper care and a proper coup they can be safe from wildlife like bobcats and coyotes.
- - there is nothing that can be put in place to make me feel safe. The odour and noise from these animals can not be contained in close living quarters that homes in an urban setting are located.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No. Rent spaces in rural areas if needed. Anyone can do this but people do not follow the rules or control their animals. Meaning smell, messes and noises. Needs more surveillance of each situation.
- Absolutely not ! Animal shelters are over crowded with Dogs and cats. There are too many irresponsible pet owners out there that can barely handle those 2 types of animals do not add more
- It is inhumane to keep livestock on urban sized lots. This is a selfish and arrogant approach to supporting and enhancing “local” food systems. Instead, the city of Calgary should look into partnering with neighbouring farming communities to support local food programs.
- I think letting people have chickens would be great, maybe even ducks. I think there should be a minimum per household of the amount of animals you can have as well as some bilaw about treatment (as i assume there are for pets) ensuring the animals are safe and healthy.
- Cleanliness and control are potential concerns. Otherwise, it depends on what livestock. Hens but not roosters? Goats and sheep are excellent weed control.
- I would love to be able to have a pot belly pig as a pet. From what I have read and seen they make pets and are clean animals. So don't understand why they can't be kept here in Calgary.
- Permit and consultation with and approval by adjacent and affected neighbours
- It should be limited to chickens. And the number should be based on the size of the lot. To ensure the animals are treated well.
- No. Nobody want more irresponsible owners.
- Ok as pets, not to be used as a food source, other than chickens for eggs would be ok. Large animals such as ponies, llamas etc. should not be allowed. Overly noisy animals such as roosters, should not be allowed.
- Potential for attracting predators and scavengers. Not a good idea in our city.
- This should not be allowed
- Correct animal care
- Licencing is needed to ensure proper care and handling of animals, knowledge about disease transmission, etc. No harm to neighbours is crucial - standards need to be established and fines introduced re: Non-compliance. Licences to be revoked under certain circumstances.
- Again, some signage, I suppose. And probably some fencing.
- As long as the livestock is contained behind a fence, I am not concerned. I am very much in favour of allowing poultry and small livestock (e.g. goats) within the city limits, mainly to increase the local food source.
- Responsibilities come with that, knowledgeable and training
- Chickens should be quiet and not disturbing the neighborhood. Chickens should have a place to live in one's property - not be free to roam in the neighborhood.
- Allow chickens, geese, ducks, (all max 6), quail, (max 12) all or meat or eggs or as pets, goats (max 4) for meat or milk or hair or pets, pigs (max 2) for meat or pets. Enforce rules for maximum number per yard.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think the by-laws should maybe concentrate on not being a nuisance to neighbors. I think a few hens would be a great addition to many back yards. Obviously large livestock will be a problem in the city.
- Sufficient fence or pen
- If you have a yard big enough and know how to care for them. Again minimum yard and structure requirements should be implemented
- There should not be urban livestock. I lived in a city were urban livestock was allowed and it was horrible. Loud, dirty and noisy
- I love that you are considering allowing urban livestock like chickens and ducks, and I heartily support this. There need to be requirements for proper enclosures and care, but with these in place I don't see any significant safety concerns for people.
- I would love to have backyard chickens. Just need to ensure owners have the necessary setup.
- Just signage that displays where animals are kept and where they graze and what to be aware of if any potential dangers exist on the property.
- Access to mobile veterinary services to troubleshoot care and upkeep
- As above
- Annual checks & permits to ensure the animal's are being looked after properly.
- Bylaws for safe keeping of animals with minimal disturbance to neighbors so there is a framework to work from if an issue arises.
- Responsible maintenance
- Chickens should be allowed with a maximum number regulated per yard.
- I want there to be guild lines for lead practice so citizens can be successful in urban livestock. I would like to see a strategy for having successful chicken coups throughout the city.
- Nothing. Small livestock like chickens and ducks should be allowed. The dont cause any nuisance as long as they are properly cared for, but the same can be said about dogs & cats too.
- A warning sign, penned enclosure and quiet. Safe marked area. No smell.
- Must be licenced. Requirements on roaming space and setback from housing. Space must be routinely upkept to prevent odours from manure etc.
- Required notification of neighbors. Bylaws to enforce cleanliness and noise.
- I would love to see people allowed to keep up to 4 or 5 chickens or ducks for egg production (no roosters!). Proper coops and cages with ongoing upkeep for cleanliness and enough space for the poultry to have a degree of freedom of movement.
- Within reason, be allowed but must have permit/permission to keep in backyard
- So long as there are regulations on the quality of living conditions, it should be allowed. We need to open up chicken farming. Many people are suffering a food crisis which shouldn't exist in a first world country. It's time for Calgary to become educated in livestock work and learn how to own them
- As long as it's not a noise disturbance
- Having number limits to prevent overstocking residential areas.
Encouraging lisencing for urban chickens to prevent abandoned spent layer hens.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Ensuring that all livestock owners are consulting veterinary advice from a licensed veterinarian.

- Ensure space and care is sufficient, and that noise/ smell can be contained to not disturb neighbors.
- Again lack of knowledge on my part. Possible noise and disease issues. Might draw more wild predator animals into the city.
- Proper care and housing of livestock and proper hygiene and cleaning up after them.
- That the animals is well cared for
- Should not be allowed
- Potentially, I think there should be a limit on how many animals you can have per household, the yards in Calgary are not very big. I wouldn't want rosters or anything that makes a lot of noise in the morning though.
- I see no issue as to why keeping livestock in an urban setting would be unsafe. Vancouver has managed to do this nicely, mixing urban and rural properties within communities. As long as people are respectful of the livestock, and there is proper fencing in place, there should not be an issue.
- I want a chicken
- I think it would
Be nice to have under 5 chicken in certain areas. On a 2 year trial bases.
- depends on the species
- Chickens only.
- I think the animals need to be kept really clean to prevent spreading of disease.
- Hygiene and consideration for other people in the area
- Gross, it should not effect other neighbors, I don't want the noise or stink by my home
- I'm absolutely against livestock in urban areas, especially chickens. They could ring disease.
- Reasonable knowledge on the part of the livestock keeper.
- I would want to have enough reassurance that the fencing is secure enough.
- Odor and noise would be the only issue--so responsible owners important.
- Small livestock should be granted.
Chickens, goats, etc.
- Concerned about the smell and noise factors
- Should not be allowed in the City under any circumstance.
- good idea
- Reasonable amount of room for the live stalk and proper housing/fencing
- Need a property large enough that the noise and smells doesn't bother the neighbors.
- Just plain no on all counts.
- awareness and knowing proper safety measures are implemented, noise control, cleanliness
- Require proper properties, and licenses should be temporary and require inspection and renewal.
- Again they should hold a license and health & safety checks made regularly especially if people living on each side of them. Unannounced checks should also be made. High standards should always be kept regardless of what pet, bees or urban livestock you have.
- No, we don't enforce the rules for dogs and cats why increase the burden.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- This wouldn't make me feel unsafe in any way. The owners would have to keep the areas clean so they don't smell. This would be important for local agriculture and local food sources. This could be a huge new movement to benefit Calgary's local food wise and money wise.
- I think that if people can provide adequate care for livestock and they are not infringing on others (ie. Smell, loud noises etc) then it is fine.
- I agree with the current regulations.
- I would love to see backyard chickens allowed by the city.
- People want to live cleaner lifestyles. They should be able to keep a couple chickens or ducks without issue! And pigs are cute pets. I personally wouldn't want one because the snorting would get annoying but I think they are brilliant.
- Chickens (6)
- I think people should have some! If under a certain number of animals just like with dog ownership. Chickens would be great to include! If the person has the space on their property for a proper housing for them then yes that works. As long as they keep with the proper lodging even in winter
- Moo, oink, cluck cluck etc are not sounds (and accompanying aromas) suitable for an urban environment. The animals deserve a proper environment of their own, NOT some patch of grass in a city. Commercial farms that confine livestock are called 'cruel' and yet we are OK with in the city? Hypocrisy.
- No, farms are meant for livestock. There are enough issues with untidy properties, can't imagine adding livestock to the mix. If I wanted to live in a rural area I would. What about allergies? Don't open this door, some humans will always push the limits.
- I like the idea of chickens but if they are noisy and it impacts my enjoyment of my backyard, there needs to be a law that neighbors can petition that they go. If they are quiet and no smelly then ok with me. Pigs, not sure.
- I'd love to keep chickens for the eggs. I'd know that the animals producing my food had a good quality of life. It'd save me 1-200 dollars a year, as a single Mom that's a new pair of boots for my kid. Also chickens mean sustainable pest control in my veggie garden! I vote yes for chickens!!!
- Yes, so long as it doesn't interfere with the neighbours' enjoyment of their property. Obviously that's why roosters are never allowed, because roosters are jerks and terrible neighbours. Hens, though, seem fine. Goats are great, but need a lot of mental stimulation or they become unhappy.
- As long as there is enough space and a limit I'm ok with it
- Look towards other municipalities that have successfully allowed chickens and copy this model (Portland Oregon etc)
- Licence
 - Limit on amount of animals
 - Adequate accommodations for the animals
- As long as the livestock aren't affecting the neighboring properties I don't see a problem - they should be subject to the same bylaws as anything else though (ie: a rooster crowing at 5 am every



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

day should be treated the same way as someone blasting music). Obviously no animals with disease.

- Not particularly liking this idea - mostly smell and noise issues - I've lived on a farm and chickens are noisy! the numbers would have to be limited and the neighbours notified.
- I have no issue with it, but perhaps a req to inform residents within a certain radius. If it presents any risks, there should be standards/requirements in a bylaw, and info provided to residents about mitigation strategies livestock keepers have in place.
- Do we really want to become like the Chinese with their rampant outbreaks every so often - too many of which are related to livestock in proximity to humans? If the city intends to promote this path, they had better first get their ducks in a row to safeguard human health.
- guidelines and frameworks for inspection, and ensuring that spaces are clean and well-maintained. I see no reason why people, with permits and inspections, cannot have a set amount of chickens, for example. Pre-reqs could include education sessions.
- Signs with details on stock and how to behave round them
- Livestock should only be in the country, where neighbours are far away and may not care about smells and sounds emanating from your yard
- I think there needs to be suitable fencing and protections between the livestock and people. There also needs to be a limit on how many and the size of yard that is a minimum. Waste from livestock also needs to be dealt with appropriately so the smell or potential pathogens don't impact neighbours
- Established limits on quantity and enclosure-types for urban livestock.
- Small livestock like chickens, pigeons, sheep, and goats ok so long as rules in place to ensure they have their necessities met
- should not be allowed
- Chickens maybe, they are very smelly. Making them legal allows them to get the vet care they need versus illegal pets. Restrict amount and space.
- There are people who care for their stock and others who do not. What repercussions are there for those who do not. Some animals are messier than others, who decides what animals can or cannot reside by you. Again canvassing neighbors before approval is issued.
- No
- protect any livestock from people. so they must be in a secure living area.
- Provided no smell enters neighbouring property and sound adheres to human noise bylaw
- I think chicken should be allowed in the city, but no roosters. Only hens.
- I have no issue with it as long as it is done responsibly. That also means thinking about smell. Farmers have to consider smell so i think for livestock in a city they would also need to consider it. Animals would be need to kept in a manner which would limit smell.
- If you have the space i.e. an acre per animal
- Not too close to other people homes, due to odours
- My concerns are noise, disease, odor. If those are well managed then I suppose it's not an issue.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I need to know they are well cared for & there is no _cruelty_ involved.
- Nothing special. I think you should allow backyard chickens (and honestly, get rid of "emotional support livestock" [removed] - pun intended).
- I think livestock belong on a farm or acreage. I would not want a neighbor who keeps chickens or pigs or whatever in their yard. Most city lots are not big enough to humanely keep animals.
- Not in the residential neighbourhoods.
- Small livestock might be ok. The only concern I would have would be with noise or smell. It would be similar to other pets. The expectation would be to keep the yard clean and the noise down
- Chicken, turkeys, and goats. I think this day and age should be encouraged.
- Not a good idea.
- Urban farm sign
- Urban livestock should be allowed, full stop. Minimum standards for cleanliness, animal welfare, and space should be outlined in a bylaw, and licencing to provide cash flow for The City to monitor standards and issue fines where necessary.
- No license, but certain conditions attached, such as for spacing and containment.
- No opinion
- Concerned about noise and cleanliness
- As long as there is no excessive sounds or smells...I guess following the same rules as for dogs
- Whole heartedly believe we should be able to have urban livestock. A permit required and specific bylaws to make sure the livestock do not cause upset to neighbors. Dogs poop in people's backyards and can bark. I dont see why chickens would be any noisier or dirty.
- Fencing so they don't get loose, rules on cleanliness to keep the smell down
- - Application and education process to have in yard.
- Nothing.
- No. I pay my taxes and do not deserve to have the smell, noise and overall disrespect from a lazy or crappy neighbor. Absolutely NOT!!!!
- Monitoring of noise bylaw
- Having lived beside someone who kept chickens I have to say this is a bad idea. The smell from them was awful and coyotes were very attracted to them.
- Contamination and breeding grounds for disease such as avian flu, increase in mouse population. There is a reason the bylaw was put in place and should remain that way
- Maximum limits for ownership
Care expectations - housing, cleanliness, secure enclosures
- Urban livestock is not necessary. If people want the cows chickens goats that can move outside the city
- Nothing
- I want to be able to have chickens in my yard. I have no concerns over safety
- No problem, let people have chickens if they want them
- Go for it!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends on size of yard, noise, number and type of animals. Not all animals should be allowed to be called "emotional support".
- Regulations regarding the size, number, noise and smell, and even more importantly, enforcement and meaningful fines.
- Livestock don't belong in the city.
- Raising chicken and Quails for eggs and meat would be another good choice for the residents.
- No, roosters allowed due to crowing noise. All other animals just need to be kept in clean living conditions, i.e. clean up poop. Also, the number of livestock being kept shouldn't get out of hand. I don't think you need 20 chickens in your back yard just to have fresh eggs on your table.
- No issues
- Urban livestock including, but not limited to, chickens, pot belly pigs, and goats should be allowed within Calgary as long as they have adequate room/yard space and proper care.
- As long as they clean up after themselves
- The City should conduct a pilot study to look into the impact of urban chickens.
- Proper veterinarian care, including vaccines and other medications.
- No will do nothing but create conflict with wild life people don't realize how scary this can be because livestock comes with outdoor Enclosures which encourages wild life into their yards
- Nothing. Urban livestock rocks!
- I'm of two minds. So long as there's no roosters and smells are contained, small livestock like chicken seem reasonable. On the other hand, Canada keeping dense human populations separate from animals like chickens offers some protection from novel strains of flu & Coronavirus jumping in to people.
- Strict yard size requirements and a place to report noise and smell complaints. There must be a permitting process and the ability to revoke it when guidelines are not followed. I'm hesitant with allowing livestock in general though.
- No - unless a documented support animal. Livestock requires specific care and should be left to those who farm, ranch and are trained in proper care and maintenance. Unfair to neighbours and the animals themselves (who need more space than a city lot!)
- Wouldn't mind it as long as smell and noise aren't bad. I wouldn't mind a few chickens for eggs
- I'd like to raise ducks and chickens.
- If you have a large property where the smell or noise coming from the urban livestock isn't an issue to individuals around you, I don't see an issue with it.
- not okay
- Properly contained in a fenced backyard, a reasonable number allowed.
- Should not be allowed in city
- No predators, nothing too loud, otherwise good.
- No Livestock in the city. Livestock should be limited to farms & acreages. Small livestock such as chickens & pigs produce lots of excrement, fleas, attract flies & coyotes to area. Absolutely NO to urban livestock in the city.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Again, I am okay with this, but people should register with the city if they plan to do this. It should not interfere with the safety and well-being of neighbours. This includes cleanliness and smell.
- Great initiative subject to suitable yard area! Should a certain threshold be met (# of livestock or type dependent) there should be a waste management plan. City should offer specific composting/waste program for a fee.
- Keeping smells and in some cases noise under control. Making sure the animals are healthy as to not spread disease.
- Permits should be obtained, so that the person is held responsible for any loose animals, or violation of noise bylaws. But I do think people should be able to have chickens etc. when approved that they have the space and knowledge to properly care for these animals
- Fenced yard, in addition to cages, 6 ft chicken wire fences required for chickens, shelter, with adequate ventilation.
- Limitations on total weight and number of life stock. I.e. max of 4 animals or up to 200lbs. So someone could safely have 2 goats or 4 chickens.
This would also require city approval on enclosures, questionnaire on animal health/safety etc.
- No requirement. Move to rural area.
- Chickens are okay. No pigs of any kind. Pigs belong on a farm in the country. No pigeons for any reason. Pigeons are dirty
- I would really love urban livestock to be allowed in the City again, especially nowadays with our understanding of producing our own food, humanely raised animals, etc. We would love to have chickens for eggs! Again, a training certificate/license program would be ideal to ensure competency.
- I'm opposed to livestock in the city--urban environments are not suited to livestock. Cleanliness, care of the animals, and noise would need to be regulated. It might increase wildlife population/negative interactions as easy food sources. Noise would also be a concern.
- Proper penning and control of the animals.
- Backyard chickens(hens) should be kept in a safe chicken coop with a wired, covered outdoor access to keep them and the area safe from urban wildlife such as coyotes and lynx/ bobcats. I would love to have chickens, urban farming should be allowed for responsible owners.
- The city By-law officers already investigate the next door neighbours for not picking up after their dogs. City crews have had to clean the mess. The smell in the spring/summer is quite overwhelming. . What will happen if they are allowed to have farm animals? Keep farm animals on the farm.
- I feel that as long as the animals are registered then I would love to see urban livestock. I feel strongly that allowing chickens, goats, etc. to be maintained in Calgary would create a vibrant and young city.
- perhaps 2 chickens or two bunnies, if properly housed and regulated and licenced with city.
- Allow urban livestock in a limited capacity or hold a public decision on types of animals considered livestock. Application to have non-standard animals. Number of animals to be considered as part of the application (eg: 2 chickens are allowable vs 20 are not).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Having organic eggs and meat of both Chicken and Quails would be great. That really a good initiative.
- chickens only (no roosters). Although I think pot belly pigs can easily live in the city, I do believe that people don't realize the work involved in caring for a pig and therefore we should not allow urban livestock outside of a limited number of chickens.
- Should not allowed.
- Chickens may be permitted in a limited fashion if properly cared for. I am against having others such as pigs or goats in the city.
- Size and numbers of animals
- Fine with it as long as the property is big enough for the animals on property and they are cleaned up after
- Should not be allowed.
- Absolutely not
- Biggest concern is the smell and noise. I believe the bylaw should address these, but otherwise goats and chickens should be allowed. Maybe lot size should be explored.
- At this point in time, I have no concerns with urban livestock. If neighbors did have any then I would expect them to respect noise and smell concerns.
- education and information and licensing like a dog of cat
- If the animals are quiet and kept healthy, contained and clean-no smell, I think it's great and feel completely safe.
- Not sure about that one, some can be quite smelly (lived in BC farm country). Chickens especially attract mice/rats.
- Chickens are fine, maybe some coop regulations and maximum number of chickens (6?). Not sure what other livestock would be in Calgary.
- The livestock needs to be under a certain size & the number needs to be acceptable for the space in which they are kept. I support urban chicken keeping, for instance, with rules to keep them from being overcrowded in their space. I am not aware of cows that are small enough to be reasonably kept.
- Allow backyard chickens
- Depending on the home owners property size I think it could work such as egg laying chickens as long as they are set up properly to meet the humane needs of the hens and a limited number of hens...no roosters! No pigs, cows, sheep, goats and horses in city yards...too stinky, too loud.
- How big? Chicken and pigs can really stink so the owners need to be diligent in cleaning
- Chickens, if looked after are fine. No roosters! Initially one of the early vocal proponents for chickens In Killarney kept such a pigsty of a rental property that people were upset. It wasn't the chickens who made the rest of his yard a mess, they were fine. Framework needed!
- I feel there should be restrictions on property size for livestock in urban settings, many yards are too small. In addition, there should be regulations on affect to neighbors including things such as noise, smell, and damage.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not sure
- No harm in two chickens for home owners supply of eggs as long as they have proper shelter, food and healthy care.
- A maximum of three chickens with proper housing for them per address
- As long as livestock is kept in humane/sanitary conditions can't escape/ roam around neighbors property i think small livestock is a great idea. Animals should require vaccinations. I would expect some regulation about what type of livestock is allowed in what space/ size of enclosure
- Small livestock - such as chickens -would be acceptable so long as they are properly cared for, a limited number of animals are present and they aren't loud and annoying.
- Should not be allowed in urban areas, rural only.
- No!
- The reasons against urban livestock are well stated. Smell/noise
- No urban livestock please
- Too many issues with wildlife, they are already dealing with too many irresponsible owners, why would livestock be any different? domestic bunnies dumped, ginue pigs dumped into parks ect. Puts too many at risk and can hurt an eco-system greatly.
- Ridiculous. Cows, Sheep, Pigs, Horses, Goats are not backyard animals. Most yards cannot accommodate a chicken coop or animals (AZA). Should have a chicken keepers license - have a regulated size and type of hen house. Kept certain distance from neighbour property line and house. Max of two.
- Taking part in collecting eggs from chickens that also enrich our lives as many other animals. It also offers a chance to see where and how food gets to the table with is very existing, especially for children.
- Adequate space for the animals and the waste products to be managed. Similar to pets, not causing a nuisance (ie. noise)
- Do not want this
- If the animals have adequate room and are enclosed properly they should be allowed. Roosters and other noisy animals should not be kept in dense urban areas. A reasonable number of hens for the size of the property would be acceptable.
- No concern for safety but livestock tend to be noisy and uncontrollable. They can also bring diseases. Although they could be no issues I believe livestock do not belong in urban cities.
- Ban completely
- Big fan. I would like to have a fancy chicken or a pot bellied pig.
- No.
- Max number of animals
- Waste management - ensure that animal waste is cleaned up and disposed of to not create a health hazard for people and other pets.
- Case by case as most people do not have any idea about the animals welfare needs. What veterinarian in an urban area are going to care for them?

- As long as they have adequate room to happily exist it could be fine. Considering the small properties characteristic of urban living, it's unlikely anyone in the city can accommodate a full-size cow for example. Small animals like goats and chickens however, could be accommodated by application
- should not be allowed in an urban setting
- Locate so as not to disturb neighbours and be kept so as urine odors do not arise
- I don't think the majority of lots in Calgary can actually provide the proper space for live stock or a buffer to neighbor . I imagine that storm drains will not deal with the H2O run off mixed with livestock excrement. My option is you should be on a rural property if you want livestock.
- Fine, does not seem to be an issue
- Nothing. I think chickens and domestic geese should be aloud in and urban setting.
- yes, i believe that this is helpful for the environment they build carbon in the soil.
- I would like to see it regulated, but would be interested to see where it could go. I would personally love to have chickens.
Noise, smell and other considerations need to be made for neighbors.
- We are not in favour of having cows, horses, pigs or chickens in our city neighbors yards - there are acreages and rural areas far more suited for this - and better for the animals.
- Given the noise, smell, and potential encroachment onto private property and potential impact on home values, I am very against this.
As well, the amount of disease potential is too risky!
- Adequate fencing.
Adequate property size definitions to ensure humane treatment for animals.
Some sort of monitoring program to ensure appropriate care and treatment of animals.
- Limit to number of animals
- Stupid idea why would I want chickens living next door to me. Omg the smell and the noise. House in our community has a massive pig that has zero quality of life because it lives in a backyard pen at night they let it roam at the midsun school playground area
- Allow a maximum of four hen chickens.
No pigs, sheep or goats.
- Believe smell and waste could be an issue and should be monitored closely
- Two major concerns with livestock is smells and noise. Have the livestock be kept in an enclosed shelter at night to minimize noise. To mitigate smell, have the livestock penned at least 3 meters from the nearest property line. Plus owner responsible for twice weekly cleanup of livestock waste.
- No to cows, goats, sheep etc. don't see anything wrong with chickens as long as noise and smell regulations are followed.
- Give your neighbors notice of the hive and a chance to discuss any issues with it. If your neighbors agree i dont see there being a problem.
- Proper fencing to ensure livestock doesn't end up roaming freely.
- A good fence



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- As long as it's capped and not an excessive noise issue
- It should be limited to small animals ,a regulation on space they need to be kept in . There should be minimums of back yard size etc . and animals should have to have regular vetting and proof of such
- I also support urban livestock. But with a limit of hens and meat rabbits per household. And they should be licensed yearly like dog and cat owners. Not per individual animal but like, a chicken keepers liscense.
- As long as it's under control
- Do not allow. Too much chance of disease
- Proper fencing.
- best practice bylaws from other well governed and regulated cities, yes please to chickens!!
- Limits on the number of animals
- Must be on private property and fenced
- I don't think it's appropriate to have livestock in urban settings. There would need to be strict monitoring of welfare and nuisance issues and this would add to our taxes.
- Chickens yes, less than four birds per household. Livestock no.
- Limitations on numbers.
5 Freedoms must be met.
- knowing that people are knowledgable and able to appropriately care
- Proper set up. Chickens and goats can add to the our food system, and help reduce pesticides to kill weeds
- I think there needs to be a size limit and regulations around the size of the owners property/proximity to other neighbors. I wouldn't want to share a fence with an animal that was noisy or smelly, but if the owner had proper shelters etc. I have no issues.
- Minimum land size requirements. Eg. Available Land must be 100m2 per livestock animal.
- I encourage it! Would love to see more urban chicken coups in backyards and community gardens.
- Limits on the number and type of animals allowed, stringent requirements for property cleanliness and upkeep, and enforceable regulations for nuisance smells and sounds.
- This should not be allowed, with shrinking lot sizes
- Don't make more noise than the average dog. Don't create smells or become a nuisance.
- I think urban livestock is a fantastic idea. I have owned chickens before, and they are not much different than dogs when cared for properly. Their enclosures are low odour if maintained, they are relatively quiet and can live with minimal impact on neighbours. Urban farming is being done successful
- Special licensing and inspections
- Within reason. Chickens would be good.
- My safety? I would be more concerned with how some livestock would be kept, fed, disposed of should one die and what the rules and regulations about slaughtering would be. I could see there being concerns over noises and smells too.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Restrictions on Noisy or smelly animals kept outside. Indoor pets should be ok if reasonable. Each case must be assessed individually.
- Chickens and goats should be permitted. By permit
- Not have it in residential neighbourhoods or near public parks, sanitation regulations, no roosters, must abide by noise regulations, containment requirements to keep them out of others property, owners of animals accountable and liable for any harm or damage the animals cause.
- Investigations by Agriculture department to ensure standards are met
Applications for a permit much like secondary suite- input from neighbours
- No. Too much potential for negative impacts: smells, noise, animal waste.
No good reason to live in the city and also have livestock.
- I like the idea of owning some livestock, such as chickens. But in reality I think they could be very disturbing for neighbours in an urban environment.
- Limit to number and controls around the smell and noise.
- Education. I love the idea of having chickens, especially for eggs, but don't know enough about the impacts on others, including smell and noise.
- I think large farm animals should be where they can roam. Maybe a eight limit.
- It's great idea. Just keep number below 10.
- Roosters may be a nuisance due to crowing but a reasonable number of egg laying chickens on a property with land area to ethically support them would be great.
- Not in favour. Roosters are really annoying and wake neighbors. If livestock pens are not regularly cleaned, they create odour and rodent problems.
- Chickens yes. But no roosters to wake us up early.
- Dependant on the space the person has. I think backyard chickens for eggs are great even maybe pigs, again if you have the space and knowledge
- Again, limits on how many one can have for their specific zone. Fenced yard. Ducks/chickens in the city, for sure! This helps families with lower income provide food for their family! Horses, goats, cows, obviously need more room to zoom! :)
- Smell, noise, allergies, concern if animals get out or carry diseases. Would diminish enjoyment of my yard.
- This is a problem for humans with allergies. Livestock belongs on a FARM not in an urban setting. Chickens cows horses goats at al need space...Humans not in rural areas have a right to not be forced indoors by livestock in an urban setting. NO urban livestock EVER.
- I'm not sure if it is possible with most livestock, but preventing unpleasant odours from affecting neighbours must be top priority.
- Yes I think people should be able to keep chickens
- Absolutely not- noise can not be controlled, odor related to feces is a huge problem with livestock.
- Appropriate pens or habitats.
- I think it would be great to have chickens or othe livestock as long as there was aduquate space



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It would depend on the type of livestock. Appropriate safety fencing and gates. Requirement to keep livestock housing clean to minimize odors. Create a minimum distance livestock must be kept away from the property line to reduce interference with neighbours.
- Nothing. We should be allowed chickens in Calgary for egg laying purposes only
- Define livestock..how many...yard requirements. I'm all for chickens...but how many would be allowed in a densely populated area? Noise? Smell? No pigs, baby horses, cows...my desire to raise livestock should not interfere with my neighbours desire to relax in his yard
- I'm fine with this if they are contained
- NO - the poor neighbour that has to listen to and smell those livestock.
- small livestock such as chickens should be allowed, with limits on numbers and provisions for animal safety.
- Permit required. Clear definition of what can and can not be kept and space requirements. Proper housing/equipment in place before permit is given
- Needing to clean up regularly so there is no continual stench from feces.
- I think as long as basic husbandry is taken care of I am very much in support of certain livestock being allowed within city limits. In particular I think having up.to 2 to 4 hens no roosters would be great to reduce insects and help recycle green waste.
- Livestock smells. Not something that I would be happy to have living in my neighbourhood.
- Yes. Limit number allowed. Certain homes.
Rules to protect animal when owners stops activity.
- I would love to have a horse. Not feasible in the space we have. If someone has the space for say the larger livestock, allow them. Chickens and/or ducks in smaller spaces for sure! This helps lower income families provide for their family! How many is dependant on the yard space etc.
- There are varieties of chickens etc that are not nuisance (noise) animals. I think that as long as the keeping of these animals does not become a nuisance (noise/smell) then allowing Calgary residents to become more self sufficient is positive
- I do not like the ""Animal as Emotional Animal Permit"" unless it is a very rare and specific situation. Chickens as urban livestock could be okay if it is monitored and the yard is large.
- Shouldn't be allowed to slaughter chickens on property. Would be open to chickens. Would be interested in having own eggs.
- - Can they be slaughtered on property
- - Could affect more wildlife
- - Cleanliness
- - Mammals as livestock not appropriate in urban settings
- You have to have some amount of educations to have those animals. Are there courses on animals husbandry to ensure people take good care of them?
Maybe a questionnaire? What is your education?
Goats - Good husbandry is needed so they meet these standards.
Chickens are small and not aggressive. Geese can be aggressive. A backyard with a small space is probably not a good place for husbandry. So, this could be allowed but people need to be educated.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Maybe the costs of good husbandry courses could offset the costs of monitoring. We have to know the people get the privilege of taking care of the animals are doing it well.

- - Cleanliness
 - smell
 - Allowing slaughtering - NO!
 - Proper housing
 - Attract more wildlife
- Limited numbers, for animal/bird welfare. Ensure have proper enclosures (size and security) for animal's welfare and ensuring not contaminating neighbor's property.
- No! I live on a slope! Do not want water runoff from my neighbour's backyard carrying disease into my yard!
- Yes, if kept clean and reasonable number of animals. Eg. 3-4 chickens (no roosters), or 1-2 goats, or 1-2 sheep. No more than 4 barn yard animals per house, zero if reasonable complaints are not addressed by neighbours, such as cleanliness, smell or noise, or over crowding/ too many animals/house
- I have NO issues with back yard chickens, provided their living space is kept reasonably clean (non smelly), not only are they a joy to raise, but beneficial as far as food.
- Livestock should be raised on a farm, not in a city. Will result in too many animals living in close proximity to too many people.
- That owners follow guidelines put forth by Agriculture Canada on animal husbandry for their species
- I'm fine with urban livestock with the exception of roosters. Don't want to be woken up super early.
- Should be allowed and licensed with investigation or application to ensure owner can meet requirements for animal safety and public concern. Review each time owner moves to another address
- Yes
- Limited size of animal.... must be a chicken or smaller.
- Chickens should be allowed, no roosters though. If the property size permits then other livestock as well such as a goat or lamb.
- Again a cap to how many based on the plot of land. As long as they are well kept and treated well.
- Proper fencing and waste management (for smells), and perhaps a limit on how many animals. I fully support urban livestock! Keeping chickens in the city would be such a benefit to so many.
- I am vegan and do not support live stock of any kind.
- Chickens could provide people with a local food supply. The number of birds would need to be limited and there would need to be rules on keeping the property free of a lot of waste materials.
- I think a couple of chickens can't hurt anyone. Maybe not roosters in the city because of the noise but as long as the owner has a place for them to sleep, what harm do they do?
- Spot checking for humane conditions, secondary compost locations for animal waste
- Certain animals can be a good addition to the urban setting.
 - diligent review of nondisturbing animals. (no roosters crowing)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

-Maintaining odor requirements/penalties

-license required and annual polling of neighbors to ensure no disruptions to clean and reasonable living.

- Biosecurity in regards to diseases. Odour and noise ordinances. Adjacent neighbours should be able to veto.
- chicken's are fine - other livestock need lots of roaming space - not fair for them to be allowed in the city - hard to feel unsafe around chickens - maybe limit the amount so the noise of clucking is not annoying
- I have no issue with urban livestock and safety.
- Animal to space ratio isn't too low, otherwise the smell could be too much for some people.
- Have a say as some can be excessive from a noise, smell and waste perspective and would not want those near where I live, better suited for acreages or farms.
- Sure why not, as long as they're not planning on killing the poor animals. Just my opinion.
- Livestock do not belong in an urban setting. Too many potentials for noise, odours, and other nuisances to neighbours. Lots in Calgary are generally too small and there is land outside the City for livestock.
- If they are cared for and contained, i see no problem
- Same as above.
- More of a nuisance than safety issue, being a good neighbor. Reasonable limits on the number of animals / no disturbance to neighbors. Proper care for the animals.
- Education on the type of livestock that are in the area and their requirements to live a safe and healthy life. Rules and regulations to reduce the impact on neighbours and for the safety of the livestock.
- Terrible idea. Smell, pests, concerns with virus outbreaks and animal/person transmission.
- No-this is a major city not a rural village. Neighbours' approval and (depending on animal) neighbourhood approval-and certainly NO roosters Regular checks of property for health and safety concerns.
- in a larger yard
- They must be kept a reasonable distance from neighbours to control noise and smell. Livestock are usually larger as well, so providing adequate space for them to be healthy.
- no
- This is a good idea. Need to consider diseases etc. I like the idea of being able to have livestock to improve our urban food system.
- No.
- New licenses should include a notice to each of the neighboring neighbors to let them know this is going in, what it means to the properties around, etc.
- As long as the livestock is kept fenced or penned in, I think this is safe.
- No to live stock. Lot sizes are too small, cleanliness, risk of disease due to unsanitary conditions. It would be difficult for Bylaw to manage any rules if live stock was approved.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If they are kept outside, they need to not impact the neighbours. This means no noise, no smells and no activities that negatively affect the neighbours. There is no need in an urban setting for keeping livestock so this would be a privilege to be able to keep them within city limits.
- Limit the number of animals to be kept. 2 pigs maximum. Strict rules regarding pens and cleaning up after them.
- Depending on your idea of livestock chickens I think should be allowed with rules and regulations but it's silly to not allow people. Now cows and large animals would be difficult to keep in check.
- Any bylaws regarding urban livestock should ensure that animals are kept in a manner that promotes the animals health and vitality and would not permit abuse.
- Very challenging in an urban environment. Perhaps this could be undertaken similar to community gardens where there are appropriate, designated spaces for keeping livestock in the city.
- These should be restricted and only allowed on large lots out of town where they can be given a reasonable living space.
- I think this should be left to farms and acreages?
- People do not need to raise livestock in city limits. The smell and noise is not conducive to a happy neighborhood.
- I don't think urban livestock posts a safety risk. Owners should clean up after their livestock and ensure they have adequate housing and are not a nuisance as with any other animal.
- I think chickens should be able to be kept by people who have no mental illness and will treat them respectfully.
- There needs to be rules and guidelines to ensure the animals are treated humanely, and do not create a nuisance. There needs to be responsible ownership which includes regular clean up after animals, no animals that create large rackets such as roosters, etc.
- I feel very safe. I am thrilled that this is being considered within the city of Calgary
- Chickens, why not
- Only allow "emotional support" animals, and even then re-think that policy. But backyard chicken coops or pigs, goats, etc mustn't be allowed. This is how diseases cross from animals into humans (Coronaviruses anyone?), not to mention the noise, smells, more calls to 311 to deal with animals, etc
- A mechanism to ensure livestock are receiving proper care from owners, have a proper habitat to retire to at night that will not disturb neighbors. Supportive of initiative with some mechanism to oversee and ensure care and quality of life for livestock and neighbors around.
- No issues here . So long as owners are clean and respectful of possible smells from any waste that might be produced their animals. Noise may be a concern with certain animals. Limits on the number of animals may be something to consider - ie) no more than 5 hens; 2 pot belly pigs or whatever...
- Access to information, a cap on how many and what type of livestock, accessible information and dedication to proper livestock handling from the city



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends on what the "livestock" is and why they're living in an urban area. I have no issues with rescued animals (eg pigs, chickens, sheep) living out their lives in a safe urban environment but would be extremely upset to find out that a neighbour was raising animals for food. Not appropriate.
- Less interested in this.. I would not be very happy to live next to someone who had a backyard full of chickens.
- Everyone should be able to chose whatever animal they wish to keep on their own property in a reasonable and responsible way
- For livestock such as chickens I would support them being in urban areas as long as there were no roosters as they can be loud.
- Cleanliness, perhaps size requirements per size /number of animals.
- Yes !
- I would feel that there would need to be identification on all animals and Licensing as well.
- Then buy a farm. This is the city.
- Appropriate regulations around safety and enjoyment of the community. For example, not all types of urban livestock would be appropriate for neighbours, there should be space requirements for different types of animals. Appropriate training should be required.
- I think that backyard chickens should be allowed, minimal number of birds per home. I also think miniature pot belly pigs should be allowed as pets. They are no different than a dog for care as a pet.
- I don't agree with large livestock, chickens maybe but not pigs, goats, cows, etc. I also think the Emotional Animal Permit thing is getting a little crazy.
- Don't agree.I grew up on a farm. Too much room for error and irresponsibility. Disease from lack of cleaning spread to animals/humans. Smell too much for city.Noise at all hours and no control to stop it. Stop roosters crowing at sun rise (stop dogs barking?!) Breeding season - what r u thinkg
- Are we talking pets or animals they torture and eat. If pets, there should probably be limits based on land available. There is nothing that makes having animals to torture kill and eat that I would be comfortable with.
- Absolutely not.
- People should be able to keep urban livestock based on the size of their homes and area they will keep the animals. They should be able to show that they are knowledgeable about how to safely and responsibly keep those animals; e.g. license, city check area, mandatory annual courses to renew license
- Love the idea, nothing!
- Plenty of signage to indicate proximity and location of livestock and guidance on proper behaviour near livestock.
- Ownership of chickens should be permitted! Allow chicken coops in backyards. Maybe limit the number of chickens per house to make sure it doesn't get out of hand but people should be allowed to have chickens for eggs and meat.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- While I believe there is a benefit in some cases & I personally would love something that would help me maintain my lawn, this seems like it could be tricky especially when it comes to smell & noise. There would need to be more discussion than this space allows especially goat vs. a couple of hens.
- Same reason we are too close together for proper livestock raising
- Yes, please! I'd like to see an education/licensing requirement though, and maybe a maximum number of animals based on yard size.
- Signage
- Livestock should not be an issue unless it is negatively impacting to others beyond current allowed species that are allowed to co-exist with humans (dogs, cats, certain birds/rabbits, etc). Should maintenance of livestock be a nuisance to others (odors, fecal waste, property damage, noise), then no
- I would love to keep my horse in the back yard. This is no longer practical, smell, noise, probably not great for the backyard or the horse. There should be thought about space aloud per animal.
- Limited types and numbers but responsible owners keeping reasonable numbers of chickens should be allowed, 100%.
- Calgary has fallen behind other cities in Canada for their policies against urban chickens. Yards housing chickens should be be able to prevent them from getting out (or other animals getting in). Max # of hens (no cocks) should be based off of the amount of coop/yard space you have available
- Current legislation is good enough.
- Livestock for support or egg production if owned by a trained member of an association/guild. Association would ensure guidelines for urban care (inc. high standards of humane area/care guidelines; veterinary care) are followed. I would feel safer if livestock-type animals are never for slaughter.
- Permit and premises inspected.
- no issues
- No thanks
- Some urban livestock should be allowed, such as chickens. Regulations regarding lot size to supports animals should be decided on. Regulations regarding sale or giving away animal products (such as eggs) should be published. It's a little unclear currently
- Common sense
- This is a catch 22 I would love to have a few chickens but they are messy and roosters are noisy and if the cages are not kept very clean then you can expect smell and other "problem" wildlife. I am responsible and understand the work that goes into having them but my concern is so many don't get it
- As long as they are cleaned up after and have vaccinations as well as signs posted
- Not allowed.
- Not in the city
- I don't know.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I used to live in Victoria where we and many of our neighbors kept chickens. It was great to co own them with a neighbour so that you could still vacation etc. They were easy to take care of.
- Absolutely no way!
- Many of my friends keep chicken in Europe, where city populations are rather more dense than in Calgary. In the sake of the animals and neighbours the # of chickens and the way they are kept should be regulated. For me this is no safety concern and chickens might have a pos. effect on life quality
- The biggest issue for me is the stink. If it didn't smell as bad, I would not mind.
- Nothing
- Have no problem with 2-3 Chickens. Otherwise would not want neighbor with anything more than that!
- No to livestock.
- Should not be allowed under any circumstance. Yards are too small and owners are not responsible enough to clean up after chicken or pigs in a city lot. People don't pick up after their dogs walking, we don't want livestock in city lots.
- Absolutely not. We are currently dealing with Covid 19 which originated from close proximity between people and livestock.
- Depends on what it is
- Wouldn't want that.
- The term urban livestock is so broad as to make the answers to this question useless
- Low smell. No large animals or pigs, but rabbits and poultry ok if limited (especially poultry)
- There should be no livestock in the city. No cows, chickens, pigs.
- Need to be in the right settings and should adhere to the same noise requirements as domestic animals.
- why is this being considered in the responsible pet bylaw? if people want livestock they should live outside the city. Living in an urban setting is no life for livestock. I would be concerned about disease, noise, attracting wildlife, and attracting pests to a yard with livestock
- Residents should be permitted to urban farm small livestock in limited quantities and under a controlled program. Notifying neighbors prior to beginning an urban farm so they are aware of any noises or smells that may occur. Small livestock could include: chickens, turkeys, small goats
- There should not be any urban livestock. No pigs, chickens, etc..
- Chickens NO!
- Appropriate regulations and training for enforcement officers
- We talking chickens? Again, nothing.
- Low noise, no chemical use. I'd say no odor, but the city's own facilities (Shepard dump etc) make enough stench as it is.
- Backyards are generally too small in Calgary to allow for this without it being a nuisance for others.
- Bylaw enforcement to ensure neighbours are free of smell and noise and any intrusion on our space 24/7.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I disagree with urban livestock. Chickens and other domestic animals living in a backyard will produce noise and odours that will disturb neighbours. I do not support allowing livestock within city limits. If emotional support animals are needed, they should be kept indoors and quiet.
- it depends, handled well this is a good idea in bolstering food security and over all awareness of food sources.
- Noise and smell- if these are managed, no issue.
- NO livestock in the city. We are currently enduring a global pandemic (coronavirus) that originated from too many animals in close contact with humans. Livestock should be banned in the city to prevent more animal-human contact particularly as many people are already unqualified and negligent.
- Why urban livestock? First, hygiene concerns. Secondly, livestock don't have enough space to live on, which is very brutal to them.
- No Comment
- Chickens would draw in wild life
- Great idea!! Chickens can help with reducing insects and rodents.I think it needs to be done responsibly and a good place to look at is St Albert.There is minimum requirements in place that include things like living quarters,neighbour support/awareness and Animal Welfare bylaws,do it now!
- NO
- Small animals that do not are not noisier than existing pets, or produce foul odors if properly cared for should be allowed with an annual license.
- As long as the space is appropriate for the animal to have good living conditions, there should be no problem if the neighbour is caring for the animals properly and doing a good job of removing old feces, etc.
- this should not be in the city
- No inappropriate smells or noise
- I worry that people will not educate themselves on proper feeding and handling of the animal, I would like them to have to allow an inspection annually for the care of the animals to be able to renew their license to raise.
- No not under any circumstances.
- Backyard chickens are legal everywhere but here, and the 'experts' who testified at the last hearing were misinformed. The WHO clearly states there has never been a case of Avian Flu, or other crossovers from backyard chickens, only factory or farmed chickens. Can send a response from WHO if needed!
- Every city block should have a community sheep to cut the grass. Each home owner gets a turn to have the pair of sheep and then pass them on to next neighbour when their grass is 'cut'. And you get free natural fertilizer for your garden and some wool as a side benefit.
- a process to deal with complaints and concerns with enforcement



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Most livestock should not be allowed in the City. Noise, odours, and cleanliness are primary concerns to good neighbourhoods. Livestock do not belong in the confines of the City.
- If they are well taken care of and not being problematic for neighbours I see no issue with it. Should be a limit to numbers of livestock and what you can have.
- As long as it's contained and not bothering close by neighbors, don't see an issue. They need to be treated humanely and with respect.
- Nothing
- As long as the animals have enough space to roam freely, and the smell does not permeate the area, this seems fine.
- Drainage, sound proofing, well fenced, continual monitoring by the health department and heavy fines if any conditions aren't followed.
- Hen chickens and smaller animals are ok to keep as hobby or pets, never to be slaughtered in the city.
- Enclosures must be clean, safe and escape-proof. Animals must be safe from potential bad neighbours and predators. Animals must not be too noisy.
- I have no problem with people having livestock. I think it's great! We need to get back to that kind of living.
- no urban livestock especially no chickens - most importantly roosters are noisy at any time. Smell of a chicken coop could be objectionable to adjacent neighbours.
- depends on livestock. proper containment would be required
- Back yard hens to a limit of 6
- Chickens are ok, but limit the number. City should be held accountable to ensure enforcement occurs on those that become a nuisance from smell, bad visual appeal. No warnings, they are ineffective and unfair to the 95% who comply
- This is not a question of safety but rather of noise and smell. There is not enough room for responsible keeping of livestock in the city.
- Should be okay upon permit process, on a per case basis and amount of animals per square footage of yard should be looked at.
- With max size limitations.
- Chickens are fine as long as citizens know how to care for the animals and the safe disposal when expired. Also I think this needs inspections to be sure that the animals are properly cared for. For eggs only. No roosters
- Definitely should be permit-driven. Chickens etc might be fine but when you start adding pigs, cows and goats then there will be issues. Best to start off very cautiously.
- Licensing and training course and proper installation for hens keeping. Chicken and poultry have a very distinctive smell which can be bothersome for neighbors. Chickens should also be tagged so they can be traced back to their owners if they are found roaming outside of property.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Should not be allowed. This is something that can get out of hand very quickly and become unsanitary, noisy, and foul smelling for neighbours. I wouldn't want this next door, living in the city is not the same as the farm.
- I am concerned about the noise and smell of chickens.
- controls for noise, odors, aesthetics
- Allowed with license & public notice to neighbours who can appeal. Signage out front of home that advises livestock is kept on property.
- I think that animals such as hens should be allowed, granted they are being taken care of properly and have a heated area for the winter.
- If we make an opportunity to have a few chickens it would not be a hazard or inconvenience to others so long as there are rules around it.
- Keeping a small number of chickens in a yard shouldn't be an issue. People with 1 medium or large dog generate way more dog shit than a few chickens. If people want to keep chickens they shouldn't need a permit either. Never have I seen a carnivorous blood thirsty chickens out attacking people
- Farm animals, including chickens don't belong in the city. I have a right to the quiet enjoyment of my property, which is an urban property, not a rural property. I would challenge in court any transgression of this right.
- We would need to ensure that animals aren't kept in cages in cold and hot weather with nowhere to exercise - - that is my big concern.
- Chickens have shown to be useful and not troublesome backyard pets in many urban areas. This has been established and should be allowed in Calgary.
- Clear standards for pens, etc. that are fair to the animal and ensure it is kept to the property (for it's own safety and that of other animals and people).
- livestock are managed appropriately, not released to public spaces
- Appropriate fencing I suppose. Not too worried about this one, I would enjoy having a chicken coop one day
- You have not defined urban livestock. Are we talking about an urban cow or an urban goat, an urban horse or urban hens??? Please reconsider this survey. I really want to advocate for responsible small-scale urban hens.
- I believe that no one should be allowed to own chickens in the city of Calgary. They are dirty and the stench is beyond belief. I am talking from experience. They would also spread diseases.
- proper precautions and designated areas need to be in place as we don't want them running around or causing problems
- Keeping livestock and humans healthy. Keep pens clean. Noise down.
- No
- Where



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Would like to see some allowances for livestock. Miniature horses as support animals, chickens for eggs etc. If the yard is kept up and maintained (namely adequate removal and sanitation of the feces, or composted), then owners should be given the allowance.
- Having lived 2 doors away from someone who wanted a couple of chickens and ended up getting 27, I'm strictly against it. I've lived in the same house for 30 years and no one had any mice issues until the chickens arrived. Next came the skunks as they are apparently quite fond of eggs. No livestock
- Chickens are too noisy
- Health and safety sanitation checks
- YES. PLEASE. Chickens at the very least. The price of eggs is outrageous and they taste nasty.
- Depends on the livestock I guess. I'm okay with chickens for egg but don't feel that most properties are set up to accommodate the space and hygiene needed
- Occasional inspection for cleanliness and hygiene to prevent the spread of illness
- People must attend a proper information course to be licensed.
- Reasonable hygiene
- Fences
- It should be permitted with limits. I'd far rather my neighbour have a pygmy goat or half a dozen well kept chickens than a pitbull on a chain in their yard. As long as they are following the same rules as for cats and dogs (licensed, not causing a nuisance) they should be allowed within reason.
- Nothing! Please allow this!
- seriously?
- I do not support livestock in urban settings.
- NO - livestock needs to remain on acreages and farms. Yards in the city are not big enough to keep animals and will create mess, odor and likely disease (just look at China's situation). BAD IDEA
- Keep it contained in proper housing and fencing
- animal welfare and adequate living space may need to be defined. if the animal is happy, it is okay.
- Absolutely NO. Disease and predators are the first 2 reasons. This law is already being abused. Shut them down or we can expect to have mini horses on the C-train along with the chickens and ducks. Disease, Disease, Disease. Coronas Virus sounds familiar.
- No safety concerns, but some level of control over numbers of livestock.
- Chickens I understand in the backyard, but there may need to be a limit set per square foot of their pasture/enclosure.
- Not every house, but limited numbers are OK.
- I oppose urban livestock, because of the smell and noise which affects the surrounding neighbors. They serve no purpose and should be limited to rural areas
- Again, no problem as long as owners are respectful of neighbors with respect to smells and noise.
- Register animals. Similar to dogs.
- I need to be communicated that neighbors are going to have urban livestock and I need to know there is a number and person or group that I can call if there are issues or I feel less safe



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No opinion.
- Nothing needed. I used to love seeing horses on 14th st -till your bylaw tyrant banned them
- Needs to be done within reason. I think having a couple chickens is OK if the person has enough space for them. But anything bigger should not be allowed in an urban setting. And regulations need to be in place so things don't get out of hand.
- A good fence and someone watching them. Signage would be nice too.
- Nothing. Seems like not a hazard. Although might be a sound / snell nuisance?
- I think so long as proper bylaws, cleanliness and similar were followed, there are no issues
- Why not? I would love to have eggs in my quaint heritage home, save a bit of money and stay healthy.
- That they are not a noise or health issue
- I want more urban livestock raised for food
- Mostly noise concerns here. I am all for a few chickens, but keep those roosters quiet!
- This is also not appropriate for our city; animal/waste odours will drift to the neighbours' yard. There are already - in my opinion - issues with cats and dogs. I imagine that the City of Calgary will need to have a much enlarged Bylaw Office.
- Management of odours, confinement of livestock
- No. Just no. You are all worried about Bobcats, coyotes, etc., then you want to introduce dinner? And a chicken is so not an emotional support animal!! They have lice and bugs and should be on a farm, where they have the space they need.
- Chickens and ducks seem fine if strict standards are created and met.
- I'm not opposed to urban livestock, as long as we can ensure a level of cleanliness and organization. People seem to have a hard enough time picking up after their dogs, how will they be a picking up after other animals, and how will it be enforced. It only takes a few to ruin it for everyone.
- I support urban chickens as long as the owner is ensuring their coup is clean. For this to happen, there should maybe be an inspection program to ensure the livestock are cared for appropriately.
- do not bother me if they are properly cared for I will support licensing and education for this also
- Pens are kept clean and safe for the animals.
- Livestock should not be in the city.
- Cleanliness and living standards that would have to be enforced. I have no problem with a neighbour raising chickens as long as I can't smell them and they are well cared for.
- Defiantly against allowing any livestock in the city. People can live in the numerous rural ares in Alberta if they want livestock. I moved to the city to get away from animal that cause high noise, unpleasant smells and are a nuisance because they get loose into community often.EU pigs big problem
- urban hens should be allowed with the number based on size and type of dwelling. they are an excellent way to supplement the food supply and lower living costs.
- Yes please!!! I would love to have chickens in my yard. I grew up on a farm with chickens so maybe no 'roosters'? Too noisy for neighbours. Also, I live in Brentwood and there are many bobcats and



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

coyotes and i think chickens could attract more... so there should be guidelines about enclosures etc.

- Awareness, if you live within close proximity. There could be concerns regarding noise and smell. Requirements to ensure noise and smell do not become an issue for neighbours should be included in the bylaw. Consideration should be given to livestock attracting wildlife.
- NO LIVESTOCK AT ALL. GET RID OF SO CALLED ' SUPPORT CHICKENS' IN URBAN AREAS. MESSY, NOISY, SMELLY, DISEASE CONTROL?
- notification, they should apply for a permit and put a notice out to their neighbors giving them the opportunity to voice their concerns
- nothing , educations is needed for people
- No
- If some one wants to raise chickens etc move out of the city to an acreage, cities are not for farming.
- I think I would like to know the rules that would govern the keeping of animals such as chickens, and I would like to know that there would be a mechanism whereby Animal Services could inspect premises where the animals are being kept if there is a reasonable doubt that the animals are being kept in
 - Reasonably small control & sound
 - Chickens good (max # per household)
 - I would love to raise chickens at home
 - Approve of only smaller animals
 - I don't have concerns. They should be in a coup, in a closed environment. They are not dangerous.
 - Leave this space
 - Adequate proof that owners are appropriately educated about safety, health and cleanliness. Public notice provided to adjacent neighbours.
 - Limit the number of livestock per square footage of lot size; implement annual fee/ license to keep urban livestock.
 - No urban livestock, it breeds disease.
 - Size and weight restrictions on livestock. I.E. (# of chickens / fowl allowed = square footage of penned in space / average area required to house 1 chicken / fowl) Categorize ALL livestock in this manner for rural livestock restrictions. Housing facilities subject to periodic approval / inspection
 - This should be illegal
 - chickens with a limit per home
 - noise and odor bylaw control -
 - I do not believe that livestock belong in the City.
 - Why not chickens and ducks?
but quails are quiet.
Rabbits the eating kind.
But not cows or goats or sheep



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Appropriate housing and caretaking along with registry. Livestock needs to be welcomed into the city!
- I am concerned over the odor and the mice that seem to appear with the livestock (including chickens)
- i believe it would be a great addition to our sustainability to allow hens within the city limits.they are not noisy, produce food, the chicken manure can be put in the green bin.I have a neighbour that has so much dog waste in the yard and this is permitted. OMG,those who have hens are responsible
- Small animals only, maybe. Perhaps we could have a few livestock facilities around town rather than having livestock in our yards.
- Permit
Inspection of animal's living conditions (must be adequate for animal needs, consultation with experts for cruelty/health hazard-free living environment).
- The city is no place for livestock
- I'm fine with it as long as the livestock have enough space and appropriate environment for their natural behaviours and necessary exercise.
- proper structure for the livestock
- Urban livestock is a great idea with appropriate guidelines, animal amount limitations, courses and licenses. A mandatory course and license to keep livestock will educate people on proper care and keep them accountable and trackable.
- Chickens - no rooster/ upto 4 hens/ upto 2 mini goats or pigs or horses
If smell or poor maintenance then fined strike 3 in effect
- Controls/rules related to odour and noise management, pilot programs, controlled numbers and breeding.
- No issue with small numbers of chickens. Roosters should not be permitted. Small coops can be managed and odor controlled
- Huge fan. Again, some reasonable regulations, but totally in.
- i am all for any one keeping chickens at a limit of 6 or a few bees hives with limit of 4
- I don't think many Calgarians would want a neighbor that has livestock animals next door.
- Effect on agencies that may be required to accept surrenders or seize neglected animals.
Realistic ability for an urban property to meet needs of livestock
Nuisance smell/noise
Proper housing
Standards of care and control
- We have no concerns with small animals such as chickens. Roosters would be a noise concern. Standard rules should apply regarding proper care and clean housing.
- If you are on an acreage or there is a lot of room between the houses, no concerns. I prefer not to have any livestock in my neighbourhood.
- Should be allowed as long as it doesn't harm your neighbours



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- This one is a little more difficult. As much as I think I wouldn't mind living beside a home with chickens, I would mind if it became too noisy or too foul smelling! I wouldn't approve of livestock larger than a chicken.
- -regulations that owners must follow and are monitored to make sure owners follow
- Suitable fencing or other containment. Licensing with appropriate inspections upon renewal and/or complaint where safety is a concern. This could be managed via the city or organizations similar to those for pigeon keepers and should be self-financing
- Bylaw & fines making it a self funded program
 - Permit
 - License for each
 - Training
 - Min size lot/setback
 - Insurance for damages
 - Neighbor consensus
 - Max permits within area

Actually none of this makes sense to me.
Why we live in the City-because we don't want to live on a farm.
- I think there should be limits to number of animals for the size of the property (similar to horses in a rural property), and regulation about if livestock ownership impacts the properties adjacent (ie if livestock feces is spreading to neighbors), but otherwise allow for it.
- Noise , odour, waste control and disposal regulations, bylaws
- It should be limited to chickens (hens only) not roosters. It would be a great idea as long as people do this responsibly I.e. clean up and make sure they have proper housing to prevent coyotes and Bobcats from eating them.
- Should not be allowed under any circumstances in cities. Too big a potential for spread of disease among humans. Remember the avian flu? Documented transmission of flu between animals and humans-more recently the corona virus, direct result of China's wild animal live markets. Not worth the risk.
- effect on other agencies that may be required to accept surrenders or seize neglected animals
 - realistic ability for an urban property to meet needs of livestock
 - nuisance smell/noise
- Livestock not be allowed in a city environment. Livestock require large amount of space for their health, not possible in a confined city area. Livestock are not support animals. Support animal is one that has the ability to respond to a persons command or intervene in a crisis. Livestock do not.
- Only given a license if they have a certified course on animal husbandry and safe management of these animals.
- They need to be quiet so as not to affect others sleep which affects our health & well being. Also cleanliness is of utmost importance so as not to spread disease & contamination of our drainage systems. Smell can also be a problem.
- Animal welfare laws need to be enforced.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Permit and consultation with neighbors
- This should absolutely be allowed. Urban livestock is great. Stop over regulating things. Raising livestock for a pastime or local food is wonderful and should be allowed and encouraged. Don't regulate livestock in the city. Let people have small ponies/horses/ chickens, etc (quiet animals)
- Smaller livestock such as chickens used as support animals only and mostly kept inside. Livestock could attract certain wildlife.
- I do not support livestock in backyards or want to live near it, due to noise, smell, transmitting of diseases, nuisance, lack of care and cruelty. Enough animals are abandoned and suffer from lack of care or cruelty. today. Laws not strong enough as is. Enforcing laws will cost taxpayers more.
- I would not like chickens in peoples yards. They will be a nuisance. What if the neighbour has a cat/dog.
Now that we are in a pandemic- I might be open to it, but otherwise not a fan due to noise/smell/other animal issues.
- I do not have sufficient knowledge of this particular subject. But, what about the smell of manure in the City?
- Realistic ability for an urban property to meet needs of livestock.
License/permit - should include consent from neighbours.
City would have to take on the responsibility of accepting surrenders &/or seizures of these animals.
Effective control of nuisance smell & noise.
- I would love livestock in my backyard and my sheep herding dog would love it as well.
- There should be no urban livestock.
- I'm good with limited amount of chickens
- I have no problems as long as there is a nuisance bylaw that the City can enact if there is an issue.
- Chickens are desirable. But not more than 6 hens per household.
- Seems unnecessary in the city
- As long as the owner can provide a proper accommodation for the number of animals he is planning to have and keep clean, not smelly I would be ok.
- Animal cages must be kept clean and well maintained. Animals must also be kept healthy.
- Effect on other agencies that may be required to accept surrenders of these animals or seize neglected livestock (City of Calgary, Calgary Humane Society, other rescue groups); Realistic ability for an urban property to meet the welfare needs of livestock; Nuisance smell and/or noise in urban areas.
- Permit-based (low cost!), Limit on number of animals (eg. 4-6 hens/ducks) per house, no roosters.
- For me it is not about safety, generally urban livestock (except bison?!) are safe. Wouldn't want bull cattle around. Nor lammas. Need them to be cleaned up after (daily?), secured in yard.
- Fences to contain livestock would be essential. There should be limits on numbers and size. Overall hygiene and maintenance of properties should be required.
Fines for allowing detritus material to collect.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Are you joking. Seen the news lately. Been to China recently? Animals in close proximity to humans = disease. And how do you build and maintain sanitary facilities for livestock when you can't keep the city half free of pet excrement.
?
- Control on number and size of animal. As long as it's not too noisy (rooster) or smelly (pig), I've got no problem with it
- Please no. There are already a lot of irresponsible pet owners in the city, and The City of Calgary doesn't seem to have the resources to manage the existing problems. I cannot imagine how The City would manage this. I do not want chickens, pigs, or any type of livestock in my neighbourhood.
- 300 characters is not enough for proper input! Urban livestock; case by case basis. Let it be. Those with illegitimate complaints [removed] could likely use a healthy dose of education on the subject they're complaining about.
- A couple or three/four hens should be permitted for backyard gardens. No roosters allowed as they are disruptive.
- Limit the number of chickens. Maximum 10. If you have too many, there might be more disease. People should always take care of them. Chickens in the city is good for eggs.
- - need pond for ducks
 - loud
 - stinky
 - egg collection
 - outside areas of the city
- - stinky
 - ponds for ducks
 - noise
 - leave them alone
- Sounds will disturb others, bad smells, running wild if get away, mini barn in backyard, 3 chickens, 1 cow, ~ limit animals, keep livestock on farms, can't keep them quiet.
- If this is referring to chickens and other animals I say please don't allow this – people don't look after their dogs and cats let alone chickens. I found chickens on Nosehill that had obviously been dumped there.

Pigeons

- Again, to be informed, know what the rules are, and how to report violations. Also concerned about hygiene of this particular practice and health issues.
- filth and disease, bird droppings
- Current regulations seem to be fine. Perhaps regulations on the number of pigeons kept.
- no concerns as long as the coops are kept clean and odour free.
- Allow it
- [personal information removed]



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Calgary is already full of pigeons so in theory they shouldn't be a big issue. But in residential areas there should be limits on #s of birds and cleanliness requirements.

- Not concerned with safety. Concerned for noise, smell and mess.
- See urban livestock as most applies. Just keep them clean.
- why?
- I am not in support of pigeon racing so I would change the bylaw that currently approves this.
- I am not concerned about urban bee pigeons
- Urban thing.
- Pigeons cause a mess when they roost, and the poo is like cement when it dries. I have never seen someone keep them that isn't a delapidated eyesore.
- Yuck. No.
- no comment.
- Property cages and housing, conscientious ownership.
- Common misconception that pigeons are unsafe because they are dirty. pigeons have amazing immune systems and are not a health threat to us. Leave them be.
- I support.
- THE WORST! As someone who has had neighbors with pigeons, it is ridiculous that the city allows this, but does not allow chickens. pigeons are a nuisance, and the feed attracts rodents and other wildlife. It is clear that even though the city regulates it, they do not enforce the bylaws.
- i think we have enough flying around. i would not want to live next door to someone who kept pigeons, they can be noisy
- Yes, however the neighbours must formally consent first.
- Leave them alone
- I don't know much about urban pigeons. Are they a food crop?
- Pigeons are dirty and noisy. They will poop all over your garage is they decide that they want to hang out there and they will return constantly. If you have a rain barrel for your garden, this is disgusting.
- Pigeon farming is something I have no real knowledge of, but seems like it could be done responsibly.
- The current bylaws are sufficient.
- No opinion.
- No. No. No. These are filthy animals with feces and feeding. Please, just no.
- How does racing pigeons benefit our community or society? Is this considered animal cruelty?
- No opinion.
- I have no problem with urban pigeons. There are so many birds in the City, what's a few more?
- I don't think that any urban pigeons should be on residential property or in the city limits on commercial property. If you want to have urban pigeons, then live on an acreage or farm.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I've had too many incidences of pigeons clearing out feeders and roosting in our own home to approve of anything regarding pigeons. I believe it's too easy for me to just "let them go" or have feeding of them become someone else's responsibility.
- Support but recommend working with Alberta Veterinary Medical Association, UC Vet School, local clubs/association to setup regulations, disease surveillance, restrict numbers and establish best practices.
- Required basic level of vet care so they're not spreading disease.
- I have never thought of urban pigeons.
- Clear guidelines for pigeon owners including expectations regarding noise and odour and animal welfare.
- Pigeons are rats with wings.
- should fall into "Urban Livestock" - enforce a maximum such as 20 "livestock" animals
- No. I'm so glad to finally be rid of pigeons pooping on my deck and patio. Please don't encourage these birds. They're cute and all, but they don't understand the concept of boundaries.
- Send an email.
- No opinion
- As with wildlife, the city needs to control their population to keep it close to what natural levels without city activities would be. This can be accomplished either directly or by addressing the underlying factors that allows the population to grow beyond the level that it naturally would.
- "...any person who keeps pigeons must be a member in good standing of either the Canadian Racing Pigeon Club or the Canadian Pigeon Fanciers Association and the pigeon wears appropriate identification." seems good enough to me
- I am fine with urban pigeon keeping.
- I would personally like to be informed if someone in my neighbourhood was planning urban agriculture. Adequate enclosures would need to be built and maintained in order to avoid predators.
- No... not really. [personal information removed] I would keep the regulations the same.
- Urban Pigeons should be entitled to a bird/sq ft ratio to prevent over crowding. Pigeons should be banded and registered with the City. If Pigeons are used as a food source there should be strict methods employed to prevent suffering. Pigeons should be in good health and free from disease.
- Cleanliness
- ?? pigeons live with us now and always. Live and let live. I don't see this as an issue.
- no opinion
- Nothing.
- Weird but okay as long as they are housed appropriately and not released to the wild. Should have to be banded so they are readily identifiable
- No. Just no. Why?
- They are housed appropriately and as per above.
- Personally I think pigeons are rats with wings. Carrier or passenger pigeons homing style that live in an enclosure are ok but not something I would want.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Don't have an opinion
- There should be NO urban pigeons in an urban setting.
- No concerns here, I knew pigeon hobbyists growing up and it's a safe operation
- I am sure people being what they are would raise them to eat them not race them. How to control that they are being well cared for from cold.....smell?
- I have no concerns.
- No, no pigeons and especially as they have been used as squab. Many cultures raise them and they are not clean.
- Special licensing
- no opinion.
- bylaw is correct..responsible pigeon owners are not the problem..bylaw must remain the same unless close quarter neighbors have issues (eg: pigeon feces) then pigeon owners must rethink where their birds are kept..
- As long as I don't see or hear the pigeons, there is no problem.
- Nothing
- Stick with current concept of being part of the club and/or licencing by education that you know how to safely care for the birds and can meet their needs.
- 1) Have a limit as well
- 2) I don't really get the use for pigeons
- Pigeons are harmless and provide no benefit and not many negatives to a city. No bylaws needed.
- Even in captivity these animals could easily contract disease from the wild birds that live inner city. That being said I am NOT opposed to people keeping them as they are a delicacy and are a very easy bird to raise.
- Pigeon cotes will provide excellent opportunities for everybody. Pigeons prefer to roost safely with other pigeons, so the system becomes self-organizing. No worries.
- Would be great if they had tracking devices so the owners know where they are and home owners can get them to come get them when they start to build nests on/in their property.
- No safety concerns here either. Just making sure that we keep the areas clean and not a nuisance to the neighbours.
- should not be allowed in residential communities!!!! filthy, loud, disgusting amount of feces. Once they set into a neighbourhood you can not get rid of them and you are stuck with all of the feces. DISGUSTING
- I don't know enough about this - do people want to breed urban pigeons or grow for food? Or is this referring to free roaming pigeons?
- Ability to ensure no disease, no noise, no waste all over adjacent properties. Appropriateness is questionable. Not appropriate in multi-family buildings.
- Contain feathers.
- It seems like you aren't asking if citizens think this is appropriate - is this a done deal?
- Current bylaws seem to be appropriate. I have no concerns.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I would want signage front & back of the property to make visitors, city workers etc aware of what animal is present. A limit on max number of animals allowed.
- Remove them in whatever way necessary.
- We are getting more wild pigeons in the city. I'm not sure what the purpose would be for having a pigeon coop though.
- I don't want my neighbors to have pigeons if the birds are noisy
- Love it, I think they're beautiful birds (and not too loud compared to other pet birds).
- Messy, filthy birds
- Not sure I understand how that fits in an urban environment. I don't believe you can humanely have pigeons in a yard and enable them to fly and stretch otherwise....
- IMO the trouble with pigeons is that it is harder to contain the breeding, especially for strays.
- I have no issues with pigeons being kept, but I do think there needs to be limits on how many can be kept on a property.
- Limited number, I don't want to see property get messed or damaged due to an unruly number of pigeons.
- Nothing.
- Too each their own enjoy. Urban chickens are doing good!
- No Pigeons.
- As long as they don't increase wild pigeon population in the city
- Owners need to keep noise and odour levels to an absolute minimum. There aren't enough bylaw enforcement officers to keep non-complying owners in line.
- Nothing. And everyone is doing it so make it legal already. Then all the knowledge, tools, supplies can be found easier and locally for those that no longer have to hide their hobby. Knowledge is power.
- No problem with the pigeons
- No problems.
- Again depends on ability to clean up after them. I wouldn't be overly happy if they were to take up roost on my house.
- We have many pigeons around as it is. Why not allow pigeons as pets?
- Totally against. Pigeons can smell, create huge messes and spread disease. They cannot and shouldn't be caged. Unless they are a Doctor approved support animal they are more a nuisance. Many cities have issues with these birds in areas and Calgary shouldn't promote the birds within City limits.
- Prefer not kept as pets at all, however coops in a yard, with a limit on how many.
- I am not a fan. As i have seen u fit cages
- No Pigeons in the city limits
- What is in place now is fine.
- Sure
- Sure not sure why anyone wants them



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same as above
- Don't know enough about what this will entail but anything pigeons isn't appealing to me.
- They are filthy and I would like to not have them here.
- No. For the same reasons noted in question #2. Animals such as pigeons need space to live and grow. A city is not an appropriate place.
- Opposed
- The problem with urban pigeons is the large amount bird droppings pigeons create on buildings, decks and patios, as well as every where on adjoining residential properties that happen to be next to a city residential property that has pigeon coups and the owner lets the birds fly regularly.
- Sounds interesting.
- No opinion.
- Is the current bylaw working? If yes I would leave it. If there is abuse or neighbours are complaining, then I would suggest exploring specific ways to address those issues based on best practices.
- Pigeons can become pests, but I'm open to responsible pigeon ownership...
- Why not?
- Noisy and messy, they need to be fully contained.
- Within reason, and again though as long as the owners have the education and know how to do it, yes.
- Urban CHICKENS please!!!!
- They're already here, keeping them as pets is another story. How to keep them safe, healthy and in clean housing. If for meat, humane killing. No selling.
- Pigeons need to be under control, their coop must be kept very clean and cleaned regularly. Any smell or noise must be highly limited. I expect the birds are not free to roam and will not defecate on surrounding property. They must be properly housed and limited to a small amount.
- None
- No!
- We seem to have a lot of them already in the urban wilds, and I have never felt unsafe because of them. So I see no need to be concerned about pigeon fanciers and such.
- Sure
- Fine if not impacting neighbouring property
- Restrictions on number of pigeons and cleanliness of facility.
- Don't know about this one.
- See urban livestock.
- Don't want them
- None
- Been around for years and most of the owners are responsible with care and health requirements
- I agree with the current bylaw.
- Waste must be kept cleaned up.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Pigeons are ok as long as they are free of disease and properly enclosed.
- Yes, however I think their numbers need to be controlled. Especially if being let out for the day
- No
- Dont care
- The waste they produce would be the main issue, I would not want them roosting on rooves in the area and pooping all over the place.
- SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED...GET SERIOUS. GO LIVE IN THE COUNTRY IF YOU WANT TO FARM.
- Nothing, highly unlikely to be threatened by a pigeon.
- I see no problem with pigeons.
- Pigeons are annoying like seagulls
- Only if they cannot escape, just like chickens, strict rules around care and number.
- I require nothing to feel safe. As with all neighbour disputes or property concerns complaints can be made via existing processes.
- Hoenstly I'd like to see some pigeons race
- they are the most disgusting annoying birds... I have had this problem , they shit everywhere and their cooing is very annoying... they make a terrible mess on roof tops and yards... again no need for them
- No, no and no!! Carrier of diseases! Noisy and messy!
- No, they are messy and noisy. Already have enough issues with wild pigeons
- Doesn't effect me.
- I have no issues with urban pigeons.
- Pigeons should not be allowed in urban areas as they they are noisey and make huge messes with their fecies . They are beautiful birds but in groups they cause many problems
- Not a fan of pigeons, as the coop has negative impact with neighbouring properties.
- Previously experienced pigeon poop on our patio due to many urban pigeons three doors away. Please -- no urban pigeons.
- Not worried.
- Limiting the number of pigeons allowed.
- Pigeons are no problem as long as they're kept and controlled by the owners.
- Don't know enough about pigeons to say much. Are they potential disease carriers? If so, then they should be kept in a coop or indoors.
- I'm not sure what this even looks like.
- Birds can be messy. Having a plan in place to ensure the birds aren't leaving excrement and food litter for the general public to clean.
- Must be certified to raise and control them in a cage and not to them free to control disease
- Think this is fine as is.
- Urban pigeons should be allowed in numbers that do not cause odor or vermin. Pigeons should not be allowed to be lived trapped, should come from breeder.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I've never experienced a problem with urban pigeons.
- They should be contained within their own property, too messy when allowed to fly out in groups
- In addition to the current membership requirements, limits on the number of pigeons
- Similar to above, otherwise there should be no issues with pigeon raising if we can already raise exotic birds.
- I've seen them around and is kinda cool to see them fly in a flock. My only issue is that they don't create a noise issue (Cooing) with neighbors or they start nesting on my roof and pooping everywhere. amount of birds is key.
- No comment. I don't know enough
- Vermin with wings. Strict control and limitation on how many (I would suggest 5 max). These animals are a nuisance and create noise and filth on other people's properties.
- Disease
- Absolutely not in an urban setting - noise/smell/bird faeces - not conducive to being a good neighbour
- Knowledge and education
- I think people should be able to responsibly keep pigeons to consume as a local source of meat
- No.
- Disease control
- Same as above, no issues that I can see beyond an abundance of pigeon poop.
- Same
- Bands mandatory, and owners fully responsible for any lost/stray landed pigeons.
- Don't we have enough pigeons already?
- They don't seem to be a problem now. Ensure they are well cared for and clean.
- Not noisy/smelling/roaming.
- They crap on everything. It's hard enough keeping my car clean.
- I consider pigeons livestock and they should not be kept in residences in the City of Calgary as they can become a nuisance.
- No comment
- As long as they are not pooping on car.
- Limit on number, and/or limit on number commensurate with exterior space available, and/or based on neighborhood density zoning (fewer or none in denser areas)
- I feel safe with pigeons and the current regulations but would prefer urban chickens.
- Should be allowed
- I don't like urban pigeons
- The current bylaws are acceptable
- I don't know anything about urban pigeons.
- Yes it a great idea
- That the animal noise and waste is cared for in an appropriate manner to not effect neighbours.
- In a decent quantity it's ok. Set a limit for example 6.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Limited numbers and significant distance from dwelling and yard areas. Noise and odour control.
- Pigeons in diapers. They poop everywhere. Are pigeons aggressive? Do they attract other aggressive or predatory animals? I don't know a lot about pigeons but having a large number of them does not sound safe or something you would want in urban areas
- yes they should be allowed as breeding, competition, companion animals and should be allowed to fly however the flocks should be locked up by sundown. People should not be allowed to encourage wild pigeons to set up flocks in the neighborhoods nor should their flocks become a public nuisance
- No issues with people having pigeons. It's not like they aren't already in the neighbourhood nesting and doing their thing.
- Only if properly housed and neighbours agree
- Sure I don't see any issues with these as long as the area around the home is kept clean. A small sign if the pigeons are allowed to flock (this can be frightening)
- Whatever.
- Just...no
- It sounds like the current system is adequate.
- Nothing... Same answer as the bees. Keep potions of you want
- Limit to # of birds , size of enclosure
- No way. Unless there's a way to ensure that they are controlled population wise. Live in an inner city area with a huge pigeon people - they are messy and carry disease.
- Unacceptable in a urban city. Do not allow it.
- I don't have a lot of experience but as long as they aren't messy, go for it!
- Nothing
- We have enough pigeons in this city but if people own them they need to be responsible and limit to a reasonable number
- I would rather see hens but a limited number of pigeons would be ok in my opinion. You (the City), could potentially make some revenue off of permits for goats and bees and/or leg bands for the birds.
- Same as above.
- They need to be free of disease and of lice etc. It's transferable to other common household pets. Pigeons are extremely dirty birds
- Allow a flock of urban pigeons. No problem with that.
- Proper coop.
- Disgusting. Absolutely disgusting.
- I can't imagine that this is popular enough to need to legislate more than what is already written in the bylaws.
- limit the number in areas to avoid over taxing resources and leaving a footprint on environment and neighbours



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A law to insure the kept pigeons have enough room and are treated humanely. Licensing for these pigeon keepers and regular checks done on pigeon keepers. Some people keep multiple pigeons in such small cages.
- Don't know about these to have an opinion
- I have no concerns.
- An umbrella :) but a roost that keep the pigeon dropping away from public areas and on the owners property.
- Why not?
- As long as they are not pooping all over my house then all is good
- Good idea but limits
- No, rats with wings, i would hate to hear the cooing and noises.
- Not a fan. However if properly kept and identified why not
- Anti bird spikes
- No concerns
- I like pigeons and would have no issue having them near.
- No comment. Seems under control.
- I think they have this category cover with the current rules, but again proper housing, access to food and water and adequate space for the animals.
- Nothing good to say about pigeons....
- Again, limited by property size
- Sure, why not.
- None, as long as they are in their natural habitat and not used for entertainment. Otherwise a warning sign of what is in the area.
- No opinion.
- Feathered rats should be exterminated on site
- Yes please, pigeons are great.
- Not in city limits.
- The current rules are about right.
- I think using them for raving borders on illegal gambling territory
But homing I'd say again set a limit like no more than 4 or something reasonable
- It's so expensive to live here and people need to be able to feed their families. I know I do. I am 100% behind people being able to use their land for all types of food.
- Current rules on pigeons make sense. I would like to see current rules remain in place for pigeons to prevent the city from becoming g Toronto and Montreal, covered in pigeon poop.
- Fine by me. Pigeons don't seem to be a nuisance. They stay where there's a food source so just don't ya e a food source if you don't want pigeons.
- If constant testing is done to prevent disease don't see it as a issue
- current legislation is fine



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Must be a member in good standing of either the Canadian Racing Pigeon Club or the Canadian Pigeon Fanciers Association and the pigeon wears appropriate identification.
- I actually like the sound of pigeons but would hope that the owners keep them contained in a safe enclosure.
- Should not be allowed.
- Not allowed. They don't do anyone any good and make a mess everywhere.
- Shouldn't be allowed. Again, if you want to raise pigeons, move out of the city.
- Doesn't seem to be a problem and so why should a Calgarian care. The current bylaws seem reasonable.
- Pigeons carry disease and should be treated as pests.
- I am concerned about humane slaughter and am otherwise supportive of urban pigeons
- Straight no...
- Proper coops and cleanup/maintenance of space.
- Needs to be clean
- I don't have enough information to comment on this
- I had a neighbour who had them and they would just roam freely around the area. He would leave the dying or sick ones out and not keep the pen very clean. This should be more regulated.
- No issues with safety here.
- None permitted due to noise, smell and defecation on neighbouring properties.
- I have no issue with pigeons
- License to own
- Noise and disease are chief concerns. Also, out of control birds escaping and taking up residence elsewhere are a big concern. Give your bylaw officers a break and forbid all mores of livestock other than dogs and cats
- No urban or suburban pigeons. We have enough feral ones that make a mess everywhere.
- Adequate housing for pigeons.
- I do not know enough to make a strong opinion on the matter
- Monthly inspection area is kept cleAn n no disease or infections . Flying ground restricted so we aren't getting poop showers from mass flock
- no, cause damage and carry disease
- A notice posted
- Is this a thing? Don't pigeons just exist?
- Not really a large problem.
- I am not familiar with this issue.
- I think the coops are an eyesore. It might hurt the property values of neighbouring homes.
- No. Absolutely not. We had pigeons being raised in our neighbourhood a few years ago. They were noisy, stinky, and never stayed in their own yards. Pigeon poop is toxic and they leave a mess wherever they roost.
- No opinion



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Can be a nuisance. They are noisy and dirty. Pigeons should be controlled by their owners.
- They are becoming a blessed nuisance. Remove them.
- I agree with the guidelines already set out.
- I have no issues with this as they are already lots of pigeons around.
- Under proper licensing yes if they are just used for racing/homing. If used for food limit flock size so they don't get out of control.
- Sure.
- Nothing
- Should not be allowed.
- urban pigeons are safe too
- NO, I am continuously cleaning up pigeon poo on my patio and this can cause sickness in my dogs!
- Haven't encountered this, but same as above regarding cleanliness and knowledge of location.
- Disease control is important. Size of owned flocks should be controlled. Proof of ownership will be an issue. Responsibilities for bird waste may be problem for liability reasons. This may require the City not allowing regulated ownership.
- Sure- as long as they are cared for
- I am in favour of pigeons
- If pigeons are truly raised for racing or homing there shouldn't be a problem with them roosting on others' property. Should have feedback from neighbors before permitting.
- Yes within a limit..if they are racers or homing
- nothing
- Limit to number allowed on a property, guidelines and resources on housing and care.
- Guidelines to ensure birds are kept healthy to prevent spread of disease.
- Worst and most poorly controlled aspect of animals in city. If someone belongs to a pigeon club then there does not seem to be any limit to the numbers they can have. Mess, noise, no recourse for affected neighbours.
- Good animal husbandry so they do not become a nuisance to neighbours.
- Not a huge fan of this because they are super noisy. I wouldn't feel unsafe, but I would worry about disrupting local bird populations and drawing in predators if they were kept outdoors.
- Never
- I think current regulations are satisfactory.
- Home owners need to be held accountable for fostering environments that do not give pigeons a place to roost - ie my last apartment had them living in the rafters due to landlord neglect
- Is there any system that monitors the wellbeing of these animals?
- No issue. Already exists in small numbers.
- Good hygiene.
- Like livestock there is no reason to keep pigeons, but an exemption may be provided for small flocks of homing or racing pigeons.
- Continue the membership requirement for pigeons.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not allowed. The pigeons even when belonging to clubs fly over neighbouring homes and release droppings all over. The owners do not go around to clean up after them. Should not be allowed.
- Really ??? Do we not have enough pigeons already pooping over everything in our yards and houses. Could be a health risk as well. Lets keep things as clean as possible.
- I mean, they can't be worse than magpies, and there's nothing we can do about those little annoyances...
- No issues with current laws
- As above
- Urban Pigeons should fall under the livestock rule, and should not be allowed in the city. As with pigeons, we are fortunate to have many small acreages near Calgary where owning and raising pigeons is possible, and would be better for both neighbours and the pigeons.
- I dont know enough about Urban pigeons.
- No restrictions necessary. Use existing nuisance laws as needed
- This should not be allowed
- I think the current rules are sufficient. There should also be a way for neighbors to effectively launch a complaint against owners regarding noise, hygiene, etc. Ideally urban pigeons should not be permitted to be free-flying and perhaps restricted to aviary cages to reduce impact on neighbors
- Licensed annually with a restriction on numbers a household can have per min space requirement - up to certain amount per person over legal age. Include short course on proper husbandry of pigeons and identification of local vet that practices medicine for pigeons as part of course.
- They carry too many diseases and are extremely annoying and loud. They should not be allowed.
- Look at any city. Urban pigeons are a disasterous plague with out-of-control roosting and crapping everywhere. Ugly spkies adorn the buildings in sad failed efforts to stop their roosting. We don't need to encourage that.
- Should not be allowed in urban areas, as these leave your property and leave waste on other property, roofs and fencing. And how does an average person understand "appropriate" pigeon identification?
- Pigeons cause health hazards by their droppings. They also cause a nuisance by their noise.
- Maybe so under 15 pigeons as pets
- As long as they're housed properly, they're a fantastic source of food, and fertilizer for the garden.
- Disallow.
- See above.
- done properly, why not?
- As with the chickens and ducks above, I see no reason why people can't have pigeons so long as the number of birds allowed is appropriate for the space available and the neighbourhood density. Probably a max of 4 birds (whether pigeon or otherwise) per house unless significant space is available.
- Bad idea. I live near a backyard full of pigeons and there is poo everywhere and they are annoying.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- In favour. Must be monitored and stringent penalties enforced if animals are not sufficiently provided for both physically and psychologically.
- Limited in number.
- No concern. They are not threatening in any way. And by the way, it's already happening in many areas. Someone's pigeons ate all the new grass seed when an off leash area was re-developed in my community.
- A maximum amount of pigeons per sq ft/coop. Inspections for cleanliness and disease prevention. Methods in place to ensure they are not attracting wildlife to the area i.e. birds of prey/coyotes/mice etc.
- Pigeons are gross, how can we get rid of these flying rats
- This is a thing???
- Again, why? This is definitely not what the pigeons want! It's a really stupid 'hobby'! It should definitely be against the law!
- Yes, but I think there should be permits given in order to keep and obtain such creatures. I think residents should have to apply for the permit. Applications should include home checks and husbandry exams.
- Ensure that it does no interfere with neighbours' enjoyment of their own property
- In order for me to feel reasonably safe in areas where there is urban pigeon keeping, i would require there to be rules and regulations. Pigeons should be licensed and pigeon keepers limited to a certain number of birds. The pigeons must be tagged, as to identify pet vs wild animal.
- Nope! Nope! Nope!
- The bylaws in place seem sufficient currently. Frequent removal of waste and a clean, healthy environment for the birds would be my only concern
- No, unless for eating. Limit number of pigeons because they make a mess.
- We have problems already with wild pigeons. Don't need anymore.
- Go for it. Doesn't hurt anyone.
- No. There is no need for this.
- nothing wrong with pigeons!
- I like the current regulations.
- they must be kept in an enclosure with a top or screen cover so that they are not causing damage to neighboring properties and must be kept very clean so as to not attract rodents
- none
- A license, welfare checks.
- Only racing and homing pigeons should be allowed and caged when not racing/coming home, and cages must be clean and all possible noise dampening must be done.
- I'm not sure anything needs to be changed other than perhaps some sort of disease testing/reporting of certain diseases.
- Disease control and mitigation of smell



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't really understand why the bylaw should be different for pigeons vs. other livestock. I think any small animal livestock should be permitted.
- I really don't agree with urban Pigeons as I constantly need to deal with pigeon shit on my vehicles as they sit on the power lines right above my carport or sit on my eaves or fence and shit all over the place for me to clean up homes and yard
- Yum.
- As per existing rules.
- I grew up with them in our neighborhood and had a few friends who raised show and racing pigeons. If the space is available and the clean-up is done regularly, no problem.
- I'm not sold on the idea of pigeons. I like pigeons but I don't know how you would expect owners to contain them to their yard. I worry about the welfare of pigeons or other flight birds that can escape yards. If they would be contained to a property I am on board.
- I don't know much about pigeons. Are they loud? Do they help sustain the human food chain?
- Current regulations seem fine. I can't imagine there are that many pigeon keepers in the city.
- Should be discouraged. I work with a wildlife rescue, and we have found that owners of banded pigeons can't be bothered to collect them if they end up at the rescue. too often they let their birds go and they end up feral . They are such dirty birds.
- Same as now
- perhaps a limit on amount of pigeons to keep from them becoming a nuisance
- I also believe that urban pigeons are fine as long as they are well taken care of and are kept in certain places.
- no no no no.... yuck... no. ... disease carrying rats with wings.... no
- Hard no
- licence requirement
- Only be allowed a certain amount
- Kept in structure so not disturbing neighbors.
- No issues with urban pigeons but maybe limit the number of birds depending on the property size, urban density, etc.
- I didn't know this was a thing, so cannot comment.
- Proper guideline for how many and proper housing
- WHY?? They're messy and noisy and I can't see why anyone wants them.
- I do not support urban pigeons. Common pathogens transmitted from pigeons to humans are E. coli, encephalitis, histoplasmosis (respiratory disease from fungus growing in pigeon droppings, which can be fatal), candidiasis and salmonellosis. A flock of pigeons covered my house in droppings for years.
- No opinion
- Nothing.
- I don't understand why we allow these and not chickens.
- Pigeons are messy and noisy and not needed in anyone's backyard.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- We had a neighbour who had pigeons. They were not a problem, but he had a large yard. In my opinion, pigeons are fine, but their coop should be kept a minimum distance from neighbours homes/buildings.
- No concerns with this. Should be fine for raising squab or racing pigeons.
- Not a fan, but that is my personal issue.
- Containment and waste clean-up
- Limit to number, complaints handled on case by case basis. Care standards
- sure with limits of no more than 10 birds
- Sure
- should not inconvenience their neighbours - safety (allergies), noise and/or smell
- The description of the current requirements seem appropriate. Perhaps requirements around locations of the roosts to mitigate any impact on immediate neighbours.
- Pigeons are not a concern, again as long as they are cared for and not neglected.
- Cleanliness and smell should be considered. Neighbours should be consulted.
- Where do these urban pigeons defecate? You cant regulate that and I don't want to be cleaning more pigeon feces off my fence and vehicles.
- Waste removal properly
- There should be no negative impact to their surroundings.
- While I'm not a fan, I shouldn't decide for others. Contact those who do have urban pigeons and have an open conversation
- They should be actively culled.
- No issues as I believe most are trained so they are not a nuisance.
- So long as the pigeons are well trained and the owner is properly licensed this should not be an issue. Pigeons are everywhere, rats of the sky, the only ones left in Alberta, we may as well put them to use.
- why not? as long as their area is well kept.
- Education and by law codes
- They are everywhere already...not worried one bit.
- Nothing.
- Nope. Not interested in pigeons pooping all over the place.
- None
- Disease, smell and noise. Since there is no way to control pigeons, anyone living nearby has to put up with the smell and mess left behind
- Licensing, standards, and policies. Specifically related to cleanliness.
- Health and safety. Responsible housing.
- Sanitation bylaws and animal welfare laws.
- Pigeons should be allowed. Other bird fanciers are allowed, why not pigeons? They are common in other countries and cultures as pets and a hobby animal.
- No!! Too many problems with noise, smell etc from unkept enclosures



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Sure
- If people want them...
- I cannot support urban pigeons. It is not possible to keep them on their own property.
- No living next to a coop would be a nightmare noise
- Every family should be allowed own pigeons on their property if cared for properly.
- The current rules are fine.
- Yes! Continue current legislation
- opposed
- Pigeons are fine but what happens when the mess they can cause isn't cleaned up. Fines implemented.
- NO
- Compliance to set rules such as keeping yard clean from pigeons waste to limit smell/flies/rodents/disease
Proper disposal of waste - not just thrown in alley
- Keep them penned on their property and not pooping on their neighbors. Keep the pens clean so they don't smell for the neighbours.
- I have never felt threatened by pigeons
- Don't like them in the city as they are smelly and ruins places with droppings.
- I certainly don't want livestock in my neighbours yard.
- Same as bees, that seems pretty safe. The smell or accumulation of feces would be an issue.
- Same as livestock.
- Proper containment, clean-up and noise management.
- No, this should not be a thing. Pigeons are pests everywhere else and they can't be contained to an owners house or yard. Hard no
- Yes.
- Why not!
- Lot size/space requirements and waste removal.
- With proper facilities to prevent noise and smells from feces, it's possible. Like on top of a tall building. In a typical R1, it would cause too much conflict
- No, why is this necessary? Why would racing pigeons be relevant in 2020?
- Quantity.
- Existing bylaw should stand
- Proper home for the pigeons
- Is this an issue. Leave it as is.
- Again, noise, fecal matter is a challenge. Attracts hunt birds which impacts cats and dogs.
- I don't see any pigeons around, which is fine by me. Don't encourage them.
- That they are properly housed on the owners property
- If they are quiet and clean it's OK, if they make a mess the owner should clean it up. Birds already poop places now and you can't stop them so as long as they don't make a big mess it's OK.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think that's a bit much to allow these. Don't they carry disease without providing benefits?
- Again I don't understand how people could feel unsafe around pigeons
- We have enough wild pigeons in the city.
- Appropriate pigeon storage/coops. Some measures to minimize things like smell and overcrowding
- control numbers, control noise, control smell, control disease, control shelter, control disturbance to my property. make sure those keeping pigeons are educated in pigeon care and accountable for their animals
- No opinion
- I'd want to be sure there is no smell or noise affecting my property. I wouldn't want the pigeons on my property.
- I'm good with urban pigeons - only thing would be a process to deal with complaints if there was an extreme issue
- Not a problem.
- I theoretically support the practice, but can understand how issues could arise or neighbours may have concerns. Is this something that could be solved by following a process like the Dev Permit process, where you apply, meet certain conditions, and neighbours can give feedback?
- There are already pigeons everywhere. What's a few more?
- Proper pigeon coops, quantity regulations, regular inspections, registration and tagging
- No strong opinions.
- Nothing - as long as the owner is responsible pigeons are fine.
- No. For the same reasons as above
- Same as Urban Livestock. Smells, noise, and disruption to neighbours.
- Well now they are messy. And do eat the bird seeds at the feeders.
- I feel that urban pigeons should be permitted. Ideally proper education (website/workshops) avail for good husbandry/responsible pet owners/ neighbours. Noise levels/odours/mess could be addressed/enforced similar to dogs. proper housing/space needs to be available to ensure happy/healthy animals.
- Pigeons should be kept in proper enclosures and should not be allowed to fly free to poop in other people's' property.
- One pigeon is cute(?), Sounds nice and is fine. Multiple birds are loud, smelly and can attract predator animals. Who wants that next door??
- keep it as it is at the moment
- I love the sound and flight of allbirds.
- Limit to numbers
- As above.
- not allowed in the city
- I also support backyard pigeon keeping, within reasonable numbers and with clear guidelines and expectations on keepers.
- NO, Pigeons are rats with wings!!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No idea about this.
- Similar to my opinion on poultry, my primary concern is what guidelines would keep the birds safe and secure, while not disturbing neighbours or enticing additional wildlife to the neighbourhood.
- No. I have a bird phobia and having chickens, pigeons, or other birds maintained in an outside enclosure would force me to sell my home and face a financial loss at this stage in our economy. I have dealt with psychologist and psychotherapist with no cure for my issue.
- Nothing needed
- They need to be kept on the owner's property and not poop on neighbour's property.
- Reasonable limits on how many
- Should be culled. Carry diseases
- Smell and noise should be kept under control. Limit number to prevent crap landing excessively in neighbouring properties.
- Bylaws to ensure they are properly cared for and some kind of capacity restrictions.
- I have no safety concerns with urban pigeons but do feel that they too should be confined to cages and not allowed to roam freely.
- Nothing can fix this ridiculous notion. This should be banned. It has no place in an urban environment.
- I don't know much about pigeons. I have no opinion.
- Belong to the appropriate clubs and provide appropriate housing
- Also seem like a reasonable thing. Just need to make sure like all these, it is within reason. Up to ## number of chickens and pigeons is fine. But 100 may be too much. But that goes for dogs and cats too!
- keep them in your own yard. I object to them sitting on my roof, my vehicle etc and the damage their droppings cause.
- Ways to prevent the pigeons from hanging out at my place all the time and pooping all over my stuff when they belong to a neighbour. A limit on the number of pigeons in a given area would be good too since they all like to congregate together. Don't want each of my neighbours to start raising them
- I like pigeons and think that there is no issue in keeping them as long as they are housed appropriately and are active participants in the hobby. I understand potential noise, smell, and feces concerns from neighbours.
- Same as livestock.
- Have not had any experience with pigeons used for racing or homing. Noise might be a negative aspect for neighbors. A barking dog can be brought inside the home, but what are the living arrangements for pigeons?
- Absolutely not.
- Same as chickens, I don't think there is a huge crowd interested in this, but as long as it is kept to a reasonable amount and standards of cleanliness are upheld, this sounds great.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I have no problems with pet pigeons. They are quiet animals and are not messy. I think it is kind of silly that there are restrictions on owning pigeons in Calgary.
- Similar to bees, if someone wants to have pigeons they must announce it if they are intending the animals to leave the property
- If you want to raise pigeons then move to an acreage.
- Again, more potential for trouble and difficulty. Should be banned.
- Only on large properties. License requirements
- Because pigeons have become a real pest in the past decade, I don't think they should be kept within the city.
- Proper care and training
- No concerns. Maybe noise enforcement if too many and they get too loud.
- I have no issues with people keeping pigeons. I'm thinking of trying it myself.
- Nothing. I feel safe wherever they are placed.
- I am in principle in favor, but would like to see mitigation strategies for nuisance and salmonella. Clear identification of individual birds and accountability of the bird owner.
- No issue whatsoever. The more the merrier!
- As long as the owner keeps their cages clean there is no problem.
- Permits only and regulated
- No, too noisy and bring disease.
- Some problem as with other urban animals. How do you balance one person's desire to keep them with their neighbour's allergies, desire for quiet, etc.?
- Same thing as livestock
- Indifferent as long as they are maintained and a minimum of basic needs are being met.
- No opinion
- Not in my neighborhood. They should not be allowed in residential communities.
- Noseplug
- Pigeons are gross. But if these people have proper training and education then sure. Just limit how many they can have.
- Definitely not, they are destructive and carry disease and not native to the area
- Same for chickens- clean living areas and limit on numbers
- I don't know much about pigeons. Probably the same as above. Far enough away so there is no noise or smell.
- As above. If you can keep pigeons then you should be allowed to
Keep other.
- Nope, just a nuisance!
- Only if back yard is big enough and they are kept clean and stay off my roof
- A limit should be in place and random inspections of living conditions. Disposal of waste needs to well managed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- NO. The public feeds them and they leave feces absolutely everywhere and it's not healthy or pleasant, esp when you live in a building and you can't spray it off your balcony/furniture. Very loud cooing at ungodly hours. Should only be raised in permitted areas similar to horses needing a stable.
- Urban pigeons are ok as long as they are deterred from the airport and not allowed to congregate in one area allowing for a build up of dropping and uncleanliness.
- There is someone near us with them and they are very respectful
- Same as bees
- Really? Don't we have enough around anyway. Wild pigeons are fine but to have a coop in the city I worry about the smell, mess, disease and noise.
- Current pigeon bylaws seem to be adequate. Again noise and odors need to be considered.
- Absolutely not as they are very noisy and their excrement causes damage to building.
- Funny this is the topic as I watched a documentary on this the other day . Lots of homeless people eat Pigeon. Apparently if the birds are disease free one pigeon is enough to feed one person.
I would 100% only allow vaccinated birds. We don't need another Chinese bird epidemic.
- I don't know anything about keeping pigeons. I'm sure it is also simple to have a system in place to make it safe and healthy.
- No info
- They are pretty messy and vocal so would want a bylaw to limit the numbers to a dull roar.
- Don't know
- Nothing.
- I have no problems with people keeping pigeons.
- No concerns, raising for eggs/ meat/ fertilizer should be allowed
- I agree with current policies.
- Nope.
- Unsure
- No way. Nothing would make this right
- No same reasons, also messy noisy birds for what reason?
- Education required before ownership.
- Nothing, they're pigeons.
- no idea what this is for? to eat them? if so. let people do what they want unless it becomes a neighborhood nuisance.
- Responsible individuals who know what they are doing. Should require a permit/course to verify knowledge base. Periodic check-ins to enforce base standards.
- Should not be allowed. The pigeon community already abandons hundreds of birds a year, creating a nuisance of non-wild pigeons that rescues have to deal with. Are a vector for zoonotic diseases.
- Limit flock size and mandate yearly health check by a qualified avian veterinarian for ALL birds on the property.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ensure they can't get loose and breed (increase wild populations). There are a couple wild pigeons that live in my area and they are quite loud. I don't mind them but if their numbers were to grow, they would be quite a nuisance.
- Oversight to see that the pigeons are being handled in a way that is appropriate for their health & that no problems are being caused for the community.
- No comment
- No concerns
- I'll defer opinion.
- I believe it should be illegal to breed and keep pigeons. They cause property damage, are known carriers of disease and are not native to this region. I'd like to see them disallowed.
- I have no issue with someone wanting to raise pigeons, however, numbers should be regulated as well as housing.
- The regulations seem good as is.
- Love them!
- I don't think it should be legal to breed or own pigeons in the city. Owners are not keeping their pigeons on their own property. They cause damage to other homes nearby as well as spread disease.
- Maximum counts of pigeons, proper housing. No pigeons roaming free, kept within certain boundaries (caged areas perhaps).
- Gross what purpose would these serve?
- permit and course to ensure animal safety/hygiene and community safety
- Pigeons re already in the city, why do people want them as pets?
- No opinion at this time.
- Approval needed for large structures
- Can they be neutered? I'm not a pigeon person to know that. But I don't think they should be allowed out to breed or catch disease from wild birds. Clipping wings is cruel, so I'm thinking a no to birds of flight.
- Leave them alone! They are beautiful creatures!
- Should fall among pet limitations... I. E. If noise, waste or smell disturb neighbours, it must be limited. But a couple of cooing pigeons in someone's yard is no more disruptive than barking dogs or noisy cats.
- Not really sure
- Keep the regulations the same
- A permit or license process.
- Only a limited numbers because they usually make some noise. To have their pigeons shelter in the car corner of the back yard.
- Pigeons should NOT be allowed in the city, period.
- Make it ILLEGAL to House pigeons in residential areas! You can't have chickens but you can have a couple dozen pigeons crapping all over neighboring houses and yards! Flying as a group so low



over the fence that it scares the crap out of you! How bout when we have downed pigeons in our yard. Grrr

- I didn't know this was something that people do, so I have no opinion.
- No. Predators plus attracting rodents.
- I don't like urban pigeons, as they make a mess, and their waste can make you real sick! Someone near us has some, and they are always around our complex defecating everywhere during the summer months.
- My concern would be for the welfare of the pigeons when people abuse them for racing
- No opinion
- Never met anyone who keeps pigeons.
They are closely related to parrots and more intelligent than people give them credit for.
I see no problem with people keeping pigeons as long as they are responsible
- I like pigeons. The current laws sound good to me
- Too messy! Health hazard.
- I don't know enough about pigeons but I see no issue.
- Education
- potential to contribute to the feral pigeon population
- They must be good to eat?
- Again, I am concerned about neglect and abuse. SPCA already overwhelmed with pets, why add livestock etc to the mix.
- I enjoy the pigeons who visit my bird feeder. It appears the current regulations work well.
- This is tough because when the pigeons are out they might nest in other places and poop everywhere. They also spread and might make our pigeon problems (ie PLC parking) worse. They'd have to be contained.
- Hell no. We have too many pest birds around already.
- I feel pigeon coops are best kept on a farm, not in the city. As much as pigeon racing is a hobby for some, the ability to keep 25-100 pigeons in a backyard will cause disruptions in an urban setting.
- Pigeons have been a sustainable food source for thousands of years! Furthermore, they are a source of phosphorus which will peak globally in 2030. Cities are going to be needing to contribute to the food supply globally in the coming decade. Manure from all livestock is going to play an important r
- Are the pigeons trained as messenger pigeons or just a colony of birds? There is a difference. If it is part of a sport such as messenger pigeons fine. But if not then no because of potential overpopulation and invasiveness.
- Should not be allowed as they are a nuisance.
- Why?
- Definitely not, due to to their mess, waste, smell and noise. Very unsanitary. Could contribute to disease. Negative impact on neighborhoods.
- again, there might be the low risk of a zoonotic disease; keep the maximum number of animals low.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I guess they can make a mess but how do you control that. Maybe limit the number of birds to a reasonable amount.
- This appears to be in place already however I personally would not want to live next to a pigeon owner.
- Appropriate coops, keeper training, club associations as stated, pigeon registration (theft is a big problem) and vaccination records.
- Too late. They're everywhere already.
- indifferent, fine as is
- Very strict rules on allowing the pigeons from cages, strict cleanup measures.
- I don't know much about pigeons... as long as they aren't noisy.
- Should be banned. It's an unreasonable hobby for a city.
- What are the benefits of urban pigeons? How do they positively impact our urban environment? Visual public information to answer such questions is important.
- Absolutely not. They are a disturbance to others enjoyment of their property. They attract pests such as mice, squirrels, skunks, magpies, ravens, wild pigeons and other bird species that learn to rely on the free food thrown about by the pigeons. I had an illegal coop beside me took 1 yr to shut
- No. They leave a message when they leave their cages and are consistently loud, unlike bees and chickens.
- I'm a little worried about the mess, but open to the idea if I know that this can be mitigated.
- The city wants to increase density in the inner city. We already have neighbours in very close proximity. If you add any type of "pet" such as pigeons, there will be health stresses on the neighbours (e.g., pigeon poop, noise etc). In trying to accommodate a few people, it's unfair to the majority.
- Small live stock is acceptable if kept in reasonable numbers, clean and noise generation is considered.
- Permits, restricted numbers, etc.
- Fine as far as I am concerned as long as the noise and odor is not disturbing neighbours.
- Current pigeon population is already a nuisance. There is no need to introduce more.
- The current bylaw is sufficient. Pigeons are also very loud and smelly.
- As long as the animals can be well cared for I have no issue with pigeons.
- More bylaw enforcement resources
- Max number limits
- No - I do not want pigeon poop all over my house and yard due to pigeons being freed to fly wherever they want. NOOOOOO
- These are fine.
- Proximity mechanism for non-owners to be protected from noxious smells and nuisance sounds; protection for pigeon owner to prevent poisoning.
- I like it, no issues.
- No. Pigeons are noisy and dirty and serve no real purpose. They too present health issues.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Nothing.
- There is NO reason there should be restrictions on this. [personal information removed] They're intelligent, birds and our city always has tons. Are we really not going to talk about the rabbits tho?
- Sure. Same thing. Education is needed.
- Birds tend to make a mess that is not sanitary. We have enough issues with people not cleaning up after dogs and cats. This would not be a good idea
- - see above
- I see the same waste problem happening with pigeons. They create a ton of waste and people can't be trusted to keep up with maintenance and cleaning. They also make a very annoying sound that will disturb neighbours. This is a bad idea.
- Why would you want pigeons?
- No opinion.
- They are noisy and they stink, so no, they shouldn't be allowed.
- If people want to adopt a rescue pigeon (yes, they exist) and keep it in their home as a pet I see no trouble with that, but people should not be capturing wild pigeons to keep or raise as food. It's horribly stressful for the animal and a huge disease risk.
- Over population
- Should be limited to 1-2 and noise levels need to be low. Probably should have a min distance from adjacent properties to allow for a good balance. should be kept at least 3m away from another property to provide separation. Permit and annual inspection should be mandatory for health and welfare.
- Small numbers of pigeons should be allowed by any home dweller provided they can be cared for and kept humanely. They should be able to care for them, clean up after them and ensure they do no harm to humans or other homes. The numbers should be based on the purpose and type of enclosure.
- Get rid of them.
- Sure.
- Disruptive, keep out of suburban/ urban communities
- If it was a direct neighbour, I'd like to know they have one, and I'd like there to be a plan in place to reduce odours and noises.
- I have no problem with pigeons either as long as their numbers are restricted, they have a proper place to live and are not just let loose but are used for racing or homing.
- Raising pigeons for racing is fine, but not for consumption.
- Direction on the number. Required minimum/maximum size of both yard and habitat. Safety is not a concern, smell and nuisance are.
- pigeons are fine as long as they continue to be used for racing or homing within societies/groups
- All pigeons should be kept in cages, they should also be vaccinated and have some kind of tracking device



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A limit on the number of pigeons that could be kept and mandatory education on how to do so in a clean, quiet way that doesn't disturb neighbours.
- They don't smell great and they poop everywhere. I say restrict this one.
- I don't know the potential problems this could have.
- An umbrella and a shotgun? Just kidding. I feel safe around pigeons.
- I am opposed to the keeping of pigeons within city limits. Neighbours should not be allowed to impose their desire to keep flocks of birds on their property because of the inevitable mess created by such birds, on the nearby property of others.
- They are pigeons, they are already everywhere.... I guess a separated enclosure and cleaning of their area.
- Not allowed to perch and be free, fly free unless they are participating in a race or training exercise.
- Permitted and inspection if complaint issued. Limit per household. Transmission of disease possible if not held to proper level
- I don't know enough about pigeons to give my opinion on this
- Current restrictions seem sufficient.
- appropriate fencing and some way to manage any smells.
- There is a guy in my neighbourhood that has racing pigeons, He takes really good care of them and they have a gigantic coop and don't ever escape.
- My knowledge on this is limited but pigeons are also vectors for disease and a specialized license and rules to prevent effluent from running off the prior will be important.
- No issue
- Not sure what use these are but there are wild pigeons so what's the harm in training some?
- I really do not have an opinion on the keeping or of raising pigeons.
- Nothing.
- As long as ownership is responsible per section 27.1 this shouldn't be an issue.
- You should not be allowed to raise pigeons on your property. Dirty, noisy and not necessary.
- All for it, if people are interested. I'd say having 20 pigeons with appropriate shelter would be reasonable.
- Limits on the number of pigeons and rules against them simply being released into the wild if the owner decides to stop caring for them.
- Why?
- I don't agree with this. We had pigeons in our area and the owner moved/passed away or didn't want to deal with them anymore and just let them out. They were used to being caged and cared for. Not a humane way to deal with this
- I am fine with pigeons as long as they are for racing only. The pigeon housing must not have offensive odours.
- Neighbor of mine has pigeons. They do roam a block or two from his home. Many of the city lampposts where they roost have a lot of droppings underneath. I have to walk the dog around this. I



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

hope there is a reasonable limit to the number of pigeons per house and per city block since they do roam far

- They are already allowed? I don't know why people want them since they aren't useful, but regulate noise/numbers. [personal information removed]
- This is unfamiliar to me. Similar to chickens I'd guess but there may need to be extra care since they can fly. I think the CPFA membership is a solid requirement.
- No restriction on pigeons
- Most people would not be able to keep more than a few animals. I guess the focus should be making sure there is a reasonable amount of livestock, not over crowding.
- Pidgeon poops and roucouulous noise.
- Limit the number of birds someone may keep (say a maximum of 4). Roosts should be centrally located in owner's yard and no higher than 6 feet up.
- I think that all animals that are outdoors should be registered. There should be some rules around cleanliness and smells.
- Urban pigeons are in no way different from regular birds. The more the merrier.
- Responsible caregiver that does not allow smell, sound or waste to disturb their neighbours. Proactive, enforceable city bylaws and productive involvement for issues.
- If clean, not noisy, love it.
- Same as above, absolutely as long as waste/smells are kept to a minimum
- We currently have some pigeons in the area. They poop all over the place. No thanks//
- As long as the pigeons are not allowed to go free and become a pest to others, this is another hobby.
- Just reasonable checkups with vet clinics making sure that they are health free of diseases and parasites and make sure they have reasonable ability to get back to the owner so as to produce more pigeons then already in the city
- Don't allow it.
- No messes (poop) in neighbouring properties. Should be kept on their own property and not left to fly about freely at all hours.
- Previously had pigeons somewhere in our area & they took up residence in our roof alcove resulting in pooing over our deck for 4 yrs. They likely were abandoned by their owner. Their constant noise was challenging for our daughter to sleep in her room. HORRIBLE EXPERIENCE but they eventually moved on
- NO We had wild pigeons nesting on our roof. Cost us a fortune to get the roof pigeon safe. Now the are living two houses down and keep us awake in the warmer season when we sleep with an open window. Too risky to get more wild pigeons. People will let them free. See Python problem in Florida Keys.
- Absolutely no
- Sure
- There are enough pigeons in the city. Not acceptable.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- These I dont see any benefits in having them around my neighbourhood. especially not atop my roof.
- More information. I honestly haven't read into the pros/cons of this and would love to see some trials being done throughout the city.
- Allow unconditionally but must be kept clean and orderly.
- Limits to the number of animals allowed, requirements on the house/cage provided for the animals, vaccination requirements, rules in place to deal with the smell, waste and noise that can be associated with pigeons.
- They're fine the way they are.
- Must be tagged and of the homing type.
- Love to listen to them. Keep them here.
- Will never feel safe with pigeons. They are a nuisance in urban environment
- Lived with a pigeon coup next to our home years ago. Big mess in our yard. Filthy and smelled.
- The accountability currently in place seems to be working as far as I am aware. I have no concerns
- The same rules as for other animals regarding medical care and not being a nuisance to other people.
- Educated (maybe certified?) owners
- Pigeons are ...well pigeons. Pretty bird but very very messy. I have a neighbor who's deck is almost unusable due to pigeon droppings, but no one is sure where the birds are coming from. This is a hard one. They are a flight bird, they can travel - pretty hard to contain. Unsure of resolution
- There must be appropriate care requirements met for these birds and a limit to the amount of animals that can be kept.
- Pigeons are dirty and smell - lived next to a neighbour's pigeon coup years ago, so have experience with this.
- To keep it on farm land and not in the city!!
- For what purpose?
- Haven't noticed
- There were 50 pigeons ten doors from me for twenty years some years back. The person has since died. They were pleasant to see taking flight up there each afternoon and I miss the sight. There were no issues and urban pigeons should be restriction free.
- unsure
- Urban pigeons should be kept to being in cages as they cause a great disturbance and may have disease in the faeces. They should be allowed but roost in cages.
- Pigeons are more human than the irresponsible pet owners, they are not harming anyone. since people do not like the droppings it doesn't mean that these beautiful birds are pests. the actual pests are the irresponsible pet owners whom making more mess by leaving their pet's mess behind in public are
- I have lived in a place with pigeons. They make a terrible mess and should be gotten rid of.
- Similar to livestock, large enough back yards could be ok.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I would keep these regulations the same.
- Nope. We don't need the diseases birds and other livestock can bring when not handled properly. Leave it to the rural farmers and ranchers who know the rules. Waste products from livestock and pigeons - how will we regulate their handling?
- Again, pigeons need lots of space, not someone's backyard.
- WHAT? Why?
- Management of the animals so they do not become pests.
- Pigeons do not bother me.
- Owners responsibility to address concerns of neighbors including droppings on adjacent properties. Urban pigeons should be permitted so long as it does not adversely impact the rights of others.
- A neighbour kept racing pigeons and they were just fine. They were kept in a hutch in his backyard and he would fly them each day. The pigeons were trained to return to the hutch. Occasionally, one of our neighbourhood Merlins would take out one of the pigeons. The neighbour took it in his stride.
- That owners have education certificates to be accountable for responsible care. A cap of how many animals may be on site.
- My concern is feces in my yard and what it may contain as well as damage to my property from it.
- Many of the same issues as above -- permits, inspections.
- hat
- clean facility with a cleaning schedule
- Should not be allowed.
- I am really not a pigeon fan and think the current policies should stand. We already have enough problems with wild pigeons.
- Based on the recent articles in the media of people eating pigeons, this is of concern to me for the safety of the birds. I don't have enough knowledge to provide an opinion though.
- Nothing
- No pigeons should be allowed.
- Same feeling as urban livestock. No concerns
- A natural part of our environment.
- These needed to be regulated and if people are racing them, this is income and this needs to be regulated. They are noisy and messy which the owners aren't going to take responsibility so this is another issue and how many they can have is also an issue that needs to be taken care of.
- I see no issue with pigeon coops
- Nothing
- respond to nuisance - usually noise and defecation
- Okay if number limited and pen restricted to center of yard and reasonable rules followed re. cleanliness, dealing with droppings.
- No issues if owner is responsible.
- I have no issue with this, and feel it would be best implemented via a permit process to demonstrate proper basic knowledge of raising and care if pigeons prior to engaging in the activity.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not in my neighborhood
- I'm fine with this, as long as they are kept track of
- The pigeons should be confined/restricted to the property of the individual responsible for them. Noise, smells, and nuisance should be kept to a minimum and not disturb neighbors.
- Must be managed in a clean coop, not allowed to fly about into other yards. Management of waste, noise, odour and debris. Health management and inspection.
- Nope.
- They would be a nuisance to any neighbours so not a good idea.
- Credentials
- By-laws in appropriate housing for the pigeons and rules on how many you can have.
- Assurances that the beekeeper has been properly educated, and a process in place to evaluate neighbor concerns.
- I don't know about this one, but my statement about responsible pet ownership applies. Responsible pet ownership means that my pets/animals do not negatively impact anyone else.
- I don't care either way when it comes to pigeons. They aren't a bother and they will be in the city whether people keep them in their yards or not.
- No dirty birds. Can't control their poop. Not on my property.
- Personally I wouldn't want pigeons next door. If the current number of complaints about pigeons is low, I suspect the bylaw is adequate.
- Contained stock only. Can have a detrimental effect on surrounding areas.
- No idea.
- Wild pigeons are a dirty nuisance!! If the homeowner is limited to small numbers of "urban" pigeons and keeps them clean, no worries.
- Pigeons are like a plague. they take too long to die, they have a type of louse that can transmit disease to humans and we can't eat them. We don't need to procreate them. Sorry , No pigeons !
- Clean conditions, bird coops can be breeding grounds for dangerous viruses
- Why?
- who needs this mess all over....again, we live too close together for this....I wouldn' t want bird poop all over or the noise.
- As long as I dont have to smell it
- Too messy.
- their poops is GROSS and toxic ... but they can be raced and enjoyed by so many. I do not have enough knowledge to have perspective.
- Would not support keeping pigeons especially in suburban neighborhoods. If the pigeons escape they will negatively impact local bird species.
- No problem. Racing pigeons and homing pigeons are usually well taken care of and do not pose an issue
- I currently am unaware of recent research in this area.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I know there's a lot of pigeons in the city they seem to be in some areas just like seagulls once again I think people just get lazy and don't take their responsibilities seriously
- messy and destructive animals
- I feel there could be potential problems with how the pigeons are managed and this would be very difficult to control or enforce.
- A secure enclosure. I may have concerns about noise.
- should be ban
- Similar to most livestock, there are risks associated with nuisances like smell, noise, and environmental management with regards to their waste. An Agricultural officer/regulator would need to be employed to manage and license the practice. There should be a cap on numbers informed by policy.
- No. I love my quiet neighbourhood and enjoy having my windows open whenever weather permits. Hearing cooing pigeons would not add to the enhancement of my neighbourhood.
- Spot checks by bylaw for the cleanliness of the cages. Their feces are laden with germs. The owner needs to make sure they are not pooping all over the place or on neighbors properties.
- Set amount per household for comfort and safety of pigeons. Proper enclosures for animal well being. Eg. no overcrowding.
- I can't believe that many people want to keep pigeons. Should be sanitary, and possibly have a mental health assessment.
- I suspect the nuisance bylaw enforcement is adequate, but perhaps a guide on how many a person can have in a residential area would be prudent.
- Nothing
- Limits on the number allowed per yard
- No Comment
- I lived next door to Pigeons growing up. My neighbour had his garage outfitted with probably 30 cages where he kept them. They are dirty and very noisy. Not pleasant. I would be very unhappy if one sprang up next to me.
- Reduce the population ... if possible ...
- Never considered this and don't know much about it.
- Allow them.
- Current regulation seems sufficient.
- Noise and cleanliness. Overcrowded. That they are not being used as food.
- Dislike pigeons immensely, so not a fan of them being kept in our urban communities.
- there are pigeons everywhere. is this a problem?
- Maybe, but not a lot. They fly around and poop all over the neighbours properties.
- Urban birds not just pigeons/ chicken /quail /turkey/pheasant. a bird is a bird why be so restrictive follow animal care guide for max # safe secure housing not on property line, non disruptive of adjacent prop. Proper cleaning to prevent rodents pests etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Mandatory licensing of pigeon barns, and mandatory standard vaccinations for all pigeons. No household should be permitted to receive a license for both pigeons and pig farming at any one time.
- Absolutely opposed. Do not at all agree with the keeping pigeons within city limits. High risk with respect to public health concerns and soiling of environment and/or personal items. Restrict these animals to rural areas only.
- Should be treated same as any other livestock.
- Same as above. Pigeons are disease carriers (e.g histoplasmosis).
- Active member in local organization. This is actually really neat.
- Considering we have spent money to put pigeon spikes on our roof due to the pigeons making noise and defecating all over our deck, I do not agree with urban pigeons.
- Ensure pigeons are caged, fed, and cared for properly/ethically. Max # of birds/sqft of space should apply, or maybe an overall max # of birds per residential dwelling (I don't know what that would be. Maybe 20?)
- I think all KFCs, Popeyes, Chick-Fil-A in Calgary must immediately add Pigeons to their menu to keep their populations in check. The City can create jobs by hiring Pigeon herders to track them down and capture them
- No, no, and no. Pigeons should not be raised in the city. They are messy, dirty and carry disease. It's bad enough we have to deal with horrible dog owners and bylaws that are not enforced. We have high taxes here and bylaw officers are not strict enough when a complaint is made.
- Seems like a pandemic avian disease spreading carrier waiting to happen. Just saying.
- Confirmation that they are being used for racing or homing pigeons. Pretty sure my neighbours are eating theirs.
- Care and attention to feed, cleanliness and housing of pigeons to ensure they do not become a nuisance to others
- Urban pigeons should continue as is
- Limit numbers
- Maintain existing policy.
- As long as their noise/mess isn't interfering with neighbours reasonable enjoyment of their property I see no issue with it.
- Pigeons are a non-issue in terms of safety. There are, however, some concerns about cleanliness and sanitation. Being taken out to fly is fine, just like dogs going to an offleash park. But they shouldn't be loose all day. Likewise, not in large numbers. A small flock is fine.
- No. Same as chickens.
- Terrible idea. no redeeming features.
- No...smell and neighbor quality of life property value erosion etc.
- No
- Never
- Number, health and hygiene, shelter type.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No opinion
- No
- Yes, continue with pigeon owners belonging to an organization.
- Absolutely
- No They are noisy
- yes but again, keep limited to how many, and sound violations
- Nothing i feel safe now. Pigeons are everywhere anyways, if someone wants one as a pet they should be able to have one.
- This could get wildly out of control quickly. Provisions that manage growth and distressing neighbour relations (noise smell and excitement)
- no additional needs
- Yes this should be allowed
- Should not be allowed, Pigeons are a nuisance .
- This is ridiculous, this is what a urban area needs is more nuisance birds... Not! this is an irresponsible idea.... you will just end up with lots of complaints and causing unrest between neighbours!
- Good
- Nothing
- No.
- If the pigeons are caged, it should be OK, otherwise, it should be allowed if the interested party has the approval of all his neighbors (at least 5 houses to his side and 5 in front).
- bylaw or guidelines regarding best practices, public education and limits to project sizing for personal livestock i.e., need a property of X size for X number of pigeons etc.
- I don't know enough to comment.
- Thought we already had these? I'm good with it as long as proper hygiene is followed
- same as hens, keep in order should be ok
- No concerns.
- Unnecessary. They do not provide food and they carry disease
- - Standards of care
- - Requirement that birds be banded and registered
- See above
- pigeons are a massive nuisance, cause a mess & are loud in groups but if properly housed & trained & kept an appropriate distance away from residences then I think it's possible to find a place for them in the city. they will attract other pigeons though so they need to be well cared for & enclosed
- should not be allowed. Again, can't control where they go
- ALL THAT POOP.....NO WAY.....NO THANK YOU!!!! ABSOLUTELY NOT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- I agree with the current regulations for pigeons.
- Weird hobby, but I don't see a problem with it.
- Same as above.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not sure.
- Should not be allowed.
- Same as chickens. Existing pigeons also wake me up.
- Same as livestock
- Prevention of bird droppings on other people's property
- Nothing.
- As long as they don't cause a loud noise and are let out en masse (poop everywhere)
- Not a fan. These animals are like stray cats. You can't control where their feces goes and that is how they become known as a 'nuisance'. I don't want any of my neighbors keeping pigeons unless they are for food alone. No racing pigeons or homing pigeons.
- If they are clean, large property, no noise and not disturbing others private property, the city should be allowed to do surprise checks on all properties whether it's bees, chickens, pigeons.
- This is weird. I'm sorry, do people really want to do this? Maybe I am splitting hairs because I think chickens, also a bird, are ok.
- As above
- NO
- Maximum six birds per city lot.
- As above
- I don't know enough about this, though pigeons can be quite loud, so that would need to be considered.
- nothing at all
- No problem. All the tall new houses in our neighbourhood are attracting lots of pigeons.
- Current rules are good.
- No opinion
- Pigeons are dirty & disgusting. I'd rather focus on naturally occurring bird species. If someone truly loves pigeons & uses them for racing or homing then I'd put up with them but not an overwhelming number please
- Rubber boots
- In my opinion, I don't think that urban pigeons should be allowed.
- No
- Clean and maintained. No smell.
- As long as the animals are taken care of sure. The city allowed this in the 60s or so and we already have pigeons everywhere
- VERY well defined waste and cleanliness requirements including fines for first time violations. Fencing requirements including visibility to limit children wanting to access area. Noise control. Minimum space requirements and setbacks from neighbouring property. Small max number of animals
- There should be a regulation to cap the number of pigeons that can be kept (I have no idea how many would be reasonable) and a minimum distance between the pigeon coops and any dwelling.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I have no opinion on this other than the level of care must be that of what is expected for dogs and cats.
- Maybe I should raise falcons!
- I see them every day downtown. I am not scared of them at all.
- Sounds like its already regulated.
- No comment.
- I have no concerns about pigeons
- Pigeons can be great for food source as well. Anything is great, under the right conditions, to have a closer to home food source.
- As long as the owners clean regularly, pigeons don't make that much noise. As long as the pigeons are not let out to fly around the neighborhood, they will make a mess in other yards.
- No!!! Pigeons are dirty and noisy. I don't like paying to get someone to clean my roof.
- Pigeon feces is dangerous to other animals like cats and children not that children are animals but they do eat the feces and can get sick.
- Current system works
- As long as there is a maximum of 5 or 6, and rules for cleaning, no problem.
- To know before my neighbor installs one and knowing they've had training before bringing them to the neighborhood
- Should not be allowed at all
- Suitable housing for pigeons and similar comments as above.
- Max 5 pigeons/ per yard. Coops must be clean and pigeons must have identity bands. Injured pigeons must be cared for by the owner and a fine given when this does not happen.
- The current law seems appropriate.
- Why?
- As long as the numbers are reasonable and the cages are clean and well maintained it should be allowed.
- No problem as long as existing by laws are followed.
- Banning.
- As long as they are registered and not able to be release into the wild
- Never thought about it
- Maximum number of birds
- Enforce the current bylaw.
- Pigeons could be kept within city limits
- Why? This has no value nor does it have merit.
- Nothing
- There must be a limitation on the number of pigeons. They must be kept well away from other properties because of the noise and smell. I like the idea that pigeon owners must be a member of good standing in an association.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There are already have good guidelines for raising racing pigeons. However if raised as potential livestock would be bad idea due to popularity in some neighbourhoods which could have same problem with attracting rodents and other pests.
- Hard NO
- much better to allow chickens than pigeons, because they can be controlled. pigeons can transmit diseases like avian flu and poop down on people.
- Why not?
- no to pigeons as you can not control the mess they make by pooping all over neighbours property .i am already seeing a lot of pigeons being kept by the Asians
- pigeons can be confined to make a mess in their own yard .
- Current bylaw sounds fine
- i see no use for pigeons in a community environment as they are messy birds
- Pigeons should be allowed for racing, homing and for pets.
- Homing pigeons are generally caged and contained. It may be a noise consideration however I think magpies are the noisy ones. If something is worse than nature in terms of noise and inconvenience then perhaps address it.
- I support this. Pigeons are great
- Do not support this at all.
- I agree with current urban pigeon regulations.
- No!! My brother had a neighbour who had hundreds of birds. The noise and stink of excrement was unbearable, there were mice everywhere, and it took years to have the city deal with this. A sad mental health situation and a horror for all of the neighbours!!
- Once again a limit on numbers and clean up would be good.
- I don't see any reason someone can't keep pigeons. Same as I said for chickens, as long as the owner is educated, and keeps the area clean and doesn't allow the feces to accumulate and smell.
- I didn't even know this was a thing
- No. Pigeons are an invasive species
- No pigeons should be kept within city limits.
- I am supportive of urban pigeons.
- Same as for chickens and bees - if kept to a very small number and parameters for coops defined.
- Sure.
- No issues as long as contained. Not to roam freely in neighbourhood, to return home to roost. Keep enclosure clean.
- Proper housing
- Why have urban pigeons at all? What purpose do they serve?
- Coo coo! I didn't know this was a thing! Love it.
- No problem with pigeons
- I don't think they should be allowed. They're noisy and smelly and carry disease.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Continued strict licensing/enforcement already in place. Responsibility of pigeon owner for any damage/necessary clean-up which occurs to neighbourhood properties.
- Ummm, really?
- Educate the neighbors
- There is no reason to feel unsafe around urban pigeons
- Pigeons should be allowed in the City with a permit. Permit conditions should make sure owners clean up and care for their pigeons to avoid odors.
- Keeping the cleanliness of the area and health of the humans around the coop is important
- what would be the purpose of this?
- Nothing really, except a stock limit per hectare to prevent over stocking.
- Regulations regarding fecal matter clean-up.
- Not a big problem where I live. The local wild life 'looks after them' for us.
- Sure!
- Awesome, more people should trap them feed them and them eat them.
- I strongly disagree. We had neighbours with pigeons and they're noisy and extremely messy. Bird crap everywhere!
- There is nothing about urban pigeon husbandry which makes me feel unsafe.
- Manageable numbers of animals, sanitary, safe living conditions.
- no concerns or opinions
- Nothing.
- I guess if they are in good standing with associations there is an assumption that they are properly cared for and cleaned up after. However I have concerns with disease feces and smell.
- Maintaining proper sanitation and hygiene around such sites is key for health and safety.
- [personal information removed] They're amazing pets and excellent game birds and trapping and raising them is a unique and fulfilling passion! Current laws are actually very open and reasonable though.
- We already have enough pigeons.
- These are filthy animals and at no time should they be allowed to live in the city.
- A limit on the number of pigeons
- Current standards still and a limit on the number of pigeons you can have. Maybe a course online so you know how to care for them properly
- Just no!!
- Nothing.
- I have no issues with pigeons. Really the city would just need to ensure there are proper washing groups so as to make sure we are not overrun with pidgeon poop. Also since Pigeons can carry disease, we need to keep an eye on that and have policies in place that regular health checks are performed.
- I do not have personal safety concerns with the backyard keeping of pigeons.
- Nothing.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No issues with these birds.
- No
- No concern with current bylaw
- Adequate shelter and maintenance
- Never. Only in rural areas. Have you every heard a flock of pigeons cooing?? Very loud and annoying.
- Owner education/permit
- First, icky. Second, there would need to be a reasonable cap on the number of birds they are allowed to keep.
- Yes, they will go home every night and I love seeing them fly. They need shelter, food, water and roosts.
- Lots of droppings and sometimes over-population when they mate and they carry diseases. They are scavengers. Due to overpopulation there should be safe and humane bird deterrents to get rid of them.
- I guess? I did not know this was something people still did. This would need to be done responsibly to prevent pet pigeons from leading to an urban pigeon nuisance, I think the current bylaw cited above sounds reasonable.
- Again, no issues with urban pigeons.
- So long as there was no damage to other's property and, in the event there was, the owners of the pigeons were responsible for remediation.
- Ok but with limit of 5 birds per property.
- This should not be allowed in the city. The pigeons are noisy and might smell, plus carry disease.
- I think the current system is probably right on this one: pigeons could quickly get out of hand if not monitored closely. Unless we go back to using them as a food source..
- Same as chicken care. Proof of proper ownership, care and housing
- I do not want nor support urban pigeons and do not appreciate leading questions on these surveys. There is more at stake than what citizens 'need to feel safe' (leading them to either approve or disapprove of this). Poor effort by administration or council, again.
- Pigeons should be able to roam free and spaces be provided so they do not make their nests everywhere.
- A roost fpr them.
- Same as keeping urban livestock. Apply Responsible Pet Ownership Regulation section 27.1
- As long as noise bylaws are respected, the animal is being cared for (fresh food and water) with proper disease management and poop is cleaned up I'm ok with it.
- Pigeons need to be contained to a soundproof coup and not able to be released.
- No concerns
- No comments, seems strange to keep sporting birds. This is the first time I have heard of people wanting to keep pigeons in Calgary.
- Existing laws are adequate.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Too many on the railways here already.
- It seems unnecessary to keep pigeons.
- Absolutely not. Messy messy messy. Poop everywhere and noisy. Scared away little native birds.
- Not in the city
- I have not encountered pigeons in Calgary but it would make me uncomfortable to live alongside them.
- Adequate and sanitary living conditions for animals
- stay the same.
- Nothing
- Definitely need to be licensed and monitored regularly -- maybe annual certification?
- I don't even know how I'd be able to tell which ones were owned by people and which ones were wild. They should be allowed to be farmed for meat as well as racing.
- As long as they're not affecting native bird populations and other populations, and are well taken care of, there shouldn't be an issue with it.
- no thanks
- Please allow urban chickens. As long as you keep restrictions on how many are allowed to be kept and that they be hens to eliminate rooster noise, this would greatly improve community an health and enjoyment. Fresh eggs!!
- Limit amount of pigeons kept further into city centre core.
- Nothing.
- Ammend current regulations. Ammendment is to allow the raising of pigeons for meat, same rules as chickens: secure, healthy, housed, watered, fed.
- With adequate space/setup/permit they should continue to be allowed.
- Pigeons are known to carry diseases and should not be permitted inside city limits.
- No experience so no comment.
- Again a limit and flyways that are not directly over neighbours' yards or vehicles, their excrement is very acidic and causes body damage over time to vehicles,
- I don't have any concerns other than controlling the mess they make - cleaning up droppings. For all three areas, the city will need more bylaw enforcement officers to deal with negative impacts from people who don't follow the regulations
- A maximum of four birds at a time.
- No. They are loud, messy and damage private property
- We have them in our neighbourhood and there is no problem. The owners must be responsible.
- Not allowed
- Nothing but I don't like them pooping everywhere.
- No
- Urban pigeons would be a fun hobby, but I don't know enough about them to fully comment.
- no thanks to this as well
- Zero issue or conflict



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No. Due to biosecurity, diseases, manure control, noise. These need to be monitored for care, abuse, cleanliness etc.
- I don't have a stand on the subject, but I would say birds need to be in a safe and clean environment
- - there is nothing that can be put in place to make me feel safe. The odour and noise from these animals can not be contained in close living quarters that homes in an urban setting are located.
- Nope. Too messy and noisy unless owners can follow the rules.
- No Pigeons . My neighbor just spent thousands of dollars trying to get rid of pigeons from her roof rafters. It is even absurd that the CITY is even considering this
- I have concerns about how these birds interact with other domestic pets and local wildlife.
- If the pigeons are not damaging property, I am OK with the existing bylaw. Since we cannot prevent the wild ones, we need to prevent damage to buildings in any case.
- Permit and consultation with and approval by adjacent and affected neighbours
- Same as above. Needs sufficient space and clean operations.
- Pigeons make good pets!! They can easily be contained in a pen, and are not the dirty fiends that pest control companies like to portray them to be. Many people have a pigeon as an indoor house pet, just like a parrot. I don't think there is any logic to make joining a club mandatory.
- Same as #2.
- This should not be allowed
- Na
- Agree owners should be a member in good standing of the CRPC or CPFA, etc.
- Yum--squab! If people want to keep them for homing/racing, I guess that's cool. Odd, but cool.
- No opinion.
- Responsibility..training
- Quiet and no mess or bad smells that disturb the neighborhood
- Allow pigeons for meat or pets. (max 12).
- I also do not have a problem with people keeping pigeons in the city. I do not even think it is bad if people raise them for food as long as they are kept tidily on their owners property.
- Caged
- Why the hell. No. You don't need to race pigeons. But if you have the space and the ability to care for em , you do you.
- This seems pretty harmless, I don't have any safety concerns
- I don't know much about urban pigeons, but in general more freedoms for Calgarians the better, provided it's not affecting the quality of life of others.
- Signage indicating urban pigeon sanctuary.
- I'm completely ok with it as stands
- We do have two pigeons that come to our yard along with other birds on a regular basis not sure they are a problem as yet. Hope not.
- Notice provided to neighbors in vicinity as pigeons cannot be contained and can be quite messy. Would like the opportunity to protest this in my community.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Adequate facility
- To feel safe with urban pigeons I would like to see them equipped with lasers that will allow them to effectively eradicate magpies. If lasers are not available, some other form of weaponry that would result in the pigeons triumphing over the evil magpie would be suitable.
- Nothing.
- Cage.
- Concerns with the diseases they carry. Require owners to keep birds disease free. Prevent birds from nesting in neighbours balcony etc.
- Required notification of neighbors. Bylaws to enforce cleanliness and noise.
- The number of pigeons should be limited for noise levels, and also to a number that can reasonably be kept clean and housed appropriately. That would vary depending on yard and/or garage (or similar) space. constraints.
- Gross, no thanks
- Yes! And chickens! And goats for pest control!
- Pigeons are an issue. They are too loud and feces are all over the house/deck
- Ensuring that all pigeons are banded to help ensure owners are liable for sick/injured birds.
- Ensure space and care is sufficient, and that noise/ smell can be contained to not disturb neighbors.
- Again lack of knowledge on my part.
- Proper care and housing of pigeons including hygiene and cleanliness. ID on pigeons who get lost so they can be returned safely.
- Should not be allowed
- I think it's fine if they're not free roaming
- I do not see a safety issue with this, as long as all needs of the pigeons are met.
- Meh. If someone wants one, and it makes them happy, who am I or you to judge? Who says and why do they need to be apart of some elitist club in order to have one?
- No
- messy and noisy.
- Why??
- Havent encountered any problem so far.
- Nothing, they are clean and welcome
- Gross
- Not in favour at all.
- Reasonable knowledge on the part of the pigeon keeper.
- I don't know enough
- Smell is the main issue so housing of the birds is important
- They already allow this so I see no issue
- Concerned about the noise and smell factors
- Should not be allowed in the City under any circumstance.
- good idea



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No concerns.
- awareness and knowing proper safety measures are implemented, noise control, cleanliness
- Absurd... they are a bother to everyone around them and directly effect everyone living near these properties. Should be contained to aviaries or special rural properties.
- Homing/racing pigeons is a long tradition & residents should be either part of an organisation to make sure they are taking the proper precautions in the care of the the birds. Keeping Bees & Urban livestock should be the same, part of a member organisation & checks made regular for Pigeon welfare.
- As is.
- Seems like a neat hobby. No concerns other then excessive poo being a problem but a responsible owner would manage this.
- Same as above.
- I agree with current regulations.
- This is kind of gross. Keep it how it is. People don't need to keep pigeons unless they are using them for the racing like the current bylaw
- Pigeons 8
- Same as above! And for personal use only. Should have extra cost and inspections to ensure a proper number of animals and housing for them
- They've been around for a good long time. Let them be.
- No, don't need the noise and dung. Plus near Fish Creek, it will only attract bob cats etc to eat them as they do with squirrels.
- Too much poop.
- Yes, so long as it doesn't interfere with the neighbours' enjoyment of their property.
- One of my neighbors has a rather large coupe. Seems as though there are many that hang out on peoples homes in Abbeydale. Not sure what to think.
- Not sure
- We have plenty of non-domesticated pigeons already, what difference does a few homing pigeons make?
- Never been bothered by pigeons - but cleanliness, smell and noise possibly to be considered and the neighbours notified.
- I have no issue with it, but I understand the stigma associated with pigeons as a pest. As with other forms of urban agriculture, I thinking having a bylaw with standards, and a process to notify residents of intent to keep pigeons and any risk mitigation put in place would help.
- These are an urban blight; they have been likened to rats with wings. If Alberta is so proudly "rat free" why are we not dealing with the pigeon epidemic in the city of Calgary. Get rid of them.
- again : inspections/guidelines for keeping them, to ensure sanitary conditions and decreased risk of disease transmission
- Proper street cleaning

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- these are dirty stinky birds if not looked after, and we will definitely have those that do not look after them.
- I think there needs to be a limit on how many pigeons people keep and where they are located. They can be noisy so I think that there needs to be a balance between how many and the ability of neighbours to enjoy their outdoor spaces.
- Established limits on quantity and enclosure type for urban pigeons.
- Sure so long as they are cared for appropriately and there are rules in place that will be enforced if they become nuisances
- should not be allowed
- Depends . I'd be okay with it
- I always thought pigeons were part of the landscape of a city. Homing and racing pigeons are for a few not the many and maybe should be designated to specific area in town just for them.
- No
- protect the pigeons from people. again secure living area.
- No more than 3, confined to owner's property.
- Responsibly kept. Considering smell.
- don't know
- N/A
- No strong views -- again my concern is managing noise, disease, odor.
- No problems with them.
- Nothing special [personal information removed]
- I think this is similar to chickens..... best on an acreage.
- Not in the residential neighbourhoods.
- Not sure. I guess as long as they are kept concealed they are ok
- No comment
- No!! This is a terrible idea! No to pigeons!
- Urban farm sign, however pigeons are very noisy and would prefer this is not urban.
- Urban pigeons should be allowed, full stop. Maintaining a membership as noted in the Bylaw, and any other rules should be upkept.
- Keep the same as current.
- Should be eradicated.
- No concerns if kept penned / caged and is well identified.
- Would they be caged or flying free? Not a fan of extra birds pooping on my car/property...and as long as there is no smell or sound disturbance.
- Keep them contained so they aren't flying all over the neighborhood
- Nothing. I don't have an issue with people keeping pigeons.
- No way!!!! There are enough birds in every single area of the city and surrounding area. Pigeons are dirty and noisy and just outright annoying.
- N.A.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Again, in a limited number and a good coop this is a good idea
- Wild birds that people feed and encourage around their homes not good
- Yet in Calgary but anybody that has pigeons should be licensed
- Nothing
- as long as not hundreds in one residence. The poo would also maybe be a concern
- As long as the fecal matter was continuously cleaned to avoid stench & the pigeons had a large enclosure. Pigeons roosting on my pergola & crapping all over my outdoor space doesn't excite me.
- i don't like these in the city because they can perch and poop in specific locations.
- Same as above.
- They carry disease. Don't want people keeping them.
- no issues
- No issues
- They should be allowed given the current bylaws surrounding pigeons.
- don't feel strongly either way.
- I do not have enough information on this. But why!?
- Yes as long as standards are met for safety of bird and that it is well kept to not both other residents
- Nothing needed.
- Pigeons are only an issue when they try to roost on your house. I assume urban pigeons would live in an enclosure. Though I have the same concerns about zoonotic events from them as I do livestock. My dad caught Psittacosis from pigeons that roosted on his roof the 90s. It was catastrophic for him
- Complaint process if there are issues, and the ability to fine owners if required. There should be some regulations in regards to the number allowed based on yard size and an annual permit to have one.. This I am not in favor of at all though.
- Should carry a maximum number of pigeons and be licensed.
- Yes and no. I agree with the sport but they can become a nuisance when they get lost and start flicking on roof tops of other properties. We also have seen doves in our area of city and this can become a big problem like pigeons. If left unchecked
- No issues either way.
- I disagree with with keeping pigeons in an urban setting.
- not okay
- Contained in a fenced backyard, a reasonable number allowed.
- Limit number in neighbourhoods
- No issues
- No to pigeons as they will be pooping all over my property. ABSOLUTELY NO.
- Same thing, I am okay with this, but people should register with the city if they plan to do this. It should not interfere with the safety and well-being of neighbours. This includes cleanliness and smell.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Posted contact information should the Pigeon's need to be moved back home, though I believe they have the information on collars. Waste management plan should the flock be over a certain number. Again suggest City offer specific composting/waste program for a fee to owners.
- I don't think pigeons belong in any urban setting. They can be very messy with feces everywhere, unsanitary conditions, constant cooing and flying around.
- Current legislation is enough. They are nuisances, and people shouldn't have them as pets unless they are part of those associations
- Do people still race pigeons?! Because they can't be contained you run overpopulation risks and public nuisance from a mess standpoint. They shit everywhere and eat gardens. They also reproduce pretty quickly. I think the cons outweigh the pros on this one.
- not allowed
- Absolutely not. Dirty birds.
- As with bees and livestock, I think pigeon keepers should take a training certificate/license program to ensure competency. Some people truly understand how to properly care for pigeons, and they should not be painted with the same brush as unknowledgeable/irresponsible owners.
- There would need to be strict rules about cleanliness and noise.
- More deterrent "spikes" on overhead areas to prevent them from landing/nesting.
- Our neighbours have racing pigeons. They are fun to watch when they fly. They are not noisy and are just quietly cooing when in the coop. I do not know of any issues with coyotes trying to get into yards nearby. As long as the coop and birds are clean and healthy it should be allowed.
- The nuisance of droppings, constant noise and presence of large enclosures of birds is not in keeping with a densely populated, urban community & is a health hazard . Birds need to be licenced.
- Must be identifiable as a domestic pigeon to an average citizen.
- I wont be interested in raising Pigeons.
- Follow section 27.1
- Limit the number of birds allowed.
- Same as roaming cats, if domesticated, should not be allowed to fly free and owners informed and fined if not compliant
- Fine with it
- Should not be allowed
- Absolutely not
- Is fine the way it is.
- A neighbor a few blocks away from us and I do enjoy watching them as I drive or walk past, they don't seem to be causing any problems.
- licensing and bylaw regarding feces
- If the animals are quiet and kept health, contained and clean-no smell, I am fine with that.
- No idea
- Health concerns, pick up feces and prevent spread of disease.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't see any need to regulate beyond making sure they are healthy, not overcrowded in their space and are not creating a nuisance. Pigeons are going to be part of an urban environment anyway.
- No
- It's ok as long as they are members of the pigeon racing clubs and roost within the owners properly built shelter and are not shitting on other peoples property.
- Sure
- Pigeon coopz have been here as long as Calgary. See above.
- I dont think birds should ever be caged
- we have seen what happens in Europe with pigeons.....maybe not the best addition to Calgary's landscape
- I have no opinion in this matter
- my only concern is cleanliness because a large flock of birds can make a big mess if its just flying around the neighborhood
- No opinion on this one
- Should not be allowed in urban areas, rural only.
- Limited amounts and appropriate cleaning.
- No opinion.
- Fine if they are contained
- AZA from previous comment - is the zoo regulations wouldn't allow those animals in such small spaces as backyards so why would we allow it.
Urban Pigeons should NEVER be allowed. Dirty, poop can corrode, etc.
- unsure.
- Do not want this
- Urban pigeons populations give the opportunity of introduction of wild falcons into the city , whose life could be monitored by cameras and observed on large screens installed in public places. This can be not only major attraction but also the symbol of the city.
- As long as they are kept safely and humanely they should be allowed
- No safety concern with pigeons. They have always been there with no major issues and they will still be there.
I find the spikes along certain perch points is plenty.
- Ban
- meh
- No.
- Should not be allowed.
- I can't stand pigeons. They roost in our eaves and poop everywhere. If keeping pigeons means more pigeons are accidentally released in the wild, I would not support this activity.
- City is too populated for someone to have pigeons. I would not want a pigeon coup next door. Again people do not involve veterinarians and pigeons do carry a number of diseases.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I have no issues with pigeons sharing our urban spaces
- limit number of pigeons; current membership requirements are appropriate.
- Not in the city constant cooing of pigeons and doves is uncontrollable. Sudden takeoff of 50 birds scares even the strong at heart. If necessary limit to five or less birds
- To me this is similar to above. We don't want to allow roaming cats or dogs (bees) so why do we allow a free roaming bird.
- Fine, does not seem to be an issue
- Nothing.
- yes, because they are fun.
- As long as there are limits on numbers and it is regulated to ensure the birds are in good health. Smell and noise to neighbors need to be considered.
- So far these have not constituted a major problem that we are aware of but as with all other things numbers need to be controlled.
- Pigeons are filthy.
- Unknown
- No no and no horrible idea same as chickens and the cooing would be unbearable to listen to
- No pigeons.
caged pigeons attract wild pigeons.
- Cause lots of waste and noise and damage
- Number of pigeons restricted by acreage of property. Smaller property, fewer pigeons. Mitigate waste smells by penning pigeons at least 3 meters from the nearest property line. Owner responsible for twice weekly cleanup of pigeon waste.
- Maybe?
- Give your neighbors notice of the hive and a chance to discuss any issues with it. If your neighbors agree i dont see there being a problem.
- Nothing.
- Proper coop
- Again, as long as it is capped, a maximum number.
- There should also be a limit on the number and they should not allowed to be at large
- I'm ok with this, with limits. I worry more about the volume and smell of pigeons. Flock size should be limited, a yearly liscense should be paid, and I'd be ok if people wanted to raise them to feed themselves or pets too, not just for racing.
- Gross, but sounds cool
- Do not allow. Too much chance of disease
- A lot of space between homes...like an acherage. I wouldnt want to live near anyone with pigeons.
- best practice bylaws from other well governed and regulated cities
- Limits on the number of pigeons
- Nothing.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- more than 10 birds should not be permitted due to the smell and waste as they fly around the owners property.
- No never allow urban pigeons
- not comfortable with this. my nieghbour has pigeons, and cares for them well, however, wild pigeons are drawn to them and have torn thier way into my roof several times to make nests near by them.. its a pain. an expensive and noisy pain
- I never knew this was a thing, so I see no issues.
- Nothing. Maybe a maximum amount for land size owned. Eg. Max 4 pigeons in suburbs
- Racing pigeons sounds like animal abuse, but respect to anyone training homing pigeons! It's weird, and I like it.
- I would be concerned about needing to clean pigeon pieces up because an outdoor cat got into the enclosure
- Tougher regulations for keeping pigeons confined to their owner's property.
- Pigeons are not clean animals, this should not be allowed either
- N/A
- I have Bowness neighbour that has had pigeons for years. The local newsletter has featured his birds, and despite a large population of birds, I've never had a problem. When people are responsible pet owners, it's a joy to have animals around.
- Special licensing and inspections
- No opinion
- Does the City check on those who keep pigeons to make sure they are in good standing with the companies listed above or if these people just own the pigeons to sell to restaurants as meat.
- This should be illegal unless birds are completely enclosed in a garage or shed. One coup in our neighborhood has continuously attracted dozens of wild pigeons that hang out near the coup. Dirty, noisy and irritating.
- No thanks
- Not have them in residential neighbourhoods, adhere to sanitary regulations, netting or other containment requirements to keep them out of others property, owners of birds accountable and liable for any harm or damage to people, pets, or property the animals cause.
- There is no definition of "good standing" when it comes to pigeon fanciers. There is no standard and no way to ensure they are not being used as livestock. Should be eliminated
- No. They poop all over the place, and don't stay only in one owner's yard. Too much negative impact on neighbours.
- I think the current rules for pigeon keeping are sufficient.
- Not much of a problem if it doesn't result in bird excrement to adjacent areas.
- There seem to be a lot of pigeons in Calgary! I don't understand the impact of kept pigeons on 'wild' ones.
- I don't have a problem with them.
- Good idea. Just keep number below 10.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Nuisance pests that create disgusting messes for neighbours and should not be permitted.
- Lord no! I would not like to live next to a pen of cooing rats with wings.
- Good luck lol
- Never heard of this. However, I was walking to work one day and had a pigeon follow me for quite awhile. It even perched on my head as I sat and talk to it. Quite the character he/she was! I loved it!
- Disease and excrement.
- These are filthy animals that are being eradicated in most European Cities. Why create a problem we will have to clean up. Don't start, it will save time and money later. Isn't excess wildlife enough of a problem?
- Sure I really have no input on urban pigeons
- Noisy and feces problem
- I grew up worn pigeons and had hem indoors . I think this is great too
- I don't have concerns, except concerns for ensuring the safety of the pigeons.
- No comment
- I'm fine with it
- No, the are very messy
- as long as they are not a nuisance to neighbors and in good standing with an association, then having pigeons is not problematic. The number of pigeons should be based on yard space and distance to neighbours.
- Again limit amount
- Some sort of constraint so they are not pooping on neighbors yards everywhere.
- As long as they were clean and didn't smell I wouldn't mind. There would need to be someone to make owners accountable
- Yes. Limit number allowed. Certain homes.
Rules to protect animal when owners stops activity.
- I believe what is in regulations now is acceptable. They are sweet birds! I have met a couple pigeons and totally wished I could bring them home with me!
- N/A
- That should be for small acreages.
- Clean coup regularly so there isn't a smell. Not a huge concern.
- They are wild-raised for training
safe is a weird word. More about mess and smell
Dogs could eat them.
Would like to have chickens.
- They are disease concerns with birds.
 - Coccidia
 - Giardia
 & others can be transmitted to cats and dogs.
Any bird can do it.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Also concerns about space issues. If you had a certain size backyard - they would need to have adequate space. You also have to consider noise.

Owners need to be educated so that there aren't too many. There has to be something in the bylaw that the birds aren't overcrowding & being well taken care of.

If people are doing this, they shouldn't just buy a license. They should have to take a class. & pass a test. This should apply to any animals.

- - What is safe?
 - Mammals are livestock
 - limits on pigeons - smell
 - minimize smell
 - can be dealt with in an individual basis, not common
 - No different than other pets
- Keep pigeons contained, so not defecating on neighbor's property.
- We don't have enough for a problem. Help keep our falcon and hawk populations up, instead of eating songbirds
- Don't care.
- Again, clean living quarters (non smelly) as they are a wonderful hobby for some, but they are also a viable, low impact food source when raised for that.
- Seems to be enough bird droppings around without adding more birds.
- Have not thought about this as I do not know the practice well. Would need more information before making a statement
- The current standards to stay the same
- Sanitation. Disgusting waste.
- Must have approval of neighbours.
- Should be allowed
- Sure within reason.
- Proper fencing and perhaps a limit on how many pigeons. A few farmed pigeons is great while a massive flock in the neighbour's yard is not as welcome.
- I would like the city to reduce the number of pigeons in the city. This may mean educating citizens or culling the birds or something else that will help. Pigeons are squeezing out other birds which decreases biodiversity.
- Don't have an opinion
- Spot checking for humane conditions, secondary compost locations for animal waste, more affordable housing, easier more humane ways to deter unplanned breeding
- I agree with allowing as long as the requirements are met, as stated above.
- Limits to how many birds are allowed per capita of land. Noise ordinances.
- They really shouldn't be on the streets. I am constantly swerving to avoid. keep them in cages
- I have no issue with urban pigeons and safety.
- Why though?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Having a say as their output can become quite damaging
- I love pigeons [personal information removed]
- I do not support urban pigeons due to potential for odours and noise.
- Need to be contained,
- Same as above.
- More of a nuisance than safety issue, being a good neighbor. Reasonable limits on the number of animals / no disturbance to neighbors. Proper care for the animals.
- Education about their requirements for urban pigeons to live a healthy and safe life.
- Pests to be culled. Except for those raised for racing and fancier clubs.
- Limit number of coops per a determined area. Birds must be kept under control and in safe and sanitary conditions-also with neighbours' approval.
- in a larger yard
- They must be kept a reasonable distance from neighbours to control noise and smell.
- no
- nope.
- Uncertain. A neighbor had pigeons and he complained about the poop and we noticed where ever they landed there was lots of poop. Still uncertain whether it's a good idea.
- Housing units for these pigeons should not exceed the height of the fence as to disturb the view of the neighbors.
- I do not know anything about the practice of urban pigeon keeping, but I can't see any safety concerns.
- Dirty, multiply quickly, control numbers. Domesticated pigeons do not stay domesticated and can become a nuisance to home owners, diseases, unsanitary conditions.
- A limit on the number in any given area, secure housing of them and a cleanliness regimen that keeps them from emitting smells to the neighbours.
- Keep what you have now
- Also should definitely be allowed I see pigeons all over the city already would be no different again provided there is regulations and rules governing good husbandry
- I don't think pigeons should be used for our entertainment. Racing animals of any kind, including pigeons, is against my ethics. If people want to raise a pigeon that they've rescued as a pet, like a parakeet or other bird, this should not be restricted by a bylaw.
- Have not encountered this, so, as of right now have no concerns.
- Most birds in general should not be caged and left out.
- Controls on number of pigeons, restrictions on locations where these can be set up (certain minimum setbacks from schools, parks, businesses). The city should also inspect these on an annual basis, as a condition for licensing.
- I do not feel any safety risk for pigeons and feel that owners should have to keep them clean and provide adequate shelter and are not a nuisance as with any other animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Why not as long as the place is kept clean and they are not with cruel humans who do not know how to treat living things with respect.
- Provided the animals are treated humanely, cleaned up after properly and are not creating a nuisance then they are acceptable.
- I feel very safe. I am thrilled that this is being considered within the city of Calgary
- Great.
- Not a fan. In November, a homing pigeon ended up on my front lawn, and wouldn't leave for 2 days. Research said it was likely injured or "lost" (look into it, they do get lost, and the way to help them isn't pleasant!). I finally had to capture & cage it, and take to an ER Vet; it was too cold out.
- Proper disposal of feces.
- This is a lost art. Doves and pigeons, when well taken care of, could be awesome pets. People should be allowed to have pigeons. Sound might be a problem if there are too many as they can be quite loud, but a few shouldn't be a problem.
- People really need to stop exploiting animals for entertainment, including pigeons. However, if the pigeons are well cared for and not causing a disturbance, it's none of my business.
- I also would not be interested in living next to someone with pigeons.
- Nobody cares about pigeons
- Same as above. Ensuring that there is also no additional burden on the community.
- No
- I agree with having to be part of a club or Association and identification.
- The current guidelines sound reasonable as long as there is also a size requirement of the yard so there is an appropriate offset from neighbours.
- No thoughts, I don't know enough about them.
- I agree with the current section 27.1 of the Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw related to pigeons.
- Same issue as livestock. Smell, noise, spreading of disease. Irresponsible care takers. If people want livestock and pigeons move out of town. There is no valid reason to allow this in a city. Drop property values. Will promote animal fighting and neighbor disputes.
- Absolutely not. I have enough issues with pigeons around my house.
- As above, as well as limits on number of pigeons regardless of size of home/area to ensure quality care of animals; e.g. how can one person properly care for dozens or hundreds of birds?
- Pigeons are no threat to me, just annoying. So nothing I suppose!
- Plenty of signage to indicate proximity and location of pigeons.
- No. Just no. No on all fronts
- The current regulations seem adequate.
- I don't know enough about this to comment
- Sure, why not?
- Signage



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Pigeons can be a problem. I walk around the neighborhood, and can hear pigeons, that are housed very responsibly way. My mother used to feed pigeons, they would arrive for feeding time and cover the roof. I don't want to see that in Calgary.
- Ensuring cleanliness standards are upheld and not by animal protection officers from the Calgary Humane Society.
- Possibly add provide veterinary care if there are any concerns, and a duty to report any human-communicable diseases.
- Appropriate enclosure. Permit. Inspection.
- no issues
- No thanks
- Yeah, I have no issue with this.
- Nothing
- Once again I don't have a problem with them but they need to be meticulously kept clean otherwise you end up with other Wildlife coming in and causing conflict between people and animals
- They are amazing to watch and are secured when not "working"
- On properties of a specific size and a member of a Pigeon organization.
- why would anyone want one. They are dirty and have no purpose whatsoever
- As long as they are in an adequate cage and well cared for, I have no issues. Perhaps owners should be required to have a permit.
- Should not be allowed. Not sanitary.
- I do not like pigeons or their noise. I am alright with it as long as it is on a certain size of land (large plot).
- Nothing
- There are lots of Wild ones so who would know!
- Our neighbors 3 doors down had them for years. It wasn't a problem for us.
- I agree with the current bylaw.
- I'm not sure what is anticipated here? I have the same disease transmission concerns.
- Hell no. They are awful and shouldn't be allowed
- Wouldn't want that either. No way to prevent them from going anywhere.
- What are the safety related concerns about pigeons? My guess is there are more concerns about nuisances from the raising of pigeons.
- Limited amount of birds, low sound & smell. Consult pigeon experts & other urban bylaws.
- Limit their numbers.
- They are cared for and looked after well... as all animals should be.
- attracting pests and wildlife to the yard, the noise and disease issues are all concerns I would have.
- Pigeons can carry disease, I'd rather see pigeons not permitted in the city
- Pigeons are a plague. There should not be any urban pigeons.
- No!
- Licenced locations



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Is this the movie Birds? I have wild pigeons all over my place as is
- Pigeons are a blight.
- Backyards are generally too small in Calgary to allow for this without it being a nuisance for others
- Pigeons should not be raised within City Limits.
- Not too healthy, lots of damage on people balconies
- Pigeons create unsightly mess and should be deterred through spikes and preventing nesting. Please continue to stop people from eating or trapping pigeons on their property, this is a health hazard.
- Does anyone ever feel reasonably safe around pigeons?
- Noise and smell.
- NO livestock in the city. We are currently enduring a global pandemic (coronavirus) that originated from too many animals in close contact with humans. Livestock should be banned in the city to prevent more animal-human contact particularly as many people are already unqualified and negligent.
- If public life is not affected, it is ok. Quantity shall be regulated.
- Pigeons are messy and leave big piles of poop when they escape and try to live on people's houses. No problem with pigeons living on bridges & city infrastructure.
- There shouldn't be pigeons in residential areas and their poo is toxic and hard to clean up and can cause disease
- Same as the urban livestock. It needs to be minimum requirements for the animals well-being balanced with the needs of the community. People need to see more animals in their community and understand. We are responsible for doing our best for them. And that we live in a ecosystem, not in a bubble
- No, they leave such a mess....
- I don't think there is a huge demand for keeping urban pigeons these days, but if properly cared for, and in limited quantities, they should be allowed with an annual license.
- Not a problem at all - they are lovely creatures. When you say this is in the agriculture category, I certainly hope that you do not mean anyone is actually raising them for food. That would be horrible.
- This should only be done if it is not affecting the people that live by you;
- Sadly they poop where they roost
- I worry that people will not educate themselves on proper feeding and handling of the animal, I would like them to have to allow an inspection annually for the care of the animals to be able to renew their license to raise.
- No, pigeons are not clean, and and make a mess.
- There have never been problems identified in this area, so I see no issues or reasons to prevent pigeons.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Pigeons aren't a native species to Alberta, so they shouldn't encourage more of these birds to populate the urban centre. They always escape the owners coops no matter how secure. Pigeon racing should be banned.
- a process to deal with complaints and concerns with enforcement
- Pigeons are dirty and noisy. They should be restricted and controlled. I would not want them within a block of my house, so I doubt most others would want them either.
- Although I am not a huge fan of pigeons, if they are well taken care of and not being problematic for people in close proximity.
- As long as it's contained and not bothering close by neighbors, don't see an issue. They need to be treated humanely and with respect.
- Keep it clean
- I have only seen wild pigeons, but if they were being cared for properly, I would not object.
- Pigeons make good pets and are easy to contain. They are not the dirty creatures the pest control companies like to portray them to be. It is totally wrong to force a person who has a few pigeons to join a designated club!!! If so than perhaps all dog owners should be made to join the CKC.
- No issues.
- not a good idea - they are messy and noisy. There are enough nuisance feral pigeons.
- unsure what this entails
- No
- Gross, they spread disease and make a mess.
- Had no idea this was a thing. As long as the owner is responsible and clean, why not!
- I have no concerns.
- Pigeons are fine as long as citizens know how to care for the animals and the safe disposal when expired. Belonging to a club that helps regulate is good.
- Nope.
- I don't know anything about pigeon breeding.
- Health screenings for these disease carriers.
- NO!!
- controls for noise, odors, aesthetics
- Allowed with license & public notice to neighbours who can appeal. Signage out front of home that advises pigeons are kept on property.
- Urban pigeons could overpopulate areas with pigeons.
- cuious to see how your going to get rid of pigeons :D
- They are a complete nuisance and should be discouraged from roosting
- Why not?
- Pigeons freak me out.
- Pigeons should not be encouraged. Noisy, make a lot of waste, cannot guarantee they won't be impacting enjoyment of my property or public spaces
- The standards seem pretty reasonable for this already



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- not a fan as they damage roofs and smells so a program needs to control this as transporting them outside the city does not work as they just fly back
- Health concerns. Keep cages clean and birds healthy.
- No
- Where
- Yard to be kept up and maintained (namely adequate removal and sanitation of the feces, or composted), noise and disease management measures to be minded.
- Can spread disease like legionnaires
- Properly contained and in moderation.
- No? What would their use even be?
- Doesn't affect me or my sense of safety.
- Don't know
- One neighbor's pigeons poop all over another neighbor's house.... should they be responsible for the cleaning bill?
- Permit & proper housing.
- Reasonable hygiene and controlled breeding practices.
- Education
- Sure why not, there are pigeons everywhere in Calgary already.
- have fun with all the crap. pass.
- I have no issues with current regulations surrounding urban pigeons.
- only under the conditions outlined in S 27.1
- Keep contained and clean.
- i feel safe with urban pigeons.
- No due to the air traffic and the increase of drones. One or the other. Both will not work well together
- No concerns.
- They are already owned by many. Perhaps a limit on pigeons may be set as they do reside in the neighborhood and do not stay secluded within the owners property line. 10 would seem more than enough
- I would like to see the city allow urban poultry farming for eggs.
- In limited numbers, OK.
- I oppose pigeons in urban areas because of the smell and noise which affects surrounding neighbors. They serve no purpose and should not be allowed in the city.
- Noisy and feel badly for people whose houses they hang out on - but that is a homeowner problem. Put up deterrents - they can be a slightly I guess but it also tends to send them elsewhere
- Register and vet care as they can be carriers for diseases
- NA
- No opinion.
- Nothing needed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think regulations are fine as is. But I know that sometimes pigeons get released into the wild and if that happens people need to be held accountable.
- Pigeons aren't a danger too me, though the owner should ensure they stay healthy and that their coop is not in a place where they can defecate on people.
- Weird but still okay.
- No concerns.
- A limit on how many can be kept in one area and that they are not a health issue
- I do not know enough about pigeons for input
- Ew. Poop clean up. Birth control?
- Again, inappropriate. A visit to the Superstore, Rona (Lowe's) and Home Depot can reveal the effects.
- Flying rats, they can carry disease and their droppings are corrosive. Again, space, cleaning, and predatory animals are all issues here. Also, the food will bring in mice.
- I have no opinion on urban pigeons.
- I don't see the harm in pigeons kept in an urban setting as long as they don't move from their homes. We have enough irritating birds (i.e. Magpies) that we don't need to add to it. If you keep them contained and they come back to you, then why not have pigeons.
- Noise-I would only be concerned about the noise, depending on the # of pigeons. For example. maybe limit the # of pigeons a person can keep in a single dwelling.
- go for it.. dont know much about them but I am not opposed to properly cared for anything
- Coops are kept clean and safe for the animals.
- I have no concern with pigeons.
- Absolutely not, why would we want to encourage this?
- Hate this . Don't allow pigeons in Calgary. Very noisy and a real nuisance. we would leave Calgary if you allow pigeons, livestock and similar in the city.
- YES please! There should be guidelines/ in place about predator-resistant (coyotes and bobcats) enclosures and disease testing. Pigeons are VERY interesting! Why not allow people go keep them. I like them more than cats and dogs... if people can have cats and dogs, then they should also have pigeons
- Awareness, if you live within close proximity. There could be concerns regarding noise and smell. Requirements to ensure noise and smell do not become an issue for neighbours should be included in the bylaw.
- NO
- agree with current bylaw
- nothing , education is needed for people
- Why?
- Pigeons are a nuisance they poop everywhere and leave messes on fences. Perhaps have some natural predators to keep numbers down



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I am not afraid of pigeons. If there are places where they are becoming a nuisance or where their waste is creating health concerns, perhaps natural control measures such as trained dogs or Peregrine Falcons could be employed to discourage them from gathering in those places.
- Cleanliness! Can't have pigeon coups left unkept. Checking every so often that nothing gets out of hand
- Only a reasonable limit per household
- Not sure about pigeons
- Has to be a limit
- Leave this space
- Adequate proof that owners are appropriately educated about safety, health and cleanliness.
- Limit the number of livestock per square footage of lot size. Current requirements to keep pigeons are fine, in the past I've hardly noticed when a neighbour keeps pigeons.
- No urban pigeons, again, they are filthy and breed disease.
- House as many pigeons as you have reasonable space for as outlined I.E. (# of pigeons allowed = square footage of penned in space / average area required to house 1 pigeon) Housing facilities subject to periodic approval / inspection
- This should be illegal
- No, no, no get rid of them
- increased cleaning where ever they are allowed to congregate. ... I would say the same for Canada Geese that conflict with pathway use . disease control
- It makes no sense that cats cannot roam but pigeons can. Pigeons are filthy and crap everywhere. They should absolutely not be allowed. There are urban pigeons in Rocky Ridge and they come into my yard in Tuscany and crap all over my garage and yard. Its' so disgusting.
- Pigeons do not stay home. These birds are always looking for new places to live and I do not want my roof to be the birds new home!! Nothing to do with safety. They are just dirty birds.
- Why does anyone need them?
- Appropriate housing and caretaking, registry and identification.
- Pigeons have done a lot of damage in our neighborhood including ruining our roof shingles
- Current regulations seem good.
- permit, inspection, adequate living conditions
- Licences
- I love pigeons. No concerns as long as their environment is kept clean and feces isn't allowed to get out of hand, since it carries disease.
- info on trapping, or warning signage when they are present
- No concerns
- Limit amount & not allowed to fly in neighbourhoods- poop!
Again smell or poor maintaining a fine with strike 3 in effect!
- Breeding controls.
- Have no issues with pigeons outside of possible noise or odors



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Gross.
- i am against the keeping of pigeons as they are noisy and dirty and poop all over .they may carry disease
- No. They are usually covered in lice and never have a form of identification. Contact CHS for stats on pigeons that do not have appropriate identification.
- Licensing and administration of tracing log
Proper housing
Standards of care and control
- We are not fans of urban pigeons as pigeons have been a nuisance in our neighbourhood.
- I do not want to hear pigeons, they can be noisy.
- Should be allowed as long as it doesn't harm your neighbours
- Again they may become too noisy or foul smelling as well.
- regulations that owners must follow and are monitored to make sure owners follow
- Appropriate licensing/supervision as at present.
- Nuisance
Filthy
- I have no insight into this, but if the current bylaw requires owners to be in good standing with regulation boards and the pigeons are identifiable, that seems perfectly reasonable.
- Same as 2
- If people do this responsibly then I don't have a problem with it.
- Should not be allowed under any circumstances in cities. Too big a potential for spread of disease among humans. Remember the avian flu? Documented transmission of flu between animals and humans-more recently the corona virus, direct result of China's wild animal live markets. Not worth the risk.
- licensing and administration of tracing log
- No. Pigeons cannot be confined thus affect the entire neighbourhood.
- Do not appreciate the noise, also they perch on my house & their droppings are all over the roof, especially the garage, which not only looks bad but is eating away at the shingles.
- Animal welfare laws need to be enforced.
- Permit
- This should be allowed. It is such a rare interest, it is totally fine. Don't regulate pigeons. Focus on addressing noise complaint issues / regulating large dogs who bark endlessly in communities at all hours of day and night and vicious dangerous dogs who endanger children in the community.
- Not sure, probably not in the city.
- Same response as urban livestock. I do not support urban pigeons due to noise, smell, nuisance, diseases, care and cruelty. Enough animals abandoned and suffer from lack of care. Laws not strong enough as is. How will this be monitored and likely will cost taxpayers more.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- My neighbors have racing pigeons. They have 2 structures on their property to house the pigeons. I think there should be a limit on how many you can have. A limit of 10 would be okay. My neighbors have around 30-40 pigeons. This is very annoying. They leave droppings and feathers in my yard.
- Racing pigeons? Are you nuts, no way.
- I do not have sufficient knowledge of this particular subject. But what about pigeon droppings and public health and safety?
- License/permit - should include consent from neighbours.
City would have to take on the responsibility of accepting surrenders &/or seizures of these animals.
Administration of a tracing log.
Effective control of nuisance smell & noise.
- No thanks, they are gross.
- There should be no urban pigeons.
- nope, do not want pigeons.
- Why not? I feel safe.
- Ok with these.
- Seems unnecessary. There are too many pigeons already.
- As long as it is clean and not too noise I think is fine. I would limit to 100 pigeons no to be too noisy
- Animal cages must be kept clean and well maintained. Animals must also be kept healthy.
- Licensing and administration of tracing log
- Nothing in particular needed for safety.
- I like the current regulations.
- Homeowners keeping pigeons should be required to maintain their properties. They should not be let out or be permitted to congregate on neighbouring properties.
- Bigger umbrella
- This seems stupid.
- I would be concerned about the oversight mentioned above (organization memberships) slipping. I'd also be concerned about people getting pigeons without the oversight - how would anyone know the difference? Again, I don't think The City of Calgary has the resources to manage this properly.
- Weird... Haha. Don't know enough to asses how they compare to keeping chickens but so long as the practices are ethical I'd say let it be. Case by case based on complaints. I'm not a robot!
- When I was young, a gentleman down the street had pigeons. It was great seeing them on their flights. He maintained their cages well and there were no issues.
- We have to be careful about disease coming to humans. But eating pigeons is good-you just have to take safety precautions. If you want to eat them, make sure they eat good food.
- - loud
-stinky
- Keep pigeons in the house, they smell, pigeons poop everywhere, they could get out.
- I have not had a problem with this, but I know they can be a problem. If these are non-native species, I don't support having them in the city.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement
June 29, 2020

Administration

What pet owners need from the Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw

- Information for non-pet owners on the rules
- Information on proper training. There seems to be an over abundance of trainers in this city still using outdated, harmful methods that are creating behaviourally unstable dogs.
- Information on why the distinction between provincial and municipal rules matters.
- Access to affordable dog training so everyone can be educated on responsible dog ownership.
- Fully fenced off leash parks, to allow for training
- I think there needs to be more signage and enforcement of leash laws in Calgary. Too many times have I been walking and run into an off leash dog. The owner does not realize that the area is off leash, or argues that they are allowed to have their dog off leash because it is well trained.
- Training and education on dog behavior and health
- I think they should get a map of off leash parks and be advised that they should not be off leash ANYWHERE else.
- low cost neuter/spay
- Dog parks need more garbage cans to dispose of dog waste, if they're not there, people won't pick up after their dogs.
- I know the signs "no dogs allowed" were taken down in non off leash parks but they really need to go back up. People do not know the bylaws for non off leash areas. Because on no signs, if you dare to tell someone they are breaking the bylaw by letting their dog run loose, they will tell you "it's not posted" after they tell you off....You have people of educating the public in off leash dog parks...why are you not doing the same public service for non off leash areas eg school yards, sport fields, baseball diamonds. These are areas that really need a new focus. It's horrible on some non off leash areas.
- Microchipping - make this mandatory.
- Enforcement on bad behaviour?
- All this information is provided but none of this is enforced.
- Rules need to be ENFORCED.
- Enforcement of off-leash dog bylaws through heavy fines and/or seizure of the animal.
- Private yards should not be used as their dog toilets. It's vandalism!
- how to avoid / respond appropriately to complaints. (I did not select 'proper dog behaviour' because this can be overly broadly interpreted without regard to age, breed etc. while I don't disagree, I worry this can take on a life of its own.
- our properties are NOT to be used as a bathroom spot, even if owners pick up..pet owners MUST understand even urine can burn the grass...stay off our properties!
- PUBLIC EDUCATION.
- Where to go to get help, like the humane society and private agencies. Info on basic animal care, food, shelter etc



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Owners should not have their dogs offleash in a non-offleash area. Even if they think their dogs are nice.
- Information about the legalities of a "vicious dog" for owner and concerned/affected parties.
- Ensure safety
- Information about good ownership behaviour and rules ppl need to follow. Dogs take their lead from their owners. Ppl need to be held accountable, not punishing dogs
- Training
- Information on proper dog behaviour, without forcing an agenda of a certain type of training down their throats. The Calgary humane society's "force free" training programs do not work for many high intensity dogs and are producing a lot of preventable behaviour issues. Just specify what proper public behaviour is, don't give advice on how to get the behaviour.
- Enforcement of the bylaws.
- To enact law that ALL dogs must be muzzled at ALL times when on leash or off leash park with their owners. This will 100% stop any and all bites which are main cause of death and injury from dogs
- Communicating concerns to their neighbour. Too many people jump the gun & just call bylaw. I think this question should be asked when someone calls in a complaint. Have you spoken to the other party?
- Rules about dog walkers and resources for training.
- Be able to control your dog around seniors with canes, I have noticed when I go walking with my dad (in a green space off leash area) who walks with a cane that he is often aggressively approached by dogs. People call their dogs and the dog continue to bark at my dad. He has even been lunged at. I asked my dog trainer friend about this. She said she to has seen dogs react to people walking with canes. She doesn't know why the cane triggers dogs. I understand having off leash area, but I have a problem with owners that don't have control of their dog. This happens more often than not. I've been walking with my dad and felt very threatened by dogs coming at us.
- What happens when rules aren't followed
- Resources for training and courses for handling resues
- More information on where dogs have to be on leash. Also more education regarding dogs not allowed off the regional pathway in the Weaselhead natural area. Despite a signage program last year, many dog owners don't seem to know the bylaw here or again they don't care because there is little enforcement.
- List of fines for noncompliance.
- information what is unexceptionable behaviour so they know exactly what is expected, when and where
- More fenced off leash parks. More neighborhood garbage bins.
- Oversee this but contract it out...tax payers should not be paying for this!
- Because of many uneducated and untrained, inverted animals I feel dog parks should be a privilege to those who license, and have done training. If parks were carded to get in/out it would also alleviate waste as people could be tracked for who uses it. Same for issues that happen within the



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

park. Too many concerns and safety issues for dogs and people. We would use but it is not safe anymore.

- Better ways to report events with action.
- Estimated costs of ownership so people can make informed decisions when getting a new animal.
- No un-neutered dogs at the off leash parks.
- Understanding of canine behaviour-
- FINES FOR IRRESPONSIBLE DOG OWNERSHIP
- More bylaw officer presence at parks
- How to manage incidents with other dogs, wildlife and people.
- Rules the Off leash areas (ie. what in control means) and info re not taking dogs off leash in on leash areas.
- Irresponsible owners need to be held accountable for their pets behavior.
- Polite and helpful service
- Less cat racism. More protection from pit bulls
- the outdoor Cat culture NEEDS TO BE CHANGED. it's outdated and preventing lost cats from making their way home. it's also not nice to let animals suffer and die in the elements when they're abandoned. a cat doesn't wear a help me sign, so we should help no matter what.
- Breakdown of leash and offleash areas
- Concise information that is timely and easily understood. Less fines and more teaching. Involvement in design, maintenance of off-leash areas; incentives to be involved. Partner with vets, dog trainers etc at off-leash areas to help people learn.
- Basic info available on care and also how to socialize their dog correctly. Provide opportunities and education in regards to basic training every dog should have.
- Nothing
- Extra goodies about dog enrichment (food puzzles, nose work, sniff walks, play with your dog)
- Display general rules when entering off-leash parks. For example, you must stay with your animal while in the park, you must pick up and remove feces, you must be in control of your animal at all times, your dog must have it's license on....
- Information on licensing. Unless you're hiring certified veterinary behaviourists. Stay in your lane.
- pick up afte your dog or get fined, we need more enforcement as the pathways look like a dog outhouse
- This should always be given out at veterinary offices and or that matter vets and vet techs need animal behavior training!!
- How to read your dogs behaviour, mood and actions to prevent outbursts
- specific dog waste containers/garbagages as seen on the streets of Europe, education on dog poop attracting coyote's etc if not picked up (because apparently the fact that it's gross isn't enough for my neighbours lol)
- Information about how to be a responsible cat owner!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- information about risks associated with punishment based training; education about dog bite prevention
- Clear signage in off leash areas. Access to garbage bins in off leash areas. Some common sense modifications to specific off lease parks. New regulations for the number of dogs for dog walkers
- People who care about their animals already research, know and comply. Others need to know the consequences of non-compliance.
- limit length of leash if on city/provincial parks and sidewalks.
- Cost of ownership and maintenance
- Enforcement of the bylaw for walking dogs off leash that is not a designated off leash area
- Are rules different in provincial areas like Nose Hill?
- Increased awareness when living in multi family residential units. Dogs in-particular should not have to be listened to from your neighbor when the pet is inside. .
- What to do if you see rules not being followed.
- Online licensing. Can license your pet at a vet clinic like many cities. No need to wear license tag if microchipped. Mandatory microchipping for ID.
- An easy to find website where all the rules and bylaws are available and easy to understand.
- Information on dog behavior and responsible pet ownership, breeding and care.
- Information on where to get appropriate behaviour help for their dog. Stop the blame game of shaming the owner. Dog behaviour is more complex than “it’s all how they’re raised”
- Not teach dogs to defecate in city parks, especially natural areas! These are not pet toilets!
- Need to know that the existing bylaws will be enforced for the comfort and safety of their pets
- Proper offleash protocol.
- Info on pet training options in the city. What areas are and are not off-leash areas (ie. not every public park)
- A requirement to spay or neuter.
- Number of dogs per home and excessive barking for extended periods
- Enforcement of rules in public dog parks and off leash areas.
- People need to take responsibility if they are getting a pet - the sellers (breeders) of the Pets should be responsible to educate them!
- PRIVACY
- All of the above should be provided by breeder/rescue at the time of purchasing a pet and/or registering a pet.
- Cat owners need more information on the impact that cats allowed outdoors have on wildlife, particularly birds (#1 cause of mortality in North America); information for dog owners that it is against the bylaw to allow dogs to harass or eat wildlife.
- “No dog” signs in school fields
- List of suggested etiquette in public and education about how to properly train these animals.
- ALL the education is important.
- Increase in patrols and enforcement of the current bylaws!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Resources or where to find information on animal behaviour, animal health, and animal training.
- Tangible consequences for irresponsible pet ownership
- Access to training
- More education on why there are off leash areas and why it is important to keep them on leash in other public areas.
- Enforcement of the existing by-law. We do not need a new by-law - just enforce the rules in the one that exists
- Poop bag stations and waste bins.
- What to do if pet gets lost and how to deal with lost pets they find (as they are more likely to try and help said animal)
- Info about how to behave safely around animals.
- Information about what is considered proper ownership behaviour such as proper waste disposal
- They need to be constantly reminded that they are always responsible for their dogs behaviour and must always have control of their dog.
- i
- Partnerships with training and care experts for owners needing further information.
- Training resources.
- Emphasis on dog behaviour!!!! Also information on proper dog park etiquette!!!
- We need to see the bylaw more and see them handing out more tickets so people get that this is serious.
- Access to resources like spay and neuter assistance
- Ways to control animals that don't involve shock or pinch collars
- To not own a pet unless you are prepared to care for it needs physically and emotionally and have the resources to do so.
- Fines for cats being caught outside and on other peoples property, for not collecting dog waste and dogs barking outside after 10pm
- Fines.
- Strong & effective consequences when rules are not followed.
- Rules for picking up after dogs in off-leash areas
- cats shouldn't be crapping in your neighbours flower beds
- More garbages, more off leash areas , more pet friendly venues
- No pets, should be allowed in grocery stores restaurants, food vendors or anywhere else where it is against health and safety codes. I'm allergic to dogs I have rights too in public. Less dog parks too many rec areas smell like feces. No dogs around Glenmore Park they are swimming/relieving themselves while off leash. Fines for rule breakers.
- We also need the City to enforce the bylaws, especially dogs off leash in inappropriate areas. There also needs to be an off leash area in EVERY community. West Springs and Cougar Ridge have none, so people take dogs to the play fields to let them run. Also need to have poop bag dispensers.
- free off leash behavior training to support dog owners at the off leash parks



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Warning signs when entering an off leash park that there are off leash dogs and you are entering at your own risk, for those with mobility issues. I have had very rude old dog owners tell me that my dog is running around too much and they have a bad hip... I want them to be aware of the risks.
- Dog training, vaccinations, vet checks, proper nutrition, etc
- information on responsible ownership to reduce conflict/impact on wildlife
- Actual enforcement of bylaws is needed. You can get away with irresponsible behaviour easily in Calgary because enforcement is feeble.
- Pick up your dog's poop
- Required training classes for dogs to provide information on pet behaviour.
- they need to see people enforcing the rules
- Rules about leash length- dogs on a 10m leash are effectively 'off leash' in terms of interacting with people and dogs in a 10m radius of the pet owner. Flexible-length leashes need to be addressed in rules.
- how to report abuses of system
- Safety tips/notices re wildlife
- - enforcement, enforcement, enforcement
- I liked the town that mailed dog poop back to owners marked 'lost property's.
- Dog park etiquette. Banning small children from dog parks (many dogs are excellent with other dogs and adults, but not kids. Dog parks are for DOGS and bringing children is an enormous risk)
- Where to go for help!
- Specifically that dogs cannot be off-leash in on-leash areas. This is a huge problem as an owner and professional walker of dog-reactive dogs. Many natural areas become completely unusable because people have out of control off-leash dogs in on-leash areas and are not receptive to hearing that they need to put a lead on their dog. They need to know they can/will be fined, and would also be legally responsible for any consequences of their dog approaching an aggressive dog on-leash. This is seriously a huge issue.
- Info on why we need to license pets and the benefits owners will receive from it
- Clearly communicated and enforced consequences for owners of vicious animals and illegal livestock ownership.
- Education and enforcement of no dog zones.
- Instruction about watching your dog at ALL times when off leash because they can poop any time and more than once on a walk!!
- Post proper etiquette at all dog parks next to stand to get free dog bags
- 1) If you pass a person without a dog: call your dog, leash it up 2) If you pass a person with a leashed dog: call your dog, leash it up 3) If you pass a person with off-leash dogs, feel free to leave yours off-leash
- What to do if your dog is involved in an altercation (sort of like those insurance cards that tell you the steps if you're in a vehicular accident!)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Neighbours who harass animals should get serious consequences. We had someone harass us for years, throwing rocks at our dog, and then making noise complaints because the dog barked. No one in the city gave a damn until I got one good bylaw officer who listened to me and looked at the complaint pattern and ticketed the jerk neighbour for harrassing the dog in an enclosed space, it took 6 years to be listened to. Bylaw needs to be more impartial and understand there are two sides.
- owner to take dog to training class and must provide proof
- WHY they prohibit dogs from playgrounds, atheletic parks, school grounds - why it is in the owners and pet's interest to stay out.
- information about how to be a responsible pet owner
- Enforcement when people are not in compliance
- Health and safety information.
- Police the off leash for people not picking up after their dog.
- Information on training opportunitie
- any info when requested
- Resources on training your pet. Currently with all the rules and regulations you still get some aggressive dogs in an offleash park. Pet owners need to know there will always be a risk going to an offleash park. If a bigger dog is playing with their smaller dog and they are not comfortable with it, then go to a fenced area or "for small dogs" area. Don't punish all the dogs by restricting the offleash area. There are limited offleash areas as it is.
- Mandatory pet ownership course.
- Sick and tired of people who think dogs can roam offleash wherever they like - sick and tired of being approached in public by other people's badly behaved dogs.
- Information about how to be a responsible pet owner, health and safety rules, pet responsibilities in regard to others and their property
- free work shops on animal care and behavior
- Signage! Sigage stating on leash were taken down from all areas of the city when the previous bylaw got changed. This in my opinion has made the situation of people letting their dogs roam loose through streets, alleys, green spaces and it turns into unsafe sitiations and agruments! Also barking dogs in neighborhoods, owners rarely seem to care when they should be caring for the pet and stopping. many seem to let the dog outside and just let it go on for long periods, its not the dogs fault, the oweners!
- Off leash park edicate. Sadly some dog owners need to be reminded that these parks are a privilege not a right and to be respectful of other people in the park.
- Education about responsible pet ownership.
- Effective investigation and enforcement, including proactive patrols of parks
- informaiton about both provincial and municipal rules, information about allergies and how to prevent your pet from causing allergic reactions in others (proper control of animals and cleanliness, especially in apartment style housing)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- a limit and licensing program for owners with 3 or more dogs, also license dog walkers and limit # of dogs
- Small yappy dogs should be kept indoors at all times. They are more annoying than magpies. Better yet, they should be banned.
- Detailed breakdown and what if any penalties are in place for breaking by-laws and engaging in improper behaviour.
- That off leash dog parks are NOT a place to take your kids sledding and it is a dogs natural response to chase play and bark with small dog like creatures moving at high speeds in off leash parks.
- Enforcement of bylaws (leash laws in parks and playgrounds))
- Where to properly report animal neglect and abuse. Anytime I have tried to report this I get trapped in a girl of 311, animal bylaw, police, and external resources all claiming someone else deals with it. And after u spend weeks calling and calling to get sent back to the same sources who say they dont assist in this....its disheartening that it seems NOTHING is done for animals in bad situations
- Info how to contact both City of Calgary Animal Services and Calgary Humane Society for info on how to handle their pets.
- Enforcement
- What is a responsible dog owner? A properly trained and well behaved dog? Spell it out for every owner please. Respect your neighbours right to freely use their sidewalks, trails and parklands without fear of dogs nipping, jumping, attacking. I am a senior, runner, walker, snowshoer, pusher of a family member confined to a wheelchair. Dogs don't know what to do with a wheelchair! Proper dog owner behaviour and proper ways to call your dog to behave properly. Why do dog owners panic when the dog "misbehaves" and talk to it like a child. Use your dog commands the dog was trained to obey. Not "naughty boy".
- Information about how kids are to interact around dogs: never run towards a dog, watch for stress signals such as turning away and lip licking and give the dog space.
- Enforcement of posted rules and related bylaws. Enforcement of where off-leash areas are.
- How to keep dog safe and a detailed comprehensive list of what is animal cruelty ex hitting, kicking, screaming at & threatening a dog no water, no food, leaving dog tied up, leaving dog out in certain temperatures. **DOGS SHOULD BE IN THE HOUSE NOT LEFT IN BACKYARDS OR DOG HOUSES!** Dogs left in cars, dogs left out at night, dogs walked with only collars (causes neck damage, spinal damage, choking hazard, throat damage)...etc etc etc! I think also that ppl who don't report animal cruelty should be reprimanded.
- Having a fully vaccinated dog. Dogs should not be allowed in off leash areas unless they have their vaccinations and received a coloured tag from the vet that shows dog has all vaccinations.
- Safety issues -- guidelines for basic training, how abuse is defined in Canadian law, and ways to volunteer to help out the Calgary system.
- I think majority of people are aware of the rules, but choose to ignore them. Enforcement is sadly required, and lacking.
- To be clear on pathways that have signs stating offleash



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- We need educated staff in more of the public dog parks near the pens or entrances helping educate and facilitates the owners enforcing dog compliance. So many owners ignore their dogs while chatting and that's when dog attacks happen. They don't know the body language that is being said by the dogs and they ignore until a fight happens. The bad dogs still get let off leash when it's just the general public around but when bylaw or someone as trained as a uniformed dog walker the owners pay better attention and keep their dogs better controlled
- Animal should be licensed (if require) when animal is transferred to new owner.
- More tickets for infractions and more enforcement
- Being a responsible neighbour, looking at our needs for a peaceful environment above their needs of just putting their dog in their backyard and leaving it to do whatever
- Proper monitoring to ensure the rules are adhered to.
- Um...dog behavior. Is this a responsible dog ownership bylaw? Or PET bylaw? I think the City should seek out PET behaviourists to better understand normal (not "proper") pet behaviour to write effective and enforceable bylaws. And to develop educational materials for both pet and non-pet owners.
- Better access to poop bags. Some parks have them, some don't, but there are going to be days where someone forgets a poop bag and has to leave the waste behind unintentionally.
- Training assistance for dogs and and cats
- This information must be given to all pet stores whom must sit down with a new pet owner and go over the information BEFORE that new owner is allowed to leave the pet store or breeder, and must be signed and dated.
- People really just don't care because no one is enforcing the bylaws on the books now. Admin needs to do their job and enforce what laws they have not make new bylaws that they also won't enforce. They know better, but just don't care (same as speeders, people driving on wrong side of road, jaywalking, etc.).
- Referrals to training, including mandatory training when a dogs is aggressive
- focus needs to be put on proper dog behaviour and proper pet owner behaviour as well as some do little to nothing to control their animals, or say "down" but then inappropriately reward poor behaviour and ruin an animal.
- Enforcement
- Enforcement of bylaws
- Options other than a physical tag that will be accepted as proof of registration. Signed- an owner who is tired of paying to replace tags when they always have a phone on them.
- Off leash parks in each neighbourhood that are safe. Bylaws to help enforce bylaws. Random checks for licensing.
- Regular enforcement of bylaws, fines
- do not bring toys to off leash parks
- Free training for our pets



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Less rules - why go after those who actually bother to take their well trained animals to off-leash parks etc - the real issue are the owners who leave their dogs chained in the yard etc
- Some kind of electronic system so that you can easily scan and get the animal's license info. There are too many pet owners who allow their animals to run free and short of catching the animal, there's no easy way to identify the animal to report it to by law enforcement. If not a system that can be scanned by a smartphone app or scanned at the entrance to an off leash park.
- Pet Owners and non-pet owners need to trust that rules will be enforced.
- Enforcement for not cleaning up after your dog especially in off leash parks
- More freedom to take dogs in stores and patios
- Some sort of central place where people can get all kinds of good information about anything to do with pet "ownership". Information about the environmental impacts of pet ownership. (See number of birds killed by cats, for example.)
- Fine those who do not want to follow the laws...
- How to reinforce people to clean up after their dogs. Especially, having extra consequences of their action if caught!
- Information on how to properly care for animals.
- The city's Killarney Aquatic Centre sits in a park that is inundated with dog urine. In summer, the park reeks.
- More bins in the off leash parks and biodegradable bags
- More signage and far higher cost penalties are needed for owners who don't pick up pet defecation. Surveys from the Vet associations don't reliably report the high number of dogs owned. The A
- City of Calgary to enforce rules on a consistent basis
- People need to not!!!!!! Have their dogs off leash in any areas outside of their yards or the 150 dog parks here in Calgary! There needs to be heavy fine for off leash dogs in areas that are not dog parks!!!!!!
- Pet friendly places, events or parks information
- REQUIRED animal training classes included in the current costs of animal liscencing
- information about the importance of financial responsibility in pet ownership including veterinary care and providing for all needs.
- Spay/neuter education
- Mandated dog training courses or access to such courses.
- Dog owners have no need to follow the by-laws. There is presently no or little enforcement. I think the pet owners need to see a visble enforcement of the by-laws. With tickets issued. It would keep them following the by-laws.
- That there animals can be removed if they are neglected or are abusing there animals
- Free pet training courses to make responsible owners
- Information about ecoli. Information about consideration for shared space and other users in parks.
- We just licensed a dog and did not find any of the above information lacking.
- Stiffer fines for not abiding by the rules.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- compulsory education and community service when charged with bylaw offence
- Bigger signs around local areas where dogs should NOT be off leash. Signs should be clear in areas where dogs should NOT be off leash, and that multiple dogs shouldn't be walked on sidewalk. Same with people running and cycling with their pet off leash. Irresponsible dog owners need to understand they are not above the law.
- More signage in NoseHill Park indicating off-leash vs on-leash zones. People are under the impression when you exit your car it is automatically an off-Leash zone.
- The city itself needs to get a good understanding of 'proper dog behaviour', presently 'throw toys' are actively encouraged in dog parks. CRAZY! Foo foo might love her little tennis ball BUT, the 'toy possessive' dog does NOT understand 'mine, yours, his' and WILL do what it needs to do to 'own' that toy. And then we get upset at normal dog behaviour when Foo foo ends up 'attacked'? ABSURD!
- List of resources for pet owners like animal trainers, SPCA, adoption agencies etc
- the difference between off leash and a dog park
- So many people do not understand the on-leash and off-leash areas. They don't see why their 'friendly' dog can't just wander with them. They don't understand that some dogs are reactive and can only be walked on-leash. They don't understand that wildlife needs to be protected. They don't understand that their 'friendly' dog might react to some people in an unfriendly and aggressive way.
- Not really an other but I think this all should be provided to everyone upon purchase of a dog whether from a breeder or rescue
- re: 'Information about what is considered proper dog behaviour' I think that the rules need to include pets who have potential issues but not are 'vicious' or 'nonsense' dogs. If we are allowed to adopt dogs that might not get along with other dogs, it doesn't make us 'bad' owners as long as we are responsible and know our dogs, and ensure they stay away from other dogs. While my dog would never intentionally kill another dog, my dog might get riled up enough to potentially hurt another dog. An instance like this might happen when another dog owner is not being responsible and has their dog off leash (in an area not deemed appropriate for this). If a dog that is unleashed comes up to my dog, my dog could potentially hurt that unleashed dog. I would be responsible, and my dog would be deemed a 'vicious' pet, yet we were the ones following the rules. This must change, there must be a way to word a policy that would also take into account these types of situations. Since we adopted our dog, we have tried through the Cochrane Humane Society (where we adopted her from) and the Calgary Humane Society training courses, and unfortunately we haven't been able to change our dog's behavior. We recognize that the risk is higher for us given this situation, however I get really frustrated with how many people think it is appropriate to have their dogs off leash in areas not deemed so. We try to hard, and our dog is SO GREAT WITH HUMANS, but not with other dogs. Not sure what you would suggest, but I don't believe that I or my dog should be found liable in a situation such as that.
- How to clean up after their animal and fine the owner for not doing so immediately.
- To ensure that you keep your pets on leash in on-leash areas, specifically Crescent Heights paved pathway, and Bowmont paved pathways. Runners do not enjoy having to stop and start their runs



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

constantly with dogs who are seemingly "friendly" as put by their owners, coming up and growling/ lunging/ barking at us.

- It is imperative that there be CLEAR AND UNEQUIVOCAL MARKING of NON-OFF LEASH areas, as many believe they can get away with it, that the bylaw is toothless, that enforcement is a joke because nothing is ever done about it. That hurts the responsible pet owners and their on-leash dogs, often creating fear-aggressive dogs, creating a lot of discord in the community between dog owners and in some cases endangering my own safety.
- Grandfathering of dogs, owned and lived by their owners, who may have passed on . It is vitally important these animals stay with family even if the quota exceeds the by laws you are wanting to implement
- Limit on how many dogs can be walked at one time. On or off leash. 4 maximum
- Information regarding the risks of some breeds.
- More large off-leash areas.
- None of the above. Not sure what this by-law even is. I have never heard of it. The city needs to increase pet friendliness.
- Information on consequences of not following - fines, restrictions, jail.
- Making so regardless if city, province, green space or park all off leash dogs should be fined heavily and often by bylaw officers regardless of who owns the property this is a huge issue that need to be addressed
- The absolute importance of cleaning up after your animal for the safety of other animals and people. It should be made more clear that not picking up after your animal could mean a fine. People should also be able to report (with a description) when they see people who do not clean up after their pets, especially since it appears to be repeat offenders mostly.
- they need more supervision in off leash areas by bylaw officers
- Signs and postings that explain why dog poop is NOT a good fertilizer! There are a shocking number of people who won't pick up after their dogs because they honestly think the poop is non-harmful to the environment, wildlife, other dogs, people, etc.
- Training links, links to pet shelters and their programs, more community visibility of rules and regs and "good neighbor" type of guidelines
- Greyhounds always have their ears back. This is not a warning sign of anything but a calm and happy greyhound.
- Dog owners must train their dogs not to bark. Most dog owners figure everyone should like their dogs. I do not & don't want the dog coming near me.
- Better signs or listing of off leash areas as I dont understand why people have their dogs off leash in fish creek park and glenmore park. When you jave an injured do its impossible to find an area safe to walk your dog on leash as I never see dogs on leash in any area in calgary including my own neighbours dont have their dogs on leash walking to the dog park two to six block away and bylaw doesnt charge them its a free for all and the law breakers know it while I now have to pull out dog spray to protect my injured dog injured from being attacked in an area thats on leash by an off leash dog



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- people need to know how to clean up after their pets and that cat owners have to keep their cats contained on their own property. and hoarding pets is not healthy for them or the animals
- Better rules at dog parks. No toys, treats or dishes.
- Understanding that dogs can only be off leash in off leash parks, picking up after their pets!
- All available online, no need for flyers
- COMPASSION when something awful happens with an animal you love and never thought would cause harm.
- Information/education on humane and proper care of pets (food, shelter, veterinary care), also requirements for physical and mental exercise, and socialization
- To know that it is illegal to allow pets to chase, attack wildlife and that many are being killed, are stressed because of this and you risk having your dog put down if cause this to wildlife. Heavier fines and be held accountable, as a pet owner
- Clear rules and fines. Direct anonymous number to all to report infractions.
- Information on what to do if they observe or interact with pet / owner not following the bylaw.
- Off-leash regulation of dog walking services- maximum number.
- Monitoring and fines if people don't follow rules in parks ie) unleash areas
- Enforcement and consequences when rules are violated.
- The only place a dog should be off leash is at an off leash park or in your back yard. Not in your front yard, not in children's parks. Your dog may be friendly but it may run up to a frightened dog who only knows to growl which can then cause a fight. Or your dog may see something, run and cause an accident with a car. Also be mindful of your barking dog/s in your backyard, no one likes the constant noise, not even fellow dog owners.
- Funding and access to behavioral services
- dog parks, and NON-dog parks, and what ON-LEASH means. I'd prefer to see NO off-leash areas in public parks.
- Bylaw enforcement - off leash dogs
- Better supervision of on and off leash parks.
- Stricter laws about off leash pets in on leash areas.
- What to do if a... 1) dog attacks you 2) dog attacks your dog
- clear information of which parks are offleash and which are not
- Information about the 5 freedoms and a checklist of what owners need to be providing their pets not only for basic needs but to ensure they are also mentally and emotionally taken care of.
- Information on fines, where to report problems (ex. not picking up poop in dog park)
- How to walk your dog on public bike/ walk path. Ie on the right to avoid accidents for overtaking bikes on left
- Know that the bylaws will be enforced
- information but less restrictions
- Information on what is proper owner behaviour, regarding positive reinforcement etc. I have a neighbour in my neighbourhood who I watched him walk with his older puppy and he would yank on



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

it's leash until it almost fell over. It was horrible to watch. Perhaps some education around that would help.

- I still believe that individuals wanting to own a dog, should be required to take some sort of class to learn about how to properly handle and train a dog. Too many people do not know how to handle their dog, and that's when people get hurt. If you cannot read the body language of the dog, there's a problem.
- Areas that are off leash and the consequences of having animals off leash in a non off leash area.
- Knowledge that fines will be applied if they don't comply!!
- The reality and truth about owning a dog or cat such as how long they live, monthly costs, and the most important of all that pets are for life and are not disposable.
- A list of Calgary based dog trainers, daycares, etc But most importantly trainers
- Easy access to community programs about training/obedience
- Information about what is considered proper CAT behaviour!
- Education on why cats should be kept indoors and fixed. Subsidized vet visits for those going through tough times. All breeders and the sale of breeder puppies/kittens should be illegal. WAY tougher animal cruelty laws. Low cost dog training classes.
- There shouldn't be a limit on the number of dogs. If people are hoarders, they will hoard. Good neighbours make good pet owners. People are afraid of Bylaw. Instead of jumping to bylaw & enforcement, can we have more information & resources? I never want to see a limitation on buckles, collars, etc.
- Average person doesn't know much about the bylaw ie: leash laws
 - What happened to licensing posters [personal information removed] registration
 - vet offices
 - billboard
 - NEEDS TO BE MORE ADVERTISING
 - Pathways need to be more collaborative/hard to be on the right
 - Too many dog owners whose dogs are not properly trained in dog etiquette -> ie: approaching other dogs without permission
 - Resources are needed
 - Who is advising city on pet equipment? Limiting tools
 - Pinch collars, Ecollars, Martigales, Choke or SLR collars
- - Tight definitions/Terms of Reference
 - ie control
 - info package at licensing
 - Social media platform
 - More signage
- Rules need to be enforced
 - More resources needed
 - More officers
 - 311 Staff



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Officers need to be educated

- Officers often not educated about canine behaviour
 - needs to be clear
 - needs to moderate behaviour
 - if you pay for a license, you expect enforcement
- education, tv spots on bylaws, radio education, lots of sign boards
- Enforcement! There is no way to make owners of roaming cats responsible. Complaint based licensing.
- To enforce the no retractable leash law! People do not have control of their dogs on them and I've seen dogs get hit by cars and into accidents (other animals) because they were so far ahead of their owner.
- Better enforcement in parks and pathways
- Reminders that cats are no permitted to roam freely
- None. we don't have an issue and you are looking for more ways to get paid
- Who is allowed at dog parks and consequences for bringing aggressive dogs to dog parks. (or abandoning their dog at the dog park) (as well as safety concerns with children at the dog park!!)
- Signage returned to cemeteries regarding dogs not permitted and enforcement of existing rule of no dogs, allowed. In particular Burnsland and Union cemetery, after removal of signage, daily usage by owners driving to cemeteries for use as dog parks, zero enforcement presence and lack of signage promotes entitled usage attitude.
- Mapping on where rules may vary.
- Clear signage in parks for on-leash and off-leash areas. The signage in the Bowmont Natural Environment Park is abysmal, particularly in the area near 40th Ave NW. It's impossible to tell where on-leash applies and where it 3nds.
- Letting your cat roam is not okay and will not be tolerated. The City really needs to drop the hammer on this one and get it under control.
- City shall have the animal selling records from licensed sellers i.e petland, licensed breeder & animal rescue orgs to ensure all animals requested to be licensed licensed. At time of licensing, owners shall read over all owner-s responsibilities.
- On bike paths No long flex leaches
- Locations of off-leash areas.
- No off-lease pets in public parks and gardens
- Fines applicable to first time offences.
- even if pet ie: dog owners know all of the above , it isn't and can't be enforced due to the lack of bylaw officers.
- Information on proper cat behaviour
- An understanding of the impact of their dog on others



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- People think it is okay for their dogs to urinate on private property (we have to garden in their toilet and I have caught Coxsackie virus from it!); leaving bags of poop around the neighborhood; long leashes permitting unknown dogs to lunge at pedestrians
- They need to know that there are fines for not following the bylaws. They also need to see Bylaw Officers in the community enforcing these bylaws (through tickets/fines).
- People will do what they want responsible people will pay not the irresponsible ones.
- The penalties for not doing any of the above properly.
- what to do if you pet goes missing; care of animal, value of health checkups, where to get more information for support of aging or behavior issues, what to do if you can no longer keep your pet
- More compassion and respect for those struggling with their pets.
- how to get help when it's difficult to care for a pet
- Campbelltown, New Brunswick bylaw: Barking is considered excessive when it exceeds: 240 barks per day between the hours of 7.00am and 9.00pm, or 35 barks per night between the hours of 9.00pm and 7.00am, or regularly exceeds 30 barks per hour during the day or 4 barks per hour during the night.
- Enforcement of bylaws, specifically where the off leash areas are and aren't, and manners in off leash parks
- Training classes on dog behaviour to prevent the potential for dog bites and how to care for dogs in extreme weather.
- Understanding the level of care needed to possess an animal in the city limits.
- Reminders of penalties when rules and laws are not followed
- information about what is considered proper dog OWNER behaviour
- they city has done a poor job communicating about the bylaw in regard to pets, there has not been any advertisement in years.
- Enforcement And signage re what areas are off leash and on leash
- Some pet owners need to be disciplined (significant fine increases, and in some cases pet removal) Many owners let the pet out running free to poop or pee , particularly on cold or rainy days. Many do not bother to clean up after their pet when taking them for a walk.
- Non-compliant owners need a smack-down; they get away with it too often and too well.
- Clear information / guidelines on what to do when conflicts occur between pet owners and others in the community. Many times, it is not a pet owner that is at fault for a conflict. And they never speak up. It would be important to provide information on how to move forward regarding reporting and conflict resolution. There are some human individuals that are causing major problems for dog owners and their dogs. Those people need to be fined. It can be similar to protection for hunters under provincial wildlife regulations. If a person impacts a hunter who is hunting legally, they can be fined. The same should be done for individuals that harass dog owners and dogs both in public areas and in their yards. Harassment and dangerous Behavior needs to be clearly defined by the City of Calgary so that everyone understand what is not acceptable Behavior



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Reminders that public parks and paved pathways are Not off leash zones. Or owners backyard. This is a huge problem in the city. Dogs off leash jumping, lunging, attacking people and their leashed dogs while the owner is too far away.
- perhaps a partnership with Humane on dog-on-dog signals for safer off-leash experiences
- Offer courses with local trainers that people can take to improve their dogs behaviour
- The right to seize pets that are mistreated, including being left outside
- Dogs and cats should be required to be chipped - not licensed. Many home pets impart NO cost to the city and as such they should not need to be licensed. The chip provides for any identification of the owner.
- Information on types of training (for dogs) and resources would be helpful. Information about cremation / end of life would be good.
- Signage at off leash parks with a list of rules
- We have a number of barking dogs in our neighbourhood and dog owners seem to be offended when we ask them to keep their dogs quiet. Dog owners must be made to understand that the bylaw says they must keep their dog (per the bylaw) from barking, howling or disturbing anyone.
- Basic information on animal communication - ways they try to tell us they are uncomfortable
- Not letting dogs walk offleash along greenspaced backyards. This is an ongoing problem with these dogs attacking mine through the fence. Not leaving dogs unattended on balconies or in backyards to just bark most of the day.
- How many dogs people can have
- No draconian or overreaching regulations that seek to end dog ownership like in Montreal.
- Information about Responsible dog ownership
- Proof of passing a first level obedience training....and the city to sponsor Canine Good Neighbor events.
- More freedom regarding off leash areas. They get too crowded and over populated which causes over stimulation and fights among other things. Loosened off leash rules would help this. Not all of us have wild and unruly dogs that have no manners and just want to walk our dogs in peace with nature. A basic training/education that owners can take that gives their dogs a specific tag to put on their collar (or something similar) that states that dog and/or owner should have a basic understanding of dog behaviour and a basic training level. If found to have caused severe issues with this tag - owner is heftily fined.
- Exact consequences is their dog injures rolls another animal or human.
- Stats on strays, benefits of spay/neuter, benefits of microchip (ie how long it takes to get an animal with a microchip home vs one without), importance of keeping microchip info updated
- People pay taxes for their land and house to limit breeders is wrong; and to continue putting license for each animal is not good...responsible dog owners should not be penalized
- You need competent staff in the park to educate the users!
- Education on what is responsible pet ownership.
- Please have your dog or cat spayed or neutered if you are not a CKC registered individual/



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Information about what to do when encountering someone breaking a bylaw.
- Nothing, there is too much government involvement already.
- Keep dogs on a leash, unless in a fenced off leash area. Ban leashes that extend and retract. It seems that they are more than 6 feet long .
- Education about the use of muzzles and other training equipment that allows all dogs to be safe.
- Resources (ie. dog training/animal behaviourist info), also clear rules/fines for dogs off leash in non-off leash areas- this is a serious problem in Inglewood
- umm, I don't need big brother to tell me how to have a pet
- Information on how to rehome pets rather than releasing them into the wild (like rabbits, reptiles, tarantulas).
- Safety precautions regarding on leash meetings. Not all dogs want to interact. Teaching people about dog behaviour and body language.
- Responsible practices regarding ownership of strong, dog aggressive, and/or human aggressive breeds as well as proper etiquette for small and/or friendly dogs.
- Bylaw should have to give owners written reasons why they are at their house. Can not enter just because you heard a dog barking. No different than police you have to have responsible cause. Hearing a bark is NOT reasonable cause.
- How to safely take care of an animals and ensure all needs are met.
- If they can't afford to provide food then they can't provide hospital bills for them and should not allowed to have pets
- Education on spay / neuter. Or mandatory spay / neuter unless a breeding license is applied for. Help reduce stray cat population. Information about dog warning signs before a bite. Understanding their dogs communication so it doesnt get pushed over its limit. Education on proper dog training (positive not punishment) because punishment makes the behavior worse. Appropriate ways to deal with dog behavioral issues and resources available. Ban declawing.
- Information about training, city dog parks
- Ways to possibly change outdated bylaws in cities that don't allow certain pets
- where to get obedience training or city sponsored obedience training classes.
- Information about how to read dog body language and how children and dogs should interact
- signage for off leash areas and what that means for those of us who do not have dogs
- Distinction between what agency does what (for example, CHS vs. Community standards).
- How to find support!! what does the license really do!! and trust !!
- Information about dogs off leash on the Calgary pathway system
- Proof of training classes
- Information targeted to young kids about what is considered proper behaviour towards pets (ask to pet etc.)
- People are very unaware of how animals/dogs are not like people and how to raise them to be healthy emotionally and so not an issue. A free/with licencing intro dog behavior class would help.
- Shared food between different animals



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It's a free country. Please allow me and my pets to enjoy our lives in peace. We don't go to off leash parks. Our neighbours have never complained.
- All pit bulls have to stay on leash always
- Information about options for recourse: For example, how to report problem dogs that frequent dog parks (with non-cooperative owners). Or how to report other people/animal owners who stand on public property (adjacent to private property) and antagonize/poison animals on adjacent private property.
- enforcement of the bylaws - fines don't seem to be issued very often, so pet owners believe they won't get caught if their dog is offleash or they are in an area where dogs are prohibited. Education and enforcement is required. At least one sign should be posted in areas where dogs are prohibited to continually educate the public.
- Bylaw reform on some of the more nonsensical bylaws surrounding pet ownership.
- Ban on vicious breeds
- concentrate on the people who abuse, neglect, keep their dogs chained outside 365 days a year, not provide vet care, that's who you need to focus on.
- When you are in an off leash area, it doesn't mean that you can sit on your phone and drink your coffee while your dog does whatever it wants including terrorizing other dogs.
- Information about what is considered proper human behaviour when in the company of dogs!
- Inclusion of all owned species/ Collaboration and communication with strategic stakeholders/ Grant assisting agencies/ Effective spay and neuter strategy (more encompassing means test, shorter wait times)
- Proper dog introductions, ensuring pets are under control in an off leash area (recall), dog body language
- Every area is on leash unless posted and you maybe ok with your dog running around and up to people but those people shouldnt have to deal with dogs off leash in leashed areas. Just saying your dog is friendless does nothing to help someone who fears dogs or an on leash dog who had surgery which is why they area walking in an area thats on leash. With 100 off leash areas they is absolutely no reason for dogs to be off leash in leashed areas
- Enforcement (fines) when posted rules are not followed.
- Location of all off-leash areas and expectation that that is the law. We live on a green space and constantly see dogs off leash. Huge potential for dog attacks only because owners too lazy to drive to off leash area. City needs to be proactive not reactive and hold owners accountable through fines and then confiscation of pets.
- inclusion of all owned species. collaboration and communication with strategic stakeholders. grant assisting agencies. effecting spay/neuter strategy (more encompassing means test, shorter wait times) [DUPLICATE]
- How to properly care for all pets, taking into account their natural behaviours when creating a suitable living environment for them.
- Lay out clear expectations/regulations on dog barking and consequences/fines/impoundment/put down dogs if the dogs bark non stop for more than 10 minutes.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The public needs to be made aware of how many cats/dogs being euthanized each month because of overpopulation. The public also needs to be made aware each month of how many cats/dogs are in each of the cities shelters. The city needs to support Trap Neuter Return Programs by working with local rescues.
- Dogs under control at all times especially off-leash. Snakes/reptiles not allowed at all in public!!
- The issues that development when pets are poorly trained and looked after. Also, dog parks are for dogs. Kids are in their space not the other way around.
- Dog owners should recognize that Calgary has sufficient Off Leash Parks already for exercise and socialization and they dont need to take over all parks.
- More effective spay/neuter strategies.
- Education and reinforcement of education, easy access to clear information on responsible ownership, services available, etc.
- More information regarding why spaying and neutering is important and where to receive financial help for procedure
- Inclusion of all owned species, collaboration and communication with strategic stakeholders, grant assisting agencies, effective low/no-cost S/N strategy (more encompassing means test, short wait times) [DUPLICATE]
- They are required to pick up after their dog goes "Number 2". We are not requiring pickup of pee so one of two should not be onerous.
- Reasonable expectation that complaints and transgressions will elicit action FROM YOU.
- With the exception of repeat offences, a bit of slack should be encouraged as not all pet owners are seasoned animal wranglers.
- Reasonable licence fees that are not out too lunch for pet owners. Why, for example is a licence required for a house cat that never goes outside?
- Enforcement is extremely important. On Nose Hill, where there is completely inadequate signage about on and off-leash areas, there is no enforcement of any rules. Dogs run off-leash all over the place; wildlife is constantly harassed by dogs off-leash; and native birds have difficulty nesting because of dogs off-leash. The dog lobby in this city has far too much clout – it's time the City stood up for wildlife and for good behaviour. It's time for dog owners to start using their brains.

What non-pet owners need from the Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw

- Information about how to file a complaint
- Information on proper cat behaviour as well. Many people may not understand that their neighbours' cats need to be licensed.
- i see too many people not knowing how to act around animals. petting service animals, teasing animals non pet owners need to inform themselves on proper animal edict
- Information about non-pet owners behavior to both the pet and the owner.
- We need to know protocol on what to do when there are issues with animals. We live on a park and have an off leash problem when it is not an off leash park.
- Bite prevention. Don't bring children to fenced off leash park, don't approach strange dogs, etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I have had instances where individuals walking through an off-leash dog park are terrified if my dog comes towards them. More signage, possibly, or more warnings to pedestrians for these reasons.
- What to do when pet owners are not following rules - continuous barking, cat roaming and leaving animals unattended.
- Monitoring and enforcement by City of existing laws. Knowledge that over 50% of bear attacks in America are caused by dogs.
- Who to contact when there is a problem and a quick response!
- Better support in dealing with pet owners who are not responsible. This especially related to noise!
- information on how to politely and positively engage with pet owners when there are concerns
- there has to be a better reporting system..not all homes can have security cameras to catch offender dog on their lawn..if homeowners are willing to write up a statement to the fact that should be enough too...s
- Do not approach dog without asking owners.
- Education on how to interact with pets in public. Often people do not know how to approach a pet and can stress it and the result can be a negative experience for both the pet, the pet owner and the non pet owner.
- Rules about what is permitted by responsible pet owners and rules public should follow to respect the animals.
- How to report
- Information on interactions with animals
- To get tough fir once on irresponsible pet owners as it is NEVER the animals fault but 100% the owners fault if their animal causes harm to another pet or human or property. Increase FINES, increase accountability (jail time) if required.
- Major Financial penalties for those who do not follow the rules.
- Resources of how to learn how to be a responsible pet owner.
- Non pet owners need the bylaws to be enforced.
- information how to protect yourself from a viscous dog, what is allowed and not allowed
- An intelligent decision on how to stop dogs from barking all day. Would you like to listen to a dog barking all day at your office?
- Understanding that dogs do bark especially when people walk right by fence property. This is normal.
- Information about [removed] and walk past dogs or ask permission to engage the dog
- We need bylaw officers to have more authority to deal with pet owners. It is a huge process for people that are being bothered by pets/bad owners
- A fast-track system to address concerns or injuries. Contract this out!
- No strollers or young children should be permitted in off leash parks
- Enforcement of areas that are not off leash
- Stop putting running paths through dog off leash areas - these people are a threat to my dog
- Culturally sensitive teaching for new Canadians who are not familiar with animals as pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If walking in a dog park, on or off leash, expect to meet a dog or dogs. If that is a concern, walk somewhere else.
- The non pet owner must tolerate the late night barking, dug up flowerbed or peed on tires. The pet owner may not appreciate that.
- Enforcement of rules to protect us from irresponsible pet owners.
- Education on what is ok, and that not all breeds are bad
- Understanding that they also need to be tolerant.
- Nothing
- I think families with young children running around in an off leash dog park should understand the safety risks
- Who to call when a problem or issue arises.
- Nothing.
- Easy access to the complaint process.
- Information about how the human should behave around unknown dogs. Many people who have never been around dogs do things that inadvertently put themselves in danger
- pick up after your dog or get fined, we need more enforcement as the pathways look like a dog outhouse
- Specific tools to communicate their needs to pet owners. For example if you have a fear of dogs how best to communicate that early and of course don't go to dog areas.
- How to read and assess a dog in approach
- some people don't have the common sense not run or ride a bike through an off leash area if you don't want to have any contact with dogs. same for kids screaming. Dog bite prevention training for children should be done in all schools
- Please make sure that what you are providing as appropriate dog behaviour is indeed correct. There are a lot of appropriate behaviours being labelled as inappropriate.
- Information about what is considered proper cat behaviour!
- Nothing. They're just going to call our anonymous 311 center and complain if any animal looks at them in the wrong way anyways.
- information on dog bite prevention; information on risks associated with punishment based training, including e-collars, prong collars & 'dominance' based training
- To feel safe while walking in non off leash parks and walkways that they won't be accused by off leash dogs
- What to do when you see rules are not being followed.
- None
- To know who to call if they have concerns about a pet or owner.
- Right to live without pet related issues such as barking
- I will not accommodate poorly controlled dogs: eg if the pet reacts to a person wearing a hood: DO NOT blame the human, it is the owner's responsibility to teach the pet.
- Enforcement of rules in public dog parks and off leash areas.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They can reference the Pet Owner info to make themselves aware if they want. It is a duplication of information.
- What to do when they see contravention of the rules.
- ALL the education is important
- Unless specifically designated off-leash all public areas are on-leash areas and you can call 311 to report any animals at large
- Information about proper people behaviour around dogs
- I check everything only because there is such a high volume of irresponsible and non-educated pet owners in the city. Owners NEED to understand how to let dogs properly greet each other and how to approach anyone else with a dog on leash.
- if your going to enforce the rules then don't bother with this
- What to do if they find a lost pet, whether or not it has visible ID. I've heard many stories of people finding pets, not seeing a tag or tattoo, and assuming it has no home. Most pets now have microchips, but they can't be seen and sometimes move around. Lost pets should be taken to animal services or a vet and scanned, otherwise these animals are sometimes kept by the finder or given away, never even having a chance to get home.
- Education around what dog owners should be doing to mitigate behaviour issues
- Info about how to behave safely around animals.
- Information on what is considered proper interaction with an animal and how to safely do so (such as not running up to animals)
- None
- Information on how to approach dogs politely to avoid scaring them
- nothing..they don't own a pet
- Reminders on common sense. If theres a playground inside an off leash, then act responsibly and not flip out on dog owners walking by
- How to act in a safe and respectful manner around pets. The [removed] I've seen people do and then whine about how the pet reacts. Training is not instantaneous nor consistent in most cases.
- A what to do if page.
- What areas are considered pet friendly and pet restricted or pet forbidden
- Non pet owners should not have to fill out multiple sheets of paper to get the Atti on they request. A simple report to 311 should be cause for a visit from bylaw.
- Information about how to spot & report animal abusers.
- Respect from pet owners, if you're on a sidewalk with your dog pull your dog to your side, don't make me go around or off the sidewalk because you have a dog on a long leash don't let your dog approach me, jump on me, lick me, scratch or put holes in my clothing, smell or rub against me/ my belongings or bark and growl at me. Pick up of their own dogs feces and disposal in their own garbage cans. If your dogs off leash they better respond to your requests immediately.
- they need some basic info about dogs. Often a pedestrian will quickly move into our space without concern or caution. My dog is not fond of people and will provide warning signals etc. It is the



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

pedestrians fault for entering our personal space...but they likely don't understand this. They expect all dogs to behave like robots. Joggers etc. should learn some basic dog safety to assist with conflict avoidance

- They need to take all complaints more serious!
- Slow down on the bike paths
- The lawn bylaw info, meaning how much of a person's lawn is the City's.
- We have come across people who don't have dogs but grab at or just try to touch our dog without asking. We have Retriever breeds so ppl like them. But this is dangerous. If the dog is a rescue or is being rehabilitated this attitude of grabbing a dog without asking can be dangerous. Non pet owners need to be held responsible for their actions too.
- maximum number of animals that can be (non) controlled at the dog park.
- Tips on addressing or resolving concerns, or where to make a complaint and what to expect from complaint process
- EDUCATION. If me and my dog are walking, on leash, and you see him and freak the heck out and act super scared- that is going to make him want to intimidate you. Public spaces are for all of the public, including dogs. If you're afraid of animals, go to a play park or ball diamond- where dogs aren't allowed.
- How to approach a person with a dog ask to pet. Don't just release your kids to go see the dog.
- Education on how to coexist with animals in society. Many people still don't understand this. Proper dog safety education as well.
- What services are available to them if they have situations with pets of others.
- Education about sharing public spaces.
- Reminder that their own behavior affects that of an animal so they are equally responsible for the interactions
- More action on enforcement of by-laws. Especially no dog areas and cleaning up after pets.
- An easy way to report a threat - real or not - that is actioned and vicious animals removed from society
- Education when they are unrealistic NIMBY's who think they should control other people
- Information on how to deal with irresponsible pet owners and pet behavior.
- just like people, we don't like everyone we met. I know I don't! Same applies to our animals. people need to understand to ask before approach an animal. also not let their kids run up to a strange dog (which to a dog that means he is being attacked). information about what is consider proper HUMAN BEHAVIOUR.
- what non-owners can do in a POSITIVE manner when they see infractions. Call the cops is NOT an option.
- Enforcement of the rules - Animal control officers in the parks and on pathways.
- information about what the city does to promote responsible pet ownership and what they can do if they have concerns.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Better recourse/mediation between neighbours with barking dogs and other problem pets. More anonymity where conflict is potential, deal with the problems.
- Information on what to do when an animal is behaving poorly or a pet owner is not acting responsibly.
- Information on how to report a misbehaving pet/owner. There seems to be very little recourse or ability to stop someone who is breaking the rules.
- info when requested
- A lot of people have allergies against animals this should be brought in consideration seems to have been set aside
- How to report and what can be reported.
- A bigger dog does not equal aggressive. People always assume your dog is out of control and freak out I, thats how we come up with all these rules and regulations. When dogs play with each other, they will yelp and tell each other when it's too much and that's ok.a lot of dog owners automatically jump in and freak out.
- Need teh City to monitor and maintain pet owner and their pet behaviour towards non-pet owners and ensure pets are on leash when visiting leashed grounds and parks, such as Nose Hill Park. It is almost impossible to walk there without getting harrassed by pets that are unleashed while pet owners mind it if pointe dto that!
- Supportive resources and enforcement in the event of a non-compliant pet owner, violent or disruptive animal.
- Sick and tired of people who think dogs can roam offleash wherever they like - sick and tired of being approached in public by other people's badly behaved dogs.
- Follow through with complaints
- More information on how to act around off leash parks. The city used to have a program teaching kids how to act when approached by an off leash dog. Sadly many adults also have no idea and act inappropriately leading to unnecessary problems for all involved.
- How to look after the animal.
- A better way to report owners who aren't following bylaws
- info regarding best practices for off-leash areas. For example, off-leash park near me (bankview) is frequently used by kids/families tobogganing and playing which is risky behaviour as many dogs don't handle kids/loud/fast people.
- In my area there are many wandering types looking for work and soliciting be hanging over fences to get the dogs attention to alert the owner. They then hassle the owner. I think that there should be fines in place for individuals who harass or tease dogs that are behind fences. THIS DOES HAPPEN IN DOVER!
- protection from other people's pets,
- Mace. Enforcement of leash laws.
- better way of dealing with pets defecating and urinating on their lawns.
- That is is not appropriate or legal to take your kids sledding in designated off leash dog parks.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Enforcement of bylaws (leash laws in parks & playgrounds)
- Info regarding how non pet owners should not be making their neighbors dogs bark by bugging them when their home.
- Citizens and tourists do not need a rule book to walk freely or ride, around the streets and parks and pathways
- Dog parks are for dogs to run and play. If they bring their children that are afraid of dogs or riding bikes or tobaggans or aren't steady on their feet, expect that dogs may run over to investigate. They may be curious. They are not allowed offleash in that many places in town. Please don't get upset if a dog licks the food your toddler is waving in front of their face.
- Information about how kids are to interact around dogs: never run towards a dog, watch for stress signals such as turning away and lip licking and give the dog space.
- Get a dog. It's a wonderful experience!
- Their responsibility in safe and proper interactions with animals.
- Improved off-leash area signage.
- PEOPLE act stupidly around dogs and that's who often gets bit! Information regarding HOW TO BEHAVE around a dog. I saw a lady at a dog park flailing her arms and screaming and hiding behind her husband and holding her child up in the air. HOW STUPID!
- How they should respect/behave towards anyone's pets
- Maybe some kind of information package could be available (upon request) about benefits of pet ownership? I am thinking about bees 'cause they are so beneficial to everyone but people freak out if they think someone might have a hive nearby. So, something to cancel out negative myths.
- Non pet omwered need to have easy access to animal behaviour training such as posters or radiot or tv that give easy safe ways to behave when encounterong an unknown animal domestic or Farrell
- If animal is not behaving in a safe manner, who do I call? 911? 311?
- incentive to microchip, spay and neuter
- If it's a pet bylaw than not just dog behaviour. And how about "normal or neutral" behaviour not "proper" behaviour. Non-pet owners need the City to have a better understanding of pet behaviour so they can be assured that bylaws and policies ensure pets, owners and non-owners can co-exist respectfully.
- Information on resolving animal disputes.
- How they can report unruly dogs.
- Must be taught in all levels of schools. And be online to find easily!
- They need to know the City is proactively heading off problems by patrolling parks and ticketing non-offenders.
- Information about what to do and how to respond when a dog is aggressive or attacks.
- A method for quickly reporting and getting a quick response to complaints that will carry enough weight to change behaviours (ie. no warnings, actually issue fines)
- Information on dog behaviour and approaching dogs. Just help people understand pets more
- I don't think non-owners care about any information honestly.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That pet owners have a right to offleash parks for the pets, the same as parents do for parks for their kids. Huge fines/jail time for ppl that are abusing, harming pets (ie raw chicken, poison).
- Confidence and trust that the city is preventing unwanted pet behaviour of other people's pets
- Non pet owners like to complain about the 'nuisance' of pets while their child screams/ yells/ destroys property, makes messes ect. They will always think they are the centre of the world and probably wouldn't be happy until Calgary gets rid of all animals
- We need monitoring and a way to ensure non-compliant owners are held accountable.
- Accountability from bylaws to enforce the rules and hold irresponsible pet owners accountable.
- Education of how to behave around animals they don't know. It is NOT ok for your kid to "pet" my dog by hitting him- and when that puppy then nips at said child- I'm the [removed]. No- maybe people should teach themselves and their kids how to behave around dogs
- Information on who to contact when a dog owner allows their dog to negatively impact other children and/or property
- Information on how to behave around animals.
- SAFETY. Public needs to be educated on how to properly approach animals in public. The [personal information removed] is an accident waiting to happen.
- What is acceptable surroundings for animals inside of a house. Filthy enclosures are unacceptable. This usually happens when people have too many animals.
- City is acting upon complaints. Ask for photographic or video proof. Please no excuses if you have proof.
- We need to know what is being done about the stench from city properties where an abundance of dogs urinate and defecate. The Killarney Aquatic Centre property and park area reeks when the snow melts. Calgary has more dogs than other cities.
- They should stop riding bikes in off leash parks
- Far higher cost penalties. Calgary parks are rife with dog defecation and urine. The stench is incredible.
- Information about the consequences of harming a dog (kicking, poison, trapping, locking in garage)
- There is no way to identify a dog owner to report them when they are not following the by-laws. I have a very clear security camera of a dog owner letting his dog defecate on my lawn and walking away. How do I report this? Make the owners wear a visible license when in public with their dog. Set up a web site with pictures of dogs and owners and a location map so I can locate and talk to them or report them as required. Another item that might be helpful....some home owners do not like dogs peeing on their lawn. It costs money and time to repair the damage. Maybe the city could provide a sign to home owners that they can place in their yard to let dog owners know that they would prefer if they moved along to another area. Some home owners do not care, some do. Make it easy for the pet owner to identify the "grumpy old man" like me. :)
- Information on how to interact with dogs, including what not to do, and how it may not be safe to immediately pet a dog, even if it seems to be friendly. They don't know the history of the animal, or how it will react.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That they can't just take an animal as their own, when they're out in the alley, street, or in the park. Because they might have gotten out of the backyard, house, or might be playing with their owner. So, many people have migrated to Canada from other countries and they don't understand our culture and love of cats and dogs. That they are family. You
- ???
- Stiffer penalties for being off leash in and on leash park, not education but fines.
- That they feel confident to say to an owner to have their dog on a leash and to pick up after the. People should be able to walk without the fear of any animal due to an irresponsible pet owner. I'm tired of the City doing nothing or making the person calling with a concern for a pet to jump through hoops by giving all their details etc as it puts the concerned neighbour off if they feel they are the one in the wrong by calling in. I was asked recently to call the Police when I saw a dog that was leashed to the fence but was on the road as leash too long. This person constantly doesn't do this to their pet and it goes nuts when people walk by...they neighbours are too frightened to call it in.
- Where to report irresponsible dog owners.
- My biggest issue is people without pets don't know how to approach animals. My dog is not aggressive, in fact she's terrified of strangers and especially kids. Some parents are great about asking if their kid can pet my dog but others just reach out to her and scare her.
- Continuing from the above comment, humans have lost touch with 'nature' and no amount of legislation is going to correct that. We dress up dogs, pay FAR more attention to our all important brain sucking electronic devices than to our pets. I have seen people forget their dog when leaving the dog park because the person was focused on their phone, but I'm pretty sure they got to share/post/tweet to the world about what they were doing, or something.
- Visible enforcement
- information about how non-dog owners should behave around animals and not think that all animals will love them.
- how they can hold dog owners accountable without feeling threatened
- On-leash vs off-leash. I cannot emphasize this enough.
- Rules for people around pets of any type would be great especially posted at off leash park entrances
- stay out of offleash areas if you don't want to encounter dogs. there are plenty of places for people to go. mind your own business.
- Rules about bike riders at off leash areas and sidewalks
- non-pet owners need to recognise that pets are part of our community and not complain heedlessly when they have had a minor negative interaction. Support for mediation/negotiation with neighbours who may be in dispute about pets.
- Information sessions for parents + kids about properly approaching animals / pets they do not know.
- Allow citizens to report dog owners online who do not clean up after their pet defecates.
- Better signage to indicate when dogs are allowed in specific areas and to when dogs must be leashed. Also provide owners with information on who to call and what to do if a situation were to arise about unruly dogs in on leash areas that pose threats to non pet owner safety.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Education about how to approach a strange dog, education about how to teach their children.
- Rules about not touching or letting your children touch an on-leash dog without the owners consent.
- Info on safe interaction for kids & Information about the benefits of pet friendly cities and spaces.
- Consequences
- For bylaw to be able to fine people in any and all private, city, provincial, or green space big fines all day long every off leash complaint should lead to a fine
- Where to find support with dog and puppy classes
- Respect. No one in this city cares about people that have fears of Dogs nor does the city actively enforce any of the laws so the Bylaw is useless.
- information about what is considered proper human behaviour around animals
- Complaints requires paperwork and proven in court that barking is consistent. Why cannot a notice be sent to the dog owner and if not compliant be fine?
- Understanding that, just because they don't have or want pets, doesn't mean they shouldn't learn to live and let live.
- more community visibility of rules and regs, "good neighbor" guidelines
- Understanding of shared spaces for example off leash dog parks that also have a bike path and our kids park
- Most dog owners figure everyone should like their dogs. I do not & don't want the dog coming near me. Don't tell me that your dog is friendly. Just keep it away from me.
- Quit talking to and calling my dog Ask first period but these are the same people that go up and pet a service dog
- What normal dog behavior is. What to expect in an off leash environment
- they should be aware of rules in off-leash vs. leashed areas. Non-pet owners should be encouraged to contact the city when they observe pets that are not being cared for properly/in distress/harmed.
- Number to call directly and at the time and can be anonymous.
- Most issues between dogs owners and non dog owners is because the non dogs owners do not know how to react. They then over react and react poorly. No matter how controlled a dog is sometimes it can be scared and In turn react.
- How to report a pet owner that is not following by-laws
- Bylaw enforcement
- How to file a complaint about pet owners not picking up their dogs waste, allowing their dogs to run free, not under control and dogs that bark.
- What to do if a... 1) dog attacks you 2) dog attacks your dog
- clear information of which parks are offleash and which are not
- where to report problems (ex. not picking up poop in dog park)
- Assurance that they won't have to deal with hassles of pet owners that don't control their dogs!
- Teaching their child how to properly approach a dog or someone with a dog.
- How can non-responsible owners be made to follow the rules. Please stop off leash areas in Nose Hill so none pet owners can enjoy it too.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That not ALL dogs need to be leashed...dog behavior education
- That dogs bark sometimes, that's what they do! If a dog is barking in a neighbours backyard, it could be because they hear something and are doing what dogs do!
- Information about what is considered proper CAT behaviour!
- They need more understanding...
- Resources
 - what about a mediator between non-pet owners and pet-owners?
 - Education (for both) (in school!)
- Enforcement
 - Can the bylaws do more for people to obtain license?
 - Set the expectations for bylaws higher so people have to become educated; they have to want it!
 - possibility of taking of course to reduce fines
 - Reward people not punish them
- to educate pet owners on respecting everyones property rights and safety
- Ways to impose consequences for non compliance. Complaint based differential licensing fee.
- Information on how to interact with dogs you do not know. How to behave in off leash dog areas.
- Education on dog behaviour, non pet owners are always quick to think dogs are vicious and scare our animals
- How to approach someone else's dogs. (ask first, pet later)
- If a person moves in to a home or building near a dog park they should be aware of the potential noise. Perhaps a sign-off of understanding.
- Responsible enforcement. I used to enjoy walking in local parks but not any longer. Too many incidents with irresponsible dog owners. Dogs frequently off leash in on leash areas and owners saying not to worry, their dog us friendly. Same thing I was told by an owner who's dog bit me. I never see any enforcement by City of Calgary in local parks. Why is that?
- How to act around dogs
- No off-lease pets in public parks and gardens
- Information about how to educate children about approaching a dog
- Public education. Calgary has May visitors and non-residence working, playing . How are they to know without a public education program or sufficient signage. Citizens of calgary should not be charged with educating and enforcing alone. Risks and safety are too substantial for the average person.
- How to submit complaints
- Protection from overly friendly and out of control dogs
- Non-pet owners need to see that the City of Calgary is enforcing bylaws (fines / Bylaw Officer presence) to ensure pet owners are following the bylaws.
- nothing you allow them to complain enough and use it against neighbors.
- That animals are living beings. Many non-pet owners tend to come off very entitled.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The understanding that they need to coexist with dogs, whether they like them or not, and that most dogs are good dogs.
- I also believe if non dog owners are in an off leash area they understand they may get dirty, jumped on, have water sprayed on them. They can be the best dog but these things can happen. Also when people bring children they need to understand not all dogs are use to children. Children should not be running and screaming at dogs.
- How to report irresponsible pet owners
- A system or way to report certain areas that are frequently used as off-leash even though they are not. As well, some monitoring of those areas and fines if required.
- rules aboutg the humans behaviours in public space with animals. they need to know that not all dogs want people running up to them. When a person walks in a straight lin to a dog, that means that person wants to fight. a human making eye contact with a strange dog - that is also a body language to the dog that they want to fight. people need to take courses that educate them about how to respect/understand how the dog communicates.
- what to do if people think a pet is being harmed
- Campbelltown, New Brunswick bylaw: Barking is considered excessive when it exceeds: 240 barks per day between the hours of 7.00am and 9.00pm, or 35 barks per night between the hours of 9.00pm and 7.00am, or regularly exceeds 30 barks per hour during the day or 4 barks per hour during the night.
- Animal awareness. E.g., animals here are well looked after; how to be a good neighbour to someone who does care for animals; not having their kids running in off-leash areas.
- Non pet owners need to know they live in a city with pets who can sometimes bark.
- How to avoid / prevent animal aggression. Some people intentionally antagonize animals, while others do it unknowingly
- Retail businesses should be made aware of the rules regarding support pets.
- Education on proper behaviour when meeting other people's pets
- How to properly interact with the dog.
- Unfortunately, parents allowing toddlers to run freely in a dog park DOES need to be addressed. Toddlers should always be within reach of parents when dozens of dogs are playing nearby.
- Tighten up the rules and regulations and follow through with enforcement as there are a significant number of pet owners who do not act in responsible manners with their pets.
- Education / information on how to act properly around dogs. So many people and their children are extremely dangerous around dogs. I'm amazed that more people don't get bit in this city. The human behaviour is the bigger problem then the dog behaviour ever will be. Responsibility for the city should really focus on human education and information. Naturally, dog owners will learn from this
- Information on what constitutes a good pet owner in terms of the amount of time an animal is left alone, crated, etc. If you don't have the capacity to be a great pet owner, don't get a pet.
- Education is key and non-pet owners need clear and concise guidelines so they can clearly identify if a pet and/or owner isn't following the guidelines so they can make a properly informed and backed up complaint should there be one.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- the website could have information for both pet owners and non pet owners
- what to do if a dog owner isn't following the rules
- How many dogs one person should have
- Not to have a trump card to complain about animals and their existence in public space
- non pet owners need to be educated and learn what actions are correct protocol for approaching animals they do not know.
- Information about what is acceptable during the day regarding noise as in barking while playing.
- To mind their own business.
- Rules around behaviors in public spaces need to be on signs in of leash areas. I saw an off leash dog jump on a person, and the owner said "what do you expect? You are in an off leash area".
- Nothing
- Education about the use of muzzles and other training equipment that allows all dogs to be safe.
- Dogs bark--- nondog owners need to understand the difference between nuisance barking (ie. extended ongoing consistent barking due to boredom etc) and regular barks that would be expected of any dog. Non dog owners seem to have unreasonable expectations in this area.
- How to properly interact with dogs. Do's and don't when in off leash areas.
- They need to understand that if they are in non fenced dog parks it is their choice to be there, as dogs can be off leash in those areas.
- Assistance from City when complainant lives in a condo. Same rules should apply regardless of where you live.
- Information about off-leash parks so non-dog owners can make an informed decision on whether to walk in one or not.
- Proper courtesy towards dogs in public
- Non-pet owners need to understand that we under no circumstance own animals. We are caretakers who have removed a being from its natural habitat and forced it to abide by our expectations. The animal has no need to provide use with companionship but we have changed them to shut out needs. However, animals are not toys or possessions. They will bark, bite, and growl. Just as human will speak, with and yell. This behaviour is normal and we should work to prevent it but also recognize that the owner is a caretaker not truly an owner. Animals are precious and should be respected. Their behaviour should be accepted not labeled as nuisance. I do not call strangers children unkind words even when they behave incorrectly and I expect all other living things to receive the same courtesy. Language such as owner, control, nuisance is used to describe slaves no respectable member of civilized society should stand for the continuation of this language in our bylaws or any legal document.
- Non pet owners need to respect dogs and not assume all dogs want to be petted or picked up
- Information That is specific for the non pet owner to be concerned
- How to behave around strange dogs and the importance of teaching their children how to behave appropriately around dogs even if the family doesn't own any because those children WILL be around dogs regardless



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Safety rules, especially around bringing food and small children to the off leash areas. Stay off phones, pay attention to your dog/kids!
- signage for areas that are designated off leash which include numbers to call if they have concerns
- Understanding the rights and responsibilities of pet ownership
- To enforce the rules that are already in place and leave the bylaw as it is. Bylaw officers at the dog parks enforcing the law from time to time would be a great start.
- defiantly rules around public spaces !! and how to approach a dog.. maybe just not without asking.. no bending down faces..
- tolerance towards those who earnestly take care towards pets.
- some basic awareness of how to interact with an animal if they feel like they have a problem. e.g., Teach kids to not run at a dog they don't know, teach parent this too!
- It's a free country. Please allow me and my pets to enjoy our lives in peace. We don't go to off leash parks. Our neighbours have never complained.
- Dog owners need to understand that we don't like their dog so they should keep the leash short enough so their dog cant come up and sniff us or touch us
- please teach people how to properly approach a strange dog-- scratch under the chin, do not pet on the head and dogs perceive this motion as threatening.
- Information about what is considered proper human behaviour when in the company of dogs!
- Information/rules relating how to safely interact with others pets in public (eg have children ask permission to pet and respect the owners answer).
- Information about what is considered proper behaviour toward approaching someone with a dog, or the dog itself, to prevent an animal from jumping on an approaching stranger and having them report it as an attack. Animals deserve personal space too.
- Quite calling someones dog you dont know you should be asking the pet owner before engaging with a dog consider ever dog a service dog in training
- Enforcement. There are many rules posted that aren't followed by dog owners (particularly in areas where dogs are not permitted to be off leash).
- We need more bylaw officer actually enforcing the off leash law. We've been bitten several times by off leash dogs and maulings are a very real potential. Non pet owners shouldn't have to deal with off leash dogs when going for a walk in the neighborhood. Signs don't work. Offenders need real consequences like confiscation and large fines. Does it take a child to get mauled before the city is proactive vs reactive.
- informtion on how to deal with noisy dog in community - non stop barking. The issue shouldn't just be passed off and confusing about getting a result. A pet owner should run the risk of having their dog put down for noise complaints.
- People direct their anger out on cats & need to be educated. Cats are blamed for killing birds ; yet windows, vehicles & other birds kill birds. Cats are blamed for defecating in yards, yet squirrels, racoons and birds also do this.
- Strict Supervision by city bylaw officers to keep everything in check on a consistent basis.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Non pet owners need to understand they have a right to use parks and should not be forced out or intimidated by dog owners
- again, education re: realistic expectations of pet behaviour (how to approach..children in particular, what is vicious vs freindly, etc)
- Pass law limiting dog ownership to two. Institute surveillence to ensure compliance to existing bylaws.No more [removed] excuses to avoid doing your job. You have or had rules. They accomplished little. YOU NEED LAWS NOT RULES AND YOU MUST ENFORCE THEM!!
- An information line to assess complaints and offer education where misunderstanding is encountered.
- Non-pet owners need a set of proper behaviour required of them when they are in the off leash areas.
- Enforcement and education

Reasonable expectations in or near off-leash parks for dog owners

- I would love to see a ban of small children in the dog parks. Unfortunately, they are at serious risk from dogs that are even playing well. Most do not look where they are going when running and playing and I have seen serious injury to even adults in dog parks.
- i really believe if they are going to a dog park they need all there shots so they arent getting other dogs sick.
- Recall is important but even the best behaved pets sometimes get distracted, especially with toys in parks
- Make sure dogs interact with people appropriately- no running and jumping up on people, chasing children, etc.
- Knowledge of dog behavior and warning signs through appropriate training
- Dogs should be on leash when they are near off leash areas, but not in them
- To be aware that if you have a dog on leash in an off leash area that they could still be approached by off leash dogs and to expect that
- Regulate dog walkers to no more than 5 dogs at a time. I constantly see 10-12 dogs running and dog walker can't possibly pick up after all of them
- Conflict resolution steps. When to say something and how to say something.
- Monitor to ensure your dog(s) do not harass other dogs in the name of "being friendly"
- Monitor to ensure your dog(s) do not harass other dogs in the name of "being friendly" [DUPLICATE]
- Re-leash when leaving the off-leash area.
- Dogs are registered with the city and up to date on vaccinations. Maximum number of dogs per owner that can be safely controlled offleash
- People need to be in control of their dogs. Aggressive/reactive dogs should not be allowed in off leash dog parks.
- Keep your dog within your area of sight at all times. If a dog does not have recall, it should not be in an offleash area period.
- Not allow dogs to jump up on/knock over people.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It would be nice if all dogs came when called but that is a big ask in a highly distracting environment. WOuld be better if there were separate spaces for high energy / bold dogs and smaller, shy dogs.
- Owners need to actually watch their dogs. And if a dog shouldn't be off leash (like mine), don't take it to an off leash park. You need to be sure your dog will be good.
- Appropriately is very vague.
- install security cameras in such sites so offender(s) are caught on camera(s)...
- Control of their dogs at all times is ALWAYS a problem at off leash parks. They are the most dangerous places for dogs and people in my opinion. I NEVER use them and recommend to anyone else to not use them either
- Ban the use of flexi leashes.
- Limit the number of dogs walked by dog walkers and enforcement of bylaws particularly in off leash areas. There are a large number of dog walkers who are walking too many dogs at one time and cannot control where and what the dogs are doing. And not picking up after the dogs.
- Share the pathway! I have taught my dogs to yield/sit/stay while onleash on a pathway of a bicyclist approaches. This is apparently rare.
- Ensure that pet owners who attend off leash parks with children fully understand not to harass or annoy the dogs so as not to create incidents.
- They should put their dogs back on leash if not in the off leash parks. It would be nice if all off leash areas close to children's playgrounds are fenced in or seperated from one another.her.
- No off leash dogs in play and school grounds, even if close to off leash area. Dogs in rotary park off Lions Gate bridge are ALWAYS attacking the children in the playground and this off-leash area should be permanently closed!!!!
- Do not allow dogs or children to interact with other dogs, on or off leash unless the owner of the other dog has invited you do to so.
- Pathway bylaws with pets on and off-leash need to be posted
- Enact LAW ASAP that ALL dogsust be muzzled at all time's while walking with owner both on leash and off leash parks
- Ensure that the person walking the 200 pound dog has the strength to control the dog.
- Dogs should be kept under control at all times, they should not be off leash if they don't behave and listen to their owners
- Which dogs shouldn't be off leash (and there are many -- too many that put our small dog at risk).
- Understand signs of aggressive dog behaviour!! Hackles up approaching others is NOT FRIENDLY!! Not approached others unless invited!!
- Like a car accident, stay onsite when an incident happens...provide insurance and contact information for resolution.
- Dog walkers should have maximum limits for how many dogs they can bring. I'd like a limit of 3 dogs per person
- But people aren't responsible enough! Not enough is done to catch these offenders.
- Only fully vaccinated dogs should be allowed in off leash parks (herd mentality)

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dog owners in an off leash, Non-Fenced area are far more responsible. I find in a fenced area people assume it's doggie daycare and just let there dogs go and do what they want while owners stare at their cell phones. There is far more poop in fenced areas than non-fenced.
- limit the number of dogs one owner has with them in a park
- It's all about respecting others. and accepting all responsibility for your animal's behavior.
- Dogs must be under control
- Properly collared so there is something to grab if need be (also with licence)
- No small children allowed in the offleash parks for safety reasons. Dogs are running around and playing and may injure them unintentionally. Kids also do not know how to react to all dogs. Saw a kid waving a stick around and a dog tried to get the stick and jumped up on him to get it. Parents blamed the dog owner when all it wants do is play with the stick.
- Dogs must always be on leash except when in off leash area
- And that not every dog is there to roughhouse with out dogs. If not invited do not approach others.
- No balls or frisbees when lots of dogs are at an off leash park.
- Don't be on cell phones ... Distracted
- Dogs must be in control
- No toys or balls- increases aggression, prey drive and anxiety in many MANY dogs. No dogs in heat at the park . No intact makes in the park (these are all bylaws in several major cities in the USA
- Do not have your dog off leash unless in an off leash park (i.e. near off leash park but not in it). SHould not have dogs off leash on school playgrounds/city playgrounds. Enforce this rule. There are many people and children who fear dogs and are not expected to be approached by an off leash dog.
- Keep your pet reasonably close at all tones - off-leash does not mean 'run amok'. Pay attention, interact with your dang dog.
- Seperate areas for different size breeds
- Be within a reasonable proximity to your dog.
- This is stupid, why would you ask that question? who in their right mind would say no to those options? Why even ask this question?
- That the dog is not aggressive and dogs shouldn't be on leash in an off leash area. Owners of small dogs should be cautious and understand the risks. Consider ya big a 25 lb and under area for small dogs. Mandatory course to use dog parks. More by law presence to educate and/or hand out fines. Dog parks are a privilege, not a right
- People who bring children to off-leash parks should never leave them unattended. Sometimes dogs just play too rough for little ones.
- No food other than treats, only play fetch when other dogs are not around, carry your leash with you at all times
- Dogs and children, the off leash areas should be safe for families
- Do not let your small child run around aimlessly and act out/scream and run. Dog walking services have a limit of how many dogs they can walk at a time (3-4 max per person)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- pick up after your dog or get fined, we need more enforcement as the pathways look like a dog outhouse
- I have a brilliant dog and we work on recall daily, that does not mean he comes 100% of the time and if a rabbit tears past him his natural instincts will trump his human. Bylaw officers MUST be well educated as to what constitutes "under control" If a human is 100 yards away and their dog is erratic that is not under control and 1 call out for recall is not enough to bring down an amped up canine. It is more effective if I command "down" and walk to my dog rather than have him come to me. He needs a time out which is his down command not come here and run all over the place while remaining in an elevated state.
- By law officers need to be in off leash parks to ensure pet owners are following the rules. I've never seen one!
- NUMBER ONE IS PICKING UP DOG WASTE!
- Truman home, just like small children near water pet owners need to be in control of their pet at all times there's always been two ways and have them within a reasonable distance
- Reporting requirements for when an incident occurs.
- How to properly interact with other owners. How your tone and actions can play into a dog's behaviour or reactions
- Dog parks are not the same as playgrounds for your kids. People that choose to bring children to the park should be aware of the dangers of your child approaching or inappropriately interacting with (taunting, hugging, running toward or away from, etc.) a stranger dog and should enter the park at their own risk.
- educate children on proper behaviour around dogs
- Be responsible for any injuries caused by your animal to other animals or people
- Dogs should not be off leash before entering the off-leash area. The off-leash area should be appropriately signed and fenced. Any animal who has a history of vicious behavior to people or other animals should not be permitted. There should be a clearly posted help number for reporting violations / cameras.
- keeping noise to a minimum
- Major issues with people letting their dogs be off leash in the parking lot before they enter the park, I have almost hit dogs running in the parking lot far too many times. Also they allow their dogs off leash on pathways surrounding dog parks, or in empty fields that are not designated off leash areas
- The other options are impossible to enforce.
- normalization about appropriate dog behavior; risks in using punishment based training
- New regulations on the number of dogs for dog walkers.
- Many dogs do not like puppies. Many dogs are afraid of children.
- Ensure dogs are wearing city license tag and name tags while off leash.
- Enforcement of laws regarding off leash dogs in non designated off leash areas



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Some people seem to believe that they do not need to pay attention to their dog while in the dog park (ie on phone, not keeping up with their dog etc) or they think they can drop them off and stay in their car.
- I'd like to see bylaw give more fines for people who do not pick up after their pets. Along the ridge by valley view park far too many people don't and it is gross for pet owners and non pet owners alike
- Don't automatically let dogs greet on leash, ask owners first.
- People should not just let their dog run up to every strange dog in the park. For example, if someone brings a fearful dog in on a leash, that dog shouldn't be swarmed by other dogs.
- General education for pet owners on how to read dog body language and what behavior is appropriate
- Persons should have no more than 3 dogs under their control in off-leash parks
- Dog to wear city tag and must always be in owners sight/within a certain distance for purposes of control.
- All of the above plus identification of dog and owner of requested in case of issues. There has been more than once personally my dogs have been attacked and the owners just left. Private dog parks perhaps?
- Unfortunately people are unaware and uneducated on canine communication and are oblivious to inappropriate behaviour from their dogs and other dogs at the park
- In control means NOT running after wildlife. The dog is NOT in control if it needs to be called back from a behavior.
- There should be no off leash areas in non dog parks. Dogs don't pay taxes. I do pay taxes, and I don't have a dog. Dog parks are sufficient space for that specific demographic. They have impacted the rest of us enough, through degrading public places for meant for PEOPLE to enjoy.
- Ensure your dog does not kill wildlife! (rabbits, birds, squirrels) because it depletes the food chain (for Coyotes) and causes danger for pets.
- The majority of issues seem to be a lack of education, particularly around appropriate dog behavior. If your offleash 'friendly' dog approaches a leashed dog/wildlife/bike/other person and does not recall, he doesn't yet deserve to be offleash and needs more training. People seem to miss the "needs more training" part.
- I go to Auburn Bay Off Leash often and it has gotten out of hand, the above needs to be followed more seriously and have actual repercussions
- Immediately remove the dog if there are negative encounters (noted above).
- If the dog is 'near' but not in an off leash area it should be leashed.
- Dogs must be controlled, monitored and not make a mess.
- be able to control your dog in difficult situation
- Listen when others ask to leash pet or remove it from the park. No intact dogs. Dogs must be under control.
- Bylaw needs to show up



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I want to emphasize points 2 and 3. Numerous times I witness owners letting their dogs run off leash and not come back when called. Last night a dog chased after a bystander's bike and did not stop or turn back for a second to return to the owners. They only retrieved the dog because the bike rider turned around to help. One other important point is that not all dogs are friendly. Not all dogs are well trained. Not all dogs like "saying hi" to other dogs. If an off leash dog approaches an aggressive or reactive dog on leash, and that off leash dog does not return when called, there will and have been issues.
- Once again there is no need for a new by-law just enforce the existing by-law
- There is no clear definition of what "appropriate" interactions are. Opinions vary vastly between dog owners.
- If a dog is upsetting another and the owner is asked to please call their dog away, the other owner should respect the request. My dog and I have been harassed (even nipped at) by dogs whose owners were a ways away, I've called to them to please call their dog because it's stressing my dog, and they refuse, say "he's just playing," or even become hostile. It's important others know it's not an insult if someone asks this, we're just trying to reduce stress for the animals and prevent a potentially negative situation.
- Most dog owners will agree that even dogs that come when called do not always in off leash parks so behaviour and attention of owners is important.
- Understanding dog body language in order to accurately assess dog-dog and dog- human interaction
- Have water/appropriate attire for dogs under/over a certain temperature
- Vaccinations are up to date.
- that an owner or dog walker has no more than 3 dogs under their responsibility when in the off leash are since they will otherwise not be able to control them effectively and can contribute to pack behaviour which is not acceptable.
- i
- Don't bring food into off leash areas, it drives food-crazy dogs crazy.
- Take responsibility for your dogs behaviour- do not bring aggressive dogs or dogs with unknown social ability to dog parks!!!!- if you're not okay with another dog taking a toy or ball then don't bring them
- Vaccinations and no dogs under 3 months allowed. Dogs in heat not allowed, honestly it should be unaltered males not allowed but maybe u have a time for that specifically
- Dogs should get priority. Dog friendly spaces are limited, human spaces are not. If you don't like dogs, get out of the park
- let dogs be dogs, make off leash dog parks enter at your own risk. too many sensitive people with tiny dogs then complain about larger dogs because their little dogs are scared of everything.
- regulation regarding the number of dogs that can be walked at one time by an individual.
- Cameras. That way no one gets away with their dog hurting any other animal or person ever. No one is able to leave poisoned meats either.
- Sadly you can't control stupid or irresponsible owners - [personal information removed].



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- dogs not coming at kids with owners saying "oh my dog loves kids" yeah my kid doesn't like dogs running up to them and jumping at them and knocking them over
- If someone asked to put your dog on a leash just do it if someone's a comfortable around your dog control them remove them or put them on a leash if someone asked you to pick up your dog faeces do it because you should've already been doing it in the first place. Don't take your dog to the restaurant food vendors food courts or grocery stores it's unacceptable it's a health hazard. Don't let your dog run at jump at bark or growl at strangers. Train your dog with the basics.
- Leashes can trigger an aggressive reaction in other dogs that are offleash. Dog owners that walk their dog 'on-leash' in an offleash zone should be more aware that they are putting everyone at risk with a potential trigger.
- a massive abuse is leaving dogs off leash into the parking lot areas. This is an issue for me because my dog is not friendly to other dogs. We are trying to enter into Nose Hill Park and struggle every time because of this. This is at all of the entrances in the NW. Start cleaning this up - fine people already. They are interfering with people just trying to enter. Perhaps there should be a gate which snaps a picture of the licence on the way in - people behave better if they think they may be held responsible.
- Dogs need to come within a reasonable time. You cannot expect all dogs to be trained to the level of police dogs. Bylaw officers for dogs must be specifically trained about reasonable dog behaviour.
- No long ropes at the off leash.
- Properly dispose of dog waste
- Proper dog training.
- Dogs should have a gps tag that can be ready via cell phone app by any person with the app - that way a vicious dog can be tracked and police notified for charges to be laid.
- In off leash parks that are fenced, most people have well behaved pets, but some owners bring aggressive, poorly trained animals because of the security of the fence. I've also witnessed people drop dogs off and leave a fenced park, while their pet is left unsupervised. I've reported these behaviors but witnessed no change. I also think signage at/near off leash dog parks needs to be better as it is frequently ambiguous. There should be more garbage cans. There should be a dog area in each community designated for dogs.
- If the owner of a dog deems the situation between two or more dogs may escalate and asks for both parties to separate their dogs, the owner must comply and the dog must be able to listen well enough to do so.
- Vaccinated. Some dog owners do not vaccinate and it puts all animals at risk.
- Current dog off leash parks are dangerous. People do not have control of their animals. SMALL children should not be allowed for safety reason until the adults can get their dogs under control.
- Safety with children in off leash areas ie: running, yelling, riding bikes in parks
- dog walkers take too many dogs and cannot control them when they are 1000's of meters behind the pack they walk.
- No toys in dog parks. It seems that every fight I see between dogs is because of a ball. Resource guarding is a natural behaviour.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Do not feed dogs that aren't your own
- Just to emphasize: WATCH YOUR DOG
- City should provide separate areas for small dogs as they often antagonize larger dogs, yet are considered the victims by uneducated by-law officers.
- Knowledge of canine communication, and knowing how to recognize if your dog is not suited to a dog park. Also, once again, no children at the dog park.
- Dogs are on leash until in off leash area
- What do to if your animal is harassed by other animals.
- People with children must educate them on how to approach dogs. There also needs to be regulations on the dog park being for dogs and is not a playground for children to run around wildly.
- No monitoring by city of too costly for results. People using off leash should help monitor. Off leash should be used to help train dogs for proper behaviour and exercise.
- More respect for the by-laws. There seems to be a "that doesn't apply to me" attitude with many pet owners
- Keep an eye on your dog at all times and don't be distracted by being on your phone or in a conversation with someone.
- Responsible pet owners should be allowed to play fetch at the park.
- Be mindful that a lot people may have to use a path to get to where they need to go and don't want to worry about an animal approaching them or their children.
- Slow speed for bikes that ride through parks - high speed commuter biking is dangerous for the rider and the dogs in an off leash park.
- Enforcement is required. The same irresponsible dog owners allow the same behaviors in or near off-leash parks as outside of them. It is more than ignorance of the rules; it is intentional flouting of the rules. The city needs signs to not merely state WHERE dogs must be on-leash but to state the reasons WHY, e.g. to maintain the safety of non-dog owners and bike riders and to protect their basic rights to enjoy public spaces, for the protection of wildlife habitat. Without clear explanations, dog-owners see anyone who suggests rules be followed as "dog-haters", or someone who's against anyone "having fun", or they argue, out of willful or actual ignorance, that "my dog isn't doing any harm anyway". See the sign at Anne and Sandy Cross Conservation Area (Nature Conservancy of Canada) for an example of an INFORMATIVE sign: "The quality of wildlife habitat may be **NEGATIVELY IMPACTED** by the presence of YOUR DOG! Studies have shown that the presence of your dogs... -caused bird numbers to drop by an average of 41% at some sites and the diversity of species fell by 35%; - can contribute to energetic loss in birds through premature flight or reduced food intake and reproductive disruption due to nest disturbance; - alters the abundance and activity of native mammals near trails; prey species numbers decrease and wild canine numbers increase; - can introduce infectious diseases such as toxoplasmosis, sarcosporidiosis and rabies, parvovirus and canine distemper to native wildlife; - can result in the chasing, killing and physical injury of wildlife; -modifies the natural vegetation found in an area; - can attract and bring cougars, bears and other predators back to you increasing the risk of human and wildlife conflicts. The mere sight and smell of dogs may cause non-lethal, fear-based alterations in behavior, habitat use, and physiology



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

among wild animals. The ASCCA was set aside for the protection of native habitat - this means NO DOGS!" For any protected wildlife habitat within the city, the same considerations must apply!

Further, despite the extensive public consultation that occurred a few years back re. dog use in Bowmont Park, the signage around on-leash/off-leash areas remains an incomprehensible disaster.

- If dog has history of aggression, must be muzzled. Use training pens provided for socialization.
- off leash parks should be banned. ignorant owners who knows their dog does not like some dogs and yet bring them to off-leash parks - they are setting their dogs up for failure.
- That people do not drop their dogs off at off-leash parks and go to do errands. Yes, this really does happen!
- Owners with dogs at off-leash areas are 100% responsible for the behavior of their dog. If your dog is out of control in any way it should not be off-leash.
- Limit number of dogs/adult. Adults (over 16) in control of dogs at public dog parks.
- carry identification that is legit when something goes badly, and take responsibility for the issue and potential damages
- When I think of dog parks I just think of diseases that are brought out of the dog park
- What to do in the event of a conflict resulting from owner and/or pet bad behaviour.
- I think it should be an expectation that dogs come when called but some leniency also expected if it is clear that they are at the park to practice recall. Some owners do not have access to a safe fenced place to do this other than publicly fenced off-leash parks.
- Make known the presence of an aggressive/violent animal. Have knowledge/training of animal ownership and dog training.
- Many dogs do not come when called and many owners don't seem to care. This needs to be better enforced!
- That humans come first before any animal
- not a fan of off leash, as to many little dogs, harass large breeds
- near should clearly be "on leash" and the owners need to be respectful of these rules for often it is the owner of the pet that is not acting appropriately not the dog! Many think its their right to have their dogs off leash everywhere cause they think they are trained and just don't follow the bylaws. Also dog defecation has gotten bad everywhere in this city, again many pet owners think its their right to not pick up and if in a green space its even worse, think why bother! Also many dog owners need to be respectful that other dog owners do not want interaction with their pets or if they are training and using the other persons dog as a training decoy!
- Dog owners need to focus and be aware of what their dog is doing at all times. Stay off the cell phone.
- Again if your dogs does not have good recall, don't let them off.
- ensure dogs remain in the designated space, ensure dogs don't run at people inside or outside the space, off leash areas should be enclosed as much as possible
- Most people don't seem to understand the non-verbal cues of a dog and what they mean. E.g.: ears back, tail down, whale eye etc. Signs of stress in a dog and potential for a negative stress reaction.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dog walkers must be limited to 6 dogs maximum. I am at the off leash area every day with my 2 dogs and will often see dog walkers with up to 15 dogs. They cannot and do not see what all their dogs are doing and often will not see when they have to pick up after them. Often with this many dogs they start adopting a “mob mentality”. That is absolutely too many dogs to watch at one time!!
- Recognition of what is and what is not an off leash area
- Pet owners with aggressive dogs who keep taking their aggressive dogs to dog parks should be held liable for any vet fees that occur because of their poorly trained animal. Its not fair people with GOOD dogs get punished because people with poorly trained dogs dont have to pay vet bills due to the dpg they never trained that keeps attscking other dogs.
- If a dog has a history of being vicious. He or she should not be at the off leash park.
- I think off leash areas should be for any pets. Some would not benefit from being off leash but the would benefit by having a 0lace to get out to.
- The leash does not come off until you are in the dog park. Train the dog and the owner. This is a “pet” peeve. Why bother with a fenced dog park if it has no gates and the dog owners don't respect the concept of on and off leash areas? Waste of money at the end of Riverdale. Small fenced in areas nearer homes would be better. Opening the car door and they bound out and run off is not appropriate In a big city.. in a big city.
- All dogs must be spayed and neutered at all times in the city when over 1 year of age. Veterinary notes required for special cases
- I go to walk my dogs in a legal off leash space. It's not a free for all. My dogs don't like playing with strange dogs and people who use parks shouldn't expect all dogs want to play with other dogs. Mine come to parks to walk and play with me and we don't stop to interact with others. Dog parks should be a nice walk for a dog and it's person. Dog parks are not a wrestling arena for those that don't know how else to exercise their dogs
- Understanding of normal dog interactions and behaviors. When their dog is being aggressive- it can be subtle.
- Split dogs by weight/size.
- I feel most of these should be done and monitored by themselves as being a reaponsible pet owner tou should be doing these things.
- Really, really hard to enforce but I appreciate the City's efforts around having local volunteers helping out
- If an incident occurs the dog owner must stay and deal with any medical bills etc.
- Responsibility of dog owners to manage animals should be increased
- Dogs should be on lease when not in off leash areas.
- More inforcement
- come when called would also be good, but there is a time of training that has to occur before this is expected initially
- Dogs should come when called - however - proofing a dog to be able to come when called in a space with a lot of distractions (e.g. other dogs, rabbits, squirrels, other people, traffic noises, etc..)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

is a learning curve. So you create a catch 22 if they can't learn in an off-leash park - even though this means not 100% recall to begin with

- This should go without saying, but also DISPOSE of dog waste responsibly - do NOT pick it up and then leave the tied bag on or near the path.
- Other pet owners should not approach other people's dogs unless given permission
- Don't let your dogs charge pedestrians
- If asked to call your dog away to not ask questions and respect the request of others.
- I think dogs should come when called but as a puppy owner sometimes if the dog is learning this might not be perfect; the off-leash park is often a place to reinforce skills and improve training.
- Actual and serious engagement of the above..
- That the neighbours approve of the nearby off-leash park (not that it be imposed on neighbours who don't want one nearby).
- Properly socialized in a controlled situation before let into an off leash.
- Muzzles for dogs that have shown aggressive behaviours on the past.
- Monitor and take immediate action to prevent or change behaviour if it is not appropriate.
- Dog should be good with other dogs- not reactive
- No large packs of dogs. These packs intimidate other dogs and owners. Also dog walkers of large packs are not capable of picking up poop and monitor all the dogs at the same time - this is a real problem when dogs first arrive at a dog park and disperse in different directions. Dog walking numbers should be limited to four.
- Have a pre qualifying test for all dog parks? People watch their children, it's not a playground
- Dogs not responding/following commands should NOT be allowed off leash.
- No dogs in Nose Hill Park
- Being respectful of other users. If another owner asks you to call your dog, call them, no questions asked.
- Do. Or bring your dog to an off leash park when it not neutered or spayed!!! Also, do not bring to an off leash park if it doesn't like the company of other dogs. So many times my dog has calmly approached another dog only to be snapped at and the owner say "oh sorry, he/ she doesn't like other dogs"
- don't used balls in the dog park
- dogs are not loose in the parking lot, children are not riding bikes/scooters in off leash parks, do not give treats to other people's dogs without consent from the dog owner
- Unneutered male dogs should not be allowed in offleash parks. They cause most of the problems I have seen.
- Watch your children when at an off leash park. It is not ok for a 2 year old to run free chasing dogs while mom and dad are 50 ft away looking at their phones. Dog owners should not be held responsible for bad parenting. I chose to not have kids, therefore I should not have to monitor yours when at the park



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dog owners with their dogs should not approach other people's children without first obtaining the parent/guardian's consent. This happens a lot at Rotary Park. So many dog owners think this is okay because their "dog is friendly"
- When your dog bites/attacks others, you must provide luscencibg info and medical info to victim. Pet owners just grab their animal and run away to avoid getting in trouble for vicious dogs. This applies EXACTLY AS MUCH to chihuahuas as it does a bulldog or mastiff
- Owner must be present at park.
- definitely pick up your waste. Nose Hill Park & other off leash areas are really bad for it not being done.
- One person (usually a dog walker or from a dog daycare) that brings several dogs to an offleash area and just lets them "go" is a problem in many ways. Dog waste is not getting picked up. Plus dog behaviours cannot be controlled when one person is responsible for all those animals This puts other people and animals at risk.
- Control the number of dogs owners are allowed to have. Canada has the most dog ownership worldwide! Calgary has the most dogs per capita in Canada!
- Avoid having your dog approach dogs that are on leash
- The only way to locate dog waste is to have a dog on leash. You can't pick up defecation when it's running around because you don't know where it defecates.
- Dogs should be socialized or owners should have good understanding of when a dog is no longer acting appropriately
- If you bring your children to an offleash park with your dogs you also need to monitor the behaviour of your children
- Put dog waste in a trash container. Monitor pets so that they do not enter wildlife areas.
- No aggressive or violent dogs allowed. No bitches in season.
- Limit number of dogs a dog walker can have the dogs off leash
- Meeting city ran training checkpoints
- Dog must be close enough so you can intervene if needed (not across the park). Aggressive dogs should not be allowed or at the very least muzzled.
- Many dog owners do not realize the dog must be on a leash on a pathway, even if the area is designated as off leash. Some of the off leash parks have become an eye sore and helath hazard from over use. There is an off leash above and west of Sandy beach. The grass is basically gone for urine burn and compacted from over use. Do not even attempt to go down the embankment to Sandy beach. The amount of dog feces in the trees is unbearable. The last couple of years the city has issued a do not swin advisory in the Elbow river downstream of the dam due to fecal matter deteted in the water? Where could this be coming from? Another off leash area that is getting out of hand is the embankment south of Cresent road. Large volume of dogs, off leash running the hill side with owners unable to see what they are doing. A lot of these dogs are also running freely on the walking trail areas used by pedestrians and cyclists. Yesterday I spotted two dogs approximately 0.5 kms from their owners. Owners must produce I.D. or dog license I.D. when requested by anyone trying to identify them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Some dogs cannot come when called; deaf, senile, not learned the command yet, or are just bitchy.
- Make sure dogs are vetted and have shots
- Walking with a dog off leash means paying attention to the dog not walking ahead and missing when the dog does it's business. Dog walkers must be able to see all of the animals they are responsible for and pick up after them. Too many dogs at once makes this very difficult.
- Stiffer fines for not abiding by the rules.
- And for owners not to stand in a group with other talking with their back to their dogs or on cellphones not paying attention to what's happening around them.
- Should be a limit of how many dogs are with dog walkers. I've seen some with 10. Too many to control plus it's very intimidating.
- The most important safety rule is having dogs on leash while in pathway. Numerous times have been riding bike in NoseHill Park and have dogs chase, nip and bite while riding by. Owner is far away from dog.
- Again, continuing from above comments... we cannot enforce 'common sense' or the 'laws of nature'. To write laws that say 'your dog MUST come immediately, every single time' is ridiculous. How can we think we are so smart as humans yet fail tests all the time and then expect that another species performs at 100% according to our rules. Get a grip! Again, as to 'proper interaction', almost 100% of people with pets have no clue what that means, and the pets pay the price. I see people discouraging their dog from 'sniffing butt' because that stupid human finds it offensive. Sniffing butt is an instinctive dog behaviour! NOT something to be discouraged. It should, in fact, be rewarded and encouraged. Having said that, well adjusted dogs 'know who they want to talk to'. Dog sees another dog approaching and chooses to just 'walk on by', human intervenes to 'encourage dog to interact' by, if necessary, forcing a face to face meeting. AGH!!!! 'Face to face' is the LAST thing dogs want to do, and they recognize instinctively other dogs that they just want to 'walk past'. And we humans think we are going to 'fix' this.... NOT A HOPE!
- control over dog
- I do not believe in off-leash parks. they are the cause of many dog attacks on other dogs because of the irresponsible owners. Owners are the problem, not the dogs.
- ban off-leash parks
- I think there needs to be some latitude in expectations when, dogs especially, behave according to their nature. Off leash is their playtime so if they chase a squirrel up a tree, so what. I won't let them catch it. Also, I don't think most ordinary pet owners actually really train a dog like a professional would.
- my biggest concern is the lack of responsibility for other in an off-leash park, my kids can't play soccer in the park 6 houses from us without having dogs bother them even though they pick an area of the park where the dogs don't hangout and it is the part of the park that has a down slope. My kids also have the right to run free in the urban parks without worrying about a dog running at them and having a owner not call the dog but rather say" don't worry they are friendly" - it seems that if my kids was running at their dog with a stick in an aggressive manner I would be held accountable.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- People don't often understand the boundaries of when on-leash and off-leash begins. They also think that any parks or pathways that do not have a sign saying "on-leash" means that it is off-leash when the opposite is true.
- and that there are City staff who actually monitor parks for appropriate behaviour. Have seen dogs chasing geese at Princes Island.
- Monitor to ensure your dog does not harass other people.
- Do not expect all people with or without other dogs to think that your dog is "friendly" when it is showing signs displaying otherwise.
- Fencing the bike paths that go through offleash areas.
- Off leash parks shouldnt have a bunch of unenforceable rules like making it that dogs mist come. How on earth can you enforce thatof stupid? Unenforceable riles
- So many rude people not picking up waste! No consequence enforced.
- Human must be in relative close proximity to their dog while off leash and human should not be distracted at length eg on the phone the entire time and unaware of dog's actions, behaviour. If dog is unable to be successful at off leash, do not bring them on leash and keep them on leash - other dogs get entangled, dog reacts to not having freedom
- Put away toys in off-leash parks where there are a lot of other dogs.
- Your dogs should have to be spayed and neutered to be at an off leash park. Especially males as Intact males are often more likely to display dominance to other males and ice versa making them more likely to have an altercation. People should also not be allowed to have puppies under the age of 4 months as they are not fully vaccinated and risk contracting parvovirus and distemper
- Just need to pick up after dog and be aware if dogs behaviour in the space. Should be no more strict than Small children
- Owners MUST have full and total control of their pet at all times. I have been pushed down by powerful dogs who run into me or jump up. Owners must be able to see their pet at all times if off-leash to reinforce that owners must pay attention to their pet.
- have seen so many dogs (not their fault) that are not properly trained and the owners do not think they have to have them under control
- Restricting bike use in off leash areas.
- Why in or NEAR. It should state ONLY IN. If a dog is not controlled enough that it can stay in an off leash area then it should not be off leash. You have just pointed out the issue with Calgary. Dog owners can get away with anything and everyone else in the City do not matter.
- We need some help from Parks on this one. There are many great off-leash areas that would benefit from better fencing to help keep the peace between off-leash dog owners, other park users, and wildlife.
- To many dog walkers At Edworthy. At times there are two or three dogs walkers walking together. ThAt means 20 - 30 dogs in a pack. Scary for me and my two☺☐ Also, how can they possibly know when their dogs are defecting, they are busy talking or on their phones. After walking in Severl



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

times a week for 20 years, I have never seen any type of bylaw officers or any monitors. Dog Walkers should have permits to use certain areas as to limit the numbers using a particular Area.

- able to control animal (physically able to retrieve animal)
- If someones dog has snuck away and they are trying to get them back and the dog stopa to get pets keep the dog there instead of letting them run further. Put training pens closer to entrances of park.
- Watch your dogs not stand in the middle talking ignoring all the dogs. People think its a place to go and let the dogs fend for themselves not taking any responsibility or jumping in when their dog attacks another dog or even calls their dog away from a leashed dog or a person who asks to keep your dog away. A person should be able to open the gate without having to worry about 5 other dogs that aren't theres
- That owners shouldn't be on their cellphones and should be watching their dog(s). Must have eye contact with their dog(s) at all times. People walk ahead of their dog(s) and can not see what their dog is doing behind them. People are visiting with others and not paying attention to their dogs because socializing with others is more important than watching their dogs.
- Owners must be within a reasonable distance to their dog to interject in any potentially negative situation that develops
- Rather than "come when called", owners should be in control of their dogs, and monitoring/managing their behaviour. It would be great to have separate areas for small breeds and larger dogs.
- To know your surroundings. Know natural areas and the wildlife that call it home. Get off your cell phone and pay attention.
- Why do you say near off-leash - "near" means ON a leash!!! And all rules would apply in a dog park and outside a dog park. The only difference is a leash or no leash.
- Monitor and immediately respond if dog acts inappropriately
- In an urban setting with wildlife, dogs should not be off leash. Ie. Nose Hill Park
- Clear signage for the boundaries of on and offleash - the signage is changeable and inconsistent and when it changes frequently, people don't pay attention.
- Only off-leash in off-leash areas!
- don't blame the dogs for inappropriate behaviour, blame the owners
- If you want to see how NONE of these happens, visit Nose Hill Park ... but watch your step.
- I realize the first box addresses this however, pet owners need to adhere to this and the only way to get the attention of many is through some sort of fining - if they do not carry evident that at least they look like they intend to clean up after the animal they should be fined.
- I understand that rules are that the dog must 100% be under the control of the owner, however I don't believe this is actually possible. No dog is 100% under the control of the owner. Owners are horribly unaware of what appropriate dog behavior is. Off-leash dogs in on-leash areas has become a major issue.
- Proper dog language and behaviour. No aggressive, fearful or unsocial dogs
- Need more fines given out so that dog guardians realize there are consequences to not following the rules.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not to get defensive when people ask for the dog waste to be picked up, for the dog owner to get their dog under control.
- Signage stating there is wildlife in the area and what wildlife has been seen/resides in the area
- Up to date vaccinations and shots
- Please set a maximum number of dog that walkers can take!!!! What I see daily at Deeridge off-leash is unbelievable!!
- many dog owners are not responsible for their dogs in off leash parks. their dog is not being appropriate and they are nowhere near or even close to the dog.
- ALL of the above, but most dog owners appear to think that their dog is a "good boy". Few owners seem to think that their dog is the problem.
- I think dog owners should be in control of their dogs at all time and be able to redirect them on command.
- People need to be responsible for their actions including their children. I think dog owners forget that dog parks are for dogs so having your child sitting on the ground eating a bag of chips is not ideal. I know dogs should be well trained/mannered but people need to sit them up for success also.
- These are all expectations now. People are busy and lazy and most of these expectations are not followed. They would also be impossible to enforce.
- If another person in the park (dog owner or not) is scared of a dogs behaviour ie. barking, running towards, jumping on the person. They should have a right to ask for that dogs leash to be put back on. I have run into this many times at nosehill park and dog owners do not see why this is wrong. I have been attacked by a dog badly in my past and when i see a dog running towards me and barking and me yelling 'stop' or 'down' doesn't stop the dog I get scared. Owners usually say 'oh don't worry he's nice' or 'he won't hurt you' it's not fair. They need to control their animal.
- some dogs don't come when called right away in off leash but they are not dangerous or vicious. I don't think that should be a requirement. I often call my dog (french bulldog) who if he is playing with another dog and having fun doesn't answer. But he doesn't bite, act aggressive to dogs or people. I have to go get him sometimes which is annoying to me but not hurtful.
- Do not allow your off-leash dog to approach a dog on a leash
- I admit, at the dog park my dog doesn't always come when I call her, BUT I always know where she is and if she is being a nuisance.
- No headphones or other distractions. Must focus on the dogs.
- The majority of ""doggy people"" don't use off leash dog parks or go at hours to avoid ""crazies""
As responsible dog owners, our biggest fear is irresponsible dog owners
- Control
 - need by law officer/ enforcement in off leash parking lots
 - need to license dog walkers
 - How do you ""monitor""?
 - How do you define?
 - Watch the wording
- When dogs approach



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- - Signage for dogparks starting 25m inside park
 - Education
 - Enforcement and education
 - Share land use
 - Bylaw Addresses this very well
- on leash or no dogs allowed, signage in playgrounds, bikepaths, athletic fields and public green spaces
- TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR YOUR DOG IF/WHEN IT INJURES ANOTHER DOG- dog owners who just walk away need to be fined and banned from owning a dog.
- Knowing when to NOT take their dog to an off leash park. Most owners are unaware of their dogs inappropriate behaviour. Perhaps all dogs must pass an off leash “test” to be able to use the parks offleash
- -Children need to be held or holding a parents hand at the dog park. -consequences for not abiding by the rules. (not picking up waste, or bringing an aggressive dog)
- Expectation that all dogs come every time they are called is inappropriate. Puppies and dogs constantly need training but how can you train them if the one area you are allowed to have them off leash doesn't allow them because they don't come back right away. Dogs won't always get along but proper ownership can allow them to co-exist in a shared off-leash space regardless.
- Dog owners to be respectful of non dog owners who would like peaceful enjoyment of parks without being bothered by dogs or their owners.
- If your dog harms another dog or person you need to be held accountable and be responsible for any associated costs.
- No off-lease pets in public parks and gardens
- Actually,, in a city our size. All dogs and cats should be on lease in public spaces. Safety first! Off lease areas - Off Lease only!
- Properly placed garbage bins. High number of garbage bins. Properly emptied garbage bins.
- Legal requirements when your dog attacks another pet or person.
- Dogs go on leash if there are small children around or if there are other activities going on that will be impacted negatively by dogs runn
- That dog owners are using actual designated off-leash parks, not just any regular park.
- Owners need to ensure that their dogs do not run up to and jump up on children
- It needs to be about socializing your dog, and not yourself, at least not so that you are distracted from what your dog is doing.
- Again it can be the best behaved dog and something can happen. Just like people not all dogs get along with each other. Once in a while maybe a dog doesn't come or gets snappy with another dog. People need to have some leeway with dogs and their owners.
- do not bring young children into the park unless they are in strollers or within arms reach of a parent. kids squeal, run, jump, and often carry food - it isn't fair to dogs to be perfectly behaved around kids in this setting.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- what do you do when there is an incident and the people don't want to take responsibility for dogs actions
- Dogs that are overly aggressive should not be in off leash parks.
- gan off-leash parks.
- To understand that often is not the best for pack dynamics to have an on leash dog at a off leash park.
- Proper training
- Bylaw officers should be patrolling off leash parks.
- I have encountered more aggressive owners than aggressive dogs. People also need to recognize that not all dog play is friendly.
- Don't bring dog of off leash area if they are territorial of owner
- i think all of the above are too relaxed - at all times a pet owner (dog or cat) must ensure that their pet does not pose a risk to other people or animals. "Monitoring" can be done from a significant distance, opens up the potential if you are not actively engaged
- DOG WALKERS need to be qualified and licensed as well as limited to the number of dogs they bring to the park. There is no way they am responsible watch and make sure they clean up after large number of dogs running loose. Again, it depends on the walker and the dogs in their care how many they can manage I have met dog walkers who are challenged to manage one dog let alone a pack.
- There needs to be enforcement of the above and those who do not act as responsible pet owners need to be disciplined (high fines, pet removal, etc.)
- There should be a maximum number of dogs per walker in off-leash parks. Some "professional" dog walkers have too many dogs, can't pay attention to all of them to monitor behaviour and pick up waste.
- In our neighbourhood nearly all green spaces are off-leash areas, so non dog owners have no choice but to use these spaces. Owners do not keep their dogs from running up to and even jumping on strangers. This is dangerous and stressful for non dog owners. Owners should be required to prevent their dogs from approaching strangers unless the stranger consents.
- Expectation that people will interfere when Behavior starts getting out of hand. This always occurs when people are in an off-leash area where they just stand around and drink coffee and watch their dogs. The dogs get more more ramped and many dog fights happen and the owners never jump in
- More signage stating on leash only areas. People think no sign means green light to off leash
- Toys at the offleash park have often caused territorial and aggression at the park. I would prefer toys and balls be kept for play at home.
- Dogs tha t exhibit aggressive barking, growling, or jumping up on people must be on a leash even in unleash areas.
- Aggressive dogs should not go near dog parks.
- Owners must be responsible when their dog acts inappropriatly and hurts someone or another dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't see the point of wasting resources to monitor people, check ins yes so behavior can be observed but not monitored, that's a waste of tax payers \$.
- If a dog is on a leash in an off-leash park, give them distance! They are probably a rescue who is just now getting socialized, and nobody knows if they have triggers or if they are fearful of you asNd your dog
- Aggressive dogs, muzzled. Specified off-leash areas for small dogs only.
- Dogs should not be allowed off leash until they are inside the off leash park!
- Do not approach dog without owner consent - same as people without dogs
- I am running on paved bike/pedestrian paths in off-leash area in my neighbourhood. I am very tired of pet owners who feel that it is fair game for their dogs jump on me, bite me and knock me over (this is a routine experience). When I politely ask them to call their dog, I have been yelled at for not liking dogs and that I shouldn't be running in the park because it is for dogs. If paved trails are multi-use then there have to be clear rules on the boards for owners to know what is acceptable behaviour beyond picking up dog waste. Many owners are just oblivious and gather on the sidewalk with several walker-friends talking and drinking coffee with no awareness of what their dogs are doing. I've been running for 40 years and I bought my house in Collingwood partly because of the nearby running trail below John Laurie. This became an off-leash area several years ago and now I have to find times when dogs might not be in the park for my daily run. To top if off many of the dog owners drive to the neighbourhood to walk their dogs there. Please put up some rules for the dog-owners beyond cleaning up waste and having their dogs under control at all times. That appears to have little impact and the number of dogs in the park is increasing.
- A basic knowledge of dog behaviour and body language
- respect that others may not like dogs or may have allergies
- Dogs that have attacked another dog/person lose their off leash rights
- That the dog is under control - "appropriately" leaves way too much room for (mis)interpretation
- Animals in heat not allowed to be in off leash areas. It would be helpful if there were specific areas for small dogs and large dogs only
- I didn't tick off dogs must come when called because dogs don't always come right away when they're having fun meeting and playing with other dogs in an off-leash park even though they may be well trained and generally always come when they're called. There has to be some leeway there. Don't be fining people just because their dog is being a dog and is not responding to commands instantly like a trained soldier.
- If an off-leash dog attacks a leashed dog then the leashed dog is allowed to defend itself without repercussions from the city.
- I think dogs running loose on public property must pass an accredited canine good citizen course and its owner must wear a button or lanyard indicating such.
- Dogs should not be off leash unless they have a proper recall against distractions, should be tested
- Should only have fenced space where they go in a few at a time. Otherwise off leash parks should be banned..you will not have enough money to properly monitor them for bad behavior. If people



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

could monitor their dogs properly you wouldn't have the issues you have. As a breeder, it is in my contract that my puppy buyers are not allowed to take their dogs to off-leash parks.

- No toys
- Inform dog owners with dogs who have behaviour issues that off-leash dog parks are not suitable for those dogs.
- Re: coming when called should be expected, with leeway allowed for a dog who is learning
- That dog does not chase bikes or other moving items
- Education about dog interactions. Mandatory obedience classes. Education regarding small children not being in off-leash dog parks.
- Dogs should not be interacting with people who do not invite the interaction. (Dogs should not run up to people and jump on them).
- Remove dogs from Bowness Park. [personal information removed] Several other dog owners let their dogs run loose. I want to feel safe in a park. Dog poop on the sidewalks there as well.
- Not taking your dog to public areas if you suspect they may be ill in order to lessen the spread of diseases such as parvo and kennel cough
- Responsible owners/handlers with their dog or dogs at all times. An understanding of dog body language and control of dogs that are being aggressive or bullying.
- Limit amount of dogs one person can have under their control.
- Appropriate recourse when rules aren't followed.
- Maybe starting to support muzzle conditioning because the reality of it is not every dog will get along with every dog.
- I don't believe bikes should be allowed in off-leash areas. There are a ton of parks and pathways and only certain areas for dogs to be free and sooooo many are fearful. Off-leash parks should not be treated as playgrounds
- Dog walkers not bringing too many dogs that they cannot reasonably control them & be aware of when there is dog waste to be picked up. Living by an off-leash park I've seen them not pick up waste, pretend to pick it up & not have complete control over the dogs as there were too many. One time I saw a person walking her dog be surrounded by the dogs of two different walkers - it was 15 dogs plus the owner's one dog.
- If your dog attacks you are responsible for the vet bills
- For people with dogs. Still don't approach without consent.
- [personal information removed]. I think dog parks are a bad idea. Too many irresponsible owners and out-of-control dogs. I refuse to use them
- Allow the animals to behave like an animal and not impose human behaviour onto animals.
- Owners should not be on phone and chit-chatting with friends not looking after their dogs
- Keep your dog off-leash in an off-leash area and on-leash in a leashed area. Not the other way around as it is not fair to leashed dogs.
- Humans behave appropriately around off-leash dogs



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs must come when called within reason - sometimes things just smell too good to recall the first time.
- be able to see when pet needs to be short leashed
- Be able to control the dogs you bring (for example, dog walkers who cannot monitor multiple dogs).
- educating the pet owners. off-leash parks are not a free for all to do whatever they want.
- An understanding of when a park is on leash and off leash, such as, if a pathway is near an off leash park, can dogs be off leash on the pathway?
- *****Put your dog on a leash while in the parking lot. The parking lot is not an off leash park.*****
People stand around their vehicles and talk while the dogs run around other vehicles and the lot.
- Understanding body language of patrons who are uncomfortable with dogs approaching
- respect for persons who are not comfortable with dogs.
- Many of the walkers walk dogs off leash in back lanes and the dogs run across streets there is no control, people also run dogs in off leash while driving their car in the back lane there is no control and is dangerous
- In a perfect world they come when called...its not practical in an off leash setting all the time like excited kids they lose focus at times. Some Off leash areas should be fenced for safety just like kids playground areas.
- Muzzles on dog if fishy
- I don't go to off leash parks because of the risks.
- clear identification of off-leash areas (what signs to look for; how to identify off-leash areas on maps); clear identification of areas where dogs are not permitted - too many dog owners think all open green spaces are a place for their dog to be off-leash.
- In off leash parks please place a minimum age (12+). Too many young kids are there who are NOT controlled and run up to dogs and harass them. Off leash parks are for dogs, not kids.
- Non aggressive and not in heat
- that people stop claiming fear and taking friendly dogs' owners to court.
- close all off-leash parks, they are the worst idea ever.
- Information about what is considered proper human behaviour when in the company of dogs!
- Dogs under control of owner, on leash or off.
- Mitigation of risks in park: toys and treats should not be permitted in any off leash park due to risk of fights over guarding
- Having a separate area for smaller dogs.
- Owners who go to a dog park and stand in the middle ignoring their dogs which they gossip is not respectful to other owners who they need to teach those people's dogs how to act or to break up a fight
- Owners carrying poop bags anytime they are in the off leash areas. Owners carrying a flashlight at night
- Don't take dog off leash until in the designated areas.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Know normal dog behaviour ie. do not pick a dog up and not expect other dogs not to be curious or jump up to investigate.
- When walking your dog and approaching people with dogs keep yourself between them and your dog.
- Other park patrons are not taken over by dogs; especially in very small green spaces.
- Off leash dogs should not jump on persons or false charge them or chase and kill wildlife. However off leash dog parks drive away other park users and wildlife anyway.
- Dogs should not be walked on leash in off leash areas, dogs who have bitten people or other dogs should not be walked in off leash areas.
- Knowing some dogs are being trained/socialized so patience/understanding may be required. If a dog is possessive about a ball or toy, expect other dogs will also want it so don't bring it out unless willing to to share.
- Dog must be in view of owner. Often, i am walking along and a dog runs up to me. In a large beautiful park like Nose Hill, dogs just run up to you (including pitbulls) and there is no owner in sight. It is terrifying.
- Dogs must be vaccinated
- Not assuming everyone loves dogs as much as they do
- Obey the laws, and observe the "rules"
- Monitor that dog stays within sight, monitor that dog stays within bounds of off-leash area (lots of these areas aren't fenced - they ALL should be), control barking, ensure dog does not interfere with cyclists on pathways.

Reasonable expectations in or near off-leash parks for people without dogs

- Ask the owner if something is concerning or questioning about the dog rather than making personal assumptions.
- Possibly be cautioned about small children in the off leash parks. We have seen unsupervised kids being approached by dogs that think they want to play. Always looked like it could go bad quick.
- I once saw someone picnic on the ground at an off leash park then flip our when dogs approached them. Leave off leash spaces for dog owners only please.
- If you are in an off leash area, be prepared to be approached by dogs
- Do not walk in an off-leash park if you do not want to be approached by a dog.
- Teach kids basic dog safety rules if you choose to bring them to off leash park.
- Bicyclists in off-leash areas need to SLOW DOWN or even get off their bikes.
- How to speak to Owners when you have a concern about animal welfare or behaviour
- Accept that people have dogs and if you don't like that, stay at home and never go outside
- Knowing what is appropriate dog behaviour and how to report concerns
- If you are afraid of dogs do NOT scream and run. Do not be in an off leash area.
- Many areas where dogs are allowed off leash are not dog parks. They are multi-use areas.
- Only allow off-leash in FULLY FENCED AREAS. Never as a part of general pathways.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Keep bikes out of off-leash areas and in parks make sure they ring a bell or yell when passing people with dogs - most don't
- Understand fundamentals of animal behavior if they wish to be in an offleash environment.
- Same information in regards to their children and not harassing and annoying the dogs so as not to create a potential incident.
- Accept that an off leash area means they are to be shared. Dogs play, and bark. And that's ok.
- Appropriate reactions for people who do not like dogs I.e. standing still and screaming at the top of your lungs as my dog peacefully walks by you is pretty inappropriate.
- There is an issue with cyclists and dog walkers. Cyclist go too fast in off leash areas. It is impossible to keep dog interactions completely off the pathway 100% of the time. Pathways through dog off leash areas should be included. Walkers and cyclists can act accordingly. However if the off leash area is wide enough dogs should be kept away from the walkways
- Respect the off-leash areas
- Owners of dogs NEED ACCOUNTABILITY and there is little to NO consequences right now for irresponsible pet owners to change their ways
- Not biking or jogging through off leash parks
- Do not expect dogs and their owners to want to engage with you.
- No children/ unsupervised minors in dog parks without a dog
- Respect dog owners' requests. Too many people approach and "rough up" dogs despite being asked not to.
- An education about what constitutes unacceptable or aggressive behavior on the part of non-dog owners. I've found that many people don't know or don't care when they are mistreating someone else's pet
- Be reasonable in your expectations. Dogs (and people) are not perfect. You cannot be in an offleash area without expecting some sort of interaction with a dog. If you are terrified of dogs, why go to an off-leash area? Seems some people do it deliberately to create trouble.
- Do not bring your children to an off leash park.
- Better enforcement of none off leash areas
- Respect of people and dogs
- In off leash specific parks, citizens with or without dogs should not be tobogganing, have kids on bikes, or having picnics
- If you don't like dogs, don't take a walk in an off-leash park.
- Understanding K9 behaviour and body language
- While I wouldn't try to pet a dog without owner consent, often the dogs approach me, not the other way around.
- To be able to enjoy public parks without fear of pets and owners who flagrantly ignore the rules.
- ASK ASK ASK
- For people with children . Signage indicating how unsanitary the ground is and to recommend not rolling around in the grass and shoving random pieces of grass and sticks in chickens mouth



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Be kind.
- So i guess you think people are so braindead that they need the city to tell them to be aware of their surroundings. As for approaching dogs without owner consent. It is impossible to guarantee you will get consent when dogs are running around a dog park. The question is pointless.
- Do not get mad when in an off leash area, that a dog is coming up to sniff you, or that you have to slow down while riding your mountain bike.
- Teach your children how to interact with dogs.
- **DO NOT TOUCH OR REACH FOR OR APPROACH ANY DOGS EVER!!!!** Allow a dog to come to you so STOP closed palms relax and the dog will let the human know if it wants to engage. It's not hard to gage a canines willingness but human ego kicks in.
- Understanding of the boundaries of designated off leash areas.
- Don't be aggressive to animals. Knowing how to react properly when feel in an unsafe situation with a dog as your movements and actions will determine theirs
- Dog parks are not the same as playgrounds for your kids. People that choose to bring children to the park should be aware of the dangers of your child approaching or inappropriately interacting with (taunting, hugging, running toward or away from, etc.) a stranger dog and should enter the park at their own risk.
- educate children on proper behaviour around dogs
- Awareness of biking - that many dogs chase bikes.
- Dog parks should be fenced off entirely with no access to public parks or bike paths. People without dogs should not have to try and avoid dogs.
- General safety around animals. A surprisingly large amount of people overreact to animals, not just dogs.
- how to avoid dog bites
- Stay away from off-leash parks if you don't like dogs - there are plenty of beautiful places dogs are leashed
- Have a base knowledge of dog behaviour and what is appropriate and not
- Appropriate activities for an off leash area (i.e not skateboarding through sue Higgins)
- Don't go to an off leash park if you dont want to run into a dog
- Have bells on bikes to make people aware of their approach. Use lights between sunset & sunrise. Similar rules for people on skateboards etc.
- I would like to see a limit of 6 dogs per dog walker. I have seen some with 12 dogs and there is no way they can watch everyone of them and pick up after them. I have seen some that have lost dogs due to too many.
- Discourage frisbee throwing between people (without a dog), discourage riding a bicycle through a dog park
- We need to feel safe if we do not own a pet. I do NOT want to meet their pet.
- Appropriate human behaviour such as what is considered to be antagonizing for a pet
- If you're in an off-leash park and you don't want animals approaching find another route.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Sharing space on sidewalks and using wheeled vehicles like skateboards/scooters/wheeled shoes with caution around leashed dogs especially when approaching from a corner or behind
- Keep bicycles out of off leash parks
- Citizens shouldn't have to adapt their behaviour to accommodate dogs. Off leash areas let dog owners be lazy. If your dog needs exercise, walk it on leash.
- Don't speed through off leash parks on bicycles for the safety of everyone!
- Contact 311 if observe negative encounters between owners and others, pets and others.
- People without dogs should expect to be able to enjoy dog free spaces in public.
- Much like the previous point, owners NEED to understand that dogs do not understand things the way that humans do. You should be asking the owner, and NOT the dog if their dog can greet their dog. It happens way too often that people walk up to another person and before anyone can agree or disagree, the dogs are face to face.
- everybody has the right to use the parks such as Nose Hill and dogs need to be under control. I did walk a dog up there off leash but kept him a way from people and bikes.
- Don't feed them anything without owner consent, teach kids not to tease dogs through fences, and that small dogs are often the most likely to cause harm.
- Respect owner requests about interacting with their dog
- don't be eating food or have food on your person when in the off leash area
- Know how to approach a dog properly once consent is given
- should never have to worry about being attacked
- Don't walk in dog parks if you don't like dogs
- Expectations of when you meet a dog outside of off-leash areas. (Runners quietly approaching from behind without announcing their presence.)
- Ask permission to pet the dog.
- Dogs should get priority. Dog friendly spaces are limited, human spaces are not. If you don't like dogs, get out of the park
- happy that others may want to approach dogs, but again. at your own risk, don't blame the dog or owner if something happens because you don't know how to behave or read a dog's behavior.
- no bike riding in an off leash area
- How can a person get consent from an owner if the dog is off leash & roaming freely (as is usual)?
- There are few off-leash parks yet dog owners are automatically at fault if their dog chases a cyclist riding through the off-leash, or a child running with food in their hand (yup, that's happened). A dog - even a good dog - might find this irresistible. BUT, it's the owner's fault, not the fault of the [removed] riding through an off-leash park. My dogs encountered a jogger at Edworthy who looked annoyed every time they barked at him. He was running (dog thinks 'HEY that looks FUN'), jogger gets pissed off and yells at me and threatens me. YET, he can jog ANYWHERE. I can't off-leash my dogs anywhere.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dog owners should be responsible for their dogs at all times. if I'm out for a walk the dog owner should be aware that there are other people in the park besides them not the other way around. Dogs don't rule, not even in dog parks!
- Bicycles in an offleash area can trigger predatory responses in dogs (even the most friendly ones!), or simply a very eager greeting. Children on strider bikes, strollers, bikes are sometimes seen. Signs should be posted to alert these park users of the risk they are creating.
- Please stop putting cycle paths through off leash areas. Cyclists are always aggressive and will openly challenge you for having your dog off leash. This is another living creature that I care for, it's more important than your midlife crisis hobby
- Education and signage advising people not to let small children run around in off-leash areas.
- Persal behavior, not screaming around dogs, running, etc
- Do not call or try to attract a dog's attention. It's not your dog. Don't call it over so you can play with it or cause a potential issue.
- Be cautious when riding bikes through off-leash areas, do not have picnics in off leash park, do not set up temporary camps in off-leash park, do not leave food, be cautious about young children running around, do not use off-leash parks for fitness classes
- Don't acknowledge my animal and he won't acknowledge you. Education is key. Too many cultures are against animal ownership, and since our city is such a smattering of different cultures, I think it's fair that the newcomers are informed that yes, having a large dog is common in Canada. Stop trying to kick him
- What is appropriate behavior in off-leash parks - ie - sledding is NOT appropriate.
- Please be patient with dog's, not all yet come back to their owner's on command and some can be very exuberant. Patience and kindness needs to be applied.
- What areas are animal free and posting of no dogs allowed areas (like parks with playgrounds)
- People with children must educate them on how to approach dogs. There also needs to be regulations on the dog park being for dogs and is not a playground for children to run around wildly.
- If you're in a dog park you should expect a happy or inquisitive dog to visit. I'd hope scared of dogs choose another park
- Monitor your children and don't expect dog owners to be responsible for them. Excessively fearful people including children should not go to dog parks, it causes issues even with well behaved dogs if they start running and screaming. Don't ride bikes through off-leash areas, some dogs have strong herding drives.
- There is a huge problem with recreational users of dog parks and their lack of understanding of how to act around dogs. Quietly jogging up being a dog and owner can startle the dog and result in a very bad situation. All users of off-leash dog parks must share in responsible etiquette.
- The onus needs to be on dog-owners, not on others! Make it clear whom the bylaws are aimed at and why!
- ban off-leash parks
- how to respond when bitten by an off leash dog in an on-leach area.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That people who choose to go to an off-leash area not complain that dogs are running around and playing.
- Be aware of dog behavior so that you act accordingly. If you are afraid of dogs or don't like them, do not go to an off-leash dog park.
- Do not tease or threaten a dog or its owner/walker
- I know there are rules about dogs being in a river but nobody follows that
- Education on how to report bad behaviour and/or infractions and what said infractions are.
- take responsibility when they are the casue of an issue and do not automatically blame the animal and have it punished.
- Expect the owners have animals under control ...
- you have to be aware of surrounding everywhere not just off leash for people constantly allow their dogs off leash on sidewalks, alleys, green spaces, play parks/fields, parks. This is a huge issue and needs to be addressed!
- Know how to behave when approached by a dog, at least stand still - do not scream or run.
- do not play/toboggan/jog in off-leash parks.
- If riding a bike in an off leash area use a bell, license the bike so one can make a complaint about a biker, speed on pathways must be enforced, may a camera would work! Also when riding a bike in the off leash parks, don't cross country your bike, STAY ON THE BIME PATHWAY, be respectful of people out just walking.
- there needs to be very obvous and clear signage and there needs to be ways for people to manouver through parks WITHOUT having to go through off leash areas and encounter other people's dogs.
- Dog training is a life long endeavor. Never encourage bad behaviour but don't expect every young dog to be completely trained immediately. Be kind.
- People need to be more aware of their surroundings and be understanding that they are in an off leash area and that they have a responsibility to ensure the safety of the dogs in the area. I have had multiple people on bikes get angry at me because they were not paying attention and ran into my dog. I have also seen people on bikes go out of their way to kick my dog while she is on the pathway. Because of this I no longer feel safe taking her to multi-use areas and have to drive 20 minutes to the nearest area that is designated as only an off leash area
- Carry mace.
- Reiterate that off-leash areas are in fact people areas that ALLOW dogs to be off leash, not dog areas that allow people to use.
- Warnings about choosing to bike and run in an off-leash park. Dogs chase
- It is not ok to take your kids sledding in an off leash off leash dog park.
- People and children without dogs should be able to expect that they will never be approached by an off leash dog when outside of an offleash area. Kids should be able to assume safety (with respect to dogs) at all playgrounds



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Do not bring young children to dog park just to “play around” these parks ARE NOT for your kids! Stay away!
- Don’t tease a dog or try to make them bark when they are in their own back yard. Also don’t throw food for them to eat as it can make them sick.
- An expectation to not be harassed.
- Yes post up the hours. But really why do the small children need to walk through the off leash area to get to their playground. This is wrong. City dogs need fenced in off leash areas. See other great cities. Fenced areas mean the
- dont ride a bike through an off leash park. you will likely get chased. City shouldnt have bike paths through off leash parks or put fence around it.
- Running in off leash areas, causes dogs to bark and chase runners. Not appropriate and could cause harm to everyone. Runners without dogs seem to cause the most problems vs runners with there dogs offleash as well or running with them.
- People should teach their kids to never run towards a dog, no matter how friendly the dog appears.
- Adults need to keep themselves and especially they’re children away, unless given permission. The child HAS to be taught how to be kind to an animal!
- Be aware of animal behaviour and signs that a dog doesn’t want to be approached
- Knowing what normal dog behavior is and why they behave the way they do.
- As I said education about dogs and how to interact or avoid interaction...NOT RUNNING AND SCREAMING!
- Tolerance and less paranoia.
- Dog owner should be held liable for any vicious animal incidents.
- Ignore dogs please. Don't let your children run up to dogs.
- Do NOT bike/scooter in off leash areas because you and the dog could be seriously injured when in motion.
- If your in an off leash area, expect that a dog will approach you. Children in off leash areas should be educated about how to approach a dog & always asking consent first.
- Be aware of normal dog behaviour
- A sign in off leash parks, entry at your own risk to life and limb.
- Teach children how to properly approach a dog in all situations. The people on bikes in parks should not ride through a park as some dogs can be fearful. I've seen dogs get hit by cyclists in dog parks.
- Instructions on how to respond when being attacked or faced with aggressive dogs
- do not eat food in the off leash park especially do let children eat/carry food in off leash parks
- Basic animal behavioural education
- If you are walking in a designated dog area, do not get all upset when a dog approaches you. You’re in their space
- People without dogs should feel safe walking near an off-leash park because every off-leash dog should not go anywhere near them if the owner is doing their due diligence and keeping their dog monitored.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Go elsewhere.
- Do not approach with out consent. Give right if way to dog walkers (people with multiple dogs)
- Do not enter off leash area if you do not want to interact with dogs
- More signage is needed to ensure dog defecation is collected from parks like Edworthy where there's an off-leash area above the park.
- Signage needs to tell non-dog owners how to report dog defecation and irresponsible ownership
- Do not bring children to an offleash dog park
- Make it clear to not touch service animals
- Do not leave children unattended or let children run around in off leash areas and approach dogs
- Do not ride your bike in the designated dog park area - stay on the paths. (ie Sue Higgins)
- Make it aware to non pet owners that these area have large amount of urine and fecal matter present. Not a good area for children to be playing. Basically they are dog bathrooms.
- Do not intentionally antagonize dogs in order to provoke a response.
- Be aware in areas with dogs accidents can happen. If scared of dogs don't go to those areas.
- Have proper protection to ward off dog attacks.
- Be brave enough to ask for pet on leash or pick up mess.
- Let people know if their dog did something wrong in a polite way
- Continuing again from above... 'Be aware of surroundings' should not be an unreasonable expectation. Having said that the great majority of people nowadays have NO idea of their surroundings. I see it all the time, they've got their heads in their devices, they're walking along the sidewalk without any device and yet, ask them 'did you see that dog/cat/coyote/skunk that just crossed the road
- It's not my job to learn about other people's dogs. I'm too busy learning in other areas of my life.
- Understand you are going to likely be approached by dogs if you are walking in an offleash park and accept that.
- People without dogs should not be allowed to roller blade, skateboard, bike, etc. through off leash areas. They are designated off leash so that people have a safe place to spend time with their dogs without getting run over or having their dogs spooked that can create behavior issues.
- be mindful of young children...i understand off-lease spaces are shared and dogs need to be well behaved. But sometimes kids can run/charge at dogs. Our dog listens, is obedient but fearful of children. Parents have to understand the space is shared and kids can't run up to strange dogs screaming at them, just like my dog can't run up to them barking and growling
- Off leash parks should be areas that are specifically designated for dogs. There should be no off-leash in a park that is regularly used by the general public, unless it is its own fenced off area.
- I feel that dog owners rights have surpassed people rights at off leash parks (Specifically Rotary Park). My kids don't run free - they stay on the sidewalk because they have been charged by enough dogs in this area. The boundaries at Rotary park are not meeting the bylaws of distances from sidewalks and playgrounds.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If you don't like possibly being approached by a dog do not come in. I see this many times people are afraid of dogs approaching them even when the dog is under control. Why are you in a dog park if you are afraid of dogs? Sadly this happens more than it should
- go somewhere else.
- Report dog owners who do not clean up after their dog.
- People are responsible for their children and teaching them
- No cycling in off-leash areas
- No children under the age of 6 walking in a dog park without being in a arms reach of a parent
- Face it, the policy of not having signage on non-off leash greenspace areas is not workable for the dog-owners who have a vested interest in such things... how is it ever going to work to inform the non-dog owners.
- If you choose to sled, bike, run, play in an off leash park you must be comfortable with dogs approaching you and being interested in your activity, if not then do these activities at a park not designated as off leash
- Slow down on bikes in off-leash areas.
- They should also be making sure their children if they have any are respectful and calm when around dogs
- Teach children how to safely interact with Dogs.
- Expect to share the space and think about the effect your choices will have on dogs. For example sitting and eating on ground.
- Monitor and watch children in off-leash areas. Teach children that loud, screaming running behaviour attracts dogs. Pick up small children or stay close by in off leash parks. Require cyclists to slow down in or near off leash areas. Teach immigrants and others who are terrified of dogs that there are areas they can walk where there are no dogs
- Signage ensuring people know when they are in an off leash area, so they aren't surprised when dogs come up to say hello
- We need some help from Parks on this one. There are many great off-leash areas that would benefit from better fencing to help keep the peace between off-leash dog owners, other park users, and wildlife.
- Limitation of city's responsibility
- Proper interaction with dogs
- Do not call someone else's dog
- Don't freak out !!!!! Know canine behavior as well.
- Don't judge a dog by the way it looks
- If you are scarred of dogs, then stay out of off leash dog parks.
- cyclists on bike paths that run through dog walk areas need to be aware and slow down considerably in these areas. It should not be a fine to dog owners where dogs go on walking/cycling path s in areas where the off leash area is shared with the pathway.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- better signage so those who don't want to be involved in normal animal interactions they can avoid off leash parks all together. there are regular parks they can go to instead
- they should know it's a shared space, and if you choose to run or bike in an off-leash area, there's always the possibility that dogs will run up to you, jump on you, and in some cases chase you. Please be patient and understanding as the dog owner gets control of and manages their dog. g.
- A general person might not be approaching, but needing to pass an owner and a dog. It should not be the other person needing not to approach; it should be the dog owner needing to detour. There should not be any off-leash areas unless it is in an enclosed dog park or out in the country. The owner and dog can run and walk together with a leash connection at all other times.
- No tobogganing or any sleds /wagons within a offleash .. dogs don't understand what they are and will chase them
- If the dig approaches you I believe you should be able to interact IF you know how to do so correctly. But I believe you should never just come at someone's dogs without asking.
- Don't scream, don't run away from dog, understand dogs.
- eliminate off-leash areas in public parks.
- Do not leave out open garbage (back alleys) or other poisonous materials (washer fluid)
- Don't act scared while in a dog park.
- Don't go into an off leash area if you don't want to be around dogs. Do not allow children to play in off leash areas.
- Not to attend unless you're comfortable and familiar with dog behaviors
- Be aware you are sharing a multi-use space and may be approached by young or excitable dogs.
- I never approach a dog, but they often approach me even though I don't want them to. Even in off-leash areas, dogs are supposed to be controlled AND on leash when on the bike path. Few owners comply with this on Nose Hill.
- If you don't like dogs then don't go to an off-leash park.
- How can we keep them out of our yards for those who just let them run free. Why cannot we enjoy our own yards without picking up their dogs excrements all the time.
- No off-path bicycling through off leash parks
- Do not ride a bike/tricycle in an off-leash park
- Do not rollerblade, bike, sled, skateboard, scooter in off leash areas. Child must always be accompanied by an adult. If children do not respect the park rules then they should not be allowed
- They need to have more education on how to behave around dogs, especially in off leash areas.
- Ban retractable leash or more education
- Partially the responsibility of dog owners and non dog owners
 - signage - educations
 - Expectations around conduct in off leash park and non -petowners
- most Calgaryians do not own a pet and pet owner/ non owner respect should be endorsed
- Bike riders and joggers with dogs on leashes on sidewalks dominate sidewalk and force other users off the path. They're hazardous.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- More focus on teaching children how to interact with unknown dogs
- If you do not like dogs no matter how big or small avoid dog park areas or places where dogs are allowed off leash. City could provide a map on Calgary website
- Children not left to wander, or too far from the parents (ex: pulled by a snow sled!!)
- Understand that dogs may come say hi to you and be alright with it.
- Lighten up!
- No off-lease pets in public parks and gardens. REsponsibility of owner to have animal under COMPLETE CONTROL AT ALL TIMES in public parks and gardens
- Watch your children to not approach a dog without owner consent
- Safety of the general population regardless of age and ability should be first! Not the love of an animal or convenience of owning an animal.
- Off leash park designations are dated in the city and many of them are now highly busy with people who do not have dog and have a right to be safe from overly aggressive dogs
- Dog behavior, not approaching dogs or have children running, chasing and screaming at them.
- Young children should not be allowed to roam freely in off leash parks. Bicyclist need to slow down
- Dont go in off-leash areas unless you are comfortable with dogs running free - I am always surprised when people stroll through off-leash areas and then don't want to be around dogs - yep this happens!
- if you are afraid of dogs or do not like dogs, stay away from off leash areas
- Do not bring open food in to dog parks. Do not allow unattended children at dog parks.
- Do not feed dogs without their owner's consent or leave food around
- Be more cautious when in off-leash areas (e.g. slow down when on a bike); recognize that dogs are dogs and will behave as such
- Education and respect
- Do not take little kids to an off leash park with a stroller or otherwise. It's not safe.
- Keep toddlers within reach. I have seen too many incidents where toddlers are running far ahead of parents and have been knocked to the ground by dogs simply running.
- Not all dogs are aggressive
- Be aware that no matter how conscientious a dog owner is about their dog, dogs are animals. If people are afraid of dogs, they should stay out of dog parks. When I go into a dog park I go knowing that accidents can happen and that if dogs are running and playing there is a chance I could accidentally get knocked down by a dog no matter how well trained that dog is and how conscientious the owner is. People enter dog parks at their own risk and should be aware of that
- We should have the right to say 'no dogs' and have the dog-owner prevent the dog from approaching us. I have been jumped on by large dogs (retrievers, labs) without even an apology by the owner.
- No riding of bikes, skateboards, scooters, anything with wheels in off-leash dog parks. This encourages predatory behaviour in dogs. Dogs need a place to be off leash if they are socially able. It should be the humans that can ride somewhere else.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- When bike riding or jogging through an off leash park stop pedalling/running if a dog starts chasing. Allow the owner time to collect their dog before continuing on. If you continue to act as prey the owner will have a hard time reigning in their pet
- to not kick or throw rocks at my dogs who are in off leash designations, bikes to let me know when they are oncoming if coming from behind. Not to yell at me, or freak out as dogs will be drawn to the energy.
- Don't walk through an off leash dog park if you do not like dogs or do not want to be bothered by them, and then they get upset at the owner that a dog is near them. Had happened multiple times.
- Do not allow your dogs to approach cats, in public space, and that offices, in pet stores...
- Again, education is key! People who don't own pets need to know the rules of how to behave themselves when at or near an off leash area.
- People need to be informed on the proper way to approach a dog, what to do and not to do. Most people are totally ignorant of this information which is why a lot of people get bit.
- Don't walk/ride in an off leash park if you don't want to be around dogs.
- Please teach your children proper behavior. 1) no running, screaming towards a strange dog. (Or familiar one) 2) ask and actually wait for an answer before approaching a dog 3) get away from the dog's face, don't pull fur, don't hit, stop provoking dogs etc.
- Information on the website i.e. dog behaviour perhaps , appropriate human behaviour with dogs to help those that wouldn't have any knowledge because they are not dog people might help eliminate some negative interactions and feedback. Knowledge is illuminating.
- Clear "off-leash" area signage
- Do not expect to not be approached by dogs or have them come near you. You're in an off-leash area where dogs are allowed to be free and off-leash. Many dogs are friendly and like to meet people so will go up to people when they see them. If you're afraid of or don't like dogs then don't go to an off-leash park because it's for dogs and dog-owners. At the same time, you should be safe to walk there so you shouldn't have to worry about being attacked but if a dog just comes up in a friendly way to say hello and get a pet, don't get bent out of shape and start telling people to keep their dogs on a leash.
- If you own a home that backs on to an off leash park and you don't have a fence you should be prepared that a dog might enter your yard for a few moments.
- ban on bicycles/tricycles in off leash parks
- No feeding with out permission
- Do not bring small children into an off leash area to see/play with the puppies, and then complain if they get knocked over.
- Education on proper dog etiquette for their kids.
- If the person does not have or is not accompanying a dog, go to a park without dogs, if they cannot accept dogs behaving as dogs.
- People walking through an off leash park need to understand that it is an off leash park park and dogs may be around them/ come say hello.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Do not allow children to play in offleash areas. There is a real risk of injury due to accident (i.e. being knocked over by running dogs). Do not bring picnics/human food into offleash areas. Again, this is behaviour that can cause a conflict with dogs -- there are many more areas which are designed for human use with dogs on leash/absent, that people shouldn't infringe on offleash dog areas for that.
- Do not bring small children to an off leash dog area.
- I can never go out behind my house (we back on to an off leash area in Dalhousie). I had a dog jump over my chain link fence, into my yard, chasing a squirrel. There are 2 dog walkers that drive there. One has five dogs and the other has 10 dogs along with several other dog owners.
- It would be nice if people were educated about not running away if they are afraid of dogs and to not go near areas that are designated off-leash if they are afraid of dogs.
- Don't go to an off leash park if they are fearful of dogs?
- Off leash parks are not playgrounds for children.
- Aware that dog savvy awareness is expected when you're in a dog designated area.
- dont bring small children into an off leash unless you can be near to pick them up
- Be respectful around other peoples dogs and recognize both the dogs and owners rights in situations such as at a dog park
- why would non dog folks be in an off leash park, designated for dogs?
- Get off your bike
- Proper behavior around animals. Some people panic and cause a situation where there should not have been.
- Leave the snacks at home, especially if you have kids. If my dog jumps on your toddler to get to the food, it's me and my dog that get in trouble, and that's not fair.
- When out for a walk, be aware when entering off-leash dog areas, especially if you do not understand dog behaviour or do not like dogs.
- Dogs cannot be expected to know the boundary of the off-leash area; pet owners should therefore be mindful of where they let their pets run offleash.
- Ask for what they need from the owner when approaching
- Just because a park is designed off leash does not mean that they "own" the park, it is still multi-user, which I feel they (dog owners) sometimes forget. They call it a "dog park" not "designed off leash park". Important distinction
- do not lead with your face!!
- Bike should not be riding on grassy areas on off-leash parks. They should only ride on the paving path (19th Ave NW Off-leash park is a perfect example)
- Each person has a responsibility to act appropriately around any animal.
- Learn how to move around off leaah dog... not act like a play thing or prey
- If you are afraid of dogs, stay away from the dog parks so you are less inclined to make accusations.
- Do not call or talk to someones dog with put consent
- Parents with children identify risks to children in off leash areas. The parks are for dogs not unsupervised children



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- When walking your dog and approaching people, keep yourself between them and your dog.
- Other park patrons are not taken over by dogs; especially in small parks.
- Some folks are scared of dogs but they should realize that staring a dog in the eyes can be a sign of aggressiveness.
- Most off-leash parks are completely taken over by dogs and their owners are no longer multi-use parks which is unfair to the majority of user groups and taxpayers.
- All parks include a level of risk which must be accepted. Scratches, dirt, etc happen.
- Especially for men: try not to be a large overpowering hulk. Avoid black clothes and hoodies. Walk properly.
- I don't expect anything of people without dogs. I hate when dogs run up to me when I am just walking along in Nose Hill. They could attack me and no one is around.
- Aside from pet owners, responsible community members should also not be littering. Pets & wildlife will pick up food improperly disposed of which can be dangerous & lead to expensive vet bills for pet owners. It is also a blight on the community. People picnicking in off-leash zones or multi-use parks need to be aware they are in off-leash zones and not leave food accessible to pets/wildlife. Homeless shouldn't be defecating in parks, or disposing needles/other trash. Cyclists and runners with pets need to be aware of pet activity and pick-up. They also need to know pedestrians have the right of way and not push their way through. Cyclists should be using bells and provide appropriate time for pet owners to corral their pets. They also should be obeying speed limits and when appropriate adjust to lower speeds as necessary.
- How to report feeling threatened by or an attack by an off-leash dog
- Information on how to communicate with non-compliant pet owners.
- Don't complain when you are walking without a dog through an off-leash dog park.
- People without dogs should be allowed to roam in dog parks but with the expectation that not all dogs are well behaved and that involuntary interaction is likely.

Expectations of dog behavior in other public spaces that are not off-leash areas

- Dogs **MUST** be on a leash. And owners must be in control of the dog at all times.
- I think that owners (and non-owners) are not as aware of appropriate dog behaviour as they could be. It's really hard to get affordable dog training and behaviour help in this City (hundreds of dollars for basic classes). That a lot of people just don't do it and their pets are set up to fail.
- Waste pick up!
- I expect dogs to not lunge or impact other users of public spaces. Many people do not care for dogs and do not choose to interact with your pets and training for public spaces is critical. I expect that waste is picked up immediately. I expect that vaccines are up to date.
- On leash and under control. Muzzled if dangerous.
- Same expectation as for humans - respect other people and the nature.
- On leash on pathways, under control, not harassing wildlife



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Owner responsibility for ALL dogs. It seems that those with small dogs seem to think rules don't apply to them and when their dog starts something with a larger dog it gets blamed on the bigger dog. ALL dogs need to be trained and follow the bylaw even if your dog is 10lbs.
- Good behaviour;
Be on a leash
- Keep to the right.
- Dogs must be on leash. Dogs must be in a heel position. Dogs must not be allowed to run up to other pedestrians/pets without the consent of the other party. Dogs must have good recall.
- calm and focused animal under control
- The pet needs to be managed in away the ensures that they are not a tripping hazard.
- That dogs are controlled (ie not lunging or jumping on people). I expect people to move off to the side of the pathway if their dog is not able to be controlled.
- To keep them on a leash. Many automobile accidents happen when dogs run into the road when they have not been leashed
- non-aggressive
with the owner
- We have dogs on our lawn frequently. They come up on my front deck when I'm sitting there and find poop periodically on my lawn. It is frustrating that people are feeling so entitled to have their dog with them at all times. The restaurant and mall's allowing dogs is getting out of control too.
- Polite, not in the way of bikes, under control or muzzled if need be.
- They should be on leash and under control. I don't want to run over off leash or out of control dogs when I'm biking.
- controlled dogs on leash.
- if near people, they should be leashed; if away from people, I don't see leashing as an issue
- dogs should be on leash
- Owners always have animal on a leash unless in a dog park area
- I expect the dog to not be aggressive. Jumping or barking is fine, I just expect to be able to walk away from (or near) your dog without issues.
- Same as with off leash parks, additionally the dogs should be taught to yield to traffic (example - cyclists)
- Dogs should be under control, and the walker should pick up waste.
- Dogs need to be on a leash/harness. If an owner knows his dog is aggressive, he/she needs to be sure that the dog is also muzzled.
- Keep the dogs on a leash and pick up the dog waste....especially in the winter. It creates an awful mess when the snow melts in the spring. Yucky.
- I am more concerned about people who have their dogs off-leash in on-leash areas and let those dogs run up to leashed dogs, and the fact that I could still be charged if my on-leash dog reacts - this is where your officers don't have a clue about dog behaviour as they told me this is the case.
- Well behaved and listens to commands. Not trying to pull leash in order to get other animals/people.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No lunging at people or other dogs. No barking
- Leashed with hold of 2 foot range (close to human), same as in stores and patios. I don't want a dog to be able to come up to me on a long lead or leash.
- Dogs should have at least minimal training so as not to be wandering back and forth across the pathway.
- Remain on leash unless otherwise specified. Do not use an extendable leash. Keep your dog beside you.
- That a dog does not run up to strangers and are kept on a leash.
- Non-aggressive, respond to owner commands
- People seem to designate any area they want as an off leash park - or have their dogs off leash in public spaces or yards without fences as they want. No defecation or urination on property that isn't their own. Should be a clear method to report violations, or tickets should be handed out.
- Dogs should be on leash in all areas that are not off leash parks. They should not be allowed to travel down pathways off leash to get to the off leash park. Areas near off leash parks should be clearly signed to indicate all dogs must be on leash in this area.
- Do not use retractable leash - keep dogs beside you and under your care and control. Keep dogs on leash
- I expect the dog to be on leash and under control.
- Basic safety (not actively trying to bite passersby). Pick up waste.
- Animals should be fully under control. They should not chase geese onto Memorial drive, chase runners, leap in front of cyclists or be anything but the best friends we've created them to be.
- Control as best as possible. If your dog is aggressive, it should wear a muzzle.
- To remain on leash and be close to the owner , not on a 20 foot leash wandering.
- Please ban retractable leashes! :) Dogs are kept under control and within 6 ft of owners. Dogs are not interfering with other pathway users (walkers, joggers, cyclists, etc) from passing safely on the left. Not allowing dogs to greet other people/dogs/animals unless the other people give permission
- Will retreat from the full extend of the leash when instructed.
Will cease or initiate a proper greeting when instructed.
Will hush or quiet within a reasonable amount of time when instructed.
- Leashes controlled and pick up after dog
- Be on leash!
- On leash and under control (i.e. not at the very end of a 20 ft Flexi with no owner awareness of the dogs behaviour)
- Owners should ensure dog is staying in it's proper walking lane or off path. ALWAYS pick up after your dog. Don't allow your dog to approach children without parents consent
- The dog is "unnoticeable" meaning they are not causing any ruckus or disturbing anyone, if this can be done offleash and the dog stays in a close distance to handler that should be allowed.
- Dogs should be on leash. If they are reactive they should be muzzled to protect other dogs and people.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A dog should be attentive to its owner and not approach other dogs and people without being asked. (Also people should not approach dogs with out asking).
- People should listen when you say your dog should not be approached! Some dogs are fearful and may be fear aggressive but people don't listen. If you are in an off-leash, understand dog behaviour and know the difference between play and aggression or just assertive behaviour.
- - be in control of your animal at all times. being on leash does not excuse your dog coming into contact with mine without my permission
-pickup waste
- Dogs should be well mannered when on leash and are not to interact with others unless asked to do so.
- Not lunging or out of control
- Dogs MUST BE leashed. This needs to be enforced. Too many dogs not on leash that cause problems.
- There are WAY too many people in Calgary who feel that they can use ANY area as an offleash area. Both of my current dogs are fine, but I had an elderly dog who was not very stable walking but still enjoyed a short walk eachday and she was twice knocked over by offleash dogs on residential streets.
- They should be on leash (often they are not). Owner should be in control of their dog and not let it lurch toward pedestrians and children. Owners should pick up the doggy bags they leave (and conveniently forget) along the pathway.
- That all dogs are on a leash and the owners are able to control them.
- Dogs not to jump or tug towards others. and if dog barks, owner should be able to assure their pet to calm
- No off leash AT ALL. Owners must be able to handle their dog (eg, don't allow your dog to run up to another without permission).
- That people keep their dogs on the leash!!! I've seen many people, especially in suburban greenspaces, take their dogs off leash there it wasn't safe for people or the dogs. Give people a choice if they want to interact with your dog or not.
- Dogs should be kept on leash and handlers must make sure their dogs respect the space of others.
- Dogs under control and not a safety hazard, such as to cyclists, walkers, runners.
- Maximum 6' leash. Flexies are often improperly used.
- No barking and lunging at people or other dogs.
- I expect a dog to be under their partner's control regardless of location. The dog may be agitated or barking, but the handler should manage that appropriately
- Dogs on short leash and always kept to the side to not harm/interrupt people using pathways. Keep dogs away from playgrounds. Not allow dogs to bark repeatedly. Not skim along/approach and bark at private fences. (Harassing dogs/people in their own yards)
- Keep control of your dog at all times. It is not acceptable for a dog to approach a human or dog without consent of owner. Humans should also not approach dog unless given consent by owner.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I believe dogs must be managed in a way that does not impact other users of common spaces - this includes barking and approaching others. Even friendly dogs can pose a risk or create fear, for example, if they jump up on a child.
- My expectations are more for the people on the end of the leash. They should manage their dogs to ensure that they are not allowing their dogs to reach people or dogs, they should move aside and give way to others.
- Dogs must be leashed. As long as the owner has control, I'm good with most dog behaviour. Some barking is ok, but the owner must know how to control the dog.
- I expect not to be bitten and approached by a dog. The owner must have care and control of the animal.
- Should always be kept on a leash & under control, the owners should pick up their dog's poop, move aside when bikes are passing, be courteous to all park & pathway users.
- Should be on a leash and the pet owner should have control of the leash and dog at all time.
- Dog must be under control, if not they should be on leash and held close to owner. If dog is off leash, they should stay close to owner and come when called.
- Under control, other will not approach without asking
- Dog under control
- Dogs should be on leashes
- dogs must be on a short leash, not those extendable leashes, the dogs might as well not be on a leash then..dogs must have proper behaviour training so the owner(s) will have better control of their dogs..the owner(s) must lead their dog(s) not the other way around!!
- Zero tolerance for hostile dog behavior, and poop.
- People with and without dogs should be respectful of each other. If an owner appears to be trying to train dog to do better people without dogs should be aware of that, but people with dogs should also be aware of those around them.
- Dogs should always be on leash and under control.
- That owners keep dogs on leash at all times when outside of off-leash areas. No exceptions, even when dogs are "well behaved."
- Under control, on lead and keep respectful distance from everyone.
- Pickup up dog waste
- If your dog is not friendly, please go to the other side of the street
- Dogs should "leashed n" when approaching people or bicycles on pathways. Dog should be under control at all times. No flexi leashes.
- Under control and respectful of other patrons on the pathway.
- Dogs should be on a leash. I see many who do not follow - they let their dogs roam freely even when the area is not an off-leash area. Especially at nose hill where they have no control of their dogs at all. The city should have bylaw officer ticketing people at nose hill who don't follow the rules.
- Dogs should be on their leash if it is not a designated off-leash area.
- Respect for everyone, owners and non-owners. Owners must pick up feces!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I expect pet owners to have their animals under control.
- Clean up
- Must be leashed and under control, no sign of aggression
- If not an off leash area then dogs must be leashed.
- Pet owners should not be allowing their dogs off leash on the pathways no matter how well trained they are. On the owners right side except when there is also a bike pathway. Dog should be on whatever side of owner that is farthest away from bike path. Control their dogs on pathways as well.
- Dogs are on leashes and poop is picked up.
- Pick up and DISPOSE pet waste! Don't let your pet relieve themselves on peoples lawns/gardens! Don't let your pet approach/jump on/lick others, especially children!
- On short leash only, keep control of your animal.
- In public non-off-leash spaces, dogs should be on-leash and controllable by the person minding the dog. Therefore, as long as the dog is well-behaved, for example a 7-year-old can walk a dog on the sidewalk. The dog should have 'proper dog behavior' as explained by city information.
- Well behaved and aren't bothering other people I am ok even with them off leash.
- dog should be under owner control/command. if they aren't fines should be issued.
- Do not interact with dogs or allow your dog or child to interact with other dogs unless you have been invited to do so by the owner of the other dog(s).
- Dog is not aggressive
- Far too many people think that their dog does not always need to be on a leash on pathways.
- Enforcement of leash laws and pet waste pick up. The inability to control a dog when on leash.
- They are under control. They are
- Dogs should be on leash and under control, little to no lunging or barking while on leash. Other people should seek permission before approaching or attempting to interact with any dog that is not their own.
- Dog on a leash, owner is aware of surroundings
- Dogs should always be on a leash in highly populated areas, parks etc.
- -They are under control
 - They are not on a long flexy leash if on a pathway.
 - They are not off-leash if on a pathway
 - They will not luge or snip at other pathway users.
- Under control on a leash.
- Walking calmly on leash. Not barking and lunging.
- It is ridiculous that they are required to be leashes on a path.
- To be able on command to listen to all commands of owner. To always be in immediate area of owner should the pet require help or pet is causing a nuisance. Must be muzzled at ALL times on/off leash while out in public with owner



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That you understand your dog's behaviour and can identify to other people. I have a dog who likes to jump when greeting, I always warn someone and continue to try to get him to not jump. People should know if their dog is leash aggressive and be able to let people walking other dogs know.
- Listening, responsive, if tied up outside without an owner present the leash is short enough that the dog can sit or lay down but cannot lunge across a sidewalk
- Short leash, not being intrusive to other dogs and people.
- Have your dogs on leash and under control. Do not let your or expect other dogs to engage with other on leash dogs.
- It's mentioned above, but if you can't recall your dog, or it won't sit or stay, it is not "under control" in an off leash area. That said, I feel like smaller fenced enclosures are an appropriate place for more "out of control" dogs, since the owner can intervene quickly (smaller distances).
- They must be on leash and under the Walker's full control. People that do not have control over their animals need to be fined
- People who choose to let their dog loose in a leashed area need to be penalized financially. I see this all the time and when someone or their dog is bitten by the unleashed dog they say, "she's never done that before."
- Well behaved, listens to owner
- Full Control of animal at all times
- They should be on a short leash at all times
- You must have control of your dog when on pathways, particularly when encounters with pedestrians, cyclists and others are common.
- I expect the dog to be on leash and controlled.
- Must always be in control and ON A LEASH. High fines and no warnings for dogs off leash in on leash areas.
- Come when called, drop things it's picked up. Socialized. No barking constantly
- Kept on a leash and the person needs to be able to control that animal. Have seen people who are overpowered by their pet.
- I expect dogs be on leash and controlled at all times. Dogs get frightened or feel threatened by other dogs so they will bark to let those around them know. Not all dogs that bark are vicious.
- pick up poop
- Pick up your poop!
- Proper dog walking on a short leash. The 'clothes line' leashes should be banned. People have no control over their dogs with leashes 20 ft long. Dogs need to walk at the persons side and mindful of their owners.
- Similar to off leash areas, pick up waste, proper dog interaction with other dogs and humans. Must be on leash, under control
- I would expect a dog to not bark randomly at people or animals approaching them. Making sure your dog is at reasonable length when walking on a leash
- On leash and waste removal and proper disposal



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- We have had a dog for 10 years and most often a walk in the off leash requires 2+ bags for waste...I continue to see dog walkers with many (5+) dogs with one or two bags as they move along the park , Can this please be addressed?
- Education for dog owners that dogs must be on leash on regional pathways, even if they run through a off leash area.
- Short leash, especially if children are present, and especially on bike paths.
- I expect dogs to behave on and off a leash park or not. I expect the owners to control their pets/dogs and not expect everyone to be happy to have a dog run or jump on them. Dogs are not humans, they are a animal and should be treated as such and not more than a human life.
- Control of your animal.
- That they are leashed and controlled (not barking, nipping or snapping at other animals walking nearby).
- My expectations relate more to the dog owner than the dogs. Many don't even attempt to manage their dog, which makes outings for people with, and without, dogs extremely challenging at times. There's a problem where off-leash dogs "charge" on-leash dogs walking on paths through off-leash areas.
- Awareness of boundaries, i.e. paying attention to which lane you're in, how much space you're taking up, if the dog is a distraction or potential obstacle. Allowing free movement around and past your dog.
- I would like to see more enforcement of on leash parks. Larger signage stating MUST be on leash. I have a dog that doesn't like other dogs so I don't go off leash, but have been on paths like fish creek park where owners let their dogs off. That's not fair to my dog and puts both at risk.
- Dogs should be on leashes and not approach people and not bark.
- Make sure dogs are respectful of other people's personal space. Behaves well on leash, friendly to people who may not ask before touching. If the dog isn't friendly to random touches get it a please don't pet patch
- ALL DOGS ON A LEASE AND LARGER DOGS MUZZLED. ALSO OWNER SHOULD BE BIG ENOUGH TO CONTROL THE ANIMAL.
- Dogs must be on leashes, per owners must clean up after their pets. Dogs should not be allowed in school grounds or on play parks.
- Owners do their best to ensure their dogs don't interfere with other people's enjoyment or activities
- Dogs should stay on leash. Signs that dogs are required to be leashed. Signs to pick up dog waste. Education for pet owners that they should not let their dogs approach other dogs without owner's permission.
- Dogs not allowed to be off leash in non designated areas and need to be a certain distance away from school yards. Not allowed in school yards even if it's in the evening.
- I always step my dogs off the path and put them in the sit to meet people. Common courtesy but so many people are off leash in on leash areas it is often hard to walk my dogs safely
- Owners respect that not everyone likes animals or may have allergies. Owners should not allow their pets to approach people, unless they ask to see the pet. Animal should not be aggressive.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Respect other peoples space whether they have a dog or not.
- Dog should not behave in an aggressive and hostile manner to an encounter with a person passing by, dog must be on a leash, and it's owner must insure dog does not escape leash from owners grip.
- On a leash and under control. Clean up dog waste. Do not encourage dog to "meet" others on leash.
- Healing, not approaching other peoples dogs, not lunging and barking at people/pets walking by and NO retractable leashes. Dogs way up, all over the place and tangling in other people. Ban those leashes!!
- They should be on a short leash!!! I'm sick of tripping over dogs and leashes!! They should not be at large busy public events! It's too hot in the summer for them to be amongst the masses.
- Owner should be in control of their pet at all times
- That they always be under owner/walkers control, leashed, not allowed to chase wildlife. ALWAYS be cleaned up after & not allowed to defacate on sidewalks
- Dogs on leash, pick up after your dog.
- Must be under control at all times by owners and pick up waste and feces at all times
- If it's not an off-leash part, people should have their dogs on-leash. Of course, dog waste should still be picked up.
- Should be on leash, controlled by owners, shouldn't be allowed to approach/jump on pedestrians
- Dogs must be on leash, pick up after your dog.
- That they are under control or being trained to be under control.
- Non aggressive. Barking within reason but no lunging, chasing, snarling, jumping.
- I expect the owner should have complete control and knowledge of their dogs behaviour. Vocalize if the animal is aggressive or fearful and needs space, but also the passerby should respectfully automatically give space to the dog and owner.
- That the dog is on leash and controlled. More compost bins in common areas so people can actually pick up their dogs waste and dispose of it properly. I find people tend to pick up less when they know they have to carry it longer then they'd like.
- Dogs should be leashes and under control in public spaces.
- Dog should be well socialized and know how to behave
- LEASH YOUR DOG I cannot express this enough. Too many people believe the world is their off leash park and it makes me crazy. Owners need to have control of their dogs which requires training.
- Dogs should be trained properly and disciplined.
- That dogs are on leash.
- Be leashed and controllable .. I regularly pass owners who have a very large dog or small who have no control even when leashed and worse when not leashed .. scary Dogs that bark or dogs who are roaming free.. I have called 311 and they say nothing they can do
- Remain on the leash at all times. Muzzled if dog prone to biting/attacking
- Under control dogs at all times.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Pick up dog poop, Keep the dog off of people's lawns when you walk it, do not take aggressive dogs out where other people/dogs are, train & socialize your dog, if you can't handle society's rules then don't get a dog!
- Flexi-leashes in public sidewalk/pathway areas are a hazard. A person does NOT have control of their dog if that dog is 20' away. Standard leashes are 6' and even that is difficult to keep out of the way of a dog/owner on a walking path
- Not allowing dog reactive dogs off leash, reactive dogs should have a warning I.e : bandana giving warning "nervous"
- No jumping at others or vicious behaviour, human or dog. Be under complete control of owner.
- On leash, on correct side of walkway, shorter leashes
- That the dog can walk past me and my pets on the sidewalk without greeting us unless given Express permission by its handler.
- Interaction with speeding cyclists who think they own the path
- The dog should be well within the control of the owner and waste should be removed.
- same as in off-leash
- Dog under control, do not run in front of in-line skaters, cyclists, etc.
- Not worried about the dog, but the owner. All dogs should have good manners, and the owner is responsible, not the dog
- Social & well trained.
- Respond to owner. Under control of owner.
- Should be on a leash if it's not an off leash park
- Too many people use off leash areas as unsupervised dog play ground. Owners stand around chatting not watching their dog and allow their dogs to run amuck. Owners need to be held responsible and I don't believe there is enough enforcement for that to ever happen. Strict Fines should be issued.
- Owners should not allow their dogs to weave up and down off pathways so bike riders don't have near-miss incidents. So many pet owners have no control of their pets and have a sense of entitlement their pet can do whatever it wants in an off or on-leash area.
- That dogs be on a leash, well behaved, and are picked up after
- On leash and under control at all times
- **DOG MUST ALWAYS BE ON SHORT LEASH. PICK UP AND DISPOSE OF POOP.**
- Should be on leash on pathways. Green space -dogs should not interact with other dogs or people
- All animals in a public space need to be under control, and not allowed to wander off leash
- If your dog is not friendly, please go to the other side of the street
- To be on leash, to pay attention to owner, to not be trying to lunge or attack other dogs, people, etc.
- That the dog is on leash and not displaying aggressive behaviour.
- Ban retractable leashes, dogs should be within arm's reach of their owner.
Owner is paying attention to the dog (not on cell phone or otherwise distracted)
- On leash always



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Pick up poop

Hold on to your dog when passing someone or another dog

- If they have aggressive behaviour the owner should discipline or remove them from the park
- Manageable and controllable by the handler. Have witness incidents where a small child is left to walk a larger, disruptive (protective) animal
- Not aggressive towards users of the bike path. On a leash and follows commands. Move off to the side for cyclists and walkers.
- Owner has control of their dog
- Should be on a leash at all times.
- Dogs should always be leashed and controlled in non off leash areas
- Not acting aggressive or threatening in any way. Public has every right to feel safe on public pathways. Should be huge fines for dogs being off leash in or on a on leash area
- Dog leashed and not jumping or running loose. Stay in own side of path with owner in control.
- As there are not enough fenced off-leash areas, properly trained and controlled dogs should be allowed to be walked off-leash by their handlers, wherever it can reasonably and safely be done.
- Dogs must absolutely be on a leash attached to a physically capable person at all times.
- on leash and under control
- Obedience, good behaviour towards other pets and people, and ALWAYS leashed.
- All dogs should be on a leash!!! Any waste should be picked up!!! People make these areas their off leash places because they are too lazy???? Elderly, less active people often use these areas for exercise and to walk their dogs it's unfair they need to deal with dogs racing around off leash!!!
- For people to actually keep their dogs on leash in these on leash areas!!!! I regularly encounter entitled jerks who have their dogs off leash in on leash areas. Then they yell and curse at me for walking my dogs there on leash particularly when my dogs get upset by being charged by off leash dog
- I have no issues with pets being off leash as long as the owners are in full control, responsible and they return when called.
- All dogs should be on a proper leash regardless of training. Flexi leashes should be phased out and disallowed as they provide no control. As long as the dog is under control they should be allowed.
- No extendable leashes, pay attention, pick up, and don't assume people wanna pet your dog.
- Dogs to have learned good manners. Young or rescued be actively trained to be respectful citizens
- Clean up their dog crap, including the baggies they leave around fish Creek everywhere! Thanks for half a job
- Similar but unsure always on leash
- That I don't have a dog jump on me and almost knock me over ... Or my child
- Dogs must be in control at all times which is already a bylaw
- For many, many reasons I expect dogs in these places to be kept on leash AT ALL TIMES, no exceptions. However, I frequently see dogs off leash in these types of spaces. I would like to see these types of locations better monitored by bylaw.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The list is too long . I expect dogs will be dogs . Most dog owners are clueless as to how dogs behave and why they do. Signage as to what common behaviour is , ideal behaviour unacceptable behaviour and star of the week shining trophy as to what is good behaviour
- Dog can be off leash if well trained otherwise needs to be on leash.
- That the dog be under reasonable control of the owner or walker.
- Don't expect to be harrassed by a dog or it's owner
- Dog does not approach strangers (i.e. run up to strangers, sniff strangers, jump on strangers). Owners seem to think this is acceptable and call out that the dog is friendly but it is invasive and unwanted especially with little children. Feels unsafe and intimidating.
- I have no problems with dogs, non dog people shouldnt touch dogs with out permission, dogs on public places should no jump or touch non dog owners without permission
- Dogs should be on a leash at all times.
Pick up after your dog
- I expect the dog owner to be aware of their dog (get off your phone).
- Dog not to be aggressive in diving, lunging for other dogs.
- I expect the owner to manage their dog, hopefully have trained them well to not mind passing strangers.
- No 20foot extending leashes. Ever. They are so dangerous for both dogs and people and cyclists. No control of the dog, crossing paths, getting tangled, interfering with other dogs and people. Stay on the right side of the path except to pass
- To be well behaved and not at risk or hurting people.
- Dogs should be under control, either by leash or clear behavioural control. However I would welcome relaxing rules on where dogs are permitted - I would like people to be able to take dogs into restaurants etc., with obvious expectations on control and monitoring.
- I expect dogs to act like dogs. But of course what your really asking about is dog owners and how they should handle their dogs in public and what rules the city should impose on them.
- Dog is under control. Dog faces are picked up right away. Dogs do not enter private property without owner consent.
- Leash your dog! Do not allow onleash greetings without explicit owner consent. No flexis please which are dangerous and can snap. Pass eachother with care and give space when needed
- an owner should always have control of their pet
- Similarly rule of being mindful of the rules and regulations
- Dogs are on a leash and controlled so they do not pose a safety concern to others.
- The owners must be able to control their dog. I've seen too many owners barely able to hang onto their dog as it tries to lunge at passerby or other dogs.
- My expectation is that off-leash areas are a safe place to let our dog run free without the confines of a leash. It also allows a safe place for interaction with other dogs, allowing for greater socialization of our pet.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs should be under control. If there is nobody around, dogs that stay with their owner should be allowed off-leash.
- Should not be allowed - ever! We have dog owners come into our neighbourhood and walk their dogs off leash and we have seen the dogs chasing the deer which, I'm sure, causes stress in the deer. The owners scoff at you if you mention anything to them. Heavy fines should be levied.
- Dog on leash & in control
- Owners pick up after dog and bylaw upholds bylaw. Dog is kept under control.
- Age and breed Appropriate behaviour.
- They are 100% on leash.
- Under owners control
- Dog under full control of the owner including leashes.
- They must be on a non-extendable leash.
- Keep dogs on a leash and clean up after them.
- Dogs should not be allowed to urinate on private property unless it belongs to the owner
- None
- Keep your dog on a leash. Don't let the dog off leash because "it will stay off the path." If it's an empty area, and you are off leash, the second you see another person, put the dog back on leash. Dog walking services don't have dog off leash in non-designated areas.
- pick up after your dog or get fined, we need more enforcement as the pathways look like a dog outhouse
- That they remain on leash. All dog owners should provide each other with dove on pathways. Do not use extended leashes!!
- Leashes! I hear all the time "oh he is friendly". It does not matter if he is friendly. My father, actually, was severely injured by a German shepherd when working in high school. It does not matter how friendly the dog is, dogs are real trauma for him and many others.
- Dogs mind their own business and so do non-dog owners.
- dogs need to mind their own business unless a discussion is had between people and agreed to interact. People need to clean up after their dogs!
- I expect that the dogs are on leash - a 6 foot leash and not on a flexi
- Good socialization skills and proper recalls.
- I think a dog should be well-mannered in all situations
- All dogs on leash and under control at all times period. If it is not designated as off leash then the dog is on leash. People never understand the pathway laws and assume if its in or near an off leash area their dogs can run free. My expectations are of human behavior as it relates to the animal
- Non dog owners should be aware of off leash areas
- Dogs should be on leashes and owners need to be in control of the animal at all times. Amount of leash should be limited so they can't wander into the path of cyclists, etc. Animals should not be allowed to approach others unless invited.
- They must be on a leash.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same rules as off leash parks.
- An owner/walker that knows their dog well, and can control them when necessary.
- On leash.
- Dogs should be on a 6 foot leash and under control by the owner at all times.
- Same as in off leash areas. Pick up after dog. Make sure your pet is safe and others around you are safe.
- The owner is aware - can communicate with the dog or other people around and control over the animal if they may be defensive. Not letting them roam on a long leash.
- Leashed and controled
- they are on a leash
- I expect pet owners to be in control of their pets on leash and to be aware when the pet approaches others.
- Dog is kept on-leash and you keep your dog in control. If your dog is in training, reactive or exuberant please advise people moving towards your dog and/or move aside to let people pass. Clean up after your dog ALWAYS.
- The dog should not be allowed to be off leash and it must be okay with approaching individuals / cyclists Etc and if it shows aggression in any way it needs to be removed
- Dog should remain close to their owner and return when called. Dog should be trained to leave people alone who are not their owners. Share the space responsibly.
- Owners collect and dispose of waste appropriately, leashed at all times.
- Walking beside owner, not barking unless something spooked them.
- Pick up your dog waste!! Move over for pedestrians without a dog. Give space, don't let animals jump or approach strangers unless permission given. Only move closer to another dog on leash with permission from owner to let dogs meet.
- Dog MUST be leashed and must not be allowed to approach other dogs or people without consent.
- Dogs should be on a leash
- Trained by owners in safe behaviour
- keep your dog on leash, ask for permission before approaching another dog, pick up the poop!
- Reasonable barking and approach are fine, not jumping at people or barking viciously.
- I expect the dog to be under control (leashed or well trained) and the owner to be situationally-aware.
- Dog must be under control of owner at all times. Waste must be picked up.
- Dogs MUST be leashed - please enforce this. Dog poo must be picked up every time
- If the dog has shown aggressive behaviour, it should not be allowed off leash until the behavior has improved.
- Dogs will be leashed, always, regardless of breed. The owner will be in control of their animal. They should NEVER be permitted in playgrounds meant for children. They will be cleaned up after / not urinate or defecate on sidewalks, yards, etc.
- On leash



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Collared licensed

- They are leashed and in control of the owner. The owner picks up pet waste.
- For a dog to actually be on leash.
- Leash length requirements (less than 6 ft.), picking up waste, dogs kept under control (leashed)
- None
- Keep your dog on a leash and keep it under control at all times.
- Dogs who are not friendly should not be off leash with other dogs.
- Similar to off-leash parks
- Dogs should be controlled at all times, they should not be able to approach or interact with others on pathways unless invited. Retractable leashes, and long lines should have to remain at no longer than 6 feet when on sidewalks and in heavy traffic areas.
- Dog must heel beside owner when walking on pathways.
- If your dog is psycho (barking at everything, snarling, chasing, snipping, etc.) you shouldn't be taking it out in public. Just like Grandma.
- I expect that the dog is on leash and the owner can control the dog.
- Dog's should be leashed, under control, quiet and clean. Honestly I'd rather have dogs outside of the owners house/yard or dog park.
- Kept on leash, be in control of dog and always pick up after them.
- BE ON A LEASH. Can't believe I have to say this, but it's a huge issue.
- That the dog be leashed and under the control of the owner. Poop needs to be picked up.
- A well-behaved dog, simply. If you are a dog owner you must be in control at all times and if not, either keep it on your own property or in the house. No one should have to deal with your bad dog.
- Dog only on 6 foot leash and on the correct side of the path. Dogs should always be on the owners right hand side on paths, sidewalks etc. so the human is the barrier between their dog and oncoming joggers, bikers, etc.
- It's often not the dog's fault. Just because they don't have a voice, you're trying to target them? It's the owners who have no sense of responsibility.
- I see a lot of dog owners allowing their pets off leash in common and public spaces. Would love larger fines and clearer info on who to call when this is an issue.
- On leash only.
- dogs to be licensed & leashed, and display appropriate social behavior with humans and other dogs.
- somewhat calm responsive to owner
- Clear signage. Garbage cans that are not overflowing.
- Dogs should be on-leash in mixed-use areas. When leashed and off-leash dogs interact, it is often unpredictable. Off-leash dogs may be a hazard to runners, bikers or families with small children. Nose Hill is an example of a park ruined by off-leash dogs (new signage has only made the issue worse)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs must be always be well mannered and in full control of the owner. Owners must be respectful not everyone likes dogs. Ban retractable leashes. Introduce seasonal rules in SOME areas...in below zero temps allow dogs off leash on the few bike paths that run adjacent to the off leash area.
- Owners must pick up dog waste, be in control of their dog, and prevent their dog from approaching people and other pets unless invited to do so.
- I expect the OWNER, not the dog, to be responsible for the dog's behaviour and to pick up after the dog.
- They are kept on leash! There are many pathways that have individuals walking their dog off leash because they're good dogs.
- Under control at all times, limit length of leash
- Dogs startle just like people. Path users must slow down when passing. Whether running or cycling etc. Most just wizz by old people, toddlers, leashed pets etc.
- To be trained to walk calmly on a leash. For owners to pick up waste AND to ensure their waste bag is deposited in the appropriate receptacle. For owners to walk their dog on the outside (right side) when on walking/cycling paths. For dogs to be on a leash of an appropriate length (6 feet).
- Under control of the owner, not on a retractable leash, not harassing others in the space
- If a dog cannot be recalled from any distraction while off leash - it should not be off leash. Too many pet owners do not understand what true control is and education needs to be given with what constitutes control.
- That all dogs will be on a leash. This is becoming a huge problem as many people feel entitled to have their dogs off leash everywhere, as "their dog is friendly". I personally don't care if your dog is friendly, just follow the laws, This law needs to be enforced and have heavy penalties
- To be on a leash, for owners to be mindful of others using the pathway (if they now their dog is bothered by others, give a wider berth)
- That owners actually have them leashed, and their pets are appropriately behaved, eg do not jump at people when walking past. All waste to be picked up.
- Be on a leash at ALL times
- Others asking permission before approaching leashed pet. Whether with another dog or not.
- No jumping on people, no aggressive posturing
- be kept on a leash, no lunging, be kept on correct side of path away from cyclists, runners, etc.
- Be cool.
- Dogs must be leashed.
Don't allow dog/dog greetings unless both owners agree in advance.
Keep your distance if the other owner is staying away.
- That owners pick up waste - too many do not!
- I expect that dogs walked anywhere except for off-leash areas to have a leash and collar on. They should also be kept with their walker at all times and poop should be picked up and thrown out.
- Leashed and under control



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs should be on leash, or respond to their owners commands. There needs to be more education that dogs aren't allowed in playgrounds. The city removed the signs years ago and people feel they can go anywhere
- that people follow the rules - I go to a number of on leash walkways to find offleash dogs (that run up to yours and owners just yell they are friendly - not always the case if a single dog runs to a multiple dog walk
- People and animals can share the pathways. Both need to be respectful. Move off to the side when needed. No flexi leashes on pathways/sidewalks as they are hard to control.
- Be on leash. Just because you think your dog is so good off leash, doesn't mean they always will be. Dogs on-leash when approached by an off-leash dog will react negatively.
- Dogs should always be on a leash and the owner must have control of their animal at all times
- dogs must not chase, harass, bite or in general annoy other dogs or people
- always on a leash and always under control
- Dogs under control at all times (leashed or not). Appropriate interactions with people and other dogs (no barking/biting/jumping)
- Clean up after your dog. Leash your dog. Be responsible for your dog.
- Dogs should be on leash, and under owners control. Education about the dangers of leash greetings, and fear signals.
- The same courtesies that apply to humans. Stay on one side of a path, let faster people pass you, clean up your mess.
- similar behaviour but on leash
- Pick up waste. Dogs on 2M leash. Interactive dogs kept aside.
- Picking up of dog waste no matter the time of year / weather. I would also like to see a limit on the use of flexi-leads as they are quite dangerous to the dog and others if not used correctly
- No comment
- Respect/consideration for others in the area, follow the rules. Just because your dog can be off leash doesn't mean it's appropriate in certain areas
- Not aggressive.
- Dog to wear city tag & must be under control. Definitely on a leash when near roads. Always scoop poop.
- Dog under leash control, including restrictions on extendable leashes, pick up dog waste
- Have a well behaved dog that is on a leash.
- 100% approve of off leash parks. Many people consider the entire city to be an off leash park. IMO off leash parks should be fenced-in areas so that everyone is aware that they are in/out of the park. Dogs should only do their business on their owners property or on city property. (no excuses!!)
- Dogs under control and cleaned up after. Stricter rules on fake service dogs.
- Dogs should be leashed and under full control of its handler at all times. All feces should be cleaned up immediately and appropriately.
- On leash. Often people ignore owners request of leaving their dog alone which isn't acceptable



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- clear definition of "under control" if an animal does not respond to voice commands immediately, they are not controlled.
- Dogs walking onleash furthest away from approaching human.
Leash should be short when approaching human.
- Dog must be under control and not bothering other people/dogs with nuance behavior (barking, lunging, growling)
- dogs are on leash and properly socialized
- Not aggressive towards people or other animals when on a leash
- Not attacking other dogs, no humping/dominating people or other dogs
- That dogs are kept on a 6ft max lead and that owners are able to control their animals in the event of a reactive scenario.
- Dog must be able to interact in a social manner with both other animals and people (including small children)
- I expect dogs to be ON LEASH. Owners should clean up after their dogs.
- On leash, controlled
- Dogs on leash.
- As above
- Owners take responsibility for dogs that injure people and other dogs
- People MUST have control of their dog. If the dog will not listen or come when called, they must not be off leash, in a park or pathway or neighbourhood.
- There is a space for learning and improving behaviour but eventually the dog must try being outside on leash in public space. It is on the other pedestrians to avoid a reactive dog if they feel uncomfortable and the owner is already doing their best with the dog. Don't surprise a dog on a sidewalk.
- Dog owners need to know that alleys are not off leash areas. This goes back to the lack of enforcement of existing bylaws.
- Dog owners need to maintain control of their dogs in these areas. Do not let the dogs approach or get into the path of other dogs or humans who are out and about in the same areas.
- Dog should heel, be trained not to jump on people, or owner should draw dog to the side if it doesn't yet know how to behave.
- All dogs must be on leash in common or public spaces with the exception of designated off leash area's.
- That they remain leashed and under control.
Being on leash doesn't mean having free reign over a 20' lead.
4' max and responsive to the owner.
Also, the dog shouldn't out weigh the person handling it.
The amount of times I've encountered a child trying to handle a mastiff is laughable.
- pet owner to respect private property, pick up after your animals, be responsible for your pets manners and behaviour.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs must be under owner's control
- That they are under control of their owner.
- Pick up poo
- Dogs should be leashed at all times when in a space that is not a designated off leash area, regardless of dog behavior/temperament.
- Dogs should be leashed. Cyclists or users of other wheeled conveyances should be aware of dogs and make an attempt not to interfere with them.
- Dogs must be well trained and under control
- On a short leash, under control at all times, and waste picked up.
- More numerous off-leash pathways would help dog owners with a desire to actually walk their dog off leash, rather than stand around in a small area where more dog attacks tend to happen. In on-leash areas, obviously dogs should be controlled and picked up after.
- Pick up waste!
- The dog owner needs to understand their dogs and behave appropriately. If the dog is reactive they need to provide it with more space if approached by people and other animals. Other people need to be respectful of the people with dogs and not approach if the dog is uncomfortable or owner requests
- They should be on a leash at all times, except in off leash areas
- That they stay on leash and under control. No use of flexi leashes with an out of control dog. Serious injuries occur with this type of leash.
- dog is on a leash, well behaved with humans and other dogs
- Dog should be in control, this does not necessarily mean on leash. If you have a very well behaved dog that listens to instructions and can be trusted to react accordingly, leashes should be optional. This means the dog needs to be WELL TRAINED.
- Dog under control.
- That the animal is on a leash and under owner control.
- Dog must respect other people/users of pathway and not run towards or invade their "bubble" especially if large dog. If dog is unable to do that, owner must move dog off pathway to allow pedestrian or other dog owners to pass.
- How to approach and on-leash dog in an off leash area etc. when your dog is on leash. Proper courtesy. What to do on shared paths.
- All dogs should be on leash under the control of the owner or person walking them
- If the dog had aggressive tendencies then the owner need to be able to control the dog on a leash no matter what.
- Owners should keep dogs away from people, bikes, other pets, etc. Pet behaviour should not interfere with others use and/or enjoyment of the space.
- Dog's are under reasonable physical control -- they don't physically interfere with other users. Allowance needs to be given for dogs who bark/react to stimuli should be accepted as long as physical distance is maintained.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs have to be properly trained, and people educated not to or how to approach someone else's dog.
- Same expectations that are listed above for off leash parks
- Respectful behavior. Some aggression/animosity can be tolerated, but truly aggressive behavior should disqualify a dog from offleash/public spaces.
- If a dog is leashed and not approached by another person/dog, the majority of issues are solved.
- If not in an off-leash area, the dog should always be on leash. Must pick up waste.
- Owners to follow bylaw and city needs to enforce bylaw with irresponsible owners. Not only if there is a bite with broken skin. Don't wait for the bite to occur.
- Well controlled dog on short leash (eg., 1m max), not long extendable that reduces ability of owner to quickly control.
- No aggression
- The dog should be leashed at all times, regardless of character, as not every pet is friendly under all circumstances. So long as the dog is under complete control of the owner, no problem should present itself regardless of the dog's behaviour.
- dogs must be fully controlled. If a person has any concerns about their animal they should be making use of the safety equipment that is available from local retailers.
- Signs on school fields "No Dogs area"
- Should be leashed. Should not defecate or urinate on any private property. Should not be allowed in businesses or hospitals (unless it's a service dog: ESAs do not count) unless it's a pet store. Should not be allowed on public transit (again except service dogs not ESAs).
- That the dog will be on a short leash on the "safe" (usually right) side of its guardian. That the dog will not be allowed to interact with other dogs without their guardians' permission, or allowed to interact with humans (esp kids) without their consent.
- Dogs always under control of the owner, not jumping on people or harassing other animals, always clean up their messes. Not too much barking either but some is OK because they are dogs and dogs bark.
- On a leash.
- Filled in survey before adding: Would like to see designated parks/open spaces throughout city where NO pets are permitted at all. Dogs owners have access everywhere (except sanctuary, they go anyway). No natural areas where people fearful of dogs or with small children can safely go without dogs.
- All dogs need to be on-leash! This also needs to be better enforced/patrolled. So many people don't follow leash laws because they are never caught so they don't care. It doesn't matter how 'well behaved' your dog is or if they 'have perfect recall', on-leash unless designated otherwise.
- Dogs should be on leash - this should be enforced
- If a dog is not under control it should not be allowed off leash
- dog should be trained to have good manners, calm, listen to owner call, friendly



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That the dog will not be snapping and snarling at passers-by. That the dog will be reasonably under control on leash.
- Dog should be under control and must have a safe and effective recall. Does not approach other people, animals or wildlife, unless in training or the behaviour is being managed. Fearful/aggressive dogs should be muzzled or under strict control.
- Consider a muzzle, if dog is
- Under control, on leash
- Leashed and picked up after. Not everyone enjoys animals.
- That dogs will not chase cyclists, and that [removed] owners will not string the leash across the pathway causing collisions
- Dog is under the control of the owner and not a hazard to others.
- That they are under control at all times.
- Dogs should be on a leash if it isn't an off leash park. The city should be posting more signs regarding this.
- Be respectful!
- Dogs Must be under control at all time that includes lunging and barking at other dogs and people
- DOG HAVE TO BE ON LEASH
- Dog on leash, under-owner control, not excessively loud or disruptive. But I think the same should be true of children and that doesn't happen, so...
- On-leash or under control
- That dogs are actually on leash even if they are good with others and that waste is collected and disposed of appropriately.
- Dogs should be taught not to constantly bark at everyone without end.
Dogs should not be aggressive towards anyone.
Dogs RELY on their owners to speak for them when it comes to meeting other dogs/humans. No one should approach or even attempt to greet a dog without full consent by the owner.
- Dogs under control.
- All dogs must be on a short leash which is held by the owner, not dragging on the ground. Dogs must heel on the owner's right side, on the right side of the path. Dogs do not cross over the centre line. Multiple dogs must all be to the owners' right on a short leash.
- I expect dogs to always be on a leash in common areas, but especially near playgrounds with children. We live downtown [personal information removed] and love having space to take both our small child and our dog - but it's stressful when a random dog comes running up to either of them without an owner nearby.
- control your pet
- I don't know because I never go in an off-leash area.
- On leash at all times.
- Dog must not be aggressive and be responsive to owner commands
- Able to walk on leash and respect from those who do not have dogs ie bikes to respect space



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- In my area (Aspen Woods), there are more off-leash dogs wandering the streets and pathways oblivious to others who may be fearful, allergic, etc. Further, owners who do not pick up after their dogs in the pathways and parks is a major problem. Dogs in playgrounds is also a problem.
- dogs should be on short leashes and not allowed to go up to people or other dogs.
- I would like to see better enforcement of the on-leash laws in Calgary, specifically in my community of Bowness. Many owners seem to think the by law doesn't apply to their dog, even when it isn't responsive to its owners commands.
- The problem with defined off-leash areas (even more so when fenced) is that they create a space "for" dogs, while all other space is predominantly "for" people. Would prefer to see expectation of good dog behavior in all shared public spaces, with more freedom as an incentive.
- If off leash they are well trained, to be on leash if not, and that the owner is monitoring them at all times
- Dog owner is aware of surroundings at all times. Not distracted by phone.
- keep their dogs close and within reach for immediate control in an event where the dog gets triggered.
- Dogs needs to be on leash - no exceptions! Do not assume that I want to meet your dog. Be courteous - if I am moving away from you and your dogs do not keep coming toward me.
- Stay off bike paths and shared paths
- Dogs leashed and in control of owner, harnessed if leash alone isn't enough to retain control, respect other people's space, don't harass people or other pets or wildlife, not chasing bikes or skateboards, relieving themselves in appropriate places (ie not on benches, people, etc)
- Proper behaviour in interactions, as long as the owner is actively monitoring their dogs behaviour, and removing a dog from a potentially reactive situation, they should be allowed to walk where they need to.
- No aggressive behaviour. Should be allowed anywhere as long as dog is well behaved.
- To be able to walk my dog without people attempting to pet it without my consent
- On a study leash at all times, can properly heel and stay close to owners. No jumping on strangers, no barking, no aggressive behaviour.
- Not to jump up on people.
- Don't have a dog offleash in an onleash area. Don't assume every dog is friendly and ask permission before allowing your dog to approach another dog or person.
- Dog is on leash. Too often dog are roaming free on user pathways
- Owner is in control of dog(s)
- Be leashed and in control. Appropriately sized leash, not 5m long.
- Always on leash, muzzle on all medium and large dogs.
- **ON LEASH AT ALL TIMES.**
This survey is useless if the laws are not enforced
- Dogs must be on a leash, but not a super long leash. Retractable leashes are great But they are also a hazard. Ultimately everyone needs to be aware the path is shared.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Be considerate. Don't let your dog jump on someone. Don't let your dog approach children unless it is obviously welcome. Don't let your dogs jump on tiny dogs.
- Dogs in an ON-leash area must be on a proper leash (no retractable leashes, no leashes longer than 10'). Dogs must be under the owner's control. Dogs should not be allowed to run at, jump on, or bark at people. Waste must not only be picked up, but also properly disposed of.
- Should be leashed
- All dogs should be on leash, licensed, and under control by the owner
- People need to understand that the dogs need space. Dogs are getting exercised and may not be friendly to dogs or humans. Education is lacking in many
- Dogs must be under owner control
- As in off leash digs and people should be respectful of those around them.
- Kept on leash, pick up waste,
- If the dog reacts to something, that the owner knows to leave and others respect their space while leaving.

I don't like kids running up to our dogs...

Small dog owners allowing their dogs to behave differently than what they expect of large dogs.

- Every off leash park should have at least 1 or if very busy 2 smaller areas that are fenced in. These smaller areas are important especially to help dogs socialize with others, or if they are fearful from other dogs from being attacked, or if they have had surgery and need a smaller alone spot.
- Your dog is behaving. If not heavy fines with exceptions of puppies learning.
- Dogs under control and not posing a danger to anyone or any other animal
- Well trained and under control.
- All dogs are different. They are not robots that all behave the same way. There should be some tolerance to those differences, and to dogs in training. However, a reasonable level of 'good' behavior is helpful.
- I expect a dog to be a responsible citizen, but I also expect that of the owners. I expect the dog to be under the control of its handler - with an understanding that some dogs must be leashed to be under control, and other dogs do not require a leash.
- What about expectations for other users? I move off pathways and sidewalks if I don't trust my dog to react appropriately.
- Not off leash then don't have your dog off leash.
- Pathways should dog sound be on leash and in control. Dog poop should be picked up
- Dogs should always be leashed unless in designated off leash areas regardless of their training
- Respect the humans. I always get my dogs to sit and never approach anyone. Not appropriate for humans to run to strangers..dogs too.
- On leash and does not approach you or bark unnecessarily.
- Walk nicely on a leash, not lunge at people as you pass them on the street, sit to greet small children
- Not barking and lunging at everything in sight.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Do not allow on leash greetings between dogs without consent
- Areas that are not off leash should be strictly enforced for people who are using that space to keep off leash animals away. People should not approach leashed dogs. Dogs should be controlled to be kept away from other leashes animals and humans using the space
- Pick up poop, keep on leash
- Dont bring dogs that arent park worthy .
- Pick up after your dog. Dog must be under control. Not be allowed to approach a person on the sidewalk or pathway without their permission or request to pet etc...
- They should be on leash. Retractable leashes are not sufficient. Dogs shouldn't greet other dogs on leash without permission from both owners.
- Ask before introducing new dogs.
- That dogs are appropriately monitored
- They should be on leashes or highly well trained.
- Other peoples dogs should be controlled and not be jumping on strangers. Dogs should be on leash at all times unless its an off leash area. I find many dog owners do not leash their dogs.
- Leash not too long, less than three feet.
Dog is supervised and well socialized.
- Don't allow your dog to be a nuisance to your neighbours by allowing it to constantly bark for a period of time while in its yard.
- Dogs should always be leashed in public spaces
- On leash. Under control.
- I'm a dog person and I am attuned with my dog so I am liberal with allowing dogs to explore and be curious. Dogs should be within close proximity to their owners, puppies are learning especially so people should be patient, knowing the signs of your animal should tell you when you need to control it
- Under control ie- not using flexi type or long leash
- Dogs need to be on leash when not in designated off leash areas
- Not vicious and on a leash.
- Dogs must be on leash or under control (ie come when called)
- Owners don't allow dogs to jump up on humans. For me, the issue is more people approaching dogs without asking rather than the dog behaviour. Maybe having designated colors a dog can wear if they're shy or not good with kids.
- Comes when called, does not fight with othrr dogs and doesnt jump up on children or adults.
- If it is not a designated off leash park your dog should be on a leash. If there is no off leash park in your community either drive to one or advocate to the city for one.
- Under the control of an owner paying attention to their surroundings. An acceptance that regardless of how "harmless" you perceive your dog to be I should have a choice as to whether I interact with your dog.
- Dogs should be kept on a leash and under control at all times.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That they be under control (not walked by a child, for instance) and the humans using the space have priority
- The owner has control of their pet and is respectful of other pets in the area
- it would be nice if we could be a city where as long as dogs are under control they can be off leash on pathways etc. would be nice if dogs were allowed to tie somewhere in front of a store for a short period of time while owners may go inside for a quick stop, and relax rules on restaurants for dog
- Dogs on leash on pathways and not meandering onto the opposite side of the path
- dogs should walk safely on a leash no longer than 6 ft. Retractable leashes should be banned.
- Cyclists should not be on sidewalks and should ride at safe speeds and signal to dogwalkers before they're on top of us.
- That the owner is in complete control of their dog. Therefore, I could walk by and the dog is not going to jump on me or bark or get in my way.
- Dogs should be leashed. Non aggressive. Muzzled in public if they are not comfortable with strangers.
- Owners need to keep dogs on leash when not in off leash areas. This is a huge problem in our city. People think their dogs are fine but don't understand that they are placing other dogs, kids, people at risk.
- That the owners and public understand dog behaviour
- On pathways that are not deemed off-leash, all dogs should be on leash and in control.
- That they be on a leash at all times. That the owner not let their dog approach others without their consent first. That the person without the dog have the right of way to the path - the person with the dog should get out of the way, keep their animal out of reach unless permission to come close.
- Pickup pet waste, dogs on leash at all times, dogs in control on leash, awareness of environment (wildlife, other people/pets), paying attention to your pet (not on phone)
- People have socialized their pet so they won't be as aggressive. Have control over this pet. Non pet owners should be made aware of how to approach a pet and how to interact with them so they won't be the cause of starting issues.
- No biting or clawing people, no peeing on them either. Barking, while allowable, should be reined in once owner realizes that their pet may be causing others undue stress.
- On leash areas should be monitored more
- Dogs on leash, picking up after dogs
- Keep your dog on leash and be aware. Just like driving. Don't text and walk!!
- Dogs must be on a leash. Never off leash. Not on a long leash if on a popular bike path as that can cause major accidents. Nor on a long leash if in a busy area. Shorter, more manageable leashes then.
- I don't mind if a dog is off leash on a public pathway as long as it listens to it's owner and comes to them as I approach and they give me the option to interact.
- Leashed.
- They should be leashed at all times, even when considered friendly



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- pathways. Can you make it CLEAR to dog owners the expectation of the dog on pathways. I have been knocked off my bike, been nipped at, charged at, jumped at because dogs or NOT on leashes. It drives me nuts!
- On leash, not lunging at people, waking politely
- On leash. Near others, on leash right beside you, don't make others go around you. Do not let your dog run, sniff/lick, bark/growl at people, control or remove them. No peeing on pavement/near vehicles. Don't take pets for groceries/eat out, leave them at home! Dogs sit on floors, not transit seats.
- On leash, well behaved, picked up after, non-confrontational, no barking
- On regular pathways, I expect that owners take precaution to ensure the safety of others, by ensuring the dogs are not aggressive or overly excited. FENCES need to be maintained.
- Your dog may be friendly but not everyone likes dogs. Be considerate of others. Keep your dog on leash if it is not an off leash area and step to the side to allow people to pass if they seem uncomfortable with being approached by your pet.
- on leash
- That owners pick up after their dogs and KEEP dogs on leash. Having them on a certain side of the path as is now required in the bylaws is ridiculous. When dog owners are approaching another person with or without a dog they need to get out of the way a reasonable distance.
- Dogs should be on leash under the control of the owner.
- Owners will move to the side/edge of path or sidewalk so passing is easy.
- People should simply have their dogs on a leash and under control. If the dog is acting out and bothering people, consider walking somewhere else.
- Dogs always kept on a leash. Give information boards as to why some dogs cannot be off leash for public to understand. The stress on some dogs who are fearful or reactive and owners can have piece of mind
- It is okay if the dog is well behave walking along side of owner.
- Dog on leash. Kids in my neighborhood bike to school on sidewalk. We step off to give them room. It is a simple courtesy that seems to be really appreciated.
- Dog should be under control, leashed etc. Muzzle if it is aggressive. If your dog does not like people or is protective, think twice before taking him into an environment where he will be stressed
- I expect dogs to be on leashes, and muzzled if necessary. And the owners cleaning up after them.
- Please please please pick up dog waste and carry the bag to the nearest bin. The owner should be attentive to the dog and their surroundings and be capable of restraining the dog if needed. Also, retractable leashes should be banned.
- Well behaved/ trained. Listens to owner. Stops barking when told.
- No aggressive behaviour towards other dogs/humans and must be kept under control by owner.
- Pick up waste. Owners should not just let their dogs run at people.
- Aggressive dogs or dogs who do not listen should not be at an off leash park



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs MUST be kept on leash. Its very common to see dogs off-leash in certain areas of my neighborhood. I have encountered difficulty in the past with other dogs approaching dogs I'm walking which are not friendly with other dogs. This can potentially be a dangerous situation.
- I think we have gone to too much trouble defining off leash areas. I understand leashing my dog on the pathways because that's for their safety with bikes wizzing past. But walking through deserted green spaces offleash should be no diff than an off leash park. Same good behaviour expected no matter
- dogs are on-leash and under control and are not causing an impact on wildlife
- i expect owner's to keep their dog at least six feet away from me when passing each other on a sidewalk.
- I had a huge problem with finding dog feces on my front lawn last summer on an almost daily basis. (I don't own a dog). I was never able to find the culprit but people dont' pay attention when walking dogs, let them roam and now I have damage to my lawn. I shouldn't have to resort to video surveil.
- I expect dog owners to stop treating every public space as if it were off-leash; show some bloody respect for non dog people.
- Doesn't jump up on people, doesn't shove snouts into people's crotches... basic manners.
- I want dogs to be approachable, friendly and under control.
- I really REALLY don't want to be subjected to incessant barking.
- No treats allow in dog parks
- Dog should be social and under control
- Proper on leash behavior. Well trained. Under control.
- Be considerate of others - if your dog has a tendency to go say hi to others, hold them close in case others do not feel comfortable around dogs. Ensure you are picking up waste!
- Pick up your dog waste!!! Winter is awful, people seem less responsible for picking up waste... people who don't own dogs don't understand proper etiquette when approaching a dog (especially with little kids)
- Should be on-leash, waste picked up, and not attacking or harassing other people.
- I would like less restrictions on off lease areas. It is inconvenient to have to walk around parks instead of through them, of a dog is safely in leash, I don't see why this is required. I would Laos like to see more off leash designated areas.
- Dogs should be free in all spaces. If something happens then there is recourse through the normal judical system.
- Actually being on leash, not running at other dogs, good owner recall.
- Must be on leash. All dogs should be on leash when outside of an off leash area. Other than that...dogs bark and act up (just like kids do) so that's normal. But the dog should be on leash or a hefty fine.
- ALWAYS on a leash and in control by the owner. Leash on pathways should have a maximum length. Too often people are not in control. The leash is around their waste and their hands are on their phone.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs are like pedestrians- therefore people on bicycles, e-bikes, scooters etc need to give dogs on leash right of way, i.e. prevent dogs on leash and people getting injured.
- Leashed and behaved both with humans and other dogs and wildlife. Do not allow dogs to lung or leap at you. Non aggressive behaviour.
- Dogs should be leashed and, if aggressive, a muzzle should be worn.
- Keep dog on leash, do not use retractable leashes
- Dogs should be on-leash and under control at all times.
- That the dogs don't act aggressively towards us. We are a dog friendly household and comfortable around dogs, so as long as the dog doesn't present an immediate danger to us I'm not concerned.
- Same as off-leash areas
- Dog should certainly be leashed and should not be displaying aggressive behaviour towards me or my dog or even children when they are being walked.
- All dogs should be on-leash in that situation
- Dog waste must be picked up. Dogs must be monitored by owners to ensure safety of other dogs and members of the public.
- On leash at all times, under control, do not allow dog to jump up on people, pick up after dog
- Be non vicious
- If a dog is aggressive towards people or animals, it shouldn't be in public. On or off leash. No one should be getting lunged at on the bow River path.
- Clean up dog waste, city needs to provide garbage receptacles on pathways at a regular interval so owners have somewhere to put the bags.
- To listen when called, not bark aggressively,
- on pathways dogs should be on leash
- in control at all times and on a leash
- On leash at all times
- I expect dog owners to have control over their dog. No jumping up on people and come when called.
- Leashed
- Pick up waste
- N/a
- Dog is on a leash.
- People should know that their dog needs to be close to them, especially when encountering others. People using flexi leashes need to be educate.
- Strict control of the dog
- That dogs are ACTUALLY kept on-leash. That people with dogs give others space, even if their dog is "friendly". That waste is picked up. That if a dog needs to be muzzled, it should be.
- Dogs to be ON leash, owners to pick up after them
- They need to be on a short leash and under control.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

I bike 12 kilometers on pathways everyday. It's a rare day I do not see a dog off-leash near a path. Having had multiple close encounters with dogs that have nearly caused accidents for me or fellow bikers, this need to be enforced.

- Dogs on leash at all times and dogs kept on edge of path way when approaching others (not walking them in middle of path). No long leashes near any pathway (running leash across bike path so riders are not aware of the leash as they approach)
- I expect the dog owners to be cognizant of where they are and to keep their dog close to them when passing other people, some folks are very scared of dogs. I think it is more 'Owner behaviour' rather than dog behaviour. And of course, ALWAYS pick up after your dogs, ALWAYS!
- All animals should be in direct control of the handler and should always be on leash. Mess pick up is very important for EVERY dog handler. Other walker should respect the handler when given warning or notification of animals behaviour (fears, triggers, etc.)
- Be on a short leash and near owners in case it needs to be recalled.
- Dogs that are not trained or are learning need extra care so they are safe and don't scare non-dog people.
- Always under control, whether on- of off-leash. Cleaning up poop.
- Dogs are on leash and under control.
- The dog should come when called and not be aggressive. If there is any chance the dog might hurt a person or another dog it shouldn't be there. Dogs shouldn't be on-leash any longer than necessary in off-leash parks as that can lead to aggressive behavior.
- Dogs are under control of the owner, they don't approach unexpectedly or jump on people.
- Dogs must be leashed on a non-extendable lease.
- That owners and their dogs with known reactivity issues need to ensure their dogs aren't coming into physical contact with anything they would be triggered by (i.e. not allowing your reactive dog to pass another dog on a sidewalk within a distance wherein they could come into physical contact)
- Kept on leash, no biting, no jumping on strangers, owner in control of animal.
- That all waste is picked up. Dogs need to stay away from kids or other people.
- Leashed, under control. Feces picked up. I feel strongly that dogs should be kept out of restaurants, shopping centres, businesses. It concerns me greatly that dog owners expect their animals to be treated like humans and carry them into shops, usually without a care for anyone else.
- Always on a short leash (not stretchy leashes). Always pick up messes and have something with you so you could. Not taking dogs to school yards, soccer games, etc. Not tying your dog in a public place which you leave them.
- Off leash should be fun places for owners & dogs. Implementing extensive "rules" are ridiculous & impossible to enforce without a lot of wasted time & money. Been using off leash for 30 years & majority of users are responsible. Don't make it unattractive due to the very low percentage of abusers
- Dog on leash and under control.
Pick up waste.
Yield to other pedestrians (to avoid unwanted interactions with the dog, or leash tangling in legs)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Clean up after you pets. Keep the dog in control at all times.
- Without a doubt, dogs MUST be on a leash and this should be enforced.
- Bylaws and citizen obsession with off-leash animals – behaviour of animal should be taken into account.
- Dogs are well behaved and return to owners when called - under control. No vicious dog should be off leash anywhere.
- Dogs always on SHORT leashes.
- Under control (that doesn't necessarily mean on leash), proper recall
- that the owner is not putting the animal in a situation where they feel threatened or scared...too many people or loud noises
- That owners will effectively control their dogs while walking them on leash to prevent attempted interactions with citizens whether the dog has good intentions or not.
- Pet owners need to be aware of their surroundings and where their dog is at all times. No retractable leashes!! Dangerous on many levels. Picking up pet waste AND disposing of pet waste. Having a 5 lb dog does not give you the right for it to be on a 20 foot leash with no recall barking / lunging
- The owner must leash their animals and maintain control over them at all times. They also MUST clean up after their animals.
- Should be under control, on leash and the owner should be ensure others are comfortable with their pet approaching people. See do not approach dog with owner consent above - how about do not let pet approach me without my consent.
- Dogs should be kept on leash when not in off-leash areas especially when children are around. Waste must be picked up. One person should not have more dogs on a walk than can be controlled safely.
- That the dogs be kept on a leash that is 1 1/2 meters long at most.
- Keeping dogs ON LEASH and under control, i.e. not lunging at other dogs. Do we even have bylaw officers anymore? I continuously come across people who are walking with their dog off leash on sidewalks or in non-off-leash parks who feel the rules do not apply to them.
- As long as the dog is under control by the owner any behavior is fine. The owner may be trying to train the dog on behaviors by doing walks in places where the dog may be stressed which is a part of the process. Some dogs don't react well to things, but as long as the owner has it under control.
- Be polite, sniff everything, pee on stuff. people should not get upset over peeing
- Dog should behave better than a toddler.
- If the only thing keeping a pet from lunging angrily or biting someone else is a leash the dog should be considered vicious and removed from society
- Etiquette!
 - 1) If you pass a person without a dog: call your dog, leash it up
 - 2) If you pass a person with a leashed dog: call your dog, leash it up
 - 3) If you pass a person with off-leash dogs, feel free to leave yours off-leash



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ability to behave properly with other animals and that if they do not do well with others ability to make sure you can move them away from the path of another animal
- Dog must be under complete control i.e. no aggressive behaviour towards humans. A pathway in an off-leash park should be designated off-leash.
- Share the space.
- Well trained and listen well.
- That dogs are on leash and that they stay next to their owner. Please banish flexi-leads, which gives dogs too much freedom and too much confidence!
- Dogs should be on leash and under control. There should always be an adult in control. Maybe an older teen if they can physically control the pet.
- Dogs should be leashed and under control, not running free in non-off leash areas. And pick up your dog's feces, PLEASE!
- WEll behaved, obedient dogs
- Keep your dog on a leash in off leash areas! Fines or warning for not having dog on a leash. It is dangerous for responsible owners of reactive dogs. We go to leashed areas to keep our dogs safe, if your dog is off leash it creates danger for everyone involved.
- To keep dog leashed and away from other people in area. Pick up dog waste and dispose of it in garbage.
Other people want to enjoy paths and parks without worrying about getting their children and themselves attacked!
- That the dogs are not violent and remain close to the owner
- Dog **MUST** be on leash. Owners must clean up after animals. Owners with reactive animals should be trained to deal with aggression towards other dogs or humans.
- To be on leash and well behaved.
- Same as off-leash except the dog is on leash.
- That dogs are on-leash unless in a designated off-leash area. That dog waste is picked up and disposed of appropriately.
- Keep dogs on leash
- Most dog owners in my area are not considerate. Often taking up whole sidewalk. Leaving fecal matter in bags all over the place.
- No aggressive behavior, on leash unless in familiar area with familiar people, following commands from owner.
- Each dog has a personality and we shouldn't get too tight about what is acceptable e.g. coming over to sniff a person. Dogs that jump on people should be on leashes. Dangerous breeds should be under tight control.
- I expect that other dogs will be on leash - however - this is NOT at all enforced and more and more people are treating pathways as offleash areas (ie. the ridge in Cranston for example). (I guess this is more human behaviour, but it's my biggest issue)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Lots of people walk their dogs before or after day light hours so they don't have to clean up after them. Our utility belt is a PRIME example. It is not an off leash area but most are and then they stop and my fence and cause my pet stress which results in a barking fit.
- My expectation is that dogs will ALWAYS be on-leash and UNDER CONTROL (not on 40' leashes or allowed to approach passersby) on pathways and outside of off-leash areas. Sadly, this most minimal of expectations seems to be largely beyond the ability of most dog-owners in the areas I visit.
- Pickup dog waste; do NOT have your dog off-leash on the pathway; if you use one of those leashes with retractable cords, give your dog a short leash so it does not impact walkers, runners, and cyclists. Do NOT all your dog to jump up on people and then smile and say "Don't worry, he's friendly!"
- I expect that no dog will be off leash unless in a city designated off-leash area. I have repeatedly engages 311 regarding issues in my community regarding the constant issue of off leash dogs and little has been done. Therefore I see enforcement, or lack there of, as a major issue.
- Under control of owner at all times.
- Dogs are leashed and controlled (Heeling) especially when on pathways (shared space)
- Animal must be under control.
- That dogs stay on leash at all times And people and other leashed dogs don't approach without permission
- on a proper leash. Not the nylon thread retractable crap
- Dogs should always be on leash and owners should always pick up after their dog.
- They should always be on leash if it isn't designated off leash.
- Do not approach a dog without owner consent
- People need to pick up after their dogs!! People with small dogs especially! They think because it's small that nobody will notice. I have a small dog and don't leave for our walks without a roll of poop bags.
- Keep dogs on leash, pick up dog waste and monitor interactions with people, dogs and wildlife.
- That people keep their dog on leash, under control, no flexi leashes, watch that their dog is not bothering anyone and keeping their dog safe from the people around them.
- Kept in control by leash, waste removed
- Dogs must be leashed.
- Ensuring all animals have a collar with proper tags. Hi
- The dog is under control
- Walk properly beside the owner and not jump at people to say Hi. This can be mistaken from some people as showing aggression. Pick up after your dog regardless where it is.
- clean and securely enclosed. well behaved owners and pets.
- Dogs must be on leash and completely under control.
- Dogs must be controlled by an adult (over 16) at all times, in all public spaces. Leashes must be shortened to heel when approaching others.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Pick up poop, control your dog, ensure that people know if your dog can be aggressive. Proper leashing and muzzling if necessary.
- I ride my bike everyday on the city pathways, and everyday I encounter the following: A dog off leash running on the pathway; and an owner with a dog on a long leash with the dog across the pathway making the leash a deadly tripwire. People need to understand pathway etiquette.
- Keep the dog leashed and must obey all rules specifically pick up the feces immediately.
- No retractable leashes, as they are dangerous to other users of the pathways and sidewalks. Dogs must heel when commanded, and be under the control of their owner at all times.
- Always kept on a short leash.
- people should not be accosted by others animals. Barked at, growled at or sniffed at.
- That it behaves and is under the control of the owner.
- under control of the owner, on a shorter leash if others/wildlife around and picking up after them and disposing in a garbage can.
- On a leash on a pathway.
- Yield to bikes and other walkers/runners
- All waste must be picked up and CARRIED with the owner until placed in a garbage.
- Dogs should be on leash. Owners should be in control and aware of the situation, such as removing their dogs from a situation they react to (children playing/bikes/specific other dogs) Ideally, pulling the dogs to the side and making them sit if being passed by bikes or pedestrians.
- Everyone needs to be aware of surroundings. Extended leashes should be reeled in when cyclists or pedestrians are in proximity. Cyclists need to exercise some common courtesy.
- I think it should be expected to respect the runners/walkers and cyclists are priority in these spaces and need to be respected.
- dog behavior ? no OWNER behavior. know your dogs comfort in all situations.
- keep them close when others are approaching. Do not let your dog walk way up on a retractable leash into someones yard. Non aggressive dog
- Typically, it's the owner's behaviour that is the problem, not the dog's. It is the owner's responsibility to leave the leash on. It is the owner who says, "Oh, don't worry, she's a good dog." I don't know the dog and I don't want it approaching me, sniffing me, or barking at me when I walk.
- Shouldn't be in public unless they know how to behave and follow rules no jumping growling or running
- On leash always on pathways. No dog with vicious designation should be allowed in public areas.
- I expect a dog not bark at me or try to jump on me as I walk by.
- In control and not acting aggressively
- That they listen to their owners and are not behaving aggressively.
- The dog is not aggressive
- A dog should be able to respond to common commands.
- the dogs must be in control of their owners

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- they should be under the control of their owners and cleaned up after, just as the rules apply for dog parks
- just follow the bylaws and City to implement its laws.
- Expect the owners have animals under control ... and leashed ...
- well behaved, no jumping. service animals only in all food service areas.
- On leash under control ask before letting dog interact with others
- That they are leashed! Sooooo often, this is not the case!!!!
- I have expectations of the dog *owner* -- complete control of the animal, pick up waste, be respectful of other people's (and pets') personal space.
- I think same rules apply. The public should not approach a dog without owner consent. The public needs to be educated to make sure they are not doing anything to instigate a fearful or reactive dog, and owners need to be aware of their surroundings and monitoring so they have control of their pet.
- 1. The dog must be on a leash
- 2. The dog should not jump on passers-by
- 3. Dogs that are aggressive to people should be muzzled
- 4. Dogs that are aggressive to other dogs should be controlled close to the owner
- Basic manners and attentive owners. Welcoming spaces for well behaved dogs and owners.
- Same as above in question 3 with added requirement for appropriate dog walking and pathway use.
- I expect dog owners to keep their dogs on leash close to them. To keep their dogs on the sidewalk and not let them walk on people's property. Not allow their dogs to urinate or defecate on people's property. To keep their pets quiet and now allow persistent barking at anything that moves.
- I expect owners to keep their dogs off of all private property and to pick up their dog feces on common/public spaces. We have a real issue with this right now in our area.
- ON leash at all times.
- Keep dogs ON A LEASH! And IN CONTROL! Sick and tired of being approached by other people's badly behaved dogs! Complete nuisance. Most owners balk or get offended when told they need to leash their dogs. This needs to be ENFORCED. Walk down the Elbow River and in community parks and TICKET them.
- All as above, plus that dogs stay off yards and easements -
- Not lounging at other dogs, people, animals, owners to pick up after their pets, no on leash meetings
- Keep on leash
- Not crossing in front of others on extendable leashes, pick up after pet, not chasing bicycles, etc.
- That dogs are on leash where required, without exception, and that regardless of whether or not off leash is permitted, dogs should not be a nuisance or threat to other people.
- The dog should be polite, and easily removed from the situation if it is required.
- Not a danger to the public.
- leashed or not the dog Must be Under control.
- do not tell me that ""Your"" dog needs to socialize and should meet my dog!
The get mad when i say NO.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Again, most times its the owner that isn't behaving properly, most dogs follow the lead of the owner and some owners think they can do what they want when they want, especially allowing pets off leash in leashed areas. You cannot assume everyone knows any space not signed off leash is leashed!
- Problem dogs should be kept on leash
- Dogs must be in control of their owners. Owners must be considerate and aware of other people and also aware of their own dogs temperament and limitations. Owners must be there dogs advocates and defend them from inappropriate behavior from others keeping them and other people safe.
- Keep dog leashes, in control, close to owner
- The dog be kept on a short leash and not allowed to jump up on people. Pick up feces. Share the sidewalk/pathway
- Must be leashed
- parts of calgary have off leash areas, bike paths and playgrounds all together. This is very confusing and hard to control, dogs running through the playground, non pet owners trying to ride their bikes through the area. Lots of arguments, accidents and injured people as well as dogs.
- Pick up waste
- controlled behaviour (i.e., not lunging at people/dogs).
- Our pathway is filthy with feces and is almost unusable. People caught not picking up their dogs poop should be sentenced to community service picking up poop the first offence. After multiple offenses they should lose their dog.
- - Owner MUST be able to physically control dog while on leash
- leashes of a proper length
- Always on leash.
- Respect for owners and non owners.
- I don't want strange dogs jumping on children or adults. I don't want dogs bullying others nor wanting to fight.
- Be muzzled if they may bite or snap. Be under the hacker's control.
- That dogs be on leash and that their owner keeps them on the same side of the pathway to allow others to safely use a walkway. That poop is not only bagged, but also disposed of in a garbage can. Aggressive dogs should be muzzled.
- That the dog is controlled and on a leash at all times. No dogs on the busier multi-user commuter pathways like At Edworthy. It can be dangerous for users if the dog is not in control and starts wandering along the pathway.
- Dogs should be "in control" on a short leash within arms reach.....not released on the long leash to be able to pull the owner out of control and bite the citizen.
- That the dogs are on-leash in these areas and owners are mindful of their dog's behavior. We live in Parkdale where we have seen an increase in off-leash dogs walking along the river, which is an on-leash area. these dogs are not always minding their own business and causing trouble, chasing wildife



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The dog should not interfere with any other person using the path or area. Frankly, some owners are pretty useless at controlling their dogs, they are on a leash but still allow the dog to "clothesline" a cyclist and still feel entitled to use the path.
- On leash and again under control.
- on leash, controlled, pick up waste, monitor interactions with other dogs and people. SHORT leashes so there are no tripping hazards across pathways when dogs aren't immediately beside their owner
- Do not approach another owner / dogs unless invited. If someone takes their dogs off the path it usually means they don't want to be approached. A curved path around those dogs is polite. Cyclists or walkers approaching from behind should make owners aware if they are passing.
- On leash and under control and supervision
- Must be controlled and held responsible for any aggression
- Respect signs where it says no dogs. Be kind. Talk to the owner with respect if you have an issue. Call bylaw if you don't feel comfortable.
- Pick up food and garbage that dogs might eat.
- That they be leashed and not allowed to come into very close proximity or contact with other people without the dog owner obtaining the permission of people that may be affected.
- That they go not block my path or engage with me without my consent.
- Even when a dog is on leash it still must be under control. Our dog had been bitten while ours and the other dog were both on leash with owners right there.
- dog on leash and owner in control
- Be on a leash
- I expect my dog to be calm and under control on a loose lead. A dog that is lunging and straining is a danger to themselves and others.
- I expect owners to follow bylaws and keep their dogs on a leash at all time and pick up after them. I expect dog owners to actually HOLD THE LEASH and not let it drag while the dog runs around at will. I expect owners not to have their dogs in and near playground equipment or on skating rinks.
- Dogs MUST be on leash. Dogs should be capable and taught to obey simple commands, Sit, Come, and Heel. Dog owners should be told this is an expectation. Dogs DO NOT understand long sentences in any language. ' I told you not to that that etc etc. Owner MUST pick up dog waste and dispose of it.
- Dogs should be under control and listening to their owners at all times.
- Most dogs should be leashed. Rarely, superbly trained dogs do not require leashing. If a superbly trained dog is heeling & under perfect control that should be acceptable.
- on-leash, and either socialized or wearing a muzzle.
- Dogs should be on leash and under control of his or her master.
Poop should be properly cleaned up.
- People pick up after their dog, dogs stay close to owners and are on an appropriate length leash.
- Under control. Not to intimidate others.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Be. On. A. Leash.
- One must have control of their dog at all times. People. Need to, pick up- after their dogs!
- The dog is always under control. A well trained dog does not need a leash to achieve this.
- Must be on leash
- dogs are on leash and owners are aware and responsible with the public.
- On leash, under complete control walking on the far side of the owner from me to minimize risk of interactions unwanted by another citizen. Again, off leash opportunities are privileges in a big metropolitan city. When not in a designated off leash areas, at assigned times, be on leash, controlled
- Always on leash! No barking, biting or lunging at people.
- -dog should be controlled
 - dog should be on a leash
 - dog and owner should not be taking up whole bike path
 - dog and owner should be on correct side of bike path
 - owner should not be walking dog while on a bike
- Will not chase people or bite
- Dogs be on a leash and under full control of their owner
- Dog parks are for dogs to run and play. If they bring their children that are afraid of dogs or riding bikes or tobaggans or aren't steady on their feet, expect that dogs may run over to investigate. They may be curious. They are not allowed offleash in that many places in town. Please don't get ups
- They should be on a short leash not a retractable type. Handler should not be riding a bike or skateboard or inline skates. They should be on foot and in total control of the animal.
- Calgary is really dog aware city and people are generally great with knowing there dogs and places they should or shouldn't go. Please dont change the wonderful dog culture calgary has!!!
- Dogs should be kept on leash at all times. While it is the law, too many dog owners ignore it. Dogs should be taught to ignore other dogs and people while on leash. They should be taught polite greetings if/when there are interactions.
- Dogs must be under control 100% of the time. No matter if they're in an off-leash area or not. However, CHILDREN Must be in control as well! I've seen bad kids out there.
- They should be under control of their owners at all times. And off leash areas should be more strictly enforced. I'm don't appreciate having my kids at the park and having off leash dogs running around them in an area that it supposed to be on leash only
- Even when on leash it is the dog owners prerogative on approaching and interacting with the dogs
- Dog on leash. Person holding the leash can control the dog. (no small children with big dogs) Flexi leads should not be allowed to be used on dogs ever.
- Dogs typically should be on leash, but also shouldn't have bylaw called on them if their dog is behaving well and sticking to the owner (almost as if it was on leash). Pick up poop. Be considerate of others that are uncomfortable with dogs.
- Close to the owner when the public space is busy



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The owner should be aware and in control. If the dog isn't friendly it shouldn't be taken to high traffic areas
- Under control by the owner or dog walker
- Under control and reaoectful
- As long as the dog is well behaved and not bothering anyone, leave them be. I hate dog parks because most dogs over the age of 3 don't enjoy strange dogs. I'd love to responsibly play fetch in any park with my well behaved dogs who won't leave me or bother other people. Leave well trained dogs alone
- Have your dog under control. Retractable leashes are unsafe for me and my dog. We are both safer if he is free to protect himself. Use common sense and know your dog. Respect others and how their dog is leashed. Not everyone likes your dog, don't let them lunge at or near me, my child, my dog.
- Owner must have the dog under control and muzzled. If the owner does not have a social dog, don't take it in to areas with heavy foot traffic or lots of animals. Don't bring dogs to events.
- Owners must always be aware of what their animals are doing and how they interact
- Do is not going to attack other dogs. Owners are present and doing their best to deal with a dog if it's being too silly.
- That the dog will not defecate on the pathway. That the dog will not be in my personal space without invitation. That there will not be aggression towards others.
- Dogs should be under the control of owner at all times and should behave in a responsible manner.
- Dog must be friendly, no agression.
- As long as the animal is on leash and under control of thier owner.
- I am understanding of some dogs behavior, for it could be due to their past if they are a rescue. I do expect in these cases that the owner (or person walking the dog) is able to handle and control the dog appropriately.
- well behaved
- Not lunging or growling at other occupants and wildlife
- That owner is present and in control of dog.
- Under control and happy
- Pickup mess and on leash.
- Dogs should be on leash and owner should be monitoring their dog
- On leash AND under control. Lunging at people on leash is not good etiquette, especially on busy pathways. PICK UP POOP. Carry your dogs' license and be respectful. I honestly think that Calgarians are very good compared to other places I have lived.
- No jumping on pedestrians, no incessant barking, and the owner should always have a strong hold on the leash.
- Dogs should not approach a person or other dogs on leash walking past them. Dog waste will be picked up immediately. Dogs will remain on leash 100% of the time in any space that is not designated as off leash.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Aggressive animals no matter what size should be reported and the owner to have mandatory training with the animal upon a proven complaint.
- If your dog is well behaved than people should be able to do whatever they feel comfortable with their dogs
- Zero aggression to people or other dogs and if necessary a muzzle.
- On leash.
- Not jumping on people, or being aggressive.
- The dogs should be on leash at all times. Anyone who has an aggressive dog, should not only be on leash, but under complete control of the owner. They should not allow an aggressive dog to approach other people/dogs unless invited. Owners should always clean up after their animals.
- I don't understand why I cannot walk my dog near parks even if he is on-leash. If a dog is on a leash I should be able to follow a path and walk next to a park, as long as I am not putting him in the slides
- Please keep all dogs leashed on pathways. A dog getting in the way of a bicycle could lead to very serious injuries. If dogs are aggressive on leash when other dogs pass, muzzles should be worn.
- Dogs should be on leash. If owner is using a flexy they should have it locked at an appropriate length to control the dog and not be a danger to other people or animals.
- Dogs on leash, owners pick up after dog.
- Calm and controlled. Not aggressive in behaviour or body language.
- Don't let your children approach an animal without having consent.
Teaching children and adults why yelling or calling to the animals when you're across the street is unacceptable, it encourages the dog to try to cross an unsafe road.
- **DOGS NEED TO BE ON-LEASH.** I can't stress this one enough and see it ALL the time. And people don't care. "Lighten up" "my dog is fine" "don't worry, he's friendly"
This is my #1 pet peeve.
- They be kept close when people are passing as some people are scared of dogs and dont like them coming close
- That you are able to control your dog
- On leash and respectful or muzzled if not no harnesses and no leash longer than 3 meters
- No jumping up on people. No biting. Waste removal.
- Dog owner should be held liable for any vicious animal incidents.
- That your dog is kept on leash and under controll. And if not, more inforcement.
- Similar to above.
- Pick up the poop. Dog should be under control.
- Dogs should not be let off leash in spaces that aren't off leash and let roam where they shouldn't be roaming. The person with the dog needs to pick up dog waste.
- Pick up poop! Leash your dog at all times unless in an off leash area.
- pick up dog waste
- no aggressive behaviour, have your dog under control at all times
- Not jumping on people.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Not interfering with cyclists.

- On leash. Controlled in both behavior and barking.
 - Dogs should be on-leash everywhere in public that is not an off-leash area. This is not just for non-dog owners' comfort (which it is) but also that some dogs do better when on-leash, and should not have to risk being approached by off-leash dogs in on-leash areas.
 - no aggressive behaviour at any time. On leash at all time. Too many hikers-joggers-bikers doing their stuff with the dog in front or behind with no idea of what happens when encountering other users.
 - Owners need to be in control at all times
 - Not to see dogs off leash, well mannered, friendly. Usually dogs off are leash even not a off leash area.
 - That's dogs are onleash in all areas that are not off leash. That your dog doesn't constantly bark when put into your yard, especially at 1am.....
 - Pick up after your dog!!! Respect the rules. No off leash on paved pathways in communities. Have control of your dog. If your dog is not social then don't let off leash.
 - Non-threatening behaviour towards people and other animals and if not, muzzled.
 - Dog is under control.
 - Dog remains at the owners side or otherwise does not impede the progress of others. IE, running across someone's path or approaching others without acknowledgement.
 - They need to be on leash, if aggressive tendencies they should be muzzled (regular muzzle or even basket muzzle). Ask before you let your dog say hello to other dogs, pick up waste, proper walking gear (no choke chains, spike collars, retractable leashes). These endanger so many pets
 - Come when called - I say this instead of "be on leash" because we will never have 100% compliance with on-leash and I am personally okay with a well-behaved dog off leash in public.
 - On leash.
 - That the dogs are on leash
 - Owners need to clean up after their pets! The fine for not cleaning up should be higher and enforceable. I live on a walk way and I'm really tired of cleaning up dog poop.
 - Human behaviour is the problem - On leash in on leash areas, keep the dog on your right (outside), no flexi-leads, ask permission to greet.
 - Pick up dog poo, don't leave poo bags hanging on trees or fences, keep the dog under control.
 - Not harassing others enjoying the public space.
- Good leash manners.
- Not trying to jump at or on others.
- Dog should be in control (ie, leashed but also able to walk near owner and not be zooming all over the sidewalk or on a 20+ foot leash), and if not then owner should be able to gain control to allow other people to pass on pathways or sidewalks. Owners should pick up dog waste.
 - If your dog shows signs of aggressive behaviour towards people or dogs they should not be allowed in off leash areas.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Yield to other pass biers
- Dogs should be leashed at all times.
- Dogs should be on leash and under the pet owner's control at all times
- The owner has full control of the animal and it is always on leash. Also that they pick up the poo and dispose of it in proper waste container.
- I have noticed that dogs are frequently off leash in areas that are not off-leash (eg. Glenmore Park.) I have frequently been aggressively approached by dogs in off leash areas as well. There needs to be better enforcement.
- Owners must pick up dog waste, must notify people approaching.
- Leashed and well-behaved at all times
- All waste to be picked up. Stay off private property (lawns), do not let dogs run up to people.
- Everyday I see people walking dogs with no leash, with a 30-foot leash, in playgrounds, schoolyards, on pathways. The 'dog behaviour' is a direct result of the 'owner behaviour' and I wish you would do something to enforce the existing bylaws.
- Properly socialized in all areas.
- Keep dogs on leash, no extendable leashes allowed, leashes dogs must be kept away from children, adults and other pets in pathways.
- Don't take your dog if you can't control it.
- Clean up poo!
- Pathways, common/public areas are not designated off leash areas. Owners must keep dogs under control at all times.
- Unless you're in an off leash area your dog should be on a leash. I have seen way too many people who think that the rules don't apply and they can do whatever they want. Also I think more people should be educated on muzzles and how useful they are.
- Move for people, quiet, non-aggressive towards other animals or people. Owner's must control their animals to prevent contact with other animals or humans unless permissible by the other person. Clean up after your animal.
- Dogs are leashed
- Dogs should be leashed when not in off-leash spaces.
- Dogs should be on leash and well behaved. Dog waste should always be picked up - Need more Bylaw officers to police this. Use Licence information to visit and educate owners and check that they have the means to clean up. Large packs of walking dogs should be stopped due to intimidation to some.
- Dogs should always be on their best behaviour. It's ok for the odd bark or outburst. Things trigger dogs. We have to understand the dogs better and not be quick to vilify them when acting up
- Not to invade my space. I'm not a dog person and I do not appreciate dogs running up to me/jumping on me.
- Dogs should be leashed and people should call out to let you know if a pet is not friendly.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If you do have your dog off leash and you see another person or dog, call them and leash them, no questions asked.
- Dog to be well mannered (or in training). To be conscious of those who may be afraid of dogs
- If it is not an off leash park then leash your dog. Unleash parks are a safe space for dogs who can't be off leash.
- Short leash at all times. No dogs at all in wildlife areas.
- None from the dog. But the owner needs to have it on a leash and be able to hold that leash and not let go. If it barks or growls I don't care. But do not let it get near another dog or human if it isn't friendly, just keep a safe distance and hold the leash and dog firm
- Dogs should be on leash and the owner held responsible for the dogs actions.
- must not jump up
- Dogs should be leashed and owners should always pick up after their dogs.
- Dogs should always be on a leash. Dog owners should not take dogs onto property that is marked as dog-free (city playgrounds, public school property, etc).
- Dogs should be Behaved. Humans should not have to be afraid for their safety. That said, non pet owners need to be aware. Dogs sense fear immediately & can behave in response to that. Owners should be aware & ready to respond. Rescue dogs can also be unpredictable. We can all coexist.
- Dogs should be on-leash at all times and within a few feet of owners (no extendible leashes), & under control -not running and jumping on strangers, barking at ppl and wildlife. If dogs are not trained to do this, they should only be in fenced off-leash parks.
- Same as off leash...well mannered, obey owners commands, pick up after them, owner is responsible for their behaviour
- That the dog is under control, and that the owner corrects the dog immediately if they are not behaving properly.
- owner has dog on short leash (plea ban extendileashes), dog is not aggressive to people, owner pick up dog poop
- if on pathways like community side-walks, your dogs should always be on leash.
- Good
- Controllable by owner, on leash
- Leashed, tethered, 6 feet away max. Leashed
- Dog must be under owner's control (leash or command in off leash areas) pet waste MUST be picked up and disposed into waste bin. Vicious dogs leashed and muzzled.
- Make sure dogs are on leash unless in designated off leash areas. Prevent them from getting too close to other dogs or people without permission.
- Dogs interact in different ways - sometimes they will be more aggressive then others, this can be normal - the issue is with untrained animals which is once again an issue with the owner and the dog just requires training



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Some dogs are trained to be off leash from day one, I think that if an individual and their dog are calm, responsible and interact well with others than they should have some leniency when it comes to not wearing a leash. Collar and tags are still a must!
- Same as the above plus ensuring their dog is on a leash.
- Dog owners must be in control of their dog at all times. Too often I've had dogs run up to me with their hackles up and the owner telling me they are friendly; that's not friendly. My dog & my sister have been attacked - in both cases there were no consequences to the dog owners even tho reported.
- I expect dogs to be on leash and the owner to have care and control of their dog or dogs.
- Waste pick up and enforcing people who let their pets off leash in non off leash areas.
- Do not jump at pedestrians when sharing the pathways/ sidewalks, etc.
- Owners need to keep dogs on leash when not in a designated off leash area. Need more city enforcement of this.
- Good behaviour on leash.
- Always picking up waste and not allowing pets to use private property
- Dog should be leashed or at least we'll trained and under control.
- Dogs should be either on leash or under the strict control of the caregiver. The city should also be asking about the behaviour of other pathway users. As a dog owner, I have had the most problems with cyclists on walking paths that are not considerate of other users and travelling too fast.
- This is a dog area and dogs are running free so let them be dogs but nothing it affects people.
- That residents keep their dogs on leash even in open fields. Huge issue in my area and my dog is not friendly with others ESPECIALLY when off leash dog approaches her on leash it's a disaster waiting to happen
- I expect dogs to be leashed when not in off leash areas, and to be responsive to me as the owner/handler.
- owners to be responsible for their dog and to respect the space of other dogs. If you can not control your dog then they should not be at the dog parks. People
Need to stop being ignorant about their own dog and that their dog is not perfect.
- That the dog does not come toward me for any reason. It does not growl or bark. It does not keep me from going about my business. The dog is securely affixed to a permanent fixture with a leash when owner is not around.
- Always be on a leash. Not letting them approach other dogs or wildlife. Always pick up dog waste.
Be liscensed
- Dogs should stay near their owners and not approach people with children unless they have the parent's consent.
- Not barking at every other animal a d/or person. Seriously. Nobody likes that neighbor.
- On leash.
Pick up after dog.
And for non-pet owners to respect distance.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

For parents not to allow kids to approach leashed pets (or unleashed) without owner consent.

- that they will be leashed at all times and on the not more than 6 ft leash if other people or animals are around. that the dog will be under control and not approaching others without permission from the other and the owner.
- Leash rules, what to use, not those extend a leash things.
- I expect good behavior or an owner who is engaged in trying to train their animal. An off leash dog park is a place to train your dog to come when called, proper etiquette with people/animals. Perfection is unrealistic, we don't expect it from people, why would we expect it from animals?
- Be under close control and on leash.
- Pick up waste
- That they are on leash! I live in Tuscany and interact with many dog owners who have their dogs off leash curing "it's ok they're friendly". I do not take my dog to off leash parks because of how those dogs react, now I have to be worried about off leash dogs in an on leash area too.
- Dog owners need to ensure their dogs are not scaring children, when passing other people, stand between your dog and other people and move your dogs away from others. Not everybody feels safe around dogs
- Dog must be leashed and under control.
- keep by your side & don't get in way of people. Have them trained to be polite & not vicious. Use a muzzle if required.
- Basic courtesy and good citizenship. It's more about human behavior than animal behavior, to be honest. It may be Inappropriate", but I'll say it anyway--your animal is not your "fur baby", and doesn't get the same rights and privileges.
- Simple....they behave and well trained...owners need to be in control
- Keep dogs on leash in designated areas. Often people will say their dog is friendly so they feel entitled to let the dog off leash. This will result in a problem when the off leash dog approaches the dog on leash. Happens all the time..
- Reinforce people to clean up after their dogs. Especially, having extra consequences of their actions!
Give Greater fine!
Have more Officers present to reduce animal waste and give fines! No warnings!
Make greater fines if caught in action!
- Dogs should all ways be on the right side of owner when on public walkways, and not on a 30foot lease.
- Leashed. Under control. Would really like to see a bandana system implemented in Calgary
- Dogs are kept close to their owner or controlled by owner so that none dog owners feel comfortable in the shared space.
- That the dog be on a leash and under control, sharing the pathway and/or public space in a reasonable manner.
- Dogs always on leash and in close range to the owner. Most owners always say their dog is friendly when they go close to other in the park area. Owners need to understand that with an immigrant



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

population, most of them have never been around pets and panic, scream, run when a dog approaches them.

- Dogs obviously have to be trained, but it's their abundance and the stench of their urine. They need to be limited to certain parks. When the snow melts their defecation spaces reek of urine. We live across the street from one of these parks and we and our neighbors want to start a petition.
- Dogs must be kept on short 6 ft leash).
- Not aggressive. Dig behavior is dependent on owner behavior
- I don't think dogs should be able to approach people or other dogs while leashes and in common public spaces (need to give people their room)
- City parks reek of urine with the spring thaw. It's so bad that dogs should only be allowed to use the parks between certain hours. Otherwise, go to an off-leash area.
- Dogs are leashed and under owners control
- They should be composed and manageable for the owner or walker
- Dogs must be monitored by owner
- KEEP DOGS ON LEASH!!!!!!!!!! And fine all that don't private property is begin damaged and wild life is be harassed on a daily why do you think we have a raise in wild conflicts!!!!!!!! OFF LEASH DOGS!!!!!! We need to step up and stop people walking dogs off leash on private property, city property green
- On leash
Not jumping on passerby's
Picking up dog waste
- Respectful of people, wildlife and the space.
- Owners must pick up after their pets. If pets are aggressive, this should be clearly noted and dog should be on short leash and muzzled. Dogs should be on reasonable leash length to not unnecessarily disturb others' use of public spaces.
- I don't have any expectations, every animal is different and should not be approached without the consent of the owner.
- Under control and giving other people space on pathways.
- The same as off leash areas.
- Owners/ dogs give space to other owners/dogs and individuals without animals. Do not let an untrained dog off leash to run up to other individuals/dogs
- Non-aggressive dogs
- Pick up waste and dog should be friendly
- Same as on leash/off leash
- Persons with dogs should have the dogs on leashes not longer than 6 feet. Owners need to demonstrate awareness of their own dog's(s') comfort level when encountering other people or animals and respond accordingly by standing off to the side, or crossing a street.
- I expect them to be dogs. Pee, poop, walk, sniff and probably get pet by non dog owners



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- In a perfect world dogs trained well enough that they don't require a leash. But otherwise relatively friendly, generally undisruptive (as possible with higher regulations dogs should be allowed in more spaces.
- Puck up faces.
- Pick up dog waste
- Well behaved, no threat,
- People do not let their kids or dogs approach other dogs without invitation. Dogs on retractable leashes should not be lunging/ growling at other dogs - if the owner can not control, they should be on a fixed shorter leash
- That they are kept on leash and courteous to others using the pathways/spaces. No flexi-leads that allow the dogs to be out of owners reach and control.
- I expect the owner to have their dog in control so it does not hurt or attack my dog.
- Be leashed. Pick up dog waste. Control your dog on leash - don't let it approach other dogs on leash.
- Must be on a leash and owner is in good trim if dog
- Dogs should not be on leashes that are too long. I believe the bylaw states 2m? Leashes should not cross a path way. Owners need to keep the animal off others. No lunging, barking , etc. I should not have to detour around an animal and his owner because they are taking up the full pathway.
- People do not pick up after their dogs....I'd like to see more waste bins and free doggy bag stations
- Dogs should be walking with their owner, or under control of their owner. I don't believe all dogs should be on leash, as some are trained very well and do not need a leash to remain by their owner. I expect dogs to be able to mark, and scent public property, and to interact with their surroundings.
- I'm pretty relaxed. As I have animals.
- Don't be aggressive towards any other living things. My PITBULL has been bit twice by a Scottish terrier and not once retaliated.
- Leashed. Muzzled if needed. Watch the length of your leash, just because your dog is 10 lbs doesn't mean it can be at large while my dog is on a 3 foot lead and can't get away from your ankle biter. Don't blame a big dog for the mess a small dog created.
- On a leash and under control
- They must be on leash and owners must pick up waste.
- They are on leash and in control not jumping move to the side.
- We live along a ravine and pathway and dogs are constantly off leash - even though 2 signs have been posted. One of our dogs gets upset when other dogs run up to him. We can't even take our dog out sometimes because it is like an offleash park to some people. Very frustrating!!!
- None
- I expect owners to be respectful of other's space and follow all bylaws, including leashing and pickup after their dogs. There have been more and more instances of people walking their dogs off leash in areas not designated as such. This includes not only green spaces but down the streets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dog is well controlled and owner shows respect for other peoples enjoyment of the area.
- Under control at all times--on a short leash--not an extending roaming leash
- That dogs be on leash and that pet owners pick up after their animals, take your dog waste home ! Owners abide by the rules!
- Dogs must be on a leash and not allowed barking.
- on leash or under control
- Reasonable responsibility from everyone at the park. Owners that have no reactivity to their dogs large or small are hugely problematic. Also dog walkers with 10 dogs and no ability to control the herd mentality.
- No retractable leashes on pathways! Such a hazard. Dogs walked on busy multi-use pathways should have other users in mind for those passing and coming other direction.
- To be on a leash and have the owner pick up after them.
- Dog owners should NOT have pets off leash ever! Once 1 or 2 do it they number increases of other doing it. Dogs should always be on the right hand side, if left handed move your dog away to the right for that short time of passing so that it's the people passing each other & not dog/ dog/person
- Have recall and not jump on people .
- On leash controlled,
- On leash unless obviously training dog in advanced obedience.
- Similar to above. Treating people and other dogs with respect. Keeping the ground clean.
- Be respectful to people walking that may not like dogs. Step to the side with your dog to let people pass without the dog jumping.
- Clearly. Dogs not in off-leash zone need to be on leash. This is a safety issue (pathway) and should have zero tolerance. There still needs to be a part of NoseHill park that a person can walk without being bothered by dogs. Currently, people don't even have a leash on their persons when walking dog
- My expectations are for animals to be animals, and humans to mess them up with ridiculous and unrealistic expectations. 'Oh! Oh! Your little dog with 1.5m leash attached and trailing is a hazard to my large mastiff!' The trailing leash is very likely for good reason but there's no convincing others.
- The owner needs to know their dog and only let them off leash if they come when they are called in a reasonable amount of time.
- New Canadians are amazing, but need extra education in their own language on the requirement to keep dogs on leash on bicycle pathways. And likely in other aspects of responsible pet ownership. You guys took the no dogs signs down from schools, so now people bring their dogs to poop on playgrounds.
- dog should be on a leash or body harness at all times. Pick up waste. Dog should have some training to listen to owner.
- Owner should always have control, and one leash and not in/near children play grounds.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- you should ask, what expectations do you have of owners in other common/public spaces - owners are the problem, not the dogs. Owners are the cause of their dogs not behaving. Obedience classes is a must.
- No retractable leashes. Dog must be controlled.
- Guardians must always have control of their dog. A maximum 6' leash must be used. Flexi-leashes must be banned. Guardians must respect other people with or without dogs. Always ask before approaching other people.
- No jumping on people
- walk dog not in the middle of pathways.. Keep them on the right
- The city of calgary needs to look at limiting the number of dogs being walked (i.e. "professional walkers) I've personal seen walkers with 10+ dogs and it is very dangerous and unhealthy for the dogs. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatoon/saskatoon-dogs-rules-1.5453562> - Other cities are looking
- Guardians must always have control of their dog. A maximum 6' leash must be used. Flexi-leashes must be banned. Guardians must respect other people with or without dogs. Always ask before approaching other people. [DUPLICATE]
- dogs must be on leash. There is nothing worse that having your dog on leash, or walking by myself and someone has their dog run up and out of control. As a dog owner there is nothing worse than assuming that everyone wants contact with my dog.
- Ability to control your dog and know how to anticipate bad behaviour
- dog on leash, owner in control, if dogs have issues, owner should cross street avoiding confrontations with other animals, thus avoiding miss behaviour
- if you r dog is off leash they need to be respectful of other dogs and people. If they are not then they should NOT be off leash.
- When taking your pets into public spaces, your dog should be under your care and control at all times.
- Calmness no jumping
- Dog is under control of an adult. Most kids can't control a large dog.
- They're on a leash and in control of the handler
- pick up poop; controlled on leash - and for owners to understand what triggers their dog! If your dog barks/lunges within 10 feet of another dog while on-leash- don't let them get that close! You're only making it worse
- That dogs should be kept on leash and in a controlled state, ie: not given freedom and space to approach others without their consent.
- My expectations are that the dog is under control of the owner.
- It seems that the current bylaw of not having a dog off leash within 10 meters of a pathway isn't beginning applied at the Rotary Park. Making it very unsafe at heavy traffic times to allow dogs to go off-leash.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- well behaved on a leash, owner should be able to control their dog while on leash, if aggressive then either harnessed or some sort of muzzle used
- I feel that Dogs should be expected to behave normally when it comes to noise, and under the same rules as the public. It can be expected that a dog will bark and will bark more if antagonized by someone. But they are quite during regular Noise Bylaw times.
- That dogs are on leash and on their "side" of the pathway. Bikes and dogs/long leashes do not go well together.
- On-leash, pick up poop
- That people keep their dog on-leash - many people don't do this. I meet at least one or two on any walk I take my dog in parks. That they should not allow their dog to harass wildlife.
- On leash.
- Enforcement. Dog attacks are so scary and often!
- Always on a leash no matter where you are. Also a length of leash that you can pull short so the dog can remain inches from you If nessecary for safety If you want to play fetch in a park go to the off leash instead. Plus pick up after your dog or don't own one!!! Frustrating this is a problem
- on a leash
- All dogs should be on a leash and controlled.
- IT annoys me to no end, people that have dogs off leash in on-leash areas.. this should be strictly enforced.
- I don't think you can police dog behaviour, it's just not going to be possible. All dogs are different and will react in their own way to circumstances. What you can expect is for the owner to understand their dogs behaviour and have controls in place like short leashes, muzzles or whatever to help.
- on bike paths, dogs should be walked on a short leash, or off to the side of the pathway so that leashes do not create a safety hazard
- I expect owners to monitor their dog's behaviour - ensuring it doesn't jump up on people; stray across the cycle pathways, chase wildlife. And don't say 'he's friendly, don't worry.'
- Please find a way to communicate that having your dog off leash in a area not deemed so, that you will face fines. I am TOO TIRED and FRUSTRATED dealing with all the pet owners who use the school field behind our house as an off leash park. There are signs, yet I have never seen any accountability.
- All dogs need to be properly trained, with good recall. Pick up after their dog in off leash and not off leash areas. BIG Fines for not picking up after your pet.
- On leash and under control.
- Owners must keep dog on leash. Many let them run off leash in non off leash areas. This endangers children and others. Fines need to be issued to offenders and since timely enforcement isnt done they know there isnt any risk of consequence. Responsible owners have to put up with repeat offender
- Have the dog on a leash at all times. Allow citizens to report dog owners who do not do this.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Well behaved, well controlled, if on an extendable leash do not let your dog have a wide berth as non pet owners/ bikers/ runners cannot see the thin leash, no dogs chasing after you when running/ not growling/ not lunging, pay attention to the signs to obey when it is an on leash area.
- Dog on leash and under control.
- On leash
- Dogs MUST be on a leash and under control.
- Owner should not allow dog to pull ahead to the point where they have no control over the dog. Ban Flexi leads!!! They are so so dangerous to the dog wearing them, the owner, and other dogs! Do not allow your dog to approach another dog on leash without explicit consent from the owner.
- Respectful dog behaviour
- Pick up waste, on-leash, monitor dog to ensure it interacts properly with other animals and people. Owners should not allow anyone to approach their dog without their consent.
- Now that it is allowed to bring your dog in to breweries/restaurants etc. it should be common knowledge about what a dog handler can and can't do with their dogs
- Keep dogs on leash. Too many people ignore the rules.
- Under owner control at all times.
- Pathways : current overview of expectations are clear clear; the public needs to be made aware of these expectations.
** Needed: new by-law stating it is illegal for dogs to be pulled on lease, even with a harness, behind any wheeled vehicle ON THE ROADS. There is no law or clarification on this.
- Dogs being quiet (no barking or lunging). Staying to the proper side of pathways, not disrupting other people using the area.
- PICK UP POOP!!! No aggressive behaviour
- Dogs should be on leash when not in off-leash areas.
- Owners need to be diligent about picking up dog waste
Dogs should be on leash
- Dog controlled in close proximity to owner, not going up to or interacting with other dogs or people without mutual consent. Cleaning up after dogs
- Dogs are to be on a leash and under the control of their owners
- No running dogs beside bikes or while wearing roller blades. Always ON-Leash and under control.
- The dog be no more than four to six feet away from he's owner, it on an extension leash. The dog does not chase bikes, skateboards, joggers, etc
- On-leash dogs should be in control always.
- Stay close to owner, respond to owner commands, able to redirect attention and focus back to owner
- Under control at all times
- I expect my dog and others, to be well behaved, respectful of their surroundings. Walk well on their leash
- All animals should be leashed and should be proven to be safe for the General Public



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Under the owner's control & on leash
- I have grown up with and have dogs (all large) and I would expect that dogs always be kept on a leash, unless they are extremely obedient/elderly. All responsibility for the dogs behaviour should fall on the owner. Dogs not accustomed to humans/other dogs should not be out before they are ready.
- Non aggression
- The owner has full control of their dog while on leash and the non-owner doesn't approach without consent.
- I expect people who have animals to know their pet and to be aware at all times. Mistakes and anxiety can happen unexpectedly. Stay off your damn phone
- People are so stupid. They let their dog attack other dogs they meet and they just stand there and watch. They do nothing to control their dogs.
- More signage in on leash parks eg. Bowness Park
- The dog isn't able to harm other people or animals.
- They owners should have control of their dogs on leash. They should be mindful when approaching other dogs and respect space as not all dogs are overly friendly on leash
- Under control
- That they behave like dogs. But that if not leached they don't charge at people. Friendly approaching for pets is always good.
- I have no expectations of the dogs behavior, I have expectations of the owners behavior and how they control their dog. They should always have their dog walking on the outside (right side) of the path, away from oncoming pedestrians or cyclists, not running all over the path, even on a leash.
- In control at all times
- I would love to ban retractable leashes on pathways because people permit their dog to be too far away and the very thin type of leash is a safety hazard. Owners must have total control of their dog - ie. lunging, aggressive approach.
- They stay on the path and aren't aggressive.
- Keep dogs on leash at all times!!!! I don't care how well trained you believe your dog is !!!
I own dogs and I believe people should be fined heavily for allowing their dog off leash anywhere but the off leash park and their home
- All dogs should be on leash to ensure the safety of them and others. Dog owners should not allow their dog to approach other dogs without owners consent.
- Well behaved, move to the side if you worry your dog may jump/pull.
- dog under control and owner aware of their particular behavior. Other people and children respecting the dog and the owner.
- Be on a non retractable, under 6' leash when on shared use pathways.
- Dogs should not approach other people while in public places. Many people are fearful of, especially larger dogs, and pet owners need to be in full control of their animals at all times.
- Dogs should be under control. And not allowed to approach others unless invited. Pick up waste



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs not on flexi-leashes, dogs not being able to have enough leash space to jump or go up to other people, on leash on pathways, poop always picked up
- N/A
- Respectful behaviour from all users. Conflict arises more often from non-dog owners than from owners.
- Not aggressive
- dog is on leash.
- Keep your dog on leash, pick up waste, do not allow your dog to approach others, keep dog away from play structures etc. Where kids are playing.
- Should be on a leash, owner should know and understand how their dog reacts to situations and they should react to their dogs reactions
- No lunging at people or other dogs.
- Dogs really should be kept on leash when not in an off-leash park. We have quite a few off-leash areas in Bonavista Downs, and people often don't re-leash their dogs when going to another area. This has resulted in dogs almost being hit by cars and almost causing car accidents.
- That they don't lunge, bite or jump on you.
- Ban flexi leads. They aren't safe. Dogs should be on a 6 foot leash or less, and the owner should have control. Never approaching another dog or human with your dog without permission
- Complete control of the dog and respect for others.
- the animal should be on leash and if aggressive, must be under control of the person holding the leash
- Owners to bring their pets indoors to stop their successive barking
- on pathways dogs should be on leash, especially when bicycles and strollers are in the area
- I expect that dogs will be leashed and that owners will pay attention what their dog is doing. I would appreciate if people would keep their dogs under control so they are not running at people.
- Dogs walking nicely on leashes, and owners paying attention to what is happening around them to help avoid possible conflicts. And ALWAYS pick up after dogs. Parks can help out by ensuring enough garbage cans are available.
- Dog is on leash at all times.
- I expect people and people with dogs on leash to keep distance from me, It is never a good idea for dogs to meet when on leash.
- Take your dog to obedience school. Owners need to take classes on what it means to be a responsible pet owner. There are some people who should never be allowed to own a pet. KEEP YOUR DOG ON A LEASH IN PUBLIC AREAS. Respect your neighbour's property & pick up your dog poop.
- The dog is not aggressive towards me, my children, or my pet. The dog is not destructive.
- No jumping on people. Being able to tell when your dog is playing vs being a pest.
- On a leash and under control
- Kind to other dogs and people, not vicious



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Must be on leash. Small dogs should be judged to the same standard as large dogs.
- Dogs that can walk alongside their owner can do so off-leash as long as they are responsible to be called.
- The same as #3
- rules should be the same including having dog always in full control of the owner (proper leashing)
- Dogs should be on a leash. Owner must pick up after them.
- Same as off leash but your dog is on leash. Outlaw retractable leashes.
- Dog not being aggressive towards the other pathway users.
- Always keep leash on, monitor dog behaviour and clean up waste of dog.
- Responsible owner behaviour regarding dogs.
- Keep your dog on leash.
 - Ask before allowing your dog to approach another dog.
 - Dont take your dog outside to meet other dogs if it is a small neurotic bully.
- Most dog owners figure everyone should like their dogs. I do not like dogs & don't want the dog coming near me. Don't tell me that your dog is friendly. Just keep it away from me.
- Well behaved, manageable on leash
- Keep a dog on the leash at all times.
- Dogs to be on leash which they are supposed to be but its not enforced so few are on leash dogs should not greet on leash and if I have walked off the path 5 feet with my dog to avoid another person who then lets their dog come after me is just mind blowing
- Dog must be on a short leash when not in an off-leash area. They should not lunge at other pathway users.
- That dogs do not roam from side to side of a pathway. That owners also pick up after their fogs no matter where they are. That dogs are ON leash unless otherwise indicated. That owners bloody well pay attention & get OFF their friggin' electronic devices.
- That people and dogs do not approach until asked and permission given. NO ONE asks, and that becomes unsafe. Also, if your dog is reactive have control of it.
- That the dog not bark or lunge aggressively at people.
- On leash at all times. Non-aggressive behaviour.
- Picking up their waste
- Same as when walking anywhere else
- On short leash
- My small son has been charged by a large excited dog several times on the sidewalk and it was scary for him. I think that it should be clear to dog owners that no matter how sure they are of the friendliness & harmlessness of their dog, it's bad manners to just let them charge around.
- My understanding is that people walking have the right of way on the paths. However, I find people riding bikes feel that they have the right away and want you to move off the paths. This needs to be clearly defined on the pathways. I also feel that as a pet owner you need to bring your dog near



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Owner is able to clearly maintain control and responsibility of their dog. Owner is always within arms reach of their dog. Dog is always on leash and demonstrating appropriate good behaviour. Inappropriate barking and growling are the owners responsibility to immediately correct and or remove dog
- Owners should not allow their dog to approach non owners at all-unless asked or solicited by that person, they should not sniff or jump on strangers
- Dogs need to be leashed on paths. Owners let dogs run everywhere & dont watch and there is dog shit all over. See Bowmont Park running along 40 Ave Nw NW from 53 St Nw.
- same as above . the owner should be responsible ,clean up after their pets and respect the public at large
- Dogs should be reasonable well behaved, considering age, breed and other factors.
- Pick up feces, ensure animal is strictly controlled if not friendly with other dogs, children or other people.
- On leash and under control at all times.
- If a person is in an off-leash dog park and they don't like dogs they should not be there
- On leash, stay close to owner and owner picks up
- Waste pick up, ensure dogs are leashed in neighborhoods. Too many kids play and dogs run around.
- Owners have control of their dog, the leash is not obstructing the pathway, and the owner and dog are sharing the pathway, the owner is picking up dog waste and disposing of it properly (not leaving bag by pathway)
- they should be on a leash and be well behaved
- Dog comes when called (especially if it's approaching other people/dogs) , stays close to owner, isn't running in front of cars/bikes, will not be aggressive towards other people or animal, owners clean up after their dog
- Minimal barking. Proper behaviour towards others. Not engaging with other people who do not wish to be approached by a dog. Owners picking up waste. Not allowing dog to defecate/urinate in someone else's yard.
- To be on leash!!! But people don't seem to get this. To not be on long leashes getting in the way of bikes or approaching other dogs or children without the owner close by. To be cleaned up after.
- Walk nicely, don't bark at cyclists, don't bite or growl. Don't pee on everything
- That they be good around the public and other animals.
- The dog needs to be under the owners control at all times.
- Owners should have control of their dogs. Dogs shouldn't be off leash and running around.
- Have your dog on leash and pick up poop and respect all around yourself, not all people are comfortable with dogs, or other dogs.
- Kept stopped and away from people passing. Kept off all lawns and hedges - poop / pee your dog at home before you go on your walk. It can be done, from experience I know this. If you and your



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

dog have an accident (yes owner because you didn't poop/pee them before left) pick it up. On leash always

- Same as dog park. Must be in control of animal.
- Socialized properly, or owner verbal to oncoming people if dog has health issues or not social
- Dogs always behave well, problem is some owners leaving them off-leash in non-designated zones
- The animal should be in control.. pick up any messes.. common sense.. honestly I'm not concerned if it's off leash playing ball in a field having a great time .. as long as the human cleans any messes and is aware of the surroundings have a great time
- Some people have extreme control of their dog due to excessive training. I believe if you have full control of your dogs a leash should not be required while using public pathways. If you do not have FULL control I believe a leash should be required.
- Dogs must be under owners control at all times.
- If a dog is not comfortable in that environment not to take them. Also to be aware of health concerns ie not taking an unvaccinated puppy to a dog park where they can be exposed to parvovirus.
- On pathways, dogs should be onleash and within 3 feet of their owners. The pathways can be congested at times and it can be dangerous when dogs wander (on or off leash) across the path of other users.
- NOT off-leash, close to owner, respect other users. Having said that, cyclists need to respect walkers and dogs.
- City needs to provide a lot more education on dog body language either through courses in person or on line. Most dogs on leash have some form of leash reactivity that people are completely oblivious to.
- Same rules as an off leash park, but with a leash.. ie. pickup after dog, do not approach dog without consent, ..
- on a leash (believe me when I say I see people let their dogs loose when it's not an off-leash park), the owner is to blame
- I expect dog walkers to always have dogs on leash , especially as most of them are now walking upwards of 15 dogs at a time. Pack mentality occurs with just 2 dogs , I am concerned dog walkers are not placing any importance on what could easily happen if a pack attacks a single dog.
- Limited aggressive behaviour unless cornered by a stranger. No biting or lunging
- on leash, a short leash when approaching others on the walkway. pick up droppings and PROPERLY dispose. I see so many poop bags just dropped on the side of the walkways, or thrown into nearby bushes. disgusting.
- 1)Owners should not let their dog lick my kid's face as we cross paths. 2)Owners need to TIE CLOSE poo bags before tossing in my green bin. 3)Owners fined if throw poo bags in blue bin. 4)Owners to pick up poo CLEANLY. 5)Same dog should not pee/poo on my lawn more than 3 times a week -- ruins lawn
- not jumping up on people, minimal barking, social interaction with other dogs and people
- People NEED to pick up after their dogs. Both on and off-leash areas are RIDDLED with feces.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs be adequately trained or muzzled until such time as they are trained to avoid biting of people specifically children. With dog ownership comes responsibilities no different than having children running about.
- Dogs must be on leash. Owners should discourage dogs from ""visiting"" unknown dogs and people who do not engage or ask to visit with their dog.
I have had repeated off-leash encounters in on-leash areas in multiple parks and streets in the city - multiple times per week.
- Pick up dog waste!!!
- None. It is upon the owners/parents to ensure proper dog etiquette. Unfortunately some parents don't get this, and ruin it for everyone else. I very hesitant about how much the city needs to be involved, the same way I don't feel the city has much say on how I raise my children
- I expect dogs in pathways should be on leash to have dogs navigate past each other. I have dogs that are not ok with other dogs and always have them on a leash. I've had multiple occasions where people have let their dogs off leash and they run up to my dog without any recall to their people.
- Not to let people assume they can just walk up to your dog with their dog. All dogs MUST be leashed. Always pick up after your dog. Even if it's-40.
- I try to keep my dog on the same side of the path as I am on.
- Dogs should be able to heel, not be aggressive, waste picked up and disposed of properly
- On leash, under control, muzzled if appropriate, pick up waste, only walk as many as can safely be controlled
- They should be on leash and move off the path so others so others can pass wherever reasonable
- That DOGS WILL BE ON LEASE WHEN IN PUBLIC SPACE! AND THAT THE CITY WILL BE OUT IN FORCE TO TICKET, REPEAT TICKET THE OWNERS THAT DO NOT OBEY THE BYLAWS.
- I expect the dog not to jump on me. I expect a dog not to race up to me or chase after me.
- Not allowing leash to cross the path, obstructing others. Not allowing dogs to jump up or bother other pathway users
- Dogs not be allowed in fountains/spray parks (i.e. Olympic Plaza), not left unattended or off-leash in spray park areas. That dogs are not allowed to bark outdoors for a period longer than 10 minutes. That dogs are not left outside in their yard unattended/monitored for longer than 30 minutes.
- Dogs should be respectful, quiet, under control, non threatening. Waste picked up immediately
- Dog's on leash should be under control. If you have a dog that you are training, take the proper precautions to keep them safe. Cross the road, wear proper footwear etc.
- Pickup up dog waste, Dog(s) must come when called, When dog(s) should be on and off leash
Monitor to ensure your dog(s) interacts with other dogs appropriately
Monitor to ensure your dog(s) interacts with other park patrons appropriately
Monitor to ensure your dog(s) do not harass wildlife
- Not aggressive/reactive. Don't bark nonstop at people or other dogs--mostly this is little dogs I've noticed the owners don't care or think it's cute...



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs should be under control at all times, leash or no leash. No lunging at people or other pets. Owner must pick up after the pet.
- To actually not see dogs off leash. No one pays attention to it and I always see dogs off leash even downtown.
- Remain on-leash regardless of how “well behaved” your dog is or whether they like other dogs and are just playing.
- Be well socialized
- The dogs should be under control at all times, proper leashed and collars or harnesses should be used as well so no retractable leashes. Dogs should not be allowed to approach other dogs on leash without owners permission
- Dogs should be non aggressive and under control, owners should be within close proximity . Dog owners should take responsibility for their own animals knowing accidents can happen and have a leash available at all time
- Not all dogs are comfortable with all dogs and all people. Just common courtesy and respect is required. If someone isn't comfortable keeping their dog off-leash then an off-leash dog should not approach the leashed dog.
- Aggressive dogs must be muzzled and under the owners control at ALL times.
- all expectations are on the person handling the dog
- Keeping a safe distance between pets before letting them greet, do not let pets charge each other to greet as it can lead to possible conflict or other unwanted situations.
Ensuring the leashes of pets do not tangle while greeting as it will lead to problems if difficulties arise.
- Dogs on leash and totally under control.
- On leash of reasonable length and no approaching of other humans or animals without consent.
- Peoples behaviour towards dogs they are passing ie dont touch them
Dog must come when called if off leash
- I am so against people in public trying to pass their animals off a service animals with fake vests that should be illegal.
- leashed and walking with in or able to be recalled back to walker to within 3 ft. of walker
- If it is not an off-leash park, all dogs should be on a proper leash (not ones that attach to collars). On pathways people with dogs should move off to the side to allow people without pets to pass in case they are nervous around pets. Pet waste should always be picked up by owners.
- On-leash dogs, people don't approach without asking (with or without a dog)
- Leash animals at all times. Clean up after them.
- Walk dog on the right hand side on a path as bikes/ folks overtake on left. So many accidents when they walk on . Insistence dogs under control, and keep on leash. Folks do not throw their dog shit in other folks garbage cans...they trespass on your land as they are too lazy to take it home .
- there should be some kind of warning system in place for less friendly dogs
- Length of leash (distance from owner), picking up after dogs, clear effort to maintain control of dogs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I expect the dog to be on a leash when it is not in a designated off-leash area, and under the control of the owner. I expect the owner will pick up any dog waste, and will keep the dog close to them when approaching/passing other people. I expect bylaw to enforce the bylaws.
- I am a dog owner, but I can't STAND people using non off leash areas as off leash. Some dogs are reactive or unsocial due to circumstance and personality. Responsible owners of such dogs DO NOT go to off leash parks on purpose. There is no regulation or penalty for people not respecting the rules
- pick up dog waste, monitor to ensure dog interacts with other dogs and other park patrons appropriately, no barking
- Owners should be well aware of their dog's behavioural tendencies, and be alert and ready to jump in when needed! Be smart and responsible about it.
- KEEP YOUR DOGS ON LEASH!!!!!!
- dog moves off sidewalk to allow others to pass. individual without an animal should not have to move off sidewalk to accommodate animal.
- Dogs should be on-leash, should not jump up on passers-by, owner should be close by.
- Dogs do not approach small children without parent consent.
- That dog is under owner control and that dangerous dogs shouldn't be out where others are if not muzzled
- If a dog is well behaved and well mannered, I believe they should be allowed everywhere. Patios, parks, etc. Ultimately the owner should be responsible.
- Appropriate walking on leash
Dogs under control
Pick up waste
- The pet owner needs to be alpha; they need to recognize the body language of their dog, and know when to intervene to avoid a situation and how to properly train the dog to avoid said situation. Dogs should not charge at runners, cyclists, etc. Humans should control their dog with ease.
- Under control.
- Polite behaviour- not running at people or pulling on leash.
- Being under control so they are not allowed to be at the end of their leash approaching other people/animals. Respect other pathway users and don't act like your dog is entitled to do whatever it wants.
- Dogs must be on leash
- Leashed and respectful. Muzzled if unsafe
- Extendable leashes should be locked at 6 feet on multi-use pathways
Dogs should not be in places where children are
- Aggressive dogs should be muzzled because even a leashed dog can attack another dog or person.
- That I will NEVER feel unsafe or threatened by a pet. Unfortunately, that is not the case, and frankly, I feel it is because I NEVER see a bylaw officer handing out tickets for pets running amok. Pet owners have told me I shouldn't be on a pathway running through an off-leash area!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No expectations of the dog's behaviour - just the owner. Such as if the dog is excited to see another dog then the owner should restrain their dog if they see a potential problem or cross the street and walk on the other side.
- Well behaved dogs on leash with owners that are not distracted with phones.
- I think dogs on leash should be kept on leash when they are not in designated areas. They should wear a muzzle if they have aggressive tendencies or an aggressive past.
- Staying on the proper side of the pathway!!! Giving other people/dogs their space!! Just being under control in general. BAN RETRACTABLE LEASHES !!
- That dogs are on leash and under control and that the owners pick up after their pets. Owners must be strong enough to control their dog(s).
- Leashed and controlled on a no extension leash. Again hard to enforce.
- Dogs get excited and are barky it is to be expected. But if your dog is aggressive or shows predatory behaviour then you need to take it to some obedience or classes to correct that.
- Understand how your dog or how other dogs may or may not wish to interact. Just because your dog is "really friendly and loves everyone) does not mean that the other dog wants to interact the same way. Respect boundaries. Keep your dog on a leash when not at a designated off leash area.
- I have no expectations of the dog. I do expect the owners to have the dog on a leash and to pick up droppings.
- Not to be bit.
- Keep your dog on the far right of the path so others can walk past without fearing a dog bite or getting jumped on.
- On leash, under control, yield to pedestrians/bikes, not excessively loud
- I walk my dogs in fish creek often and pass lots of animals off leash. This always makes me nervous. But as long as your dog is leashed i dont' really care how he acts its your problem.
- On a leash. For the safety of the dog and others passing by.
- They should be on leash
- Dogs often not under control on pathways, parking lots, sidewalks. Have been jumped on, had dogs run in front of my bike or into my backyard if gate is open.
- ok
- Friendly
- Should be leashed while outside of off leash parks.
- Clean up after pets, on leash, stay right when passing others. Be in control of your pet at all times
- Dog is on leash and under control.
- Do not let your dog approach a person unless they've stated that the interaction is welcome, pick up after your dog, keep on leash
- Dog is well behaved and responsive to owner.
- Hav control of it
- Owner needs to be in control of dog at all times - dogs should not lunge at pedestrians/cyclists.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Respectful behaviour including giving space between pets and anyone who is not the pet's owner, unless there is consent.
- If you have aggressive dogs, harnessed and muzzlef
- Well behaved and trained.
- Keep dogs on leash if they are not on your property.
- Not allowed to be aggressive towards other animals or people.
Those with friendly dogs need to be aware that other dogs may not be friendly and not allow their dog near another dog unless they have asked the owner.
- Owner should have control over their pet.
- Leased, share walkway, no harassment of wildlife,
- Respect. Training happens in these areas as long as dog is on a leash and moving to make room for others I'm happy
- Pets kept on leash,
- always on leash, muzzle if vicious or have social anxiety with people or other dogs
- no jumping on people, no growling, showing aggression to other dogs, always on leash
- Your dog must be socialized properly with other dogs. Dogs should be allowed to play. Dogs should not chase people
- Dog must be on leash. Dog should not be on an extend-a-leash. Dog must be responsive when being called. Person walking the dog should not have headphones on or be on their cell. Their focus should be on what their dog is doing.
- Dogs should behave in a reasonable manner when in public spaces. Whining and excited jumping are ok but lunging/nipping are inappropriate and dangerous. General public should also be educated to know that dogs can become frustrated when on leash, this does not mean they are aggressive just frustrated
- Kept on a leash, listens to its owner and doesn't lunge or jump up
- See #3.
- Dogs should be on a leash and well trained. If the dog is known to be aggressive toward strangers and has shown that it may bite people, then it should have a muzzle while in public.
- Dogs should be under control at all times.
 - ""Even if I'm at a greenspace, and a dog is under control & being picked up after, I don't care if they're off leash""
 - ""our whole lives revolve around our dogs being well behaved.""
- - Dog should be on leash without doubt
- - Competent dog handlers
- - Education
- that they listen to the owner and not attack or come to me unless I call them.
- no dogs in school grounds, playgrounds, athletic fields.
on leash in public parks , bike paths, all public areas, all pathway systems groomed and natural
its not the dogs behaviour its the owners behaviour that needs to be educated and addressed



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Consideration for other parons and other dogs.
- should be under the control of owner at all times,
- I firmly believe that every dog who utilizes an off leash dog park should attain a Canine Good Neighbor title from the Canadian Kennel Club.
- i think it would be great if NEW dog owner would have to take a course to get a licence for their dog, and learn the appropriate behaviour required to own a dog. most dog owner think off' leash is free for all ? they need to learn that the dog MUST be monitored and come back on recall.
- We live along fishcreek park in Deer Run and with our last dog we were in constant fear while walking her. She was reactive so we kept her on a leash. Yet the number of people that walked their dogs off leash was astounding. This needs to be patrolled and fines given out along with proper signage.
- Everything currently listed
- They are well behaved and non aggressive.
- Under control and observation of owner
- I expect dog owners to have their dogs on 6' leashes (no retractable leashes!) to have a proper handle on their dog and to be respectful of the people around them.
- in control while on leash - no barking, lunging, running wild.
- Same really
- Pick up all waste. Be on leash. I am sick and tired of off leash dogs on pathways approaching my reactive dog on leash... then the off leash owners getting after my dog which is immediately and directly under my control.
- People should NOT be letting their on-leash dogs swerve around the entire path and make other users have to slow down or go around their dogs. This happens way too often!
- To be leashed and not out of control.
- No biting, chasing, or other aggressive scary behaviour. Otherwise, it is all good.
- Owners must have control of their animal, either through obedience or leash, at all times. Too many ppl think it's a free for all. It ruined my dog to be able to go to off leash because he was attacked by a dog at a young age and is now fearful of other dogs. Dog parks should have by law patrol.
- That people will respect how I handle my dogs, ie not just interacting with them at their own discretion. If I have multiple dogs if they could provide room for me to pass safely and promptly. Clean up after my dogs.
- I don't think owners should be on their phones and unaware of what their dogs is doing. A dog is leashed for a reason, keep your dog in check
- Friendly dogs. (or muzzled dogs for those that have aggressive tendencies) -Choke chain or like(Not harness), for those who have a dog too strong to control with a normal collar or harness.
- on a leash or heeling properly
- Existing bylaws regarding no dog areas currently ineffective due to lack of signage, fines and enforcement. existing rules regarding on leash requirements ineffective due to lack of enforcement



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

and fines. In general the entire city has become an off leash dog area due to lack of enforcement and sign

- I expect
- I expect that they're trained to obey they're owner, and will not attack other dogs/ people.
- That current rules and regulations are respected by pet owners and non-pet owners.
- Pick up dog waste. Dog owners leave excrement everywhere: on sidewalks, pathways, and in our parks. Again, no enforcement and dog owners know that and look the other way and often willfully do not pick up their dog's waste. Dog owners often don't respond well when asked to pick up their dog's waste.
- If it's not off-leash your dog should be on a leash no matter how good/okay you think they are. Always pick up your dogs poop and throw the bag in the garbage, don't just leave it on the ground.
- Dogs should be on leash and able to obey their owner, the owner needs to be able to control their dog.
- Keep the dog under control / clean-up any messes / keep the dog off others property / be sensitive to people who may not like / may fear dogs.
- well trained dog and owner
- Let dog be a dog. Dogs shall be on leash all the time unless the owner can control. But neck harness shall be baned, but using shoulder harness.
- I have had dogs for 25 years & lately there has been a small dog population boom & they either have them on these long uncontrollable leashes ,or even if you have your dog on a leash they let theirs run up barking & snapping If you had a Rottweiler or something that would not be accepted
- n/a
- Keep dogs under control, don't let them go back and forth across the path, don't take up the whole path, allow others to pass. And always clean up after your pet
- A dog must be under control by it's owner, **MUST BE ON LEASH**
- Dogs are under control.
- That they are on leash on the right hand side of the owner.
- User beware..
- Leash trained, not aggressive
- Always on a short lease and under full control
- Keep your dog on a leash, keep your dog on the outside of the pathway so they have more room.
- **ALWAYS On Leash.** That's sharing public space responsibly and fairly.
- I live close to an offleash dog park between braeside and southwood. I have been attacked while walking my dogs on leash on the sidewalk with someone who thinks they can walk their dog offleash on a sidewalk. It is necessary to print bulletin boards at the offleash to say - Your dog must now be lea
- Dogs should not jump up on people or approach cyclists, scooters, skaters, joggers etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dog is under control near pedestrians and cyclists, move off of pathway with approaching pedestrians and especially cyclists due to collision potential.
 - Dogs are kept on leash and do not come up to me and smell me.
 - For dogs to be on leash
 - Every day I see dogs off leash in the green space behind Woodbine Elementary School. People know they are breaking the law, but also that nothing will be done about it. There is also a huge amount of dog mess on the green and the pathways that does not get picked up. It is not a child friendly area.
 - That the dog is under control by the owner or the dog walker. The dog responds immediately to commands .
 - That dogs not negatively affect other users of the space. They are not to interact with bikes or other users of the space. Even as a dog lover, I can't know if a roaming dog is friendly or well-socialized. There should not be freely roaming dogs in public spaces or on pathways.
 - I expect that dogs will be leashed. It isn't happening. I don't like unleashed dogs running up to me, and the owner saying "he won't hurt you" Not everyone likes dogs...I should have the right to run or walk without someone else's pet running up to me.
 - The the dog respond to the owner and not jump up on people. That dogs are controlled and held away from other people until some common understanding of the interaction is established. That dog poop always be picked up -
 - Safety is essential. Owner must be in control.
 - Not allowing leashes to cross the sidewalk or path hindering other's passing; making non-pet owners to be fearful when passing a dog on public sidewalk
 - That they are on a short leach, that they do not lunge, growl or bark at people.
 - I expect the owners to be just as responsible. Pick up poop control them when around others.
 - Expectations of people should be to not approach or forcefully touch other people's animals without permission. Any dog behaviour is fine other than biting people.
 - Dog owners should know No dogs are allowed in city playgrounds, school yards, cemeteries, playing fields and made to sign an affidavit every single year, that they will obey dog bylaws before dog license is granted.
- Tuscany playing field along T. Springs Blvd. is now ""The""dog walk area. Yuck!
- on Leash is ideal, not barking or lunging.
 - Dogs come when called. Dogs are not running on multi-use pathways. There should be a limit to how many dogs are walked by paid dog walkers. I have often seen up to a dozen dogs being walked by one person.
 - Should not jump on on people come when called stay with owner at all times.
 - Ask first. Do not allow children to approach screaming and flailing.
 - If it is not off-leash owners should be expected to follow that by-law and maintain pets on leash, they should be expected to clean up after their pets, no aggressive or dangerous dogs, ensure dogs are kept under control and not permitted to jump up on people walking by.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Have great recall and to be leashed at all times, and make sure that the owners are aware at all times of dogs reactivity to different situations.
- Pick up waste, leashed at all times when in public when the potential of coming into contact with people or other animals is a possibility
- Dogs on leash, but when I have my dog on the far side so it does not come in contact with another dog I don't expect somebody to let their dog come to my dog. My dogs are friendly but if I'm out running their run is different than an off leash run. They are on the far side for a reason.
- Dogs on leash,
People should ask before approaching other people's dogs.
- On leash unless specified, owner walking only not on bike
- Comes when called, is not aggressive to people or other animals, that they are on leash
- Dogs not off leash along pathways, unless it is marked that they may be.
- Dogs should not approach strangers without consent just as strangers should not approach dogs without consent
- Dogs should be under control and behaved. Leashed on a 6 foot lead. No flexi leads
- Dogs should be under the control of their guardian, whether leashed or just very well trained.
- On leash where it is on leash
- same as above
- Under owner control.
- Should be leashed
- To be leashed and owner to manage appropriate behavior when passing other pets (leashed cats or stroller cats) and other people, children
- Dogs should be under the control of an owner, at all times.
- Dog should be on a 6ft lead no longer. And kept close to the owner not jumping or bothering other people on pathways
- Dogs should stay near their owners and not bother others. Owners should be able to demonstrate their control over their dogs.
- That dogs be on a leash and under owners control. I constantly see and meet dogs that owners can't control, and it really disturbs me. Has made me start to fear dogs.
- Dogs should be leashed or if not leashed should have 100% recall.
- Not pulling the owner. Not showing aggression towards people or other animals. No jumping on people. Dog is socialized with other dogs. Owners pick up waste.
- If the Owner expects their dog to be aggressive it should have the proper collar & Lease to control the dog so it cannot lunge at another dog/person. And to ensure the dog wears some sort of muzzle if very aggressive.
- Dogs should be on leash and owners should get off their phones and pay attention to the dog's behavior.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- As long as a dog is leashed, every dog is different so if the owner takes proper precautions then there shouldn't be rules for dogs on leash. Everyone needs to Exercise their dog, so be respectful of that and their space.
- They must be leashed and not lunging at people.
- Dog be leashed and under control. And treated well!!!
- owner has control, dog on leash, dog listens to owners, owner uses cleanup bags, owner respects others and other dogs and allows space between pets while walking
- I see so many off-leash dogs in areas that are not off-leash. I do not want to be fearful of off-leash dogs when walking the pathways in my neighbourhood. Dogs should be on leash, period.
- Not be off leash. Have control of your dogs and monitor interactions with other people and animals, pick up after them
- your question should be: expectations of the human behaviour in other common/public spaces. humans need to understand that we are not all Gods and we know everything. we don't. behave appropriately and your animal will follow. take obedience classes.
- Do not harass other people, other dogs, or wildlife. Be polite and reasonably calm when allowed to greet.
- Dogs should be leashed.
- I expect that people will know how to keep their dogs close by even when they are leashed. People will be fined (and fines increased each time) people don't pick up their dog's waste.
- Respectful of others, safety behaviour depending on the situation - eg. dog walks on the side away from other pedestrians/bikes/cars vs requirement to be on a specific side of owner.
- Dogs must always be leashed. A proper size leash is a must as many are way too long.
- That the dogs are leash and under control. Preferably not on a Flexi-lead.
- Control big dog behavior towards little dogs, so aggressive!
- always keep your dog on leash they may seem fine to you but you do not know if the other dogs are friendly
- Campbelltown, New Brunswick bylaw
Barking is considered excessive when it exceeds:
240 barks per day between the hours of 7.00am and 9.00pm, or
35 barks per night between the hours of 9.00pm and 7.00am, or
regularly exceeds 30 barks per hour during the day or
4 barks per hour during the night.
- Do not approach a dog without owner consent ... anywhere.
- That owners keep their dogs on-leash when not in off-leash areas
that the person walking the dog is physically able to control/redirect should the need arise.
- That the animal is under the complete control of the owner, at the end of an extenable leash in a busy area is not under control. I also expect that if an animal is not friendly or properly socialized it shouldn't be put in situations that could have a negative outcome for the animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Following by laws, do not let your animal touch other people. Do not let your dog chase people or jump up.
- I expect owners to keep their dogs a sufficient distance from other walkers so that if the dog lunges, the owner has enough control over the leash to prevent contact. This sometimes means that the dog owner/walker may need to step away from the main path with the dog to make room for the passerby.
- Should be on leash at all times, not tangling others up in its leash, exhibiting socially acceptable behaviour
- Dogs should be on leash. They should walk politely on leash without pulling or barking. I can do it with 10, (and do daily), why can't people even try to do it with one?
- All dogs need to be on a leash. Stay off private property. Stay on the sidewalk. Pick up after your pet.
- Pet's need to be taken care of. It's the responsibility of the owner to know their dog's behaviour and act accordingly based on it. Don't have an issue with flexibility as most dog owners know if their pet is super friendly vs shy or easily scared to trigger a response (bark, run, etc.).
- Dog is on leash and if reactive that they take a wide berth around people
- Dogs be leashed at all times.
- Dogs are well-behaved (for dogs); that they are kept to their side of the path just as expected for people; if at a street festival, that they refrain from excessive barking or jumping and that the owners recognize when their dog is uncomfortable and bring them to a quieter spot.
- Clean up after your pet. Pet is in control on leash.
- Have appropriate leash, collar, etc. Know your animal. If they are aggressive or over excited regarding strangers, for instance, keep dog off to side of sidewalk and allow others to pass.
- On leash
- Dog should be leashed, not barking Karma and owners should have some control
- dogs are on leashes and under control of their owner
- Leashed and passive and obedient.
- In care and control of a responsible and knowledgeable person
- To be generally well behaved and under control. This becomes a bit complicated when you are trading a dog. This also applies to off leash. It is difficult to train a dog to be well behaved in an off leash area if they can't be off leash until they have learned.
- Listen to owner commands, not chase joggers or bikes
- On leash
- For others to control their Pets when others are in the area.
- All dogs to be on leash and under control. Dog owners must ensure others are safe around their dog, non-owners need to learn how to properly interact with a strange dog. Any informed dog owner know it is the owner's behavior in question not the dog's.
- Must be in control at all time. Regulations on retractable leashes for people if have their dog out to the very end of the leash and it's interfering with other people or pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Human should have control over animal at all times. Not allow dog off leash in areas that are on leash
- Not letting dog poop without picking it up!
- Why are you focusing on dog behaviour? Focus on owner behaviour because with a well educated owner, the animal will be well behaved. An owner SHOULD recognize when their animal's behaviour is not acceptable should be able to correct it with proper training. Sidewalks=leash always!
- That they be kept on leash and picked up after.
- That people can coexist. Dogs on leashes
- Dogs are clams and allowed to enjoy pathways. Also that there are pathways that are off leash for owners and dogs to use. New Off leash area at nose hill has very few paved or gravel pathways to walk on - dogs and owners cannot be expected to walk in tall grass.
- dogs must not pose a safety risk to public or other pets. The owner is responsible to ensure it doesn't pose a public safety risk
- Dogs should be under control. If off leash they should not be a threat to people or other dogs.
- Better signage for people to be aware of exactly where off lease areas are. IE: elliston park- many dog owners permit dogs to run free in on lease areas when the only off leash area is the top of the hill
- That dogs be properly restrained and controlled.
- Dogs must be under control
Dog owners must pick up after dogs
Limit the number of dogs that a dog walker can walk at one time.
- Owners need to clean up feces after their animals. Owners should not take their pets off leash in areas that are not off-leash (public pathways, parks, etc). Owners need to control their animals (barking, growling, etc.) when on leash on public paths, in public parks, etc.)
- There will always be dogs with behavioral issues, and people need to be allowed to use training tools (prong or ecollars included) to maintain on and offleash control
- Dogs must be trained and must respond to recall.
BAN EXTENDI-LEASHES. These are so DAMN DANGEROUS. (I chose not to use other four letter words)
- That in a leash area they are on leash
- Many owners do not leash these dogs on these spaces; this should be enforced. Owners need to restrain their dogs when other pedestrians/bikes approach. I have been nearly bitten and have been chased by dogs even on leash on designated bike pathways. Owners leave the leash too slack.
- Always on leash and owners pickup and carry out or properly dispose of dog waste. Glenmore pathways are lined with dog-shit, some bagged but most not demonstrating too many dog owners are NOT responsible.
- Clean up after dogs, always.
- Aggressive dogs should be on leash and under control.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The same expectations, but owners should be allowed to maintain their dogs behaviour. People who own dogs are FAR more likely to be utilizing the cities open spaces than non-dog owners as dogs are outside nearly every day.
- Dogs must be leashed and under complete owner control, including not barking excessively.
- Expect good manners from human and canines. Like humans, dogs are not going to best buds with everyone they meet. If you know that your dog is friendly and LOVES other dogs, don't assume the other dog is friendly and loves other dogs. Keep a safe distance and check first -whether on leash or off.
- Common courtesy (both ways)
Dog under control
Not bothering other people
- Pick up after your pet. Keep pet on leash. We walk in city parks at least 1 or 2 days a week. We have NEVER seen a bylaw officer enforce on leash rules or poop pick up. Dog owners are very defensive and aggressiv if they are reminded of the on leash rule. Enforcement Signage & education needed
- Absolutely stay on-leash, stay on designated pathways, dog to be under control when passing other dogs / people, pick-up after your dog, not leaving bags containing your dog's excrements along the trail
- Not to bring aggressive and reactive dogs to the parks.
- Control of your dog, pick up after your dog.
- keep your dog on a 6 foot maximum leash. Dogs running off leash on leash-only areas are a hazard to me when I walk my dogs.
- To be on leash at all times and not be in school grounds.
- Listen to their Handler. Ability to be redirected. But again, the bigger issue is people. People allow their children to run right up to dogs and many people just think it's their god-given right to go and pet a dog. It's super dangerous
- I expect to feel myself, my child and dog are safe to go for a walk free of lunging,biting,jumping, charging dogs not under owners control. I expect to not see more dog poop than grass once the snow melts.
- Dogs be on a leash
- Dog listening and obeying owner. Owners should not be distracted and paying attention to their dog (ie: joggers dragging dog behind them and not stopping when dog poops while running)
- That owners be walking dogs on leash, and that if you have a yard facing a pathway that your fence be high enough for the dog to not lunge over if it's not friendly.
- they should be friendly and well behaved
- not lunging/barking at people passing, even small dogs and puppies need to be trained not to jump up on people. That needs to be told to non pet owners too who state "it's ok" when a dog is small, depleting the training the owner may be doing to stop the behaviour
- All dogs should be leashed in public/common areas.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- dog is leashed and under control. Dog owners yield to pedestrians. All dog waste is picked up and properly disposed of immediately.
- Dogs should be on leash and be paying attention to the handler, no lunging or other excessive behavior. I expect dogs to not be barking at strangers, and to not try to sniff, i expect the handler to move off the path if people with or without dogs are on coming, watching for different behavior.
- On leash, owners aware of surrounding,
- Calm controlled behaviour in public places. If the owner can not control their dog, other measures such as muzzles or gentle leaders should be used to protect other dogs and people.
- Must be on leash, pick up waste, must be controlled by owner
- Dogs should be leashed. Dogs and owners should be courteous and respectful. Owners should pick up after dogs.
- I expect dogs to be under control and to stay away from me and my dogs and give us space.
- Remain on leash under control
- Pick up after your pet, fines for disobeying off leash (if they are off leash or leash dragging). Non retractable leashes shouldn't be used either on public pathways etc.
- Dogs must be leashed. The dog must be under control of the owner, not stretched out and strained at the end of a 25' leash. Leashes NO longer than 6' in the presence of other people and animals.
- Mutual respect of the surroundings.
- Be on leash and do not charge people.
- Pick up after your dog.
If a dog is on a leash in an off-leash park, give them distance! They are probably a rescue who is just now getting socialized, and nobody knows if they have triggers or if they are fearful of you and your dog
- I expect dogs to be kept reasonably close to their owners, so that on a very open pathway, the dog has the opportunity to sniff/roam, but when there are many bikes/scooters/people, the dog is not allowed to endanger itself and others by stretching its leash across the path.
- Under control by owner.
- same as off-leash areas in addition to extra safety for other pets and people. Example: aggressive dogs, should be muzzled or not allowed in the general public. Example: Bit Bulls
- I wish there were more guidelines and less absolute rules. For instance my dog loves biking but all pathways require your dog on leash. Maybe major commute ways but other places they could be off leash ?
- They should be leashed. Many times dogs on a leashed walk do not do well in dog parks, or are in training, some consideration of others is always appreciated
- Owners should keep dogs close so they don't chance getting in front of cyclists (who can be as much at fault as dog owners for not obeying rules). If biters, should me muzzled. Keep distance from other dogs just in case.
- Not to chase bikes
To listen to owner's instructions



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs on pathways are a danger to cyclists and roller-bladers. Owners need to keep their dogs in the correct "lane" on the pathways. Owners must also ensure their dog does not threaten/scare anyone nor jump on people - control your dog! Know the bylaws.
- Dog is leashed and under full owner control. Waste should be picked up and disposed of in garbage can. Garbage cans should be available along pathways.
- Owners should make sure their dogs don't harass other dogs and people (one of my own dogs is reactive and is closely monitored). By harassing, I mean lunge at or jump up on other dogs or people. Barking is okay — it's dog communication and owners can choose public spaces less busy.
- I expect the dog owner to take full responsibility of their dog. Dogs should NOT be off leash in public spaces. Dogs that are on leash must be under control; if the dog is aggressive to dogs or humans a muzzle must be worn to not only protect others but protect the dog itself.
- If I am on a paved pathway in an off-leash park I expect the owner to have the dog under their control at all times as posted. I find it exasperating to be told that I have no business running in an off-leash area. I've paid enough taxes and I am running 4 blocks from my home.
- We need to respect that others may not like dogs or are scared of them. Strangers need to ask if they can touch a dog first or before they come up to them. We all have to share the pathway.
- That owners are being sure to keep their dogs from meeting other dogs unless consent is given. That people ask first to pet dogs and keep their children from interacting with dogs without permission.
- Well trained & respectful of others. Exceptions within reason for those in training.
- owners should not let dogs approach other people or dogs without permission, and should retrain their dog if the other party specifically requests they do not interact with them/their dog.
- Owner should also have exceptions that they need to follow.
- Being under control and not on a flexi leash. Not having the length to jump at people. Not continuously barking
- that the rules are followed. too many owners think it's okay to break the rules if few or no people are in the park.
- Pets should be excluded from attending large venue events
- Dogs must be kept on-leash. Dogs need to come to their owner when called (rather than the owner saying "don't worry, it's really friendly"... that doesn't matter if you have a phobia of dogs and are confronted by a dog trying to sniff/bark/jump on you). Poop must be picked up.
- That the dog is beside the owner when on a path. Not lunging at bikers and other walkers. I walk my dog in Bowness and Baker everyday and we are constantly met with dogs off leash that just run around with no supervision. It's not an off-leash area!
- uncommon sense... manage your dog, be aware of environment and other citizens
- Dogs should always be on a leash and held closely to the owner. Waste should be picked up. If the animal is at all hostile, they should be muzzled.
- Always pick up after your dog
- Leashed and under control.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs should be on leash , if someone's dog is known to be aggressive, they should move to the side or cross the street
- Dogs should be under control of owner, not run away and up to other people or animals.
- People should be in control of their pets and have them leashed in public areas.
- Owners MUST have control of their pets at all times. In common/public spaces as in dog parks, owners tend to socialize with each other (which is great), but often their pets not behaving appropriately. I've almost been knocked over in the dog park and in common spaces - owner not paying attention.
- They should not be off-leash!
- Dogs will chase wildlife, this shouldn't be a bylaw infraction.
People should be aware that dogs will be in off leash dog parks, and should not expect to be able to sled down hills without meeting a dog.
- Just because you have a small dog, it is not exempt from having appropriate behaviours.
- that people follow the rules of on or off leash, pick up after your dog and that your dog is under control at all times.
- Dog comes when called & are leashed when wildlife is present, owners pick up after pets (need to provide receptacles/green bins - there isn't one at area behind my home & result is lots of poop bags launched into our townhouse's garbage enclosure & it's disgusting.
- dogs should be under the control of the owner (not pulling on leash to approach people), pick up waste
- Dogs are leashed and well behaved. Dogs being walked on a bike path are on a SHORT leash so the owner has control & can pull in the dog when bikes go by
- That the dog is under control and isn't aggressive to other people on pathways
- Well mannered
- Dogs should be on leash and should not be barking/lunging at others.
- Owners should not use those long leashes that allow dogs to wander 30 feet or more from owner. They tangle the leash around pedestrians and cause safety issues
- Nothing really - -if they are on leash, then let them be happy.
- That non designated areas should be considered off leash when in forest and wetlands.
That animals respond when regarded and that owners have leash present if needed
- Again, that the dog is under control.
- proper manners, be respectful, pick up ur dogs belongs,
- Pets MUST be on-leash and Owners MUST keep pet away from other people.
Non-pet owners do NOT appreciate being approached or sniffed by another's pet.
- I would expect owners to be aware of their surroundings and not allow their pets to interact with other people or pets without express permission. I would expect dogs to walk calmly on a non-flexi leash next to their owners, and that owners understand techniques for reducing excitement/reactivity.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They have recall and are supervised. It is aggravating when owners just take off the leash in an off-leash park and watch their phone or talk on their phone paying no attention to their dogs behaviors or cleaning up waste.
- Consideration of others.
- The client needs to be in control of their dog. Training is highly recommended to help with that process.
- Dogs should be under control at all times - I've seen far too many poor interactions with lazy pet owners who ignore their dog's bad behaviour - more enforcement needed.
- Dogs that are undergoing socialization need to be on a leash and kept a certain distance away from other users if they deem the dog a risk to them (dog or person).
- That people keep their dogs on a short leash when coming up to people with or with out dogs and all dogs should be leashed
- Common sense stuff. Dogs should be on-leash, well behaved and under control not harassing other dogs or people.
- Dogs are leashed and not on a retractable leash. Retractable leashes should not be allowed.
- Dogs who can sometimes be aggressive must be leashed at all times
- Heeling, auto sit, within arms length. 6" leash max, owners actually pay attention to their own dogs so they are not bothering mine, I don't care if their dog is a puppy it's 100% inappropriate
- No aggressive or insecurity behaviour
- Pick up. No rgressive behaviour. No flexi-leashes on sidewalks.
- Dogs should behave appropriately around other patrons of the public spaces (eg. bicycles, rollerblades, children, etc.) and dog waste picked up. Well-behaved dogs should be welcome with their owners. Encourage community usage, responsible dog ownership included.
- That both dogs and people are respectful of one another
- pick up waste, dog under control - either leashed or verbal,
- Yield to bicycles on pathways.
- Dogs should be well trained and obedient to their owners.
- Dog on leash under control. Pick up after dogs.
- Dogs need to be leashed to prevent unwanted interactions.
- All people approaching someone with dogs should not assume the dogs are okay to approach - all dogs need to be leashed regardless of whether the owner says they have control over their dog. I have heard from people with off leash dogs 'no issues it is friendly' and then it goes after my male.
- To be on a leash and under control
- People be able to control their dogs. If anything happens causing the dog/s to yank on the leash, the handler must be able to restrain the dog/s.
- On leash dogs should no be meeting unless owners have both given consent to the meeting. If a dog is for some reason off leash in an on leash area, the owner should have 100% control of the dog, as if it were on leash.
- That the dog does not interact with others



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If you have a dog that is on leash aggressive, keep it away from other people/animals you may encounter on pathways/public spaces. Do not allow your "friendly" dog to approach another dog without a controlled interaction to ensure safety for both animals.
- I don't expect to be jumped on, barked at or chased.
- No lunging at passerby, handler will move aside when approaching person or people on walkways, dogs are lead trained in order to prevent leash aggressive behavior.
- The dog should always be under control of the owner/handler and be neutral to its surroundings
- people should be neutral. Ask before petting and dogs MUST be on leash. I also think municipalities should have at registration a leash colour system for dogs if your dog is reactive. Or the city should have a dog behaviourist test the dog and owner, upgrades are free if the dog is trained correctl
- Dogs should be on leash and in control. People without dogs should not approach or reach out to a dog without permission. Share the space respectfully.
- Dogs should be leashed at all times and under control
- Dogs leashes and not bothering anyone else sharing the pathway
- If you have a reactive dog, keep in out of dog parks! Don't take it to a place with a population of animals!
- Polite manners
- Pick up after your animals, maintain control of your animal
- Dogs on leash, dogs should not be dog or human aggressive.
- Dog should be on a leash and kept under control at all times. Dog should be taught to not jump up on people.
- Your dog must not pose a danger to others and must be under your control
- They are on leash and kept within a foot of owner when approaching or passing other people/dogs
- Polite leash manners
- Respectful
- Obedient
- Owners need to pickup dog waste!!!
- dogs should be on leashes - 6ft, and should be under control of the owner. dogs will be dogs and depending upon circumstances react differently. people should know their dogs and act accordingly. I have dogs and am a breeder, my dogs have formal training. all dogs should have obedience training
- No lunging, barking or other general obsessive behaviour that an owner can't control. If they are doing training - it must be clear.
- Should be leashed
- Dogs must be on foot leashes. If on flexible leashes, they must be shortened to 6 feet, or less, and the dog must be brought to heel when other people are around. Do not let your dogs approach other dogs on leash without owner consent. A lot of dogs are more defensive on leash.
- Be under control of the owner at all times
- Have their dogs on leash. NO EXCEPTIONS



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs should always be respected. Kids need to ask before touching. Owners need to be in co from at all times.
- Well behaved and socialized
- I expect owners to be aware of their dog and it's behaviour. I don't mind reactive dogs, or even dogs off leash, but you need to respect other people.
- owners keep dog under control
- Dogs need to be under control at all times
- All same as above for in off leash areas
- Not to long of a leash.
- Not barking or lunging at people or dogs.
- Dogs on a leash. Pick up after dogs.
- No barking at people or lunging at them.
- Dogs should be leashed in non off-leash areas using a leash that adheres to the maximum leash size allowed! Too many dogs off-leash in the school field behind my house!
- On-leash and controllable
- The dog is social and not aggressive.
- That dogs are kept on leash and not running unleashed up to dogs on leash. That they are controlled and not harassing people or other dogs.
- Dogs should be on leash, or very well trained to absolutely stay at heel. Dogs should not bother other dogs or people, no matter their size.
- All the same rules as an off leash park except dogs remain on leash
- Leashed and under control.
- They behave safely
- They are not aggressive
- Dogs should be under control and close to their handler. They should not approach strangers uninvited. And strangers should not approach the dog without handler consent.
- People should follow on and off leash areas to not cause disruption to others. Dogs should be behaved or precautions taken if you have a reactive dog. (I.e. basket muzzle) if your dog has aggressive tendencies
- Dog on leash .
- Pick up waste, don't let your dog off leash, don't use extendi-leads on busy pathways, share pathways with other users (be aware of cyclists).
- No over-excitability when greeting people & other dogs.
- Leashed, controlled
- Under control and ON A LEASH.
- No off leash walking. No letting your dog greet other dogs or people without consent
- My dogs dont go. Dog parks are dangerous for the dog.
- Allow the dogs to be dogs but take the time to find help for you and your pet before issues become out of control.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That a dog and owner do not pose any safety threat to any human.
- Good leash manners, not behaving aggressively toward people/dogs.
- On leash, pick up waste and have dog under control at all times.
- Keep your dog on leash and under control
- Ban Flexi's
- Dog needs to be under control of the owner in place and observing their dogs.
- Controlled on a leash or reliable re-call, non-reactive behavior in all circumstances
- They need to be on leashes, and should still not be approached by people/not the dogs owners. Dog waste should be picked up.
- That dogs should be well mannered, walk appropriately on leash. No flexible leashes or long lines in public spaces. Nothing longer then a 6ft leash. Dog owners need to have control of their dogs and should be be well behaved.
- They should be on a leash, close to the owner (not those 20 foot long leashes). They should not defecate or urinate on private property. They should not be pulling on the leash and lunging at people or other dogs.
- I expect dogs to be well trained and to stay quietly by their owners side. Should they have to go to the washroom, I would expect the handler to pick it up immediately and dispose it properly.
- Dog on short (not retractable) leash, owner paying attention to what the dog is doing, picking up after dog, dog comfortable in public, owner not allowing dog to approach other dogs without asking first.
- That the person with the dog controls it.
- If a dog poops it needs to be cleaned up or a \$500 fine and that the owner must be able to control the dog. (with in reason obviously there are some very bad situations that may cause a dog and owner to be terrified)
- They have to be leashed.
- All dogs should be leashed and not causing a disturbance of any kind .
- Under control at all times, either through verbal or leash
- Your dog is on a leash. That should include the front area of your home so that people can walk their dog through their own or another neighbourhood without getting attacked.
- I think we need to be more understanding of dogs who bark at other dogs or people, as long as their handler is clearly trying to work on the issue. There is an expectation that dogs should be perfect all the time but behaviour modification takes time when done ethically.
- Always be on leash. Always
- Mutual respect. Keep dogs on leashes. Have people be respectful of those owners who do have dogs on a leash and give appropriate space.
- Manitory muzzles on all breeds. So dogs can be allowed to go anywhere with owners
- Dogs should be leashed, not allowed to make contact with strangers without their approval, and not be noisy



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs should be able to sniff and check out their environment (Not be a robot) but should not be pulling towards people or other animals. They should be under control or their owner working on training their dog in these environments with positive reinforcement. No retractable leash. Max 6ft leash.
- Keep dogs close to the owners and not on a LONG leash. I have had a dog jump up on me (was off leash in a leash area). Owners think it is cute and I dared not say anything.
- Dogs are on leash at all times, licensed and controllable by owners... No retractable leashes
- Close supervision by owner.
- Able to walk on leash properly.
- The dog should be trained to be respectful of people and other animals. Dogs should not be on retractable leashes. A 6ft or shorter leash is a good length when in public.
- None. Most people have enough common sense that they don't need a long list of rules to tell them how to conduct themselves in public.
- Dogs to be on leash, and under control. Not letting your dog approach another dog with consent of the owner and letting reactive dogs have their space, giving them lots of room to pass.
- I expect the owner/handler to be able to control the dog or dogs that they have with them. I also expect others to respect the dog and owner/handler.
- Dogs must always be on leash and controlled. Ban flexi leads.
- Walking on leash and picking up after your pet.
- Dogs must be on-leash and owners must pick up after them.
- That they be on a leash! Inglewood has people walking their dogs off leash everywhere- even on the sidewalk! It's not safe for others that have their dogs on a leash
- Proper etiquette, if your dog is not good at greeting other dogs, know that other dogs may correct your dog but some won't. Understand what good play looks like. And pick up poop!!
- People have proper leashes and are able to keep their dogs under control
- I expect dogs to be leashed and owners to be in control of their dog.
- I expect dogs to learn how to behave in these areas and for other people to allow the handler a few second to achieve this. It is hard to teach a young dog immediate behavior without the help of everyone involved. We try to achieve calm before anyone else approaches but some times we don't see someone
- Waste pickup.
- Proper leash walking and not lunging.
- That the dog is well-behaved and responds to their owner. It is up to the owner to dictate what the dog can and cannot do. Asking for the other owners permission for another dog to approach and meet your dog. If an owner pulls their dog aside then that means that they do not want to meet other dogs.
- Owners must have dogs on leash at all times unless in an off leash park.
- they must be on leash at all times - pick up after your pet and no harassing wildlife
- short leash and friendly dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Leashed, in control, calm, quiet.
- I feel that dogs should be under control. Getting over excited it drastically different that signs of anxiety and aggression. Unfortunately this ALL falls on the owner. The public also needs to respect the dogs space and their owners.
- control of your dog while on leash; being able to walk by/share a sidewalk and have no lunging or aggressive behaviour
- Enforce on leash rules. Dogs should be on a 6 foot leash in urban areas. If owners use a retractable leash, the dog should not be allowed to wander more than 6 feet away from owner.
- Make room on pathways for those walking by.
- First and foremost, the dog must be on a leash!!!
- Always on leash, no exceptions. If aggressive to humans, muzzled. Bright colored leash and vocal to other owners if aggressive to other dogs.
- Good recall, their humans paying attention to them - not just turning them loose then standing around drinking coffee and chatting.
- My dogs are expected to remain at my side, if I am in a busy place then a shorter leash is used. Because I have a reactive dog he is muzzled anywhere we might run in to another dog.
- Dogs must be on a leash (nt retractable) pick up poop
- Under control, on leash, no barking
- On leash at all times, even in parks and fields. City needs to patrol and post signage around fields and parks as a reminder that leashes are required. Waste needs to be picked up. Even if your dog is friendly not everyone or all others animals appreciate them
- To be under control
- That a pet is under control by its owner/handler and animal waste is promptly removed.
- Dog owners should follow the by laws & be respectful of others
- Owners must control their dogs, dog will sometimes unexpectedly react. As long as the owner is controlling the dog and not allowing the dog to harm another, it is okay. Dogs will not behave 100% of the time.
- Dog handler has control over their dog.
- Dogs should be on a leash and in owners control
- Have them on a leash
- Dog is attentive to handler, not outwardly aggressive towards passerbys. Dog listens to handler and responds to commands given by them.
- That the animals are properly trained, are not aggressive or if they are generally aggressive/learning to overcome aggression that they are properly controlled and muzzled. The animals should have a right to live their lives as well, owners should be able to work with them to overcome barriers.
- Quiet, respectful, obedient. Should not be a disturbance in the send of acting poorly. Should be kept on a leash & asked to focus on the handler until strangers & stranger dogs pass.
- People teach their dogs good behaviour and if your dog attacks some other dog or human take responsibility and own up to the damage and pay for the vet bill or doctors bill/ambulance



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs and humans sharing space, if you see a person with their dog and they move over it's only fair you do the same.
- Dogs should be under control.
- Well behaved and well mannered. Responsible and respectful ownership
- Dog must remain on leash at all times.
- If you walk multiple dogs be able to control them especially around children. Pick up after all of them.
- i expect dog to be well-behaved and not approach strangers without permission. no barking.
- On leash. Pick up. Pedestrians need to learn to share with those walking dogs.
- Dog under control
- mussel if aggressive,
- Dogs be on a leash and under control at all times.
- Should not lunge at people or animals
- Dogs should be on a leash and be obedience trained.
- To not aggressively lung at passer bys
- Owners should control their own dog and everyone can get along
- Dogs should always be on a leash. They should be well mannered and respectful and the owner should have complete control at all times.
- to be on leash and under control of their owners so that they do not attack or harass other dogs, children or people
- Leashed, close to owner.
- Staying on leash. I have seen many dogs running around in yards and streets while the owner was walking nearby but not paying attention
- As long as the owner is actively trying to train/control their dogs. I don't expect owners to have full control 24/7 especially with young dogs. But if thats the case 6 foot leash should be a rule.
- Pick up after your dog. Have your dog under control.
- Quiet, well-mannered, biddable dogs
- In regards to recall and other behavior it should be evaluated in taking a holistic view of the dog, their background and age. Recall on a 10 month old whose behavior is being proofed will differ from a 5 year old trained dog.
- Reactive dogs be contained appropriately, and their space respected by other dogs/ park users
- Dogs on leash and under control.
- For them to be leashes and respectful
- That their owner has control of the dog at all times and is picking up their waste
- For the animals to be comfortable and for the caretaker to be properly socializing their pets.
- Control of dog and/or communication. Training has to start somewhere, so owners should at least communicate if their dog is reactive.
- Not all dogs can be perfectly behaved, for example puppies, but I expect no excessive vocals/lunging. No flexi leashes, they do not provide proper control of any dog, and most importantly not letting them greet other dogs, even if yours is friendly doesn't mean mine is.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They should use their common sense
- That there is more emphasis of what proper dog behaviour is - maybe this can be part of the licensing process where they watch a video on behaviour and what is appropriate and what is not. Again too many dog owners can't fathom their dog is 'bad' and look to blame everyone else.
- Dogs to remain on leash at all times
- That they are able to be managed responsibly. ie. Come when called.
- On leash, under control. Dog waste picked up
- Keep your dogs on a leash
- Similar to dog park rules
- Do not assume all dogs get along
- Dogs should be leashed until inside designated off leash areas.
- Owners to be blunt many owners off leash or not seem to misread situations with their dogs or forget to pick up waste. It should be mandatory that if you own a dog you should take them through at minimum a beginners obedience class by the time the dog is 18mths or face fines.
- On leash and under control. Dogs should not meet while on leash as this causes issues between the dogs and is potentially dangerous
- Dogs should be on leash in these areas,
- Dogs are to be leashed and under control.
- They should be calm and under control
- An animal that is under control or that can be put into control quickly. Keen owners that are well versed in dog body language and have the proper training tools necessary to manage their dog
- Under control (ie not leaping or lunging at people/other dogs).
- Even more than off-leash, the owner should be monitoring the dog (not sitting on a park bench reading while their dog terrorizes nearby people and animals.)
If they're on a leash, that still means the dog should generally be in a close proximity to owner to control them properly.
- Dogs should remain off personal property (not allowed to wander around on privately owned lawns, etc).
Dogs shouldn't be permitted to be walked on retractable leads. This totally eliminates the owners control and puts them and others at risk.
- Dogs should be on leash on pathways/when not in an off leash area. My dog had been approached by many aggressive and reactive dogs on pathways and the owners did not have the dog on a leash and under their control.
- I expect that dogs will be on leash and have had training so that they do not jump on people with out dogs
- If it is not an off leash park, all dogs should be leashed. If paths are to be shared, everyone has a responsibility to keep our dogs safe.
- leashed and proper control of dog, dog not intruding on people's space.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Keep dog on leash in on leash areas even if they are friendly. Don't let your dog approach other on leash dogs without owner consent and actively make space to avoid on leash greetings.
- Calm behavior, no lunging, limited barking.
- Dogs should be on leashes outside of off-leash areas unless the dog is trained so well that it doesn't need a leash.
- Again to be on a leash at all time when not in a designated off leash area ,except when in their own yard. Not to be left in their yard , barking all day long or for extended periods . Owners responsible to clean poop up in public areas and in their own yard so neighbours do not have to smell.
- That the dog will stay with its owner, and that it will be on a leash.
Here in Silver Springs, I often see dogs off-leash in the playgrounds.
- Control of animal at all times, leashed. Picking up after the animal
- Stay on your leash, don't bark too much, don't lunge at people.
- On a leash, short leashed in large crowds, not jumping on people, owner understands when it is time to remove the dog based on its behavior.
- That the dog is on leash, and that the owner has control. Also, that a dog is not left alone and tied up outside businesses.
- Dogs kept at close range on leash, get rid of flexi's in public, owners acknowledge behaviors their dog struggles with and respond appropriately
- Dogs need to behave whether on leash or off, owners need to clean up.
- Polite on leash
- Lots. Dogs always on leash. Do not approach me without consent (my child is afraid of dogs), ensure your dog is not a nuisance (running at large), pick up poop.
- That they are under control of the owner at all times, and feces is picked up immediately
- Owners should be aware of other pets on pathways - being aware of signs that their pet or other pets they meet are agitated and know what to do to mitigate altercations between animals.
- Owners always have them on a leash to avoid issues. Just like humans, dogs wont like other dogs or people and there will be posturing occurring from the dog. Owner needs to extract their dog from the situation immediately to avoid harm from all involved.
- pet owners have taken their dogs to obedience classes so that they can be educated as to how to avoid putting their dogs in bad situations. never set your dog up for failure, this is what people do not understand, then the animals is blamed, when the person is to blame.
- respectful behavior period
- Strangers not approaching my dog without my consent. Dogs to be on leash. Ability to bring dogs to most public spaces.
- Dogs need to be on a leash and dog owners have them under control while on the pathway. Dogs should not be able to jump on, walk in front of, or snip at runners, walkers, or bikers. As someone who all of the above has happened while running on the pathways, I feel unsafe when dogs aren't on a leash.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Young children walking dogs that do not have control of them. Too many dogs in play grounds and school yards even though there are signs. Dogs should not be tied up outside stores, they can become frightened and bark, bite or lunge.
- on leash and under control
- People keep their dogs on leash. I have seen people crossing busy streets with no leash.
- I have no concerns about dogs being off leash in an off leash area if I can see that they are obedient and well behaved.
- Dogs on leash
Within reasonable distance of owner
- Friendly behaviour.
- Non reactive dogs off leash in public environments
- same as above
- Gentle, non-aggressive
- Same as noted above.
- In other public places keep your dog on a leash and keep it under control.
- The dog is under control and the owner warns if the dog is not friendly
- Not aggressive to people or other animals.
- Do not let your dog interfere with other people or animal enjoyment of the area. Never allow your pet to harass wildlife. and if they do injure an animal it should be mandatory to get the injured animal to help.
- Healthiness
- Red eyes! (I've seen more dogs with red eyes. Concerned that this means they want to attack me)
- Listen to owner
- - don't bite - don't bark - stay close to owner
- show respect
- Lesson - Pick up dodo, Leash/muzzle, coular
- keep your dog away from people and other dogs, as on leash is maybe used by people and other dogs not good with other dogs
- The dog should be kept under control and not be threatening other people or animals
- All dogs should be on leash, period.
- It creates a scary situation for pet owners when blame is unilaterally placed on the animal/owner. It seems all regulation is designed to do to do this. A better balance is needed to ensure that there are repercussions for members of the public who interact inappropriately with animals/pets.
- I expect the dog to be on-leash at all times when not in a designated off-leash area. The owner should be in control of the dog at all times. Owners should shorted the lead to bring the dog closer to them when approaching others in common areas.
- Be on leash and under control of the owner. Even if you have a somewhat aggressive dog - you need to be able to remove your dog from any situation (ie. walk off the pathway & keep distance to avoid an issue with another dog coming towards you).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The dog is not aggressive towards humans or other dogs, such as growling or constant barking at passersby. I think if the dog(s) is/are well behaved and on-leash, no issues at all. Dog owners should be aware/monitor their dogs, and remove them from the situation if the aggression continues.
- Don't let your dog come too close to me unless i express interest in your dog.
- Always on a leash and in control
- it on a leash, that the owner picks up, that the owner is not walking more dogs that is reasonable to control (this might be linked to dog size)
- Pick up waste , no lunging
- I do not frequent off leash parks as there has been such a huge increase in dog attacks on people and other dogs. Although I know it's impossible for the city to fully monitor off leash dog parks I really do think that with proper proof of an attack.
- Dogs must be under control at all times. Any dog can be unpredictable and owners and walkers must be diligent.
- On leash at heal as best one can. With in 6 feet. With an awareness that some dogs need more space when passingnother dogs and humans. That being reactibe dogs not mean aggressive
- To not have dogs allowed to run up to you, allowed to bark or jump on people.
- That anxious and aggressive dogs stay far enough away from others that their behaviour does not affect other people.
- My expectations are that bike riders are courteous of people with dogs on leash. We cannot jump out of the way in a millisecond just because they are zooming down the pathway and they do not wish to slow down.
- owners are the issue not the dogs, owners need to take their dogs for obedience classes to understand how to read the dogs body language.
- Dogs should be on leash and under the owners control.
- Pick up waste
- On leash at all times, owner responsible for keeping dog near them so it can't harass people or get in their way (or scare them - the common/public spaces are for all humans, and not all humans are comfortable around dogs.
- No excessive barking/growling.
- Dogs should always be leashed and under control. They should be licensed and vaccinated.
- Still under owner control with or without leash
- I think every dog owner should be trying, even if their dog is not perfect walking on a leash around the neighbourhood, the owner should be teaching them proper behaviour. If your dog is not ready to walk on a leash or be around other humans and dogs then start small and try to avoid others.
- Frenzier barking, agression, or letting your dog wander on a long leash with little supervision is not acceptable
- Dogs jump. Dogs bark. Dogs have to be around other dogs to be taught how to behave around them, which means they need the opportunity to learn. I only expect them not to bite while walking past a person or other dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Awareness
 - Other reactive dogs
 - Leashed
 - Pick Up waste
 - Muzzled when appropriate
- Dogs should be on a leash, owners should walk dog to the right of the pathway so those who want to pass can go on the left, share the pathway as others use it, shorter leashes so dog remains in control should a bike or scooter come by.
- Dont assume everyone with a dog wants your dog to approach there is a reason dogs on leash are not in off leash areas medical, fear aggression Experts say dogs Shouldnt meet on leash in the first place as well If I Move away from your dog why are you then letting you dog come near me?
- Must be on leash. Stay on footpaths and off designated bike paths (leashes are a danger to passing cyclists). Owner needs to be able to manage their pet (i.e. small owner/child relative to pet size). Barking should be controlled.
- Appropriate interaction with people and other animals.
- -dogs kept on a leash
 - owner being able to control their dog
- On leash and under control, not barking, growling or jumping at other people or dogs
- To be on leash at all times
 - To be under control on leash at all times
- Your dog should not charge another individual/pet/wildlife, and should be responsive to commands (on-leash or off-leash should not matter if the previous statement applies).
- I would expect dogs to be on leash. Perhaps this seems as though I'm stating the obvious, but my partner and I have stopped going to some parks (the Weaselhead, North Glenmore Park) because there are so many off-leash dogs in areas where signs state dogs must be on leash (or are not allowed at all).
- NEEDS to be on a leash!! Owners think their dog is non-threatening or friendly off leash but not always the case. I don't want to have any interaction with a dog on or off the leash when on a walk. Need to be serious consequences for dogs off leash-more bylaw officers/large fines and confiscation.
- Owners keep their dogs on a leash, clean up after their dogs, what responsibility is the city taking to educate pet owners and the on going problems in neighbour hood parks where dog owners are not following the bylaws
- awareness
 - other reactive dogs
 - leashed
 - pick up waste
 - muxxled when appropriate [DUPLICATE]
- to be under owner control and do not approach public without consent.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I expect a dog owner to be in control of their dog, to follow the rules for on-leash behaviour, staying away from playgrounds, picking up dog waste, and not letting their dog run around a public area with its leash on and not in the owners hand.
- Owners need to keep their dogs from walking across our lawns. PLEASE keep them on the sidewalk. We have to garden in all of that dog urine on our shrubs and lawns as well as all of the contaminants of dog poop etc. that they carry on their feet. We are also tired of shoveling the snow knocked down.
- Dog must be trained to obey owner
- They should be kept under control, on leash, muzzled if required, poop picked up but dog owners should be encouraged to take their dogs in public spaces for socialization
- Don't have off lease parks. Dog owners should pick up poop everywhere including off lease areas.
- People need to train their dogs by professionals if they are unable to.
- Non aggressive, muzzled if bite history. Education of leash reactivity
- that the dog is friendly and will respond to owner's verbal commands at all times. Many pet owners are clueless.
- If anyone is disrespecting the rules, there can be a decent and respectful conversation about it. That everyone stops and considers the rules. Ex: a biker shouldn't charge past an off-leash dog in case there is a physical risk. Similarly, all bikers should use a bell when going past an on-leash dog.
- keep pets under control on a short leash
- They should be on leash, dog waste should be picked up, dogs should not false charge or jump on people, should not chase and kill wildlife or destroy nests, should not defecate in Calgary rivers and create dangerous ecoli for health and safety reasons. Dog owner should not threaten or attack persons
- Dog owners do not follow laws. You have to be blind not to see this. Just go to a playground that has a sign over a bench that states no dogs allowed and you will see an owner with a dog sitting there. Calgary does not enforce laws and the city of Calgary is the primary offender. You pretend.
- Basically, that the dog is under control. This does not necessarily mean that it needs to be on a leash. Part of being under control means it should not approach strangers to interact with them uninvited, even if it's just a friendly pup, as some people are scared by or are not interested in dogs.
- Dogs must be leashed.
Owners must remove waste.
Dogs must not be reactive to people or other dogs (barking/lunging/snapping/growling)
Dogs should be muzzled when appropriate.
- Make the extending leashes vanish as they are a safety hazard for dogs and people. People still don't seem to know they are not legal or their dangers. I expect to be able to have my dog around (on leash) and not be harassed by a dog who is not in control (dragging their keeper around for instance).
- Dogs should be in control of the owner/guardian. They should be ON Leash. Dogs with bad behaviour, are vicious or cannot be controlled should not be on pathways.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs should be under control. Some dogs do not need to be on leash if well trained. Excrement pickup is critical for dog owners.
- under control, not necessarily on leash.
- Under no circumstances should dogs be jumping up on other users of the park.
- on leash and controlled by owner. Dog owners often think everyone loves their dog. When the dog pulls on their leash, dog owners often let the dog come right up to you. I don't want that.
- Dog on leash and well behaved. Vicious dogs should not be allowed
- Dog waste must be picked up, owner must be able to control dog, strangers must ask owners consent before interacting with pet.
- Make sure your dog is well behaved. You have to work and do your best to train your dog and give it enough exercise.
- Awareness, other reactive dogs, leashed, pick-up waste, muzzled when appropriate
- On leash and under reasonable control of owner.
- Dogs on-leash. Dogs under control, not jumping up on people as they meet and pass. No biting dogs, or those who may bite, without a muzzle to prevent bites.
- If the dog is on leash on a pathway, they all have the same right to the pathway when it comes to accessibility. Dogs however shouldn't be jumping up on people. People should also react in a calm manner as pets will sniff people. If people are nervous, they should make it known in advance.
- If dog is on leash and under control by the owner, there is very little behavior that should be policed (other than using the dog to threaten someone).
- Generally, it is the same as a vehicle, i.e. having "care and control" over your animal to ensure the safety of people (especially children) that may be using sidewalks, pathways, playgrounds, etc. and - quite simply - following the rules (that is, keeping pets on-leash unless in an off-leash area).
- Same as off-leash dog parks.
- If the status quo is maintained, Calgary will continue to be a city truly "fit for dogs."
- A dog should have appropriate behaviour, be on leash, and not lunge at people, or bikes, skateboards and so on. Dogs should be on a short lead, and in control at all times
- All above, plus do not let dog approach / jump on others without asking them first (or having them ask you).
- Common courtesy. Ensure that problem animals comply with the rules in place.
- would like to see stricter enforcement with respect to cats and dogs on other properties, and roads. Actually following through and not having to have video proof as this happens during the day when people work. If the problem is a tenant that is being uncompliant the owner of the property needs to then be responsible. Feels like the rules are in place but are just not enforced.
- That dogs be under control

Reasonable number of dogs' rationale

- I think it should depend on the size/square footage of the residence. Pets need space.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Most Yards in Calgary are not very big and dogs create a lot poop. Winter can be very long and snowy and yards can fill up with poop very quickly. Also, it's difficult to control and monitor many dogs at an off leash park.
- I don't think there should be a specific limit. It depends on the home situation and so many other factors that can't be predetermined. A small condo with 15 dogs is a lot different than a larger farm-like acreage with 15 dogs. It should be about the owners ability to adequately care for their pets.
- More than 2 dogs can be difficult to control in all situations. Packs of dogs bark. Waste Clean up can become difficult/challenging with several dogs.
- I love that the city of Calgary is the one safe haven of foster homes and does not limit the amount of dogs per household. Some people can manage quite a few dogs and some should never be allowed to own more than a stuffed dog.
- I think it depends on the household. You're probably going to get a lot of "4s." I think potentially 5 or 6 dogs would be ok. But when you put "5+" it includes the potential for 99 dalmatians which is just getting cartoonishly unrealistic.
- Personally, one is a lot for me. But who am I to deny people their pets? If they are properly cared for, and there is enough space and love, then you do you.
- This is hard to say and not so fair to generalize. As long as dogs are treated with dignity, respect, have enough of space and all their needs are met, one can have as many dogs as they can take care of. You don't control a household's number of children, so the same goes here.
- I think if someone has more than 2 dogs and take them out alone, it is very difficult to keep watch and control over all three at the same time
- i personally know plenty of GOOD dog owners that own 3 to 4 dogs perfectly fine, but people need to be well trained and good finances when owning that many animals.
- Depends entirely on the owner and the individual's capacity to care for X number of animals.
- I don't think it is okay to necessarily limit people from owning more than 2 dogs, but this feels like a reasonable number
- They are like family, but no one person can effectively walk and "control" a large pack of animals at once
- Calmer when 2; aggressive when more than 3.
- Too crowded if more less attention paid if too many dogs hard to train more dogs
- Dogs require a lot of training, and having more than three may mean that some of that training would suffer. I would rather there be a few well-trained dogs than many poorly trained ones.
- The number of dogs should be based on one's financial situation, living environment and space require for the specific breeds
- Personal experience (a puppy, an adult and a senior pet).
- If the dogs are being cared for appropriately I do not think the city should be mandating how many dogs per household.
- Dogs are social animals and need at least one friend
- Depending on the size of the dog and access to off-leash areas would determine the number.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It seems reasonable that 2 dogs can be controlled safely and also to have 2 barking dogs in a back yard is the most noise I could take. Dogs like a buddy so it seems fine with 2.
- It's not the amount of dogs that matters, it's how responsible and well trained the dogs and dog owners are. I know lots of people that shouldn't be allowed a single dog, and others that can easily manage a 10 dog pack.
- More than 3 dogs in any household that isn't a breeder seems excessive? If there are more than 3 dogs I feel like there is a higher chance for a dog to be neglected or a problem missed.
- i have one dog...having more than 3 would be problematic when exercising them on or off leash. also making sure you can afford food/vet fees
- two dogs is reasonable; but someone might want to introduce a new dog when an existing dog is getting old - so three.
- There should not be a limit on how many dogs an owner can have, so long as the owner is able to provide a safe and healthy life for the dogs.
- No more than 6
- 5. I believe the number should be 5, unless the household applies for a special exemption (for example, a breeder)
- Three is about the limit that one person can control when walking dogs, and I would use this as a maximum, unless the person is a reputable breeder, in which case there could be times when this number could be exceeded.
- It's expensive to own a dog, especially if they live long lives. The dog(s) need a good home, good food, enough attention and proper vet care. If an individual/family is burdening their finances with a dozen dogs in their lives, these animals are not getting the care and attention they deserve.
- It depends on the person and circumstance. I know people that rescue and foster and are able to take care of many dogs.
- I love dogs?
- Most people are untrained handlers and can manage 2 dogs, only trained handlers can reasonably manage 3-5 at a time
- Dogs are pack animals. Having a solitary animal may not be the best thing for that animal. Having too many dogs can get out of hand what with vet bills, food, proper care.
- I do not have any issue with the number of pets - as long as they are being cared for, fed, veterinary, etc.
- I think it depends on the size of dog and dwelling. I think 4 is acceptable if they're small and well-behaved.
- I guess it depends on the size of the house / dog
Are they taken care of
- Dogs may require companionship so more than one should be allowed. Due to space constraints a larger number should not be allowed. Exceptions should be made for dogs with puppies until the have found new homes.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I have no issues with number of pets if they pets are cared for with proper feeding, exercise, medical, and licensing.
- I think that the size and type of household needs to be considered. Someone with a large house with a yard could be allowed more dogs than someone in an apartment for example.
- The average house could likely comfortably accommodate this many dogs. Unless very well trained, more than four dogs would put the people to dog ratio at risk, which leaves opportunities for dogs to become out of the control of owners.
- Animals - that we have bred into existence- stress our ability to meet climate goals, they create waste and generally add to our overall footprint. They are cute though.
- Dogs come in a variety of sizes and care requirements. Forcing an arbitrary limit is unfair.
- More dogs means more barking. It is harder to control each additional animal.
- Very few people have the experience to manage more than two dogs.
- I believe it depends on the household, and their abilities.
- As long as the pet is well taken care of, the number should not matter.
- It is not the number of animals a person houses but more how they are cared for both physically and mentally. Ethical breeders can have a few more dogs than the normal household due to the nature of their breeding program. It never should be capped. Make owners responsible for their animal number
- Minimum number of well-trained dogs a responsible, experience individual could properly have oversight and control over
- One per adult hand in the household.
- 2 is companionship, 3 is too many, think about the feces and smell in the yard and you should be charging extra after 2
- Do not believe in limits due to the multiple of different situations that can occur.
- I believe if your dogs are under your control and you are able to properly care for them and your property, it shouldn't matter how many there are. I would just want to see all dogs in a residence licensed
- The more dogs the more walking, the more waste to pick up, more vet bills, more food/medication costs, more licensing fees. I am comfortable with 2 but perhaps 3 if they were small dogs.
- This is not a limit, just an average number per household.
- Seems like a reasonable and managable number but Calgarian should be allowed to keep as many as they want as long as doing so doesn't negatively impact any other Calgarian and the health and safety of the animals can be maintained.
- Most people have trouble keeping up with picking up poop and responsibly walking more than 3 dogs at once.
- The number of dogs is irrelevant. It's the people that matter. Some people can handle 10 dogs, other people can't handle one dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It depends on the 'owner', the type of dogs and how often they are walked and interacted with. More than 4 becomes unmanageable, especially when walking. Hard to monitor behaviour and pick up after four dogs let alone more.
- Don't know. What do animal advocacy or other animal rights groups recommend as a suitable number of dogs per household?
- If people can properly take care of their dogs and have the resources necessary, who cares how many they have in their house. it's their property and they should be able to do with it what they please.
- If the animals are being well cared for with a healthy environment then it should be up to the individual to determine the number of animals.
- Every person is different. Some people can easily handle 7 dogs (provide food, training, exercise) while others can barely handle one. If you are a responsible owner, the number of dogs you have isn't relevant.
- There isn't a set number. Some people can care for many dogs and some can't even care for one. Plus sometimes houses have roommates that have their own dogs.
- Three dogs are more than enough for one home due to backyard size. The costs associated with owning a dog can get expensive.
- It really depends on the household and what the role is of the family members. I have seen homes with 1 dog that is not well looked after and the home and yard is a mess, and homes with 6 or 7 that are extremely well cared for and their home and yard are spotless.
- It allows one to be a companion for the other. A person has only 2 hands... one for the leash of each dog when they are walking it.
- Really I think as long as they are all being cared for and treated if ill who am I or you to decide. Some breeders have multiple dogs at a time depending on who's visiting and when for breeding purposes.
- It all depends on the number of the household (humans :)) the size of dogs. the size of house. and even maybe income of household they can provide for that dog. There is no right answer.
- More than that would compromise the ability of the owner to handle them.
- Dependent on circumstances, breeder, rescue etc. Should someone have 30 dogs sitting in the house while they are off to work all day, probably not. But, having said that it would depend on breed and how they are housed/managed etc. Also how many caregivers are there for the number of dogs?
- It is not the number of dogs, it is the behaviour and care of the dogs that is important. My multi-dog household is better behaved than the neighbour's 1 terrier, left to bark at people walking down the alley.
- It could be two, but since we have so many 'apartments' included in household put '1'
- it depends upon the size of the dogs, how responsible the owners are
- Yards aren't big enough in Calgary for more than that.
- Three, each individual dog will have their set of needs and wants. And I feel that more than that wouldn't be meeting the dogs needs and could potentially have effect of the dogs quality of life.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It is not the number of dogs that causes issues, it is irresponsible ownership.
- No more dogs than one person could reasonably control off their property at a time.
- Depending on the means and ability of and given person. Some have the means and skills to care for 20 dogs. Some zero.
- This is based on reasonable attention owners can give to their dogs and also the impact of multiple dogs (even well behaved ones) on surrounding neighbors.
- Prefer no arbitrary limit. Responsibility is not contingent on number. I think Calgary has been very forward thinking in its approach to dog ownership in the past and would hate to see that eroded.
- It really depends on the size of the dogs and the space the owner has for them to roam and run.
- Depends on what your criteria is for household. If I look at Calgary Housing, I think it is reasonable that one does not own more than two dogs.
- Same as the beer rule...you're allowed to order as many beers as the number of hands you have.
- I think this all depends on the size of dog and size of property. Small property 2-3. Larger property and homes 4-5.
- If an individual is responsible, there should not be a limit. Limits are there to control individuals that are not responsible.
- Walking more than 2 makes it harder to control the dogs. The more dogs there are together the pack instinct kicks in.
- I think a max of 4 dogs and 5 pets in total is reasonable.
- Companions when people are away working all day
- at least the one dog will have a companion..if people are so passionate about dogs, go volunteer at the shelter(s)..again we live in a city, close confines, not a farm/acreage...
- In an urban setting this number should be zero or two. Dogs need jobs and/or interaction to be happy. If an owner can't have two, they need to have zero, and if they can't have zero, they need to have two.
- It's more about how responsible the owner is, not about number of dogs. I've known some very good owners of 5 dogs and less than ideal owners of just 1.
- 2 dogs per one person. Otherwise care and time lacks.
- I think that the number of dogs per household will vary based on the household size, yard size, care of the animals, ect. Should be pets only, there should be limits if using for breeding, or leaving the dogs un-fixed and allowed to have puppies.
- Although I do not have that many dogs I believe that it should be an individual choice
- I think anymore than 3 is too hard to handle and monitor (unless it's puppies, or a litter just was born)
- As long as the owner is being a responsible owner, providing good care and being respectful of neighbours I have no issue as to the number of dogs. We have a neighbour who has 1 dog that is more of problem than my 3 dogs.
- If the pet owner is responsible, there shouldn't be an issue
- It is a good size and the dogs have a companion.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Some people have different limits than others. My limit is 1 dog and my sister has 4 who are very well cared for.
- This is difficult. If the residence has more space, then possibly the limits can be extended. After 3 dogs it is impossible to have responsibility/cleanliness for them all.
- I don't believe that this is a fair question. Factors need to be considered including size of house, number of residents caring for the animal, size of yard/exercise area, financial resources.
- No limit
- Doesn't matter if they are taken care of and trained
- Why do they need more? Less is more.
- People can responsibly care for many dogs. A limit does not ensure good care of that the animals won't be a nuisance to others.
- I think this depends on the owners' ability to care for multiple dogs and dependent on the size of the owners' home and yard. There are people who foster who have multiple dogs and they have the space, resources and knowledge to handle this.
- Depends on size of house/available space and also size of dogs.
- Owners generally don't take in more than they can responsibly handle, give enough attention to, provide vet care and love. Different sizes and ages dictate the home environment. Numbers won't change behaviours if hoarders and breeders.
- Most yards are small and ownership commitment is low
- Noise and environmental considerations for neighbors are more important than someone's want for more animals.
- As long as the animals are being properly fed, vaccinated, and with vet care there should be no limits. Decisions should be based on quality of care not based on the number of dogs in the home. For some even one is too many and they lack the ability to care for the dog appropriately.
- My choice is based on what I think a typical family can handle appropriately, in terms of giving each dog the proper care and attention they will require. Obviously, this number will be higher in some families and lower in others based on location, number of family members, etc.
- An owner can typically afford the feeding/grooming/veterinary care & licensing fees. Barking dogs are better controlled with 2 or under.
- It isn't the number of animals you have it is how you care for them.
- I think it depends on the ability of the person to properly provide for the animals. Do we limit the number of children a family can have?
- As long as the animal is well taken care of and is not a nuisance, there should be no limits.
- One dog per adult seems reasonable. If a household wants more dogs than that they should apply and neighbours can comment.
- It completely depends on the dogs and the household.
- It is dependent on the individual and what they are able to handle. The animals' welfare must be taken care of and safety of the public understood.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- As long as the dogs are trained, and properly taken care of and follow bylaws, the amount of animals shouldn't be limited.
- More dogs = more noise, waste and smell
- If a family is able to control a number of dogs they should be able to. Some people cannot look after 1, experienced dog owners can handle more.
- Sanitation is a primary concern of mine. Since very few dogs or cats are trained to use toilets I'm concerned about Faecal buildup and contamination.
- Depends on the household. I don't think this needs to be limited.
- You need to be able to control your pet at any second, must be able to walk properly and you only gave two hands thus you can only properly walk one or two dogs but not more at once
- If a person can handle it 3 dogs is not unreasonable.
- if at an off-leash park with more than 3 dogs it is difficult to track them and ensure their interactions with others as well as their waste management is maintained. I also do not think you can restrict dogs based on square footage so this would be suitable for apartment and oar House styles it wou
- Some people can't properly care for one dog, while others can provide excellent lives for multiple dogs. The number shouldn't be limited as the abilities of different dog owners are vastly different.
- Dogs are very time consuming and require a ton of mental and physical interaction and we have off leash parks for other dog interaction. Most people don't have enough extra time for multiple dogs.
- On average this ought to be lower, but as a maximum, 3.
- I believe that as long as the members of household can adequately care for those animals they should be allowed to have them, perhaps special permits could be considered for breeders and such. I would put a limit at four but with puppies being exempt
- Depends on the house
- How does someone give total support needed for their dogs...Financial and emotional as well as physical like walking their pets.
- Not necessary to have more than 2 within the city
- When over a specific number people get overwhelmed and pets end up in humane society or given away.
- Depends on any negative affects on neighbors or property value
- As long as the multiple dog owner complies with all bylaws in place and is not causing a problem to their neighbors it should be left up to the owner as to what they can care for properly. Trying to limit people will only drive them underground.
- I think that multiple dogs are fine, but in an urban setting I wonder if more than 3 is reasonable given the expectations of responsible pet ownership. However, I am not aware of best practices and am more receptive to more pets if owners are responsible. Irresponsibility is the bigger issue.
- Dogs are family and 3 is the right number
- It depends on the home and type of dog. Many people live active lives and can happily and safely house many dogs. Breeders etc also have larger numbers of dogs at certain times, and it's a slippery slope to limit this number.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Any more and you can't watch them all in the parks.
- As long as all dogs are healthy, taken care of, licensed, and have space.
- Possible noise and I believe that is a controllable number.
- I believe it depends on the size of the house and breed of dog. One person can usually control 2 dogs depending on size.
- If you are a responsible dog owner you should be allowed to have 5+ dogs. But if you get caught hoarding then all dogs must go.
- It depends. 1 for a 40 +kg dog, a couple for a small breed. what is it with the need to have a pack?
- I do not believe it is universal, one household could have one dog that is out of control and another could have 5+, all of which are well behaved and controlled. It comes down to the owner, not the number.
- No more than 2 per adult caregiver.
- Allows for breeders/ show animals
- We have a large/medium do who is well trained, and well cared for. That being said , neighbours have one small, extremely vocal and poorly cared for dog that impacts a lot of people with noise. We think that the bob cat is hunting for this.
- That is a reasonable number considering that every household could have a dog. The amount of dog feces in the city should be considered in this question. There is a large amount that is not picked up. Environmental concerns rise with the increase of dogs in the city.
- To many and u can not provide properly
- Three dogs can be managed by one person, but more than that would be too difficult for one person to properly care for - picking up waste, properly exercising the animal, cost for proper veterinary care.
- 1 or at most 2 dogs per household and only depending on the type of dogs and also the dwelling where they live. It can be cruel to keep a certain breed under certain conditions.
- Unless someone is on a large property, 3 or more dogs is not fair to the animal. Urban settings are not meant for multiple animals and neighbors should not be bothered by others pets.
- One or two is a reasonable amount, one can be lonely if owner at work all day so a friend is ok.
- Enough to provide companionship for the dogs, while at the same time limiting impact on neighbours.
- I know there are people who have multiple dogs and I think that's a choice based on their personal situation and feeling. But I think overall four dogs is the upper limit of what most people can handle
- Manageable in a city urban environment and provides company for the dogs. Less mess within a community.
- I don't care how many dogs are in a household. If there are no complaints and the owner can provide appropriate care it doesn't matter how many dogs are in the household.
- Im okay with 5. It really depends on the household. For me personally I'd never have more than two cause I can't handle that much! Others can handle it amazingly and should. More than 5 is hoarding.
- ONE PET AND A COMPANIONFOR THE PET.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- This seems to be a fair number and a number that is manageable. More could mean that dogs get neglected.
- Some people can easily handle having a large number of dogs, while some people shouldn't even have 1 dog. I have known people with 12 dogs in their household and you would never know there were 12 dogs living in their spotless house.
- Depends on the dogs and weather they are nuisance to the neighbours /community. For dog breeders they should be registered with the Canadian Kennel Club in order to have multiple dogs. Dog breeders should not be limited on the number of dogs if they are responsible and registered.
- With current life styles, rare for people to manage walking more than two dogs.
- If there are no complaints or issues who cares. I have had 6 ish for over 30 years in Calgary with no issues. When you add my current competition dogs, my retired dogs and my upcoming dogs it is easy to have several. The single dog in my neighborhood that barks all night is much more annoying.
- Maximum 3, but preferably less but only if you own a house with a yard. Otherwise only one if in an apartment or condo.
Animals are expensive and an owner should be able to financially take care of all animals and pay for food and vet bills.
- You can have one dog and not be a responsible owner. You can have 5+ and be a great owner.
- Too many dogs on a residential property can have problems with excessive barking and owner not regularly picking up dog feces on their property, which results in bad odors and a health hazard for adjoining property owners and their families, and animals can't safely live in crowded conditions.
- Assuming two are easily handled when on leash, etc. And average yard is fine for two, including how much waste.
- I don't think there can be a specific number. If you bred a dog, you'd have puppies, well over 5. If you are not breeding, a good rule is a number that can be loved by each person. 2 people=2 dogs. (Adults) but personally, 2 is plenty to ensure good care.
- One MAXIMUM in the city and then only small quiet dogs. Big dogs deserve a full home and yard to roam in. Two, maybe three in a rural area...more if on a farm *with enough people to take care of them!
- Not too many- this of course counts as permanent pets, not a new litter.
- Seems like a reasonable number for proper control & financial obligations
- 3 should be the limit. Most households cannot responsibly care for lots of animals under the APA
- More control and not overpopulated
- Completely depends on the person, their finances, and the amount of space, size of dogs, etc.
- In urban areas more than this isn't necessary except for mother dog with pups until pups weaned and moved to new homes
- As long as the dogs are licensed, owner can care for them, they are not excessively noisy or cause for concern I think if the owner is responsible within reason no number should be placed



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It may depend on how many family members are in the household, however I do know the time, responsibility and financials it takes to care for multiple pets. Ppl should not live beyond their means. They should be able to provide each dog with the proper amount of exercise, attention & stimulation
- Any more than 2 is difficult to control and indicates a 'collection' or possibly even a hoarding or unlicensed breeding operation. Citizens should have to have and pay for a kennel license with 3 or more dogs.
- I think it depends on the size of the home and the care that is given to the dogs. A mansion with a large yard could carry 5+ dogs, where an apartment can only have 1 small dog. Subjective question.
- 3 and below for responsible pet owners like myself. 4 and above should be assessed and approved by the city per household.
- A reasonable number is different for different people. Some people can only handle one. Others are fine with lots of dogs. The current rules work fine. As long as the pers are licensed and well cared for that is what is important.
- As a breeder I do have multiple dogs I obey the bylaw and have lived inner city for 30 years and have never had a complaint about my dogs. With education and enforcement of the bylaws we should not have to limit numbers and basically punish good owners
- As a breeder you need to have several dogs - the number isn't important - your responsible behaviour is
- I believe it depends on the situation people who show and breed their dogs will have more than people who do not. So long as they are licenced and well cared for, contained and trained there should not be a limit
- Dogs can learn from each other.
- Seems to be a reasonable amount
- How can an owner control and monitor more than 2 dogs?
- Noise from animals - two can keep each other company - three becomes a crowd!? Noise again! Be considerate neighbour.
- Responsible pet owners should not be limited in number of pets on site as long as bylaws are followed. There is no limit on number of children per household, nor should there be for pets as long as owners show responsibility for their animals behaviour
- Average household has 2-3 people living there, 1 or 2 dogs per person will allow sufficient care of all animals as well as maintainability of defecation areas.
- Two dogs tend to keep each occupied, any more and you have a greater chance of a pack that can be harmful to the public
- Most people don't have a house or backyard that is big enough for more than two dogs. The more dogs, the more noise (&poop) there will be.
- I have 5 dogs... It would also depend on the type of dog. A household with 5 giant mastiffs or 5 high drive dogs would not have the same impact as a household with 5 teacup poodles
- if there's multiple people in a household you just divide up who your watching vs who the others are watching



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 2 is manageable & provide adequate companionship for each other & their humans.
- Depends on breed, specifically size, size of home and property, level of care and quality of life in the home.
- 3 allows for people to own and foster dogs but also maintain control and meet the needs of animals and neighbours.
- I don't think we should limit the number of dogs per household- if you own your property and have the resources, you should be able to have lots of dogs. I know many loving, responsible owners with 5+ dogs (I work in vet med.)
- It's none of the city's business if the animals are licensed and behaved.
- More than 2 is a kennel
- Numbers would be determined by size of breed, size of house and yard. Some people can handle more dogs while others could probably handle none.
- dogs are pack animals; may depend on size also, if someone has two 150-pound dogs or two 15 pound dogs
- Any number ok as long as they are well cared for, kept under control, and don't disturb neighbours. Restrictions should only apply to those who have abused dogs or allowed them to disturb neighbors (ongoing).
- As long as the amount of space in the home suits the amount of dogs, there should not be a limit as long as the dogs are healthy.
- It really depends what type of house/property one has. And how much time to take care of the dog...
- Quality of the dog's environment & life is far more important than the number of dogs. There are members of the public that should not own a dog.
- Noise and excitability seems to increase when there's more than 2 dogs, and to last for longer periods of time. Very annoying for neighbours.
- Dogs are a big responsibility. Many people can manage one pet well enough.
- No restriction as some people can deal with a large number.
- Size of the house, yard and human to dog ratio should be factors in determining
- More than 3 creates dog poop and pee smells lingering in yard, barking, and potential neighbour conflict.
- Multiple pets usually leads to unsanitary conditions fostering the spread of disease. Additionally the noise quickly disturbs the neighbors.
- Why is more than one dog necessary? One idiot dog-owner creates a lot of mess and racket in a quiet neighbour when his / her dogs are not properly trained. Two double are double the idiocy. My neighbour across the alley has two badly trained mutts Barking is constant...and it is NOT cute.
- It depends on type of dog, type of household.
- Two animals is enough for anyone to handle at one time
- I think anymore than 3 is too hard to handle and monitor



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- the rules in place work well. There are hundreds of legitimate ethical kennels in Calgary and the pet population is the better for it. Those who are causing grief are the unethical people who often only have a dog or two. It is not the ethical people with 5+ who cause trouble but they get blamed
- I think it depends in part on breeds of dogs, (ie harder to have multiple large dogs in a home than smaller), it depends on the owner's ability to take care of the dogs there. I think having a set limit doesn't cover all situations
- Two is reasonable. depends on how responsible the dog owner is and how well the dogs are trained.
- As long as you can provide for them, pay for them, keep them in good health and avoid incidents with the public there should be no limit. People who follow the rules should not have a limit imposed on them because others can be responsible
- Dogs are social animals and 2 is manageable by one person if they're well trained (both dogs and the human)
- It depends more on the house really - I would say three dogs would be easy to manage and maintain in an average sized house in Calgary
- With smaller pets, it's entirely reasonable to have 3-4 pets (they are company for each other) however getting into larger numbers can cause more pack mentality (with dogs especially) and may limit ones ability (cost) to care for them appropriately (unless a breeder)
- Lots of people foster for rescue organizations and so I don't feel there should be a limit on pets in a house so long as they are being properly cared for. 6 small 10lbs dogs is very different from 6 large 100lbs dogs
- no real preference on that as long as they are trained and well taken care of. Also depends on size of home etc.
- But much depends on size of house, you wouldn't have 3 German shepherds in a one room apartment.
- I think more than two likely leads to space and noise issues.
- Anything over 2 becomes hard to handle
- This question is improperly framed and biased because it presumes that a limit is required. The # of dogs is not the issue; the issue is management. One annoying dog can be tremendous problem whereas multiple well behaved dogs are a joy (and a \$ make for the City in license fees).
- More than 2 should be considered a kennel and pay subsequent fee for such.
- I think it's a reasonable number
- any number as long as they are well taken care of and have ongoing training and socializing.
- As long as the owner has the ability to properly care for the animals without interfering with neighbours, etc. the number doesn't matter. (This includes financial means)
- This was hard for me to chose as I feel it really depends on the person's ability to take proper care of the dogs, the size of the dogs, how much exercise they need.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It's not really the specific number, it's how someone is responsible for them. People can have as many kids as they want, and they aren't my cup of tea but I have no say over how many kids are running around screaming, riding bikes on sidewalks, etc.
- Any number of dogs as long as the home/garden is large enough, the dogs are well cared for and loved. They get plenty of exercise, veterinary treatment and the owners are responsible.
- Provided that the dogs get enough exercise, stimulation, and care, I do not believe there needs to be a cap. Dogs thrive in packs.
- No more than 2. More than that, you should have to have a certain size of yard or house.
- It depends on the individual, some are more capable than others.
- If the owner has been adequately trained and has enough space for the dogs
- I think people can have as many dogs as they want if they are cleaned up after trained adequately and healthy.
- I've met plenty of people who cannot manage 1 dog and met plenty who can easily manage over 20. There are plenty of bylaws in place to address someone not taking care of their dogs. Why punish the ones who are? It won't be the violators who will be affected.
- 2 is reasonable for me due to the time commitment, amount of extra work it would require and the cost to have more than that. Some people's lifestyles can accommodate and do well with more than 2.
- if the animals are well cared for, have medical treatments when necessary, and owners are not overburdened, it should be fine. some people are overburdened with 1 pet and don't treat their pet well, and someone who has the means to care for 5 animals or more if it means they're not on the street.
- 4 is a safe number lots of family's have 4 kids so why not 4 dogs!
- There are a multitude things that can go south quickly . I would max out the limit to four dogs per household . If they would like more dogs within the household - education and training courses should be mandatory .
- It depends how many people are in the family and how much room you have. In a two person home 4 dogs are easily managed with the educated owner.
- For a house, in an urban setting, 2 gives a companion to play with, while 3, you will tend to get 2 ganging up on one. I like 2 as a minimum if you have more than 0. 2 is not a limit. If you want to legislate a limit, lets say 6 adult dogs - litters of puppies don't count. Number 6 is arbitrary.
- Have always had at least 3
- Dogs require adequate space. Dogs can begin to exhibit pack behaviours in large groups which can be dangerous.
- Two so they have a companion, the third is normally when one of the dogs is getting older, you get the third dog so it can learn the other dogs behaviours
- I think it should be a matter for each household to decide the number of dogs they wish. I think a maximum of 5-6 is not unreasonable.
- Depends on the size of the house and if the wellbeing of the animal



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals do best in pairs usually but a household should not be limited to 2 IF they are cared for, controlled and loved.
- It depends on the number of people committed to helping, the access they have to fenced yards or other walking areas.
- 1 or 2 is enough or it will be too crowded, dirty, expensive. Time management won't be good to make sure they are walked, washed, loved properly.
- A pair is plenty
- One dog can get lonely, two play and keep each other company.
- A household may very well be properly responsible for half-a-dozen dogs... another household may not take proper care of 1. I don't want an arbitrary limit.
- Breeders exist and will have easily at least 6 dogs in their place at any given time (2 parents and 4 puppies minimum)
Or some private owners have a dog who has pups and they keep them all
Private dog daycares also exist
I think there's too much nuance to set a definitive amount
- The size of house, type of house, nor the number of people per household is stated; so an appropriate answer cannot be given.
- 4 dogs can be reasonably cared for in the typical household, which is one to two adults. More than four dogs and there is a proliferation of feces, an inability to properly exercise the dogs, and general animal welfare is a concern due to the inability to pay for a vet, food, etc.
- Two MAX. More than that is border line hoarding and I do t believe the dogs needs can be fully met if more than 2. Not fair to neighbors Otherwise.
- 2 would ok with proper training. If there were more it could be allowed under certain conditions ie foster or proof of a well trained dog from a certified trainer. It would be fair to the animal and owner
- If small breeds 2 for medium or large due to environment living in noise causing or inadequate space
- The number of dogs allowed per household should be based on the space available to properly support the number of dogs being maintained.
- The backyards in the city are not big enough for several dogs. Nor would the owner walk several dogs so they could get exercise.
- 2 is generous. I live in the beltline and I'm appalled at the number of large dogs that are kept in apartments.
- Needs to be a reasonable number of pets that can be managed.
- It's like kids. You should not have more dogs than you have hands, especially if you are taking them out in public.
- Just thinking the average size of a home and people out walking dogs. Two seems manageable and two in a home seems to be a good number for the animals.
- It really depends on the size, training and responsibility of the owners.
- Respect for neighbourhood.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- You're trying to find a way to limit ownership. This should not be your consideration. If there are issues, the city can seek the legal route, however having multiple pets myself and never having a complaint, I feel you're trying to single out those that do own multiple pets.
- It depends on lot size. A large property can accommodate more dogs than a small City lot
- Obviously the size of the dog and the house matters. 5 or more Chihuahuas is not a problem but 5 or more huskies might be. That being said, it all depends on how they are cared for. Too many dogs rarely seems to be a problem. Should be case by case.
- Apartments should be limited to 1 dog due to square footage and possible disturbance to immediate neighbours.
Single detached homes could have up to two dogs given square footage of house/yard.
Any dogs beyond 2 / dwelling would require City review/licensing.
- Some owners should not have 1 - some owners perfectly capable of managing a dozen
- 2 you can still control
- Good balance between enjoyment of pet owner and chances of negatively affecting neighbours.
- Three fixed dogs is reasonable to care for & provide love and attention to each of them. More than that and it becomes too difficult, even for people who claim they could own 4+ dogs easily.
- Dogs need companion and socialization. Too many dogs could end up having sanitary issues or noise control issues if the dogs are territorial and reacts to noise outside. Also this may limit the backyard breeding that is going on.
- We have small homes and yards and are close to our neighbours. Clean up and noise are a problem for some owners.
- Every other city in Canada has limits but we don't. My next door neighbours came here with 5 dogs because they could not live anywhere else. The dogs bark and fight all the time and they cannot control them. I see this as a real problem all over Calgary. Give your bylaw officers some leverage!
- I think 4 dogs is reasonable if a person wishes to own more than perhaps a special license could be made available after a home visit is conducted in which it can be proven that the person has the means (financially, emotionally, and mentally) to provide proper care for that many animals
- More than 3 dogs decreases your chances to de-escalate a conflict in a safe manner alone. This should apply to dog walking services who like to walk 8+ dogs at one time alone. Not safe. Need to also be able to provide necessary medical costs as they come up. If you can't afford the vet bill....
- I don't think this is a fair for the city to dictate. There are too many factors to consider.
- I have 3 kids and know how different it is to contain 3, compared to the two we used to have. Dogs and kids are basically the same, right?
- It is not about the number of dogs, rather , about how they are cared for and if someone is respecting their neighbors.
- The current bylaw is fine how it is - all dogs in a house hold should be licensed. Putting in caps will discourage people from licensing existing dogs.
- The number of dogs someone can have is dependent on finances, property, and number of helpers. It also depends on breed and size. Some breeds do better in packs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I have had 3 dogs before. In an off-leash area, it becomes challenging to monitor their behaviour as well as clean up after them
- Depending on number of family members and size of yard and space and attention care etc. For example I live in an area with suited homes. at one time the neighboring home had 6 dogs! 5 of which were all over 75lbs. That is ridiculous and we had to change our fence. Permits for more than 2 is good.
- This needs to be evaluated on a case by case basis. 10 pocket dogs is very different then 10 large breed dogs. Property size can also make a big difference.
- Because dogs are social animals, 2 is enough to provide companionship to each other.
- Safety and hygiene
- Some people who have multiple pets do no care for them properly. No vet visits. Cheap food. Not spay or neutered due to cost.
- I just don't think people need to collect animals like some kind of hobby. Two pets can keep each other company, and it's not too much work/time for the owners. It's manageable. Anything more can lead to hoarding with some people, as we have seen time and time again. Very sad.
- Two dogs is a lot. But it depends on the size as well. Two big dogs vs. Two small dogs is a different thing.
- I would have said more than 4 but I feel is there is no limit, that opens things up to back yard breeders, mills, even hoarders... so it is a tough one.. for example I could have 5 or 6 with no problem, because I am a trainer and respect the laws. But other people maybe not so much....
- LOL. I have three dogs. :-)
- Depending on the size of your house and backyard. 4 is the max I would allow because more than that is is hard to control
- No restrictions as long as they are cared for
- I think people can self-monitor; but hoarding and puppy mills need to be identified and stopped
- I believe one person can reasonably handle one leash in each hand. If there is an incident walking can animal this could be controlled.
- Dog ownership should be a function of your ability to properly care for them. 5+ dogs in the home of a responsible dog owner is better than one dog in the home of someone who doesn't care or understand their responsibility to the pet and how they affect their neighbour.
- Just make sense to me don't get me wrong I love pets but. Pets are becoming more important than people in that is my concern.
- Unless you have an acreage or sufficient room to be a dog babysitting service, I would struggle to imagine having more than 3 dogs without it becoming a sanitation and safety issue.
- Depends on the owner(s)
- It is dependent on house size, owners capabilities, dog size. We should not be legislating maximums, we should be legislating ownership abilities. You can't care for and manage x amount of dogs? You should not be able to have that many.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 4 is more than enough. And it should be counted for small dogs more than big dogs. Small dog owners get away with a lot more than big dog owners wherever they go. They are the ones the most aggressive at the offleash and nothing is ever done about it.
- Sometimes a house already has 2 dogs and they need to watch a friend's dogs. If the house and property big enough for 4 dogs. Size of dog, living conditions should play a part in decision and level of responsibility of person
- Allows dogs to have a buddy while not being an added burden on the household.
- It really depends on the home and who lives there and their management style. For some people 2 dogs is too many, for others they can handle 5 or more better than some owners handle 1 pet. It should be up to the home owner as long as all dogs are licensed
- This is depending on the species. Having a Mastiff and St. Bernard is very different than having a Sharpei and Miniature Poodle. The former require greater control than the latter
- complete freedom of choice as long as all the bylaws are being respected
- No reason just three seems like enough work! If you're a good owner and take care of them, number shouldn't matter.
- Depends on a household, but it seems hard to manage a household with more dogs - not sure there should be a limit and certainly higher numbers can be cared for well with good planning and lifestyle.
- Three is enough dogs to have companionship, and can be kept in a reasonably-sized Calgary household.
- How can a person spend time, train and exercise any more pets than 2?
- As long as the owner can properly care for the animals, they are not constantly outside they should be able to have as many as wanted)
- Dogs are social animals and need company. More than two are justified only when there are pups.
- Most homes can only really accommodate 2 dogs need for space and attention. Perhaps a larger number based on a larger home.
- Multiple animal home must be controlled by owner. Kept clean and safe for human and animal health. Control over animal behaviour should be apparent.
- The majority self-limit, the few who don't are special circumstances. I have 5 small dogs, I am home most days so that they are not left in the yard on their own, I clean up my yard and have a cleaning service come in once a week as well, take them to the vet, have a large home...
- I do not believe that numbers matter in this case. Care of the animals including training and husbandry and impact on neighbours are the keys here. If the home provides enough space for the number of animals and the care required and neighbours are not impacted by constant barking or damage
- I would think any number would be appropriate depending on the owner's ability to responsibly care for their dogs, walk them all regularly or separately as needed, pay for their vet bills, etc. For most Calgarians, this would be a maximum of 3. Puppy mills should be banned and enforced.
- Any more than 3 is hard to control, meaning the owner is not in full control of their pets at all times
- People should be able to have as many animals as they can reasonably care for.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- This is a number which the owner can reasonably manage.
- It completely depends on the size of the household and the owner's ability to care for the dogs.
- I don't think restrictions on the number of dogs is necessary. Someone with one poorly trained/contained dog can make far more trouble for the community than multiple well-behaved dogs. I think public education, and following up on complaints is a better way to monitor and control dog ownership
- A pet must be given very good care and exercise. Too many folks have been known to have more animals than they can take care of.
- Obviously it depends on size of house, size of dog, size of yard. Dogs are pack animals and, while they're fine on their own with humans, they thrive with other dogs. But common sense must play a part.
- Some people can't own or handle one dog. Others can easily handle 5 without issue. Not the government's job to tell somebody they can't own a lot of pets.
- 5 or more is just too many
- What's the house? What's the situation? I have no right to tell people what to do and if they have the space and inclination to keep 5+ dogs (say an acreage) that is their right.
- As long as a person is financially able to care for their dogs, and the animals are living with healthy, safe conditions and are not being nuisances to neighbours, there should be no limit.
- Too many dogs leads to unsanitary conditions, financial constraint, not enough proper time spent with each dog to ensure proper behavior training. Noise levels increase and the possibility of dangerous situations increase.
- This should not be dictated by the city.
- Dogs require a lot of attention, regular walks/exercise, proper health care and training. The more dogs you have, the more expensive all of these things are and the harder it is for an individual or family to make sure they are meeting all of these needs.
- If maintained and clean and healthy and fixed.
- as long as owners provide adequate care, enrichment, and are not bothering others, there should not be a limit
- i think depending on the size of the house and if a person is taking good care of their animals they shouldn't be punished
- Many Calgarians have a love for pets, and are involved in many sports, training, dog showing and it would be unfair to limit that choice and right. Can we limit the number of children people have?
- Proud pure bred dog fancier. Often have dogs being shown that I do not own, or puppies that will not live permanently with me. If they do not bother neighbours or cause a nuisance, are healthy and provided for, then it is nobody else's concern how many pets I own.
- Home/yard square footage and dog breed/size are important factors.
- Dogs need exercise. Two hands two dogs. Owners need to always be able to manage their dogs. Not respectful to neighbours to have a yard full of dogs next door. . . Regardless of size. multiple dogs do form a pack mentality... can be worrisome.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It depends on the owner. If you own a dog daycare or are a dog trainer then I have qualms about you owning as many dogs as you believe you can handle. If you are an average joe then I don't think it's reasonable that you have the attention to have more than 3 happy balanced dogs.
- It is my experience that the more dogs per household the less compliant the owner becomes with picking up after the dogs.
- Manageable for members of the household.
- A mature and responsible person should be capable of owning 2 dogs.
- too many dogs can bark too long and poop can accumulate in yard
- As a pro dog-walker/boarder, I know one can only have responsible control of a limited number of dogs. When you are picking up one poop, another is happening behind your back. If an aggressive dog runs into your group you cannot stop a fight. Some owners leave poop in their yards all winter!
- As a dog walker and trainer I believe that having more than 4 dogs in a home is unreasonable, more likely to be a nuisance to neighbours and unlikely that all animals would receive appropriate amounts of exercise and attention.
- I feel it is a matter of experience. Some people can easily handle owning 5+ dogs and some people can not adequately care for even one. 4 seems like a reasonable number for common pet owners, but there should be some exception made for responsible breeders who may have more than that.
- If the pets have adequate living space and are having their needs met or exceeded, there should be no problem.
- That way the dogs can have a companion, but not be too many to be a nuisance for neighbors etc
- Unfortunately my opinion is that it varies depending on household make-up and income. Responsible pet owners need to be able to afford upkeep (vet, food, groomers) and need to have enough time to give to their pets.
- Huge difference between 2 dogs in a 1000sq ft condo with neighbours on all sides vs a 3000 sq ft single family home with a large lot...
This is the issue... It should be Dog per sq ft... not just a cut and dry number.
- I think 4 is a reasonable number for people who have a few smaller dogs. Im not saying this is a limit!!!
- I feel strongly that you can be a responsible pet owner with multiple animals. People can have 1 dog and be a disrespectful pet owner "allow the dog to bark, have zero control over dog, allow cats to roam, not provide adequate care for animal"
- In the city, a household does not and cannot look after ie: clean-up after, control more than 2
- It should honestly depend on the owner. But maybe it should cost extra or have additional steps to have more than 3 dogs per household.
- As long as the animals are cared for and trained appropriately and the house is clean, the number should not matter.
- I think the more dogs in a household the less proper care and attention they get.
- Depends on a number of factors.
- Difficult to manage and train more than 2.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Give proper attention to each one.

More affordable.

- Anything beyond that cannot be properly controlled and cared for by owners.
- It really depends on the time the owner puts in. If the owner just leaves the dogs in the yard, one dog is too many. If the owner takes great care, walks the dogs etc. I can't see a reason for limiting the number
- Caring for dogs is expensive and requires a lot of responsibility. I believe that in order to own more than 3 dogs in one household, an individual must be able to provide proof of ability to maintain proper care for those animals (finances, yard space, sq ft. in-home, etc)
- Whatever someone can provide space and adequate care for. Some owners should have no more than 1 and some handle 5+ well.
- The more dogs in a household the more chance there is of noise complaints (one dog barks and sets off the others). Also, some people aren't very good at keeping waste picked up. The more dogs, the more smell.
- I would say 4 as it is maintainable (unless of course someone has a litter of pups that would be there for a short duration
- This depends on the individual. People who have dogs for breeding, competition, show, may exceed this number of animals while still providing adequate outlets and care. If you move to put a limit on the number there needs to be an exemption process for people who have multiple dogs for this purpose.
- I'd say 3 or 4...maybe 3 larger or 4 smaller...
- Depends on the home and the reason for all the animals and whether or not the owner/s have the capacity to care for this number of animals in a clean and healthy environment and that the animals are not neglected or suffering in any way
- barking, management
- beyond that within the city a home does not have the space to safely accommodate more than this and provide fair and proper care
- I know many bad owners that have one dog and I know many amazing owners that have 10 dogs. I don't believe limiting the number of dogs makes people better owners.
- Three is the outer limit of what most people can handle
- At 3 or more dogs there needs to be more than one owner to properly control the dogs and observe them. Also pack mentality is dangerous in off leash parks
- There is no reasonable number. I have seen terrible owners with dog and amazing owners with 8 dogs. The number of pets does NOT indicate how responsible you are.
- This should be left up to the dog owner themselves. Many people view their dogs as their children and have no intention of having human children. People are allowed to have as many kids as they want, should be the same with dogs as long as they are adhering to requirements and animals are healthy.
- More dogs often means more noise.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- While many individuals are able to understand the needs of multiple dogs, the average owner within the city does not have the physical space for the well-being of more than 2 dogs. As well there are behavioural issues that arise when several dogs live in one space that not everyone truly understands
- No restriction unless Canada agrees on a federal level. Municipalities have different household limits so it restricts people's abilities to move for jobs, family because it may result in pets being given up and that is not right. If you meet/exceed requirements for care taking it shouldn't matter.
- Dependent on type of dog and size, ability to follow the bylaw regarding caring for the animal appropriately
- a litter of puppies would go over this limit. For adult dogs 4 is more than enough
- I believe that any more than 3 dogs the owner has less control if walking them together. Also take into consideration noise and smell from the house/yard if the owner is not responsible.
- It depends on the property size. Perhaps there could be restrictions Or additional licensing placed on 4+ owners, but I wouldn't want to see hard limits, especially with foster and rescue situations
- I believe that is a fair number unless you are a breeder.
- Even two dogs being walked on the path is a nuisance. Two dogs and their owner(s) take up a lot of room. Sadly many dog owners think their dog has more rights than people. The rules that are already in place are too difficult for some. Go for a walk east of the Southland dog park and have a look
- I've seen more issues with an irresponsible owner of one dog than a responsible owner of ten. Rules should penalize issues, not numbers.
- Animals are social and should be able to have a "friend". To ensure appropriate care can be provided, to keep the community clean and to keep the community at an enjoyable noise level, two dogs should be the maximum per household.
- There is no one correct answer. A person may be incapable of caring for one dog while another person may be capable of caring for 10 dogs. This question lacks context.
- Situation specific. A bitch with 5 puppies might be very appropriate in a larger household. Same bitch with 5 puppies might be unhappy and too noisy in a tiny condo.
- the maintenance of the private property (picking up dog waste and managing urine issues) becomes overwhelming after 3 dogs. the smells and unsightliness can get out of control too easily
- Pet ownership creates excessiveness in the use of our resources. Why are we paying for "toys" coming from Asia for pets? The manufacture and transport of these super big pet stores is wasteful in my opinion. I question the food for these animals: why is good food used for pets when humans need it
- Depends on household. Size of property etc. Five pugs is different than five st.bernards. Should be dealt with on a complaint/neglect basis.
- As long as the dogs are not bothering anyone it isn't the city's business
- Its not about how many dogs you own its about how you properly care for the dogs. People can be negligent owners with one dog.
- More than 3 dogs would help limit the amount of feces that can accumulate on a property



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- We live in the city. Most people can care for and train 2 dogs. Once in awhile you can find a responsible pet owner of 3 dogs but it's not the norm
- Really depends of the size of the dog. Having an amount restriction is inane. Have how many per sq ft or based on size.
- Depends on the size of the dogs, size of the house and ability of owners to provide proper care.
- One is a companion for the other.
- This is quite a number of dogs but often there are dogs who need a home and people are willing to care for 3.
- It doesn't matter how many you have, it matters if you are taking good care of them. Also, a litter of puppies or kittens can't count.
- Depends on size of both dog and home.
- Depends on size of home, number of people living there that are able to manage the dogs (responsible-maybe older teen and up, able to arrange proper healthcare/training/exercise/picking up after), maybe no more than "responsible member + 1", so a lone adult could own 2 dogs for example.
- City 3-
Depends on lot size, noise and control of pets
- This totally depends on responsible ownership.
- Some dogs are bonded pairs, some dogs like having a friend or two.
- Depends on the size, breed and ability to control the animals
- It depends on the household, # of people in the home, #of other pets, responsibility of the owners,
- I don't feel a limit should be implemented as many I individuals have multiple dogs in their household and make sure they are well cared for exercised, trained and non disruptive to neighbours.
- Unless someone is specifically trained to breed, train, groom or otherwise care for dogs, more than two dogs leads to dogs that are poorly cared for.
- All dogs require and thrive on individual personal interactions with their owner(s). I can't imagine a situation where there are four or more dogs in one household where each dog would get the individual personal interactions needed.
- Most people don't have the time needed to properly train or care for one dog.
I think as you pass three - unless you're breeding or running a dog daycare and they're literally your business - it just becomes to much for a responsible owner.
- As long as their animals are being cared for properly and not neglected or abused, it's up to an individual to decide how many pets they have in their household.
- Not your business how many dogs someone has as long as they are being cared for.
- As long as people can feed and maintain and clean up after the pet then this shall not be an issue
- Dogs can be a lot of work, money time. They also need adequate space and enough attention/training.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There shouldn't be a limit - it's a question of whether the owner is responsible. You can have ten dogs live with a great owner and not even know they are there, versus have one bad owner with one dog that causes a lot of problems. Hoarding does not qualify as responsible pet ownership.
- "household" is a vague term. Also one must consider the size and requirements of the dogs and the capacity of the individual owners.
- I haven't given much thought to this question, but I know I wouldn't ever want more than 2 in my own house.
- I think 1 would be lonely - 2 is fair to the animal. More than 2 would be hard for most people to manage and you rarely see people walking more than 2 dogs. We know there are many households with more than 2 dogs so that means they do not get proper exercise and therefore proper care.
- I think a responsible owner can have multiple animals that are well cared for and trained and there should be no restrictions.
- There should not be a limit. Hoarders will find a way around the law, and limiting pet ownership only faults responsible owners/breeders
- I think the owner should be allowed to make that decision themselves ONCE they can support the animals by vets costs, neutering/spaying etc.
- 3 can be reasonable with proper management and dedication. More than 3 is not reasonable for most households. Too large of a pack.
- It really depends on how large the household is and how well the dogs are being cared for. If one dog is not being well cared for, then that may be too much for the household. Other people may have the time and resources to care for 5+ dogs in their household.
- If you are a RESPONSIBLE pet owner, that means you provide your animals with appropriate exercise and mental stimulation and you ensure they are not a bother to neighbours (excessive barking etc) There are sadly few truly responsible dog owners in Calgary. Most are very entitled.
- There should not be restrictions on the number of dogs, but harsh penalties and ownership bans for people who mistreat their animals, regardless of numbers.
- If the people can care for multiple animals including healthcare there should be no limit.
- AS LONG AS THEY ARE BEING TAKEN CARE OF PROBABLY AND NOT BOTHERING THE NEIGHBOURS. AS IT DOES NOT MATTER IF THERE IS 1 DOG OR MANY. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PET OWNER TO CARE AND LOOK AFTER THEM AND TO KEEP THEM UNDER CONTROL WHICH INCLUDES BARKING AT ALL HOURS.
- The reasonable number depends on the size of the house and household. No more than 2 dogs per adult.
- Some dog owners like to have a friend for their dog and so 2 dogs is appropriate. But there will be times where one dog is possibly aging or sick and so the family might want to bring on a third dog to help with the loss of the aging/sick dog. Or you have dogs merging from blended families.
- 1 or 2 is normal, 3 is a lot but also not weird, 4 starts to feel like a lot.
- There is no reasonable number. What is more important is are their needs taken care of (medical, physical, social, nutritional), and are they infringing on anyone else's rights or laws (barking etc).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I believe the limit should be subjective, based on financial viability, and potential for noise complaints (attaches homes, condos, apartments)
- I would have preferred zero as an option. I don't support keeping pets in urban environments.
- Any number as long as proper care is provided, there is adequate control of noise during quiet hours per noise bylaw and waste managed on a regular basis.
- It all depends on each individual case. Hoarding is not a good choice.
- Dogs are high maintenance and to properly own then requires time and effort. Too many makes this difficult.
- Absolutely dependent on whether the dogs are foster, rescue, etc. I am fine with having an individual limit on dog ownership, however some cases of high ownership are dogs unadoptable through normal methods, medical cases, fosters etc, which require living in multidog households.
- Size, breed and temperment are a big factor in this - the number is reflective only in the ability of the owner to control & keep them from being a nuisance to their neighbours.
- People have various needs and ability to care for pets. I don't want to see this restricted unnecessarily. I train dogs, compete in dog sports, buy dogs from responsible, ethical breeders that maintain the integrity of what a dog is. There are times when a person can reasonably have more than 5 dogs
- People should not be restricted from having as many dogs as they can provide excellent care to. This can vary by the household and so shouldn't be regulated by the government.
- I feel like more than this is a bit much, especially with the sizing of houses in Calgary. More than that, depending on the type of dog, could be too much to handle and control.
- the more the dogs, the less likely the owner will be able to control all in a public setting. At home, the amount of feces quickly accumulates with more dogs and quickly makes it unpleasant for neighbours.
- It depends on the house for size of the house, yard etc. An apartment vs a mansion, the size of the animal should be considered as well as the area in the home designated to the animal(s)
- Being able to properly exercise and care for more than 2 dogs is challenging, especially for those who have busy lives. It is unfair to the dogs themselves if their owner is unable to give them enough attention.
- The correct amount of dogs per household varies. Some people should not be permitted dogs and others could have a kennels worth of dogs. The amounts base on the size and breed of the dogs and how much training or experience the handler/owner has.
- As long as the animals are healthy and happy, it isn't the business of anyone.
- Most people can't seem to care for or train one dog it seems, so more would amplify the issue. Walking more than one dog seems to provide opportunity for hazard. I also think large dogs should not be kept in small apartments or condos.
- 3 is a lot, but as long as animal guardians can manage their animals and control their behaviour i'm ok with 3.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- One is usually good, two is OK too. More is harder to control though if they are well trained more is OK. Most people don't train well though. I don't think the LIMIT should be two, just a good number. The limit should be how many you can responsibly take care of.
- I would think four is plenty, Calgary yards aren't very large and houses are located close together. could be bothersome for close neighbors.
- Why would someone need more than 3 dogs. Not many people are responsible pet owners to begin with and the more dogs you have the more difficult it would be to care for them all properly
- I think it depends on how many people are in the household to care for these animals AND the property size. If its a family of 4 with teenage children living in a large home, they can easily care for 4 dogs at a rate of 1 per person. If its 4 dogs living in a small apartment with 1 person, no.
- More dogs generally equates to more noise. Any friends that live next to multiple dog households always complain about the noise.
- The number is irrelevant as long as they are being adequately cared for
- it all depends on the area of the house and the availability of back yard space.
- Depends on the household. Some people should have zero dogs, because they're terrible pet owners. Good owners can have as many as they can competently care for. Who cares?
- As long as dogs are properly cared for, including vet care, exercise, waste pickup, there should be no limit. Some people make care better for 5 dogs than others take care of one.
- As long as each dog is being cared for, fed, safely contained/controlled and socialized properly, there should not be a limit on dogs in a household.
- Generally, there are two adults per household, and discipline for two dogs can be handled by two adults.
- Bylaws shouldn't limit how much property a citizen owns. Currently bylaws and the Animal Protection act should be enforced to limit unreasonable amounts of animals
- More than 3 is unnecessary, and you probably can't care for them properly. Even growing up on a farm where dogs were work animals, we never had more than 4.
- One for each hand. Countless people with too many to handle on walks
- Any more than 2 starts to feel excessive and unnecessary.
- Number of dogs depends on size of the dog and the size of the home and yard
- Basing on average house size. Should be dependent on space available to ensure humane conditions.
- One dog is more than enough for most households.
- Company for each other
- Many people are well able to manage their multiple dogs. Many people cannot even manage 1 dog. It is not the dog number that is the problem rather it is irresponsible people who cause the problem. Don't blame the responsible dog owner
- Doesn't matter how many dogs its how responsible the owner is.
- This depends on dog size and whether or not the owner can afford to care for multiple dogs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I believe that a good dog owner could successfully run a household with up to four dogs; however there should be guidelines for dog behaviour. If someone had four poorly behaved dogs and get reported multiple times, they should receive a mandate to improve pet behaviour or have pets removed.
- More than two is difficult to manage and I would question how well the animals are being cared for.
- There are people who are irresponsible having one dog, yet many who have multiple dogs who are wonderful caregivers or foster parents. The number of dogs should not be restricted, punishing good, responsible owners who are honest about their animals is not the way to address the underlying issues.
- This is dependent on the type of dwelling. Most apartments should be maximum 2.
I would also say it depends on the family. 2 per adult seems reasonable.
- I think 4 is a lot of dogs personally, but manageable if you are really dedicated. It's really hard to walk 4 dogs alone, but could be managed with a partner
- Two is reasonable for a person to keep under control, pick up their feces, and can keep each other company.
- I think 4 is a reasonable number
- Owners of pets need to be able to properly take care of them. Though I feel 2 is reasonable, I guess it depends on the owner. We cannot say folks can only have 2 kids per family?
- 3 dogs permanently at a home would be the max, given barking, poop cleanup etc.
- I only have one dog currently but believe a person can handle 2 dogs. If there are more than 3 dogs, most people cannot properly monitor each dog and ensure it get the correct amount of exercise and mental stimulation.
- The existing by-law works if licensing is enforced. Putting a limit on numbers does not. Enforce the licensing and the numbers will take care of themselves
- If a household can properly care for the dogs and follow the bylaws then there should not be any restriction.
- Dogs need to be walked, and I don't believe that an individual can safely and responsibly walk more than two dogs at a time.
- unless you are a licensed dog breeder I do not see that you need more than two dogs. a male and a female. It is difficult to control more than two leashed dogs on a walk
- Dogs are social animals and do well in packs. I think 3 is reasonable for an average sized household.
- I don't think there should be a limitation on pets in a household. The limitation should be whether the pets are well taken care of (e.g. whether vet care provided for all animals), and that they don't constitute a nuisance or hazard.
- I think if you have the space, money, patients and ability to handle more than a few dogs at once, you should be able to take on As much as you feel is reasonable and not in anyway abusive, neglecting or hoarding behaviours
- Depends on the owner and what they are set up to handle.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- manageable number where you can still track of training an allot quality time
- Dogs require lots of work and attention. If an owner has too many dogs, they can't adequately provide for all mental and emotional needs. While every home is different in time and skill, I believe 5+ dogs are too many for one household, and a limit of three per person is reasonable.
- Some people love to have multi- dog homes but walking more than three dogs becomes too much for passing on the sidewalk safely. Dogs bark and more than three can be loud, even if they don't bark often, and people should live on an acreage if they need more dogs.
- Just a guess. Some companionship for pet.
- Depending on the amount of people living there four is manageable if they have enough property and enough time to devote to their care
- I think there should be consideration for environment dogs are in and breed. I know of a calgary breeder who has 6 Bernese Mountain Dogs, 1 Bloodhound and 7 cats in a duplex. However if an owner can provide all necessities, clean environment & lives in a larger property then more should be permitted
- Anything more and the welfare of the animals inside the house can be concerning
- My issue at dog parks is not with responsible pet owners, it is with people employed as "dog walkers" that often have 5 or more pets with them. When they have this many, it is difficult to keep them all accounted for and ensure that all feces is picked up.
- I think that if a person has more than 4 dogs they should have to prove they can adequately care for all dogs before being able to get any additional dogs. There are plenty of reasonable owners with lots of dogs, and irresponsible owners with one dog.
- Depends on the household and the person. In a big house with an owner who is good at handling dogs, have 10 great danes, what do I care?
- Depending on size and owner. More if smaller, less if bigger dogs. Owner must be in full control of multiple dogs
- Responsible pet owners can have a large number of well cared for animals. It's not about the number it's about the capacity of the owner, even 1 is too much for some people
- I have 3 already!
- Depends on the owners and their dogs. Some can have one done 5+.
- Pets require care and unless breeding, 2 dogs per person is a reasonable number to love and care for
- As long as the dogs are cared for there shouldn't be a limit
- Any number is fine if they are cared for, trained and well behaved.
- Over 2 makes me think of a pack. Also barking concerns.
- Unless you're a superstar dog trainer, 3 is reasonable to keep under control. Also, vet costs. You should only have the number of pets you can afford.
- As a dog owner I don't think city yards are big enough for more than 2 dogs. I also don't think people can properly take care of more than 2 dogs (daily walks, training, etc). The only exception should be SHORT TERM fostering situations, where 1 dog is fostered for no longer than 3 weeks.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depending on breed and size
- It depends on size of yard, experience with animals, level of care provided, including licensing, vet care, spay/neutered, etc
- I have marked three but there are many of my friends that have more than that and their dogs are very well cared for. I also know many that have ONE and the dogs are not mentally stimulated/exercised. So really it's not the "reasonable number" as it is properly exercising/mentally stimulating
- No need to restrict pet ownership as long as the owner is properly caring for their animals
- anymore than this and the animals will begin to display pack behaviour.
- It depends a lot on the individual owner. I know trainers that have many dogs and it's ok. I know some people that have a single dog and probably should have no dogs. This isn't black and white.
- The number is not important. Care and training of the dogs is more important
- There is a fine line between having a lot dogs and hoarding. However if someone is fostering and it is short term then having more than 4. Should be fine
- Basing this on average household size.
- Too much poop yards too much barking
- Kinda a one per adult idea.
- I see some people put in 8 dogs in the off leash park and then sit on there phone and do not keep track or clean up after their pets. 2 is plenty unless you can prove that you are more than capable of taking care or more. Example breeders or some trainers here (have 4 superdogs), but should be 2.
- We had three well trained dogs and they were no problem to anyone.
- Depends on the situation and level of care by the individual
- Animals are not property, a household must be able to at all times meet the needs of the animal. Both financially and socially.
- I don't like the idea of restricting the number of dogs per household, it discourages pet adoption for experienced and responsible owners.
- Everyone has their own limit to which they can be a responsible pet owner. For some, zero is too many. For others, the limit is excessively higher (10, 12, 15+). The onus should be on the dog owner to decide; with a supporting role from bi-law enforcement, managing the less-than responsible owner
- Depends on the situation. 5 Great Danes is not as reasonable as 5 chihuahuas.
- Maybe a better question is to ask how many kids in a family is reasonable. If the dogs are cared for, being trained and active, why should I care?
- It should depend on breed/size. I really couldn't care less if someone owned five pugs.
- I think 2 is manageable for someone to walk. More than that is hard to manage and hard to watch behaviour at off leash and be vigilant about picking up the dogs poo.
- This is difficult to answer, some people can manage many dogs and others can barely manage one
- I loved having 6 dogs when we rescued and I know some people with 10 dogs who are well cared for and responsible.. i love that Calgary doesnt have a limit even though I only have 3 now.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs need exercise and more than 2 becomes a chore for a lot of people so they leave them in the yard to bark and annoy neighbors.
- That is not a simple question. Depends on the size and the behaviour of the animals. Some large animals can be wonderful house pets and some small dogs horrible. Breeders do have more animals as the puppies come and go. Must be healthy and safe.
- I personally don't feel like there should be a rule on how many dogs to a household. HOWEVER, if a household has more than 3 dogs they need to be able to provide proof that all dogs are taken care of properly, up to date on shots, fixed, and all dogs are well behaved; or are in training.
- I would worry that with more than three it would be hard to provide all the mental and physical stimulation the dogs need and deserve.
- Three is enough and more will certainly shift to pack mentality
- Hard to make a restriction... some folks do great with 6 Yorkies but not so great with 2 Great Danes. I'd probably cap it at 6 to discourage puppy mills.
- I have 4 dogs
- In the city I do not think there is sufficient space in a residential space for more than 3 dogs. There are too many people that have more than that and they are not properly cared for and yards are not properly maintained therefore causing odors in the neighborhood
- 2 seems like a good manageable number of dogs.
- I think it depends on the number of people, the yard space, and the size of the house.
- Responsible pet owners can manage multiple dogs. Dogs are pack animals and limiting never works to address hoarding issues. Focus on mental health to prevent hoarding.
- I think it is entirely on a case by case basis. Someone with a large house with lots of land can accommodate as many animals as healthy.
- The dogs can keep each other company and one person can handle two well trained dogs. Also, more dogs could work depending on size and training level.
- More than 2 is too hard to keep under control.
- Depends on number of people to care for and train dogs, expertise and time available.
- Depends on how responsible the owner is.
- Depends on house size, size of dogs.
- It depends on the owner and as well the goodness of fit of the owner and dog breed. Many people pick the wrong breed for their lifestyle. If it's a good fit, three or four dogs isn't an issue.
- If all dogs are cared for, under control and not negatively affecting the neighbours, number of dogs should not be limited
- Depends on the household and the living conditions of the animals. If space permits, multiple dogs is fine
- Dont need an army.
- The city should not dictate what is a reasonable number. 1 dog can be as disruptive as 10. Proper care is the most important thing.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends on the household and the dogs. A big house could have more but a one bedroom condo can't have a lot. There's no one answer to that question.
- It's hard to say as some homes are big enough for 1 and others for 5.
- Allows for owners to give proper attention to each dog.
- It makes no difference to me.
Be a responsible owner
- Two dogs are enough for any family. If they want more they should have to fill out an application and pay an extra fee.
- No one needs more than two
- I believe this number is the maximum that you can have while being able to provide a clean, healthy environment with appropriate medical care for each dog
- as long as they are well cared for, and happy, and relatively well behaved, i don't see why its anyone elses business. people can have as many kids as they want or can reasonably take care of. why is this any different?
- I have 3 well behaved dogs that interact well with others .
- Exception should be only for registered breeders and or fosters for dog rescues
- Depends. For breeders needs to be some allowance for more.
- With houses being so close together and yards so small there is no need for more than one.
- Dogs require their owners to have enough time to give them individual enrichment (i.e walks), and the financial means to provide veterinary care to all of them. Depending on how may people are in the house, more than this is cost and time prohibitive.
- Related to physical house size and number of people per household.
- 1-3 allows for the owner to have control. Anymore and it feels as though an owner would not be able to control be dogs when necessary.
- Fewer dogs are more likely to have all their needs met just for economical reasons. One is not always the best or healthiest choice for the animal(s). Most do better with a canine companion and that brings the bonus of two dogs having been homed with it.
- A household should be able to focus full attention on each dog. If they are not, they should not have so many dogs. 3 is a reasonable number but the real number depends on the willingness of the owner to focus their attention on the dogs as individuals.
- Too many and people won't be able to keep track of their care. Good to have more than one so the dog can have a companion and be better socialized.
- Given the average nuclear family (4.5 people) it seems reasonable that each person should be responsible enough to care for an animal. Families like this would bond with their animals and each other, thus strengthening their ties as a family unit.
- Regulating household pets numbers does not inhibit hoarding tendencies.
People who neglect or abuse animals will do it regardless of numbers and some of the best pet owners I know have multiple pet homes.
- If the owner is responsible it would not matter how many. I'd say 6 to 7 limit.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 2 large size dogs, maybe 3 if smaller. Two large dogs is even a lot for some breeds. When on a walk must be able to control them. I know with a strong breed one could take off and be stronger than owner, let alone several more. Also consider dogs wellbeing. People with too many cannot afford that.
- Any amount given it's not disturbing other property owners, and the animals in question are not at risk.
- As a dog care professional, I know it takes a lot of work to be able to control and maintain control of more than 2 dogs. Without them becoming their own pack.
- It's usually one person taking the dog out for a walk and they only have two hands.
- Depending on what a household is considered, if you have reasonable space, and are respectful to community members, neighbours, and not neglecting your dogs, 5 dogs is reasonable to me
- manageable for owners
- As I said earlier it should not be based on the number of animals it should be based on the owner. You start restricting then people will still have the pets but then won't licence them. I have 6 and my dogs live better than most humans but there are people with one that abuse and neglect
- I believe there are way too many dogs in the city. 1 is enough especially for people who reside in apartments condos or any type of condensed housing. 2 is acceptable for properties with private yards. We are in the city not on farms. Apt dwellers are putting puppy pads on balconies, it's disgusting.
- People buy dogs, then hire walkers and doggy day care because it is a status symbol rather than a family member.
- The larger the pack, the more likely that a disease will spread. Within an urban environment, there is no reason to have multiple dogs, assuming that they are not true working dogs, but rather they are companions. Four dogs reflects the avg space that could be offered to comfortably keep the dogs.
- I believe a household with more than 2 dogs might not be able to provide sufficient individual attention and mental stimulation required to give them the best life.
- As long as there are no issues created, people should be free to live as they choose. There should be a limit, but the limit should be one which maintains a healthy home environment in general. I would suggest it land somewhere around 8.
- For dogs over 50 lbs, only 4 dogs per household. Under 50 lbs = 6 dogs allowed. Any mix of small and large dogs = 5 dogs. Breeders are exceptions but they should be limited in the city to 6 large or 8 small dogs and require a business license.
- However many the owner can take care of responsibly. Must be able to feed and provide health care.
- Especially if they're big dogs, more than that's just impossible to actually control.
- Depends on the size of dog and the size of household. Six pekingese shitzus are not the same as six border collies.
- It really depends. Some people can handle multiple dogs and will take the time to train them, while others cannot handle even one dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- most people complain about vet bills and proper training fees. Some people don't think their dog is important enough for such bills. Which is not in the interest of the dog. The more dogs the higher the bills and their training and health will be neglected. Less animals can be less stress.
- One or Two is my choice. They can keep each other company if there are two.
- 1 per adult
- 2, except when breeding (1yr leeway for young dogs)
- I've only ever had one dog at a time, but in my honest opinion more than three dogs has potential to be more than many people can handle.
- It totally depends on the household. I don't think this should be regulated.
- I think if you have the room, and are walking them, and keeping your yard clean, you should be allowed, as pets need company too! I wouldn't even put a restriction, if it wasn't for the noise, and smell. It is sad that some people start hoarding animals, so restrictions are necessary.
- It really depends on the size of the household. As long as all of the pets are well cared for and spayed/neutered, I see no problem. However, I am opposed to backyard breeding due to ethical concerns.
- As long as the dogs are properly exercised, fed, and loved, you should be able to have four. This allows for each dog to have a companion
- Really depends on how big your place is and how big the dog is. And your mental health. And if your fostering or rescuing.
- There are plenty of dogs in shelters. Having an increase in number allows people who are willing to adopt more decrease the amount of dogs in shelters.
- Hard to control more than that, esp walking. Also, barking and behaviour.
- My neighbour has 8 and all I hear is them barking and her yelling. More than two animals and you can't afford pet food or vet care. Neglect happens.
- Hoarding situations are sad and difficult, but I believe they are also somewhat rare. I don't think there should be any household restrictions because I believe people are capable of properly caring for several animals at any one time. Such is the case in fostering situations with local rescues.
- Maybe one or two per person?
- beyond 4 and you should consider running a kennel
- how about the combined weight of all the dogs should not be more than the weight of the owner. not joking about this one. think about; it makes sense.
- Dogs are a lot of work and can do a lot of damage. While there are many good dog owners there are just as many if not more bad ones. Don't see the need for more than one.
- One dog can be a meaningful loving and loved member of the family. More than one means the owner(s) generally can't monitor their dogs outdoors properly and they run rampant - humping other dogs, biting and harassing my kids. It should be legal to shoot these kind of dogs.
- Difficult to take good care of many dogs and to have a good handle on their behaviour. Although this number is flexible - more responsible owners could have more if they show obedience school training.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It depends on the breed and the household, if dogs are well behaved and the owner is responsible why should there be a maximum, we don't tell people they can only have x number of children
- Walking more than two dogs is awkward and potentially dangerous. Also, health care is expensive and few people can afford to care for a lot of dogs properly.
- 4 dogs are enough to keep under control
- This would be maximum! I have 2 very senior dogs who will not be with us much longer. I have opportunity to adopt new pup. I won't, but I could see this as a case for 3rd dog in someone's home, or when family volunteers as foster for homeless pets.
- Seems a reasonable number.
- Having multiple dogs can be a gratifying household, however, in my opinion >3 would be hard to continue to be a responsible owner. I also think there should be exceptions to allow more dogs for breeders.
- I feel like I am a responsible pet owner with one dog, and I can't imagine how difficult it would be to take care of more than two, REGARDLESS of size.
- There is a large variance in the size and ease of handling for dogs; it is difficult to write one law that covers all cases.
- If people want more, move to an acreage.
- Most people have on average 2 dogs. Having 3 allowed in a house accommodate fostering of dogs which helps Calgary's shelter system pressures. When you get over 3 dogs, then there is the question of illegal backyard breeding and puppy milling.
- I believe if anyone would like to have more than two dogs in the city then they should have to apply. The type of dog and the size of yard should be considered.
- I really don't know. Whatever would be respectful to your surrounding neighbors, and if the animals are taken care of properly.
- Calgarians who choose to foster dogs or breed dogs need to be accommodated.
- this depends on the size of dog but generally for a mid sized dog, unless you are diligent, folks just toss the animal out back and the neighbour is stuck listening to the constant barking, the mess and over all disruption of poorly maintained dogs and property.
- depends on the size of the breed how much room the household has outside space etc.
- +4 dogs generally develop a "pack" mentality. Regardless of training, this will lead to excessive barking, guarding, etc.
- The number of dogs one person can monitor and handle on their own (on leash). Or two dogs per adult.
- Ownership includes proper health, training, feeding, clean-up and companionship to foster a great relationship with your animals...more than two dogs may put a strain on your ability to enjoy your pets.
- It depends on the household, the size of the dogs, how they are cared for...
- You can not possibly monitor any more than 3 dogs at a time whether at the off leash area or on leash.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- One per human; varies on household size.
- Dogs are pack animals so they like company. But no single human should care for more than two dogs at a time. They deserve the love and attention of their owners, it's hard to control more than two dogs when out on or off leash, and a bigger pack means more barking and noise for neighbours.
- Doesn't matter how many dogs as long as they're walked, well exercised, fed and loved
- Often 2 adults in a household, pets often like a pet companion.
- 3 dogs is enough responsibility for one owner.
- - as an owner of a 76 pound Lab cross, I find one dog more than enough for the household; however, I recognize others have their own opinions. That said, I definitely feel there should be a hard upper number of allowed pets in a household to try and minimize the occurrence of huge numbers of pets
- Noise- barking, owners not picking up after dog in own backyard is not enforceable but accumulates and smells
- This 100% depends on so many different factors. There shouldn't be a limit. I know irresponsible people who have one dog and shouldn't and I know someone with five and they have the best life ever. No. As long as they are licensed, there shouldn't be a limit.
- Noise levels increase with the number of dogs someone has and often one dog will get the rest excited and barking. Waste levels also go up and people aren't the best at cleaning up after their dogs as it is.
- I believe 2 or 3 dogs is reasonable as long as they are taken care of properly and get along with each other because they have each other to play with and interact with therefore making them easier to get along with other dogs.
- Same number of dogs per adults in the household to keep control
- You need to be able to control, recall, keep an eye on, and clean up after your dogs. More than 2 becomes hard for 1 person to manage. Also more than 2 dogs creates a pack mentality that can become an issue
- Depends on how responsible an owner is
- People that live in the City need to considerate of others especially neighbors. Most people do not know how to properly train their dogs therefore barking and other issues arise. People tend to get lazy with their pets as they get older.
- I would base this mainly on the basis that unless they are small dogs it is borderline unethical to have more than 3 dogs in Calgary's small housing/small lot sizes.
- That's about all the poop I would want to scoop!
- It's not really about a number but rather the level of care that's needed to take care of them.
- It depends on the dogs' behaviours. I have neighbours with only 1 dog in their household who make a lot more noise than households with multiple dogs.
- Max number of dogs per area, not household. Higher density areas would have way too many dogs if each household were to have multiple dogs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I feel that 5 should be the maximum. Dogs are a huge amount of work and I don't believe that anyone who has more than 6 dogs is able to provide adequate care. I do know several people with 5 or less dogs who provide outstanding care.
- It depends on the household, care given, the amount of space they have (you would not want 2 dogs in a condo for example as there is no space)
- Any number more than 2 means they don't get the proper attention and care. It's also poor environmental choice
- I think it is hard to have a firm number - as long as dogs are receiving sufficient physical and emotional care, and have sufficient space, then people can have as many dogs as they like.
- More than 2 risks noise, smell impact for others
- Personally I have 2 dogs and I guess it really depends on what size the dogs are and what size your home is. I know a lot of folks with more than one dog and they are extremely responsible and have a very fine household
- It is expensive to care for more animals through their whole life. Little or large more animals become harder to control and monitor.
- Between 1-3. 3 is a lot to handle. Over 3 and you start losing focus on your dogs which means less training, less attention, more dogs running away etc.
- It depends on the person and the dogs and where they are. I don't want to limit someone without knowing the situation.
- However many dogs the owner can take proper care of.
- The number depends not on the house hold but on the available space. Having 5 dogs in an apartment doesn't make sense, but in a single detached home with a large yard no issue. As long as the dogs are under control and not a disturbance why have a numerical limit?
- I would say 1 if dogs didn't enjoy companions so much.
- It's good for dogs to have other dogs in a household, but if there are more than a few, it can be difficult for the owner to ensure their yard is kept clean, dogs are controlled and to ensure barking isn't an issue for neighbours.
- It is not the number of dogs that a household may have but the owners that cause neglect. Someone with only 1 dog can have a disruptive or neglected animal where as someone with 4 or 5 can have healthy, happy and friendly animals.
- It completely depends on the sizes, temperaments, and behaviour of the individual dogs, as well as how much physical space is available in the household, as well as the owners' ability to provide adequately for their husbandry, medical needs, mental enrichment needs, and physical exercise needs.
- The reasonable number of dogs is the reasonable number that can be appropriately cared for in a home environment. If the home owner has the funds and time to see the animals properly fed, housed, vetted and socialized.
- Personal choice
- 3 adult dogs unless they are puppies of a registered breeder - This allows owner to plan for having a mix of dogs ages, on young dog, on middle age, one elderly dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Size of lot and size of dogs is a factor but if someone has a lot of time to give their dogs this changes my opinion. If someone has the time, \$ and space for more dogs they may be a better more responsible owner than a person that only has 1 dog and doesn't properly care for it
- The amount of dogs depends on the size of the household (how many people in the house), the type of household (apartment vs large property), size of dog. I have had three dogs in the past, and dogsit 5 at once, and 3 was the maximum manageable amount for one person.
- Any more than one and they start barking at each other.
- Excellent and responsible dog owners should be allowed to have 5 (or more) dogs. I see no issue if they are altered, healthy, licensed and looked after.
- City shouldn't be limited citizens on what they do on their own property if there aren't societal impacts. 10 small dogs on a large property that don't bark should be allowed. 1 dog that causes issues shouldn't be allowed.
- Potential for barking and poop control is better with limited numbers. I lived beside an owner who did not pick up poop from ONE small dog in his backyard and the odour was considerable.
- I'm a very responsible pet owner and couldn't imagine the chaos of owning more than 4.
- depends on the size of the animal, the size of the house and the size of the backyard and the care provided by the owner/s
- More than 4 dogs results in a nuisance level regarding noise for other citizens, and it's imperative that the city curtail hoarding behaviours of some owners for the safety and welfare of the animals.
- 1 dog ideally is best for most households. More than 1 dog things become challenging to walk the dog properly ensure barking is kept to a limit. Dogs are pack animals so more than 1 then things can get out of control, behaviour escalates
- This is not an appropriate question. I think there shouldn't be a limit, but people should have a special license or people who have more than 4 animals. The license will need to ensure animal welfare and monitor for backyard breeders and puppy mills.
- Zero was not given an option here.
- For urban areas, too many dogs are bothersome to those around them if they are not well behaved. Cost to keep too many dogs and train them is high.
- Please explain to me why I need to explain my choice.
- I chose two but it really depends on the person and the type of house they have. My vet has 21 pets and is able to provide them with proper care and attention. I have one dog and am able to provide her with proper care and attention, but one is enough for me.
- Anything more than this is getting excessive, especially if they're big dogs as having adequate space for them to go outside/play is hard when there are so many, as well as waste disposal.
- There is a point where taking care of animals is off set by the individual amount of animals
- Dogs are like toddlers. Having 3 kids between the age of 1 and 4 keeps you very busy.
- The number of dogs depends on the size of the house and yard. Two dogs may keep each other company.
- If you need another for your existing dog ie to transition ok but beyond that it seems like a lot to me



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- As long as they are well-cared for and well-behaved I don't care how many dogs you have, but I'm hard pressed to believe that one household can give more than 3 dogs the exercise they need. But if you can, go for it. Get all the dogs!
- If you have ability to care and you know what to do to care for those dogs you should be able to have more plus it would allow for the ability to foster dogs that need foster parents before permanent family is found for the dogs
- Dogs can develop out of control pack behaviour.
- In order to handle the workload from owning a dog.
- Live next to a home with 4 to 5 dogs at any given time. Four adult owners cannot control what has turned into a 'pack' of dogs.
- Dogs become very stressed and noisy when they're cramped. Also it produces a lot of waste for others to smell.
- One dog per 18+ person in the household (responsible handling)
- Dogs like companionship - but anymore than 2 is a kennel, not a home.
- Dogs left alone all day may do better with a companion. More than 2 dogs and I believe people have difficulty keeping them under control out walking.
- Generally speaking 3 should be a max but this is dependent on breed, house/yard size, pet behaviour or if the owner is in a special circumstance which allows them to have more ie a professional dog trainer.
- It depends on the household
- It depends on the size of the household and economic status. There is no one size fits all number of animals that should be allowed. If you have the space and means to keep many dogs, it should be your choice.
- they are always hanging around outside on other peoples property
- We like to see dogs rescued and so sometimes having more than one or two dogs is reasonable. To have too many can encourage more barking and smells from poo and pee harder to maintain. Even three is pushing it.
- There needs to be a limit on the number of animals permitted in each household. Too often do people have excessive numbers of animals (e.g., 30+ dogs) and the welfare of those suffers. We need a limit on the number of animals for their safety. This will also help identify hoarders.
- A reasonable number of dogs would be 1 per adult in the household, as they need to be able to walk the dog on a daily basis and have the time and resources to give the animal the attention they require.
- We do not live in a nanny state. If an owner can responsibly care for multiple dogs, it should be their prerogative. If they fail to responsibly care for multiple dogs, the penalties should be significant including the potential seizure of the animals.
- Two dogs are companions to each other. There is less barking then when there is only one dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It is hard to set an absolute limit, as it depends on the size of household, amount of time the household has to care for the dogs, etc. However, it is possible for people to be responsible owners of several dogs.
- 4 seems excessive for the average home, especially if they are large. Imagine if they were all barking outdoors at once
- Not a fan of urban dog ownership. People don't have the time to adequately care for more than one. I find most owners in my area simply let their dog out in their yard as opposed to exercising them. As a result dogs in my area are always barking at each other all hours of the day.
- Depends on the dog breed, number of responsible members of household.
- More than 3 requires a lot of cleaning, walking and vet care. More than that will likely cause issues with health and cleanliness. That said, that is a notion, and not based on research. What does the research say in terms of impact on dog or human or public health? That is the real concern.
- I can't really answer this as it varies so much. My husband and I (no kids) have three dogs. We are very much able to keep them happy, vetted, etc. If we were a blended family with inlaws/kids living with us, I feel that more dogs wouldn't necessarily be obscene.
- It really depends on size, space and breed. I've never had more than 3 at any given time and found that a reasonable number to care for and walk safely.
- Large dogs - 2 per household; this is a number that might conceivably be under control by one person when on leash. Small dogs - 3, for the same reason. Also dependent on owner's financial ability to maintain them properly, e.g. provide food, sanitation and regular and incidental vet care.
- This is three dogs licensed to a single home. The more dogs in a home, the more the dogs seem to bark. Also, I think that our lot sizes really cannot handle more than three dogs.
- Unless specific cases where support animals are needed I don't think it is reasonable expected that a family can care for more than 3 dogs at once.
- A single, competent adult should be able to adequately care for up to 3 well trained dogs at any given time.
- Many foster dogs, or breed puppies, or take in older dogs from shelters. As long as they have the proper room go for it.
- It depends upon the size of the house/yard, and the size of the dogs. Two Great Danes take up more space and resources (and require more space for a healthy life) than three Basset Hounds.
- Should be none of the city's business unless there is a care issue.
- It depends on how many adults are in the family, in a household with one adult, 3 dogs is more than enough. However, 2 or more adults are responsible for the animals, it's ok to have 5 or more dogs. It also depends on the size of the dog and the family income.
- don't judge everyone the same. Some people own 1 dog, others more. Everyone different. Dogs are fed, taken care of, vaccination/rabies, see vet when sick, no restriction. Start restricting #s, you will be creating a huge problem you will have to deal with. people will dump, you will be culprit
- That is hard to say....small dogs vs large dogs, attention of owners to exercise, ability to properly feed, ability to keep property clean etc.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- You only have 2 hands, one hand for one leash. Dogs do well in pairs.
- It's none of your business how many dogs I have
- we do not need near-packs in households with noise and sanitation problems.
- Any more than 3 would just be pure chaos. Your neighbours start to hate you for the amount of noise and dog poop in your yard (especially in the spring)
- I have 3 large dogs, 2 of them are working dogs and getting older. It was out Vet's advice to introduce a puppy to help with playing and exercise for the 2 older ones. If you can afford your pets food, shelter & welfare, keep them trained (friendly) & respect noise bylaws there should be no problem
- Space, reasonably manageable by 1 or more people, quality of care that is able to be provided, reduced improper breeding
- I have had three dogs at one time and that really is all one person can handle. Even if there is more than one person in the household, there may be a time when only one person is looking after all of the dogs.
- This does not apply to responsible/registered breeders
- My preference is one dog per household, but realize that some dogs do better with a companion and that owners might have an old dog and want to bring in a younger dog. I also wonder if breeders need a permit to operate in the city.
- you can easily walk 2 dogs on your own or with family members. They are a pack animal so 2 is good. At most 3 if they are smaller dogs I guess
- More can cause lapse in training from owners
- I don't think one blanket number can be applied because dogs and households vary in size
- I believe much more than that they are harder to keep and eye out to make sure they are behaving and not causing problem at off leash parks . Cheaper also for vet bills, food and licensing.
- not too many, but not too few.
- I have not selected any number because I think there are too many factors involved here. I think the biggest factor is how many dogs an owner can handle/support in a way that is fair to the dogs. For some people this would be zero, for others it may be 4.
- Overcrowding stresses animals. The ability to manage health, waste, noise, odour and debris decreases as number of animals increases.
- It obviously depends on how large the home is but in a regular single family home I think 3 dogs is the max someone should have to ensure that the dogs are comfortable in the home and that they do not feel threatened or that they wont have enough food or love and attention.
- Manageable
- Unless they're well trained, more than 4 dogs tend to get out of hand
- It depends on the size of the dogs, behaviour, size of the house and capabilities of the owner. Generally, I think most detached houses in Calgary can provide a yard and adequate space for 3 dogs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends on size of the dog(s) Is the owner capable of caring properly for the animals? Do they bark and is it a nuisance to neighbours?
- One dog per person in the household, plus one dog (e.g. 3 people means 4 dogs). This is to ensure that the people can provide the care and attention required for the animal.
- No more than 2 per adult.
- 2 will at least keep themselves company whilst owners are absent.
- It is reasonably easy to be in control of, and care for 3 dogs if alone, if others in the household I believe more would be acceptable as well. (other considerations as well as size of house/yard, availability of owner etc
- This is an individual choice. The City of Calgary does not get to decide this. It is the pet owner's responsibility to meet their animal's needs.
- I have 1 and have had 2. Two is a lot of work 3 I think is too much work and corners will be cut re following the rules
- Concern with animal safety after 2, as well as nuisances to neighbors
- It should be the number that can be exercised, given attention and love, and controlled by the owner(s). That can vary by household, but 2 seems like a good number. More could be handled by someone who is devoted to that goal, but that's a lifestyle choice, rather than something for everyone.
- It depends on the owner. There are currently laws that address hoarding. No need to increase municipal red tape. The city would be better off simply better enforcing current bylaws.
- But I also don't believe that I have the right to decide how many dogs people should own. If they are happy and well taken care of then it's none of my business
- I believe that 2 is reasonable and allows an owner to provide companionship for their dogs. However in some instances 4 might also be reasonable for someone with a lot of space and proper dog setup.
- I think it depends BIG time on the size and breed and Owner and their knowledge of their dog and the breed's needs.
- we have 4 , 3 are tiny and one is medium size. If you can afford to feed, water, vet visit 1/year per, medicate and license, maintain your yard space from poop I feel you can only provide a love and affection and everything fore mentioned to 4 in a 3 person house.
- Most of my neighbours don't walk their dogs, they just leave them in the back yard. They don't have the time or attention to care for more than 2 dogs.
- Unless you have a large yard two dogs is definitely a limit so many dogs living in apartments locked up all day annoying other people also dogs have taken over population of children ridiculous
- It might also depend on dog size, yard size too.
- I feel that one household should not have more than ten dogs
- This should really depend on square footage of home and yard space. 4 huskies in an apartment is animal cruelty.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I say 2 dogs if the house is in the city or suburbs. Calgary lots are not very big and you get neighbours with more than 2 dogs and the barking can be deafening. I also find dog owners don't pick up their dog's waste in the winter so come spring, the smell can be quite unbearable.
- I would have said 1, but I believe some dogs are happier and behave better with a companion.
- Depending on property size.
- Assuming 2 adults in the home - 2 adults could walk 2 dogs each. Otherwise limit of 3.
- The dogs should have companionship as well, so it should be more than one. Owner can only control so many animals at once - if an average adult can handle 3 kids, 3 dogs is about right. So there should be at least 2, and due to life expectancies, 3 allows for transitions so that dogs are not alone
- There shouldn't be a set number. It'll depend on type of housing and the experience of the owner. Condo vs acreage. Experienced handler/trainee vs first time owner
- i don't think one person wan walk more than 2 dogs, so having more than 4 in a normal household is too many.
- I believe that is up to the owner to a degree, provided the animals are cared for appropriatley
- Smells, waste, on grounds aurrounding houses. Noise, barking and disturbance in nights and afternoons.
- Dogs need attention from their owners ... becomes more difficult beyond one ...
- depends on size of home, care provided etc. you can have a great dane in an apartment if you walk them lots and provide good care. some people have one pet and are terrible owners others have 10 and no one could know.
- Any more is detrimental to the dogs and starts to create a pack effect
- I don't think a hard limit is the right way to approach the issue. For some owners, 2 animals would be too many; others could responsibly take care of a much larger number. Only in individual cases of irresponsibility should a limit be imposed.
- This is completely subjective (can the dogs handle the space they are in, some big dogs do better in small spaces e.g.having 3 great Danes in a 2br appt might actually be okay), and the owner's ability to manage (are they a certified trainer? Do they genuinely like animals? are they able to monitor)
- Only very experienced dog owners with expertise in dog training can safely and effectively train and care for more than 3 dogs in a household.
- Dogs are pack animals, they should always have a companion. Sometimes if one is elderly and sickly you need a new companion starting out for when the senior pack member passes away.
- Two dogs can provide companionship for each other when owner is away for short periods.
- Dogs make a lot of mess and many owners don't pick up after their dogs. Dog pee and poo is a major pollutant. Do your research. Other cities who have restrictions on # of dogs have way less pollution and nuisance problems. We could spend less of our tax dollars just catering to dog owners.
- I think that it benefits both animals and humans when there are a limited amount of pets in the household.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A dog per adult in the household. My household has two adults.
- You only have 2 hands, so the maximum # of dogs you can pet at a time is two.
- More than three dogs can more easily result in dogfights at the house when two dogs are playing and another interrupts this. Even well trained dogs can get into fights, and it becomes difficult to manage more than two dogs at once in the event one is injured.
- Two dogs are the most that can be properly controlled by one adult person.
- As someone who participates in dog sports I do not feel having more animals is unreasonable. I know many highly competitive dog owners who can care for 10+ animals to a higher level than some individuals with only one animal.
- Prevents hoarding
- A large house with a large yard and responsible owners could certainly handle more than 5 dogs, depending on size and breed. It is the quality of the owners more than the quantity of dogs.
- Depending on the amount of space a person has, as long as all dogs are well cared for and the person is able to provide a safe environment I don't see an issue.
- Individuals should decide what a reasonable number of dogs is, not the city. All dogs should be raised responsibly.
- the number of dogs a person can manage is dependent on the home, yards, dog size/breed, home owner work. the number is not as important as requiring the dog receiving proper care.
- who am i to limit what a person can resonantly keep? i don't know their capacities.
- Not sure, it depends on how many people are in a home to care for them. Over 5 may be getting to be a bit much
- Shared accommodation when can be a problem with the current limit aswell as fostering, I have 2 dogs and when I want to foster I have to have mine removed to make room, maybe a foster licenses that allow for more than the limit for short times.
- Hard to look after too many dogs. Smaller dogs maybe can have more but all should be neutered so as not to cause issues and unintentional breeding.
- It's none of my business nor anyone else's.
- If the household has the room for them dogs are good in packs. As long as they are well behaved, follow the bylaws and aren't extremely noisy this shouldn't be a concern
- Barking, running loose. Annoying neighbours
- Average three - depend s on the size of dog and size of property
- depends on the size of yard and house.
- Three is a family. More than 3 is a pack. Personally I only ever want one, but i can see that a larger family with a big house could accommodate more
- I think 4 dogs should be the max for pet households as it allows them to care for and maintain healthy dogs within a reasonable amount. I believe if you want more you should have to obtain a licence from the city to do so, including breeders as sometimes puppies stay with them over the age of 3 mont
- - Beyond 3 dogs it becomes difficult to monitor dogs welfare, as well as control nuisance issues



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- behavior deteriorates with more animals in house
- Assuming it's a family of 3. You should never let the pet outnumber the people in the household. In a worse case scenario (i.e dog fighting, fire, etc), each person can grab one.
- If they are cared for properly and don't bother anyone, the number is not an issue.
- More than 3 is too many to manage and can involve a lot of barking
- 2 large dogs, may have more small dogs. Loud barking that can be heard by neighbours.
- It really depends on the family, number of people, house size and then dog breeds, their sex and age. I think this is very personal and the city should not interfere. Provided the dogs and adults have an agreeable life the city should not interfere.
- I dogsat 4 dogs once, and it was mayhem. More than that would be a literal nightmare, and I'm certain the dogs would behave terribly.
- The number should vary based on the size of the home. Apartments/condos should be limited to two to keep noise and smell down. Homes with more space should be able to have more. Really it comes down to responsible ownership.
- I don't have dogs, but this seems a reasonable and manageable amount.
- This depends on the household....how big it is...how big is the yard and if they are properly taken care of and given relief from bad weather.
- It really depends on how well cared for and trained the dogs are. Hard to put a number on this. One household could have five well behaved dogs, another could have one unruly dog. Depends on the dogs and owners.
- Properly caring for an animal is a lot of work and expense I would question how well a large group would be cared for.
- I know of a lady in Dover that has approximately 10 chihuahua's and 4 or 5 Aussie's. She only has a few licenses that she switches between certain dogs, not all dogs get walks. (She used to have 12 cats as they passed away they have been replaced by the Chihuahuas brought in from the U.S.
- more than two dogs are hard to properly control and monitor
- Whatever the owner is comfortable and safe managing. Circumstances vary a great deal. Personally I would not have more than 3.
- I don't see a need for a limit as long as all dogs are properly and humanely cared for
- This is a difficult question. I know people who have more than 5 dogs and they are more responsible than some owners with one. I believe that there should be unlimited numbers unless the owners continue to get charges. You can then use section 55 to impose limits or other conditions
- Dogs have strong affiliation with whom they believe to be in the pack. More dogs creates more opportunity/ risk. I would say 2 cats are lots as well.
- Depends on the household, size of yard and the owners ability to lead and care for their pack.
- Really my preference is zero, but I'm trying to be reasonable. However, I also feel sorry for dogs that are left alone by so-called "dog lovers" for hours and hours every day.
- I believe that one should be enough but I know others may want more and 3 seems reasonable.
- I think once owners have too many dogs, the care is sometimes compromised.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- if you have space and the ability to care for X amount of dogs why not
- I think two is reasonable, though depending on the size of the home, or the size of the dogs, that could differ.
- 2 for large, 3 for small dogs. Providing appropriate space and decreasing noise levels.
- I have had five dogs with no issues, though it is a lot of work to give them all appropriate exercise and to clean up the yard every day. Problems result from the owners, not the dogs.
- One per human.
- One dog can already be significantly disruptive to neighbours (noise, etc).
- Way too many dogs already licenced. Improper waste disposal concerns, barking when dogs are left in back yards and a general lack of by law agencies to enforce the existing bylaws for the existing number of dogs. General attitude of some dog owners that bylaws do not apply to them.
- Three's a crowd.
- I can't imagine taking good care of more myself?
- A male / female. An older dog with a younger one that will eventually replace them. Temporarily after puppies are born a household may exceed this number. Once there are more than 2 dogs they pack & become less under control & more disruptive / dangerous.
- I guess it depends on the size of the house and dogs. You cannot have 5 large dogs in a tiny rental property. Its nkt fair to the dog. But I would say the number should be more than 1 as various dogs do not do well alone
- this number should be decided on size of house and size of yard. A single dwelling should just have 2. Unless they foster animals, (which count as temporary)
- I think as long as people are able to take care of their dogs well, They should be allowed to have them in their property.
- It depends on the person. I know people where 1 dog is too much, but also know a lady who has 6 of her own and 1 foster and they're all well taken care of and happy
- More than 2 dogs are challenging to give proper attention to. When on leash, un trained owners have a hard time controlling more than 2.
- But owners need training and type of dogs. And type of building and space to run and play
- I've seen responsible pet owners with 6 dogs, and irresponsible owners with just one. The number of dogs isn't relevant, but the owner's behaviour is.
- Any more than 2 you shouldn't live in a city plus having two gives each dog a companion so they are never alone
- Whatever number the owner can adequately care for.
For me, it is 1.
- Some people support volunteer for rescuing dogs. We should not limit groups like these.
- I think that it is great to have dogs as pets but too many become a nuisance for neighbours and the public. There should be exceptions made for dog breeders and maybe a special permit for such.
- One possibly two.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 3 maximum. No need for more in a family household. Issues arise when there are too many. Barking, aggression, lack of exercise, territorial, feces amount.
- As long as the dogs are respectful- non barking the number should not matter. One is too many for some people and others can deal with numerous.
- I think that is a reasonable amount to handle, and in terms of noise and cleanup.
- This is a floating number depending on whether you are dog sitting for family and friends, or if you have a litter of puppies, or if you are fostering. It is not the number of animals as the ability to properly raise and provide appropriate behavioural expectations for your dogs.
- It gets chaotic over that amount and creates a lot of waste as well
- If someone can afford it, why restrict them to less, as long as they follow the rules for picking up after them and ensuring they don't get into fights or show inappropriate behavior
- It totally depends on how many humans are able to help care for the dogs. Also depends on the experience level of the owners. I truly don't think that there should be a legal limit imposed since circumstances can be widely variable. Economic factors need to be taken into account as well.
- People should have the right to own as many pets as they can. As long as they are properly taken care of, the number should not matter.
- It is someone's home, the city does not have a say in how many kids people can have in their homes why put limits of dogs. UNLESS there are suspicious activities that lead others to believe in mistreatment or quality of life issues. property size and dog size can effect ability to number of dogs too.
- It depends on the dog owner. Extremely skilled and knowledge dog owners can have multiple confident and well balanced dogs in a household. Some dog owners are challenged with just one (and likely are not suited to have a dog to begin with).
- A family member has 3 large dogs. It can be noisy. The upkeep of the yard is hard in the winter, so when spring comes around, it can be very smelly
- I don't think you can properly take care of more dogs
- As long as the dogs are managed and care for responsibly, the government has no right to dictate any limits on dog ownership or otherwise. We are supposed to be a free and open society, punish those who break the rules, not over-regulate the majority.
- Most people cannot reasonably care properly for more then this. Medical, behavioral and other needs cannot be met with too many animals.
- I think that people should be allowed to have as many dogs as they like, providing that they give proper care and clean up after them. Be considerate of neighbours.
- This is dependent on size of dog, size of house. But is an average
- I think for the standard household 3 dogs are reasonable. I think a lot of people may start to neglect their dogs if they own more but this is not true of all households.
- Unless you are a breeder I don't think more than 4 is necessary.
- It should be based on how the dogs behave and are trained.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends on the person and situation. Dog enthusiasts often have 4-5 dogs responsibly kept. I can take better care of my four dogs than some people can their one dog. Don't limit the amount. Penalize those who are irresponsible and causing problems.
- A number I'm happy with. But could be a few more depending on space.
- After three, dominance may play a part. There's also no way of knowing if pets are being properly cared for.
- If you are a breeder of purebred dogs, and are responsible, license your dogs, provide proper nutrition and clean shelter, care including health testing that is certified with the offa.org, clean up after your dogs and respect your neighbors, the number of dogs should be your choice
- Really depends on how good the owners are. Problems could be dealt with under other parts of the bylaw without limiting people who are responsible owners of many dogs
- We are an urban area and the dogs deserve appropriate space,
- Anymore than that and you have potential of a pack. Maybe even with 3 but its easier to control 3 than 5! I couldnt imagine
- Depends on the size of the household and competency of the owners.
- Dogs require an awful lot of care, I can't see more than 2 dogs getting adequate care in a single family home
- It's tough to take care of more than 2 dogs but I think owner's should be able to have more as long as they treat them well and take care of them.
- It depends on the size of the house
- No one's business really. I have had 6+ dogs in this city for decades with zero complaints, from anyone. Responsibility is not a number of pets.
Some people take better care of their numerous pets, than others can care for one child.
- Depends entirely on size of home/yard, size of dog, and experience, lifestyle and means of the owner
- I think it should be based on owner history and their experience with dog ownership. I personally would not have 5 dogs in the city but I know GREAT dog owners who can handle it. I think not everyone should be allowed - maybe a city application for any more than 3.
- If the dogs are cared for and well behaved it's not an issue
- Noise and mess. Most can't clean up with one dog.
- Some people who have dogs foster therefore may have multiple at a time
- Less barking compared to more than 1.
- I think we all can manage effectively different numbers and do not believe the numbers is the issue. I would like to see a multi-dog license option that requires us to do more training and knowledge (maybe pass a test like the CKC "Canadian Good neighbour") or have a veterinarian certificate.
- Dogs are high maintenance. Depending on the number of the people in the household, it would be hard to properly care for and attend to all dogs needs beyond 4.
- I think this depends on the person, I know some people with up to 10 dogs and they care for them like their children. I think the number of animals depends on the persons capacity to care for them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Reasonable based on the ability for an adult to manage.
- Some people want their pet to have 'company' when they are away from the home. But, it is difficult to control even 2 dogs, let alone any more than that.
- No need to restrict people's amount of pets
- I think four is probably enough. Maybe exceptions if some are temporary foster dogs. If people clean up after them and they don't bark excessively, I don't care about numbers.
- It depends on behaviour, not number. Need allowance to foster puppies, senior animals.
- Depends on size. 3 st bernards is outrageous 3 dachshunds is reasonable. Depends on size of house and years too. What's reasonable to keep them safe and cared for too.
- As long as the household is capable of licensing, feeding and caring for all dogs in their care and they do not become a bother to neighbors around them, I dont see a reason to limit the number of dogs per household.
- Depends on the size of dog and size of household. 4 chihuahuas in a standard size house is more reasonable than 4 mastiffs in an apartment.
- It mainly depends on the size of the household and the size of the dogs. But I think no more than 3 dogs would be reasonable for a detached house.
- I feel that dogs are very costly to care for properly (food, vet care), and also take a lot of work and time. Many dogs on one property in the city could lead to excessive barking, smell from feces, and could lead to poor neighbour relations.
- Houses are different sizes as are dogs. There are already rules for maintenance of property, enforcement cost, freedom of choice. Deal with problems under existing regs rather than adding more invasive and costly regs
- I don't believe in having a limit. As long as the owner is a responsible dog owner and is able to care for the animals, keep their property clean and not disturb the neighbours why limit? One nuisance barker is worse than 5+ dogs that are well behaved.
- It's hard to walk more than two leashed dogs at once.
- In my experience, people with many dogs or cats have a hoarding mentality, and do not necessarily provide good care for the animals. A couple of dogs can provide company for each other, after that you have a pack, with associated pack behaviours. Needs experienced, strong owner and a lot of room.
- Depends on size of the animals and of the space. No apartment should have multiple large active breeds. Multiple small dogs isn't an issue unless they're constantly too loud.
- I have no opinion on this. It is the individuals choice
- I don't believe that people should be told how many dogs they can have. There are responsible folks that have multiple dogs and irresponsible folks with 1 dog. It comes down to the owner, not the number of dogs.
- All should be spayed and neutered. Owners must be able to care for all animals in their home. No puppy-millers or backyard breeders. No breeding permitted.
- 4 provides a lot of doggy love. But still manageable.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If the person can afford their care and vet bills there's no reason for a limit
- It depends on the owner, the space, the purpose and size .too vague
- It needs to be bylaw officer's discretion there are households that should not have one dog that are households that have 5 plus dogs and you wouldn't know because of the care and extras that go into being the dog owners I believe an average of 3 but with approval more
- To control the amount of dog poo, barking, smell, interaction with nature.
- Depending on the size of house and size and energy levels of the dogs, and how many people are in the household to help care for the dogs. I chose 3 as a reasonable middle option but I think more would be fine in a very large house, for example.
- depends on the house. A condo two is more than enough. A house 3 seems enough. A property with land could house more. That's a tough restriction to place. Seems that it should be more based on condo rules or community rules or safety as judged by the humane society (not 20 cats ex)
- Noise!
- Depends on the owner.
- 4 is a lot
- If properly controlled
- It's all space dependent.
- That is a guideline. It depends on how big the home is, what people can afford, and if the dogs' needs can be comfortably met.
- Depends on the type of dog and the space available for the dogs.
- More dogs can cause noise and waste issues for neighbors.
- I think some people can reasonably handle more than three dogs (e.g. breeders, those who engage in dog sports or other performance-type training) and so maybe they should be able to get a permit?? But, the vast majority of people can't manage more than that without unduly impacting their neighbours.
- No reasonable to think you can control more than 2 dogs. I have seen it many times in the off leash areas I use (John Laurie's pathways); just too many dogs. Biking to work at slow speed and ringing bell: bitten twice and one crash which put me out of work for one week.
- We at one time had 4 dogs and they were always in the care of 2 adults, more dogs and less adults equals trouble
- I feel two is reasonable. Money wise and space wise in a household.
- Really depends on the size of the dogs and the size of the house and if there is access to a yard
- One person has two hands, can only properly walk two dogs at once. Houses and yard size. Healthier for the dogs.
- I don't think the city needs to impose limits. Obviously hoarder situations are a concern, but those are a rarity. The city doesn't have the right nor the ability to determine if someone can or cannot adequately care for 1 dog / cat or 10 dogs / cats.
- 3 dogs for pets, more if you are involved in breeding or showing, perhaps.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It is people choice to determine how many animals to live with. Unless the SPCA or other investigatory bodies deem they are living in squalor and need to intervene, people have the right to live as they choose.
- This is a hard question because it depends on the house size, and the care the pets are getting. Ideally though, I would say 3-4 should be the maximum, not including if you have a dog who just gave birth to puppies.
- I think it depends on the size of the dog and room available, as well as availability of owners to spend time/resources on the dogs. Every situation is different. Maybe there could be a review of a household if you have 4+ dogs to make sure they are in good care.
- Multiple dogs is a choice, so long as not a nuisance to community (noise, smells, etc). Should all be licensed.
Some people like to foster dogs as well as have some of their own.
- As many arls they can take proper care of
- As long as they are being taken care of then why does it matter, what if the amount in the house hold belong to different people
- Selection based on the ability of an owner to properly care for the dogs. I have two larger dogs myself and I walk them separately to ensure control. If I had 4 I would never walk more than 2 at once, again to ensure control.
- Number of animals is not the issue. It's the care of them. Someone can care for 6 better and with less nuisance (noise/odour) than someone with 1
- The number of dogs does not matter. It matters that they are properly cared for. One dog can be inproperly cared for.
- Dont have one
- I don't care as long as they're cared for and not a nuisance.
- It depends on the size of the dogs. But I really think there should never be more than 4 dogs in one household as they will lack the attention they deserve.
- Some people have various dogs and may foster dogs.
- As long as all the animals are provided for physically and mentally and the owners have the means physically, emotionally and financially to provide for the animals through out their life span. And as long as the animals are not a nuisance to the community the limit should be lifestyle dependent.
- It really depends on the owner and the sizes of the dogs
- Two large or small dogs are manageable but more than that, it would be up to the owner's skills.
- This is too broad. It's unreasonable to just choose a number when there are many factors that would impact this decision. How big is the home if there are five or more dogs? Five dogs in a one bedroom apartment is very different than five dogs in a 5 bedroom home with a yard.
- Most people I know own 2 pets. Companionship for a dog
- I think more than two is to many for a healthy house. If someone wants more than that, they should move to the country and have them in a barn



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It depends on the dogs.
- It depends on the size of the dog. If you have two big dogs and two small dogs then that is fair. If you have 4 big dogs then no. That's how I see it.
- I get uneasy about laws that tell us how we can live at home. I don't think anyone needs more than one dog in the city, but some people can care for more responsibly, and so i don't feel it is my business in that case. The main consideration- can they afford to care for them, and not bother neigh
- Originally I was going to select 2, but sometimes a third is nice. However, the size of the home and yard dictates that size of your dog allowance. Don't want a Great Dane living in a 2 bedroom condo with a fake grass balcony!
- Any number that can be properly cared for.
- 1 if the bylaws are respected (maybe 2 so they have company if alone much of the day).
- I don't think there should be more than two dogs in a household inner city, unless living on an acreage or area that has enough space for more than two.
- Four seems too many.
- I've owned more than one dog at a time and although my dogs were well trained, they tend to want to listen or follow each other when there are multiple dogs, rather than the person in charge of them. If you love animals and have well trained animals, 3 is plenty. No need for more.
- We foster. At any given time we have our three dogs PLUS 1-10 limiting the number of animals I can have in my care means I can't foster.
- Really a case by case basis. If dogs have enough space to roam, are fed and cared for then 5+ could be fine.
Some people have one dog and can't manage. It really depends.
- Dog walkers are a necessary profession. They provide for people who have animals and can not get there dog or while at work. Dogs behave well in packs and dog walkers do not take dogs that don't interact well with others. A living can not be made by taking any less than 5 dogs at a time.
- Dogs are social creatures, they stay calmer with company when owners not around. Three or more are too many in an urban setting.
- If people can afford to keep that many dogs why shouldn't they? As long as they're all looked after and healthy I don't care how many people have.
- More animals means that owners are less able to control their animals appropriately
- I believe it depends on the size of the house and dogs
- Noise, pet waste, and pack behaviour would be a concern beyond four dogs. Perhaps allow more with a permit?
- As a Labrador retriever dog owner, I would say that one was enough. However for smaller dogs two might be appropriate as company for each other. The cost of vet care and the cost of living could preclude good care of more than two dogs. Barking dogs can be disruptive especially in large numbers.
- Depends on size. 3 little dogs or 2 big dogs. More than that and you cannot watch them properly

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- My Aunt owned 4 dogs at one time because she has a dog obsession and it was very obvious that the care of the dogs seemed to diminish with the more she decided to take in.
- We have 5 dogs. We have had 6. We try to keep them quiet and inside out of respect for our neighbours. We scoop at least once a day and bleach the run in the summer so it doesn't smell. We keep our dogs fenced or on leash. It's about respect, not numbers.
- Too me the number is not an issue as long as each individual has their needs met. Basic needs but also, training, exercise, enrichment.
- I believe that unless you are a dog trainer or involved in the animal world professionally most individuals do not control animals
- The number of dogs depend on space and behaviour control and manageability.
- Selected "1," as "0" was not an option. Barking, excrement, and other unavoidable issues make dog ownership problematic in many parts of the city.
- Many people are capable of owning, caring for, providing for, to an adequate and humane level, 5 or more dogs. Number of dogs in a household is not an accurate indication of their well-being, noise level, safety, concerns...
- # of dogs is irrelevant to a point. I know people with 4 dogs who are incredibly responsible pet owners. While some with one or two let their dogs run rampant. I've had 3 dogs, successfully. 4 seems like a lot But more than 4 should require a special license to board, foster or breed.
- Depending on the size of the property more than 4 dogs would be acceptable.
- in the city backyards could be large enough for four dogs to run comfortably, or for the small dogs, four dogs on leash at the same time.
- 3 seems to be manageable for an owner based on personal experience.
- As a volunteer with a rescue and foster dogs, there should not be any limit so long as all dogs are provided with food, water, shelter, love, and are licensed and taken care of. Unfortunately cases of hoarding animals also exists
- It's actually dependent on the type of dog, for me. Three small dogs would be fine; three large dogs would not be able to be controlled by one person.
- Depends on the size of a house/space. Including type (an acreage may have multiple, a condo may be limited. The owner must be able to afford all the accompanying expenses. As well as manage them for outdoor activities. If they are breeding, the. Umber must be flexible for periods of time.
- This the max # I think is reasonable to walk at once and be able to control and intervene in case of an incident. If there are more dogs, and the owners are not responsible, it more easily leads to issues.
- Crazy dog people
- i Don't think it has anything to do with how many you can have but how well they're looked after and that they're not a nuisance to neighbours
- household unlimited, but off leash 3 maximum by 1 owner (if you have more, walking by group by 2-3)
- really depends on breed, size of dog, number of adults in home, size of the home



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends on the size of the house and backyard space honestly... I have seen an owner with 5 huskies and they regularly pull sleds for fun. So even with a lot of dogs, if they are exercised regularly and have responsible pet owners I think it's fine. It comes down to the owners at the end of the day.
- Depending on size of breed and size of house/ property.
- It takes work and time
- Dogs have big litters of puppies. You need to keep them together until weaned and ready to sell/give away. Can easily surpass 5 animals.
- Depends on the size of the home and yard. Maybe only one in an apartment. Maybe more for a large property.
- I think the rule for number of kids and number of dogs should be the same...
When there are so many dogs needing rescue, how can you put a cap on it?!
- Depends on the house / job - if you're a professional dog walker or a stay at home parent living on an acreage, or a responsible dog breeder - who is the government to say how many dogs someone can have?
- If an individual feels they can responsibly take care of 3, than 4 really isn't that much of a stretch. The individual(s) would need very structured rules, plus there are people with 2 to 5 children in the household which to be honest is more costly and time consuming and no one seems to mind that
- I picked 5 but really it depends on the dog and owner and size of home and property.
- It depends on the size. Two big dogs or three little dogs. They are social animals and enjoy the companionship. It is difficult to provide proper care for more animals and barking dogs are loud and annoying.
- I don't believe that limited numbers of dogs is the answer. If people know how to train dogs and are responsible then this is not an issue. Too many people buy dogs and then don't know how to handle them. Maybe licensing should include training.
- I feel 3 is an appropriate number as then they have a buddy. Unless you live in a big house with a yard. Dogs needs space and care.
- It's really up to the owner, I think depending on the situation. Some people should only have one, some can handle three.
- Dogs need to be socialized in a healthy way by regular exercise and consistent behavioural training. An owner with more than 2 dogs, is unable to provide adequate care and attention. Dogs who bark and howl regularly in a yard (for Mins often or an hour one in a while) are not being properly care for
- If they are small dogs and have responsible owners, it is entirely possible they can have more than 5. Some people will rescue small, senior dogs that may never have a chance at a home if pet limits are imposed.
- I'd consider this an appropriate average. More than 3 seems irresponsible.
- Depending on the household, size of the dogs and owners, 3 dogs can usually be handled by one person. I think more than 3 is hard to manage, pick up after etc.
- It depends on the amount of living space, the number of responsible individuals who are able to help take care of the dog(s).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Eg For an individual who is unable to care for themselves or is unable to see to regular feeding, walking and cleaning of a dog, even 1 would be too many

- There is a pack mentality as soon as more than 2 dogs enter a space. When a person with more than two dogs enters public space, it becomes much more difficult for them to maintain care and control of their dogs.
- More than 3 is a business
- If you exhibit proper responsible pet ownership have as many as you can handle! That should only involve the city in mistreatment or hoarding cases
- I feel the number of dogs is relative to size of dog, of owners situation, meaning is the owner involved in dog sports. If so the Dogs are usually well cared for, exercised, and responsive to owner/handler and trained.
- As long as dogs are all taken care of. Not referring to hoarding. Meaning food and clean water daily. Waste is picked up, barking is controlled, and health of animal is monitored. Vet visits. If one can not afford an animal then they should not have one. Numbers should'nt include people that foster
- I believe the max. # of animals (whatever animal) per household should be limited to 2. The city should implement this. It would cut down on stray cats, reduce the number of animals in shelters. Find a way to track pet ownership.
- I think 4 is the absolute max for a lot of people. Maybe being able to apply for some kind of license to allow for more if certain criteria are being met
- The dog should have a friend. Owners have two hands - one for each leash.
- Upto two small breeds, maybe more considering livibg situation
No more than one larger breed.
Dependent on number of actively training owners
- It is a reasonable number.
- it depends on the location and whether or not it is a mother and puppies: one in an apartment, puppies not included until they are 8 or 10 weeks old, condos and apartments often restrict numbers
- I think if people are responsible pet owners it shouldn't matter how many they have.
- If the animals are safe, cared for, well loved, and provided with proper diet, medical care and exercise I don't particularly think a numerical limit is necessary. For instance, there is a large difference between having 5 Great Danes and 5 pomeranians. Hoarding cases can be dealt with separately.
- 2 is manageable, most people do not control their dogs well when they have pack mentality
- Personal opinion. Anything more than 3 dogs turn in to more of a pack than a family unit and can't be properly controlled by one person.
- Dogs tend to motivate each other to bark, when everybody has more that one dog, barking becomes very annoying to those of us that have no dogs.
- In order to have more than 4 adult dogs, a business licence should be required. It's OK for breeders to have more dogs as long as they are responsible and as long as neighbours are not adversely impacted.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- With large numbers of dogs in the house How does the animal receive proper and adequate attention, training, or exercise?
- too many lead to excessive barking, smells in outside areas, etc. Example is woman that was just charged with excessive amounts of dogs. Woman that babysat them, knew the situation & did nothing about it should be charged or fined also for not reporting it, neighbor or not.
- I would say 3 is the maximum--and even that many seems a bit odd to me, especially in an urban environment. Proper care of that many or more animals within a city becomes pretty challenging, in my estimation.
- People(responsible) pet owners can have as many as they want,the key is `responsible' know their limit,which 4 is good for most,but some can handle more,size comes into play I would think
- This depends on a lot of factors. Size of the dog, how much exercise they get, behaviour of the dog and owners.
- As long the pet are well care of, and doesn't cause chaos, I don't think numbers of pets matter.
- The amount of dogs in a household should depend on the owners ability to provide quality of life for the animals
- Depends on size, 3 dachshunds are more reasonable than 3 goldendoodles. Also depends on the space the dogs live in.
- I think there has to be a balance between the right to own animals, and the right of individuals who choose not to as far as noise, waste, and the ability of the owner to control the animals. A numbers cap also limits the financial exposure of people who can't figure that out for themselves.
- Decreases the burden on animal shelters and having to put them down. They too are living beings and should be given an opportunity to feel special like any member of the family.
- One dog-per-household means dog owners are not breeding dogs and can control the amount of defecation and urine. With one dog, owners are more interested in keeping their dog indoors on days when temperatures dip below 30. Noise from dog barking is less. Stench is less. Owner control is better.
- Two dogs are enough and easy to control. This does not include licensed breeders or the occasional and temporary puppy litter.
- Any more and you should have to get a special license or training on responsible ownership and behavioural characteristics.
- Dogs improve residents' lives, increase activity, reduce stress and provide companionship
- I think this should be the maximum. More dogs is just a lot in one space.
- The most reliable statistics come from the American Pet Products Association which reports that 67% of households own a pet. They know these numbers based on pet food purchases.
- Depends on the size/context. 5 Great Danes in a condo maybe not. 5 wiener dogs in a condo sure why not.
- Some people have the time and resources to care for many animals and they should be allowed to do so



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I would say two based on dog waste produced and upkeep of clean up also size dependand, large dogs two , small dogs up to four.
- Depending on the size of dog, history of owner, size of property, access to green space/walks.
- Depends on size of home and dogs. Dogs require a lot of care.
- If a person is able to walk groom and care for them there's no reason to limit animals it a problem when they are not tended to I think I should be based on a person to person based on their ability to care for the animals
- I think for many folks, the costs of responsible dog ownership including vet costs can be reasonably managed with 2 animals. I don't have an issue with people having more than 2, they just need to be able to afford their care
- Any more might open up noise issues, or potentially neglect issues. Depends on size of house and yard.
- I don't think it's appropriate to say/limit a reasonable number of dogs per household as it would be dependent on each household and their situation, similar to how households have their own discretion for number of kids, etc.
- I believe any more than three dogs for one household is too much in terms of keeping them under control, insuring they all receive proper exercise.
- This is entirely dependent on the household. How many humans are in the house? How big is the house/yard? Are the owners taking responsibility and exercising their dogs etc etc
- I really do not like this question, it depends on the dog and owner. 1 is too many for a bad owner, where as a great owner could have 5+.
- I've seen lots of people with 2 or 3 dogs and they can handle them fine and appear to be able to provide the care and attention that the dogs need and deserve
- Any more then 2 dogs is unmanageable for a single person to control should they be aggressive towards each other or someone else/s dog.
- Too many dogs in Calgary
- Most people are incapable of caring for multiple animals. While there are exceptions to this, I feel this would help reduce the number of animals being re-homes or surrendered
- I don't think this should included temporary animals like fosters or dog sitting
- We have 2 currently and have only had more after breeding our dogs- 3 is a reasonable number
- 2 is "reasonable" within the city in my opinion, but I am not against more so long as they are treated and fed properly, vaccinated and have a clean home. If noise is or becomes an issue, then fines. If someone lives on a large property they can have many.
- Bill Bruce had such an intelligent approach to this question - it is not the # of dogs, but the behaviour of the dogs that matters. I have 3 well behaved dogs and listen daily to the barking of neighbourhood dogs who live in one dog families. Deal with the problems not the numbers.
- Most families shouldn't be out numbered by their pets



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Unless it's an animal rescue or fostering, there is no reason any household requires more than one dog. Most who buy three or more dogs are not mentally fit to have such a privilege. Psychological evaluation should be given to those who wish to have more.
- Households in 2020 can be multigenerational and many dogs may be appropriate due to individual circumstances
- As long as the dogs are adequately fed and cared for, with excellent veterinary care and safety, then a household can have as many dogs as they want.
- The reasonable number of dogs per household is not a number that can be assigned. Depends on lifestyle, breed and age of dog, exercise, training, space, etc. some people cannot take care of 1 dog suitably, others can take care of several with no problem
- Depends on the home. If you live in a large home with a large yard and the space and means for many dogs it should be allowed.
- Dogs are a lot of work and anything more than three just seems like overkill to me personally. Especially if they are big dogs
- I think it depends on how many family members there are and how large the household is. More than 5 dogs is obviously unreasonable in an apartment but could be very doable on a large property.
- I don't believe there should be a limit on dogs. People with 1 dog can be more irresponsible than those with 5+. Hoarding situations won't be stopped by restricting number of pets. It shouldn't be able how many pets but how responsible the owner is.
- As many as can be responsibly looked after by the owner
- One per property owner. Not house hold. Do we really want a city over run by dogs? I keep track of the dogs that pass my house in a day. Average on a nice day 85. (Some of these are local, 2 and 3 trips)
Shitting hour is what I call it. Right after work, everyone is out for a walk.
- My fiancé's parents have 2 dogs and they have their hands full with them, I think after three you have less time to properly care for them and monitor them.
- I believe that three dogs are easy for a single person to take care of and control, and most houses have enough space for each animal. I don't believe in putting a limit of three dogs per household. Pet limits should be put in place on a case by case basis based on quality of care.
- Once it gets beyond four it becomes difficult to give them the care, attention, grooming needs, walks per day, and the large expense
- Who are you to judge how many dogs someone has? As long as they are all loved and cared for. If you can love and care for them all, go for it. Be responsible. Know what you can handle.
- Depending on sizes, and number of family members, you don't have the space or time for more.
- I don't think someone could reasonably have control over more than 3 dogs.
- This is just a personal opinion - as 2 dogs can keep each other company. Dogs require a lot of work and I feel more than 2 can just get overwhelming.
- I think a reasonable number of dogs to have is two, however I don't want to decide how many dogs people should get to have.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be no limit
- Unless someone is breeding responsibly or fostering animals to be adopted I do not see why someone should have more than 3 dogs
- There are many dogs and cats that require homes. Three would be responsible to allow rescues to be placed in adoptive homes without running the risk of hoarding situations.
- Each situation is different as is each persons ability to properly raise and provide for pets. 5 chihuahuas's is also a lot different than 5 great dane's. There should not be a limit placed on this.
- This depends on the space and how many other people live in the house. A person living by themselves with a large home shouldn't be restricted to 1 dog when their space allows it. Perhaps do space and people ratio. 1 dog per 600sq per two people(doesn't have to be this math but something similar)
- Proper attention to dogs could lack if there is more than 3, anymore than 3 could be a health concern for both the owner and dogs.
- We are getting too many animals in certain areas of the city and the number of interactions with non dog owners is increasing.
- depending on the breed and space available
- There are many people who have fosters and rescues that can manage that amount, but I do believe it has to be managed by looking at individual cases. Small apartments with one big dog are more than enough, let me tell ya.
- seems like a manageable number in terms of Leash-walking, cleanliness of home and yard, noise.
- It really depends on the size of the dogs and the house.
- Most owners cannot control 1 dog so 2 is enough for most especially factions age and strength of owner. Same with paid dog walkers. They never pick up as they can't and how can having 8-10 dogs give your dog a proper walk!!!!
- Good company for each other.
- Depends on size and breed
- I do not care how many dogs someone has as long as they are properly housed, and cared for and supervised if outside for more than 15 minutes.
Yard must be clean of feces. I think the owner should sign an agreement making it okay for the Humane Society to check housing conditions.
- I think two per person is reasonable. So having a couple with two dogs each is fine. I would say 3-4 is reasonable. They are pack animals. More than that and it's something else.
- If the owner has more dogs they better have the money for vet and training. More than 2 can create negative dog behaviours depending on the owners
- I know many people who love and can give the attention to multiple dogs in one home that meet all the individual dogs requirements for great quality of life. Training and medications and proper food quantities



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It's a random number picked out of the air. You cannot legislate common sense. Living on urban acreage with lots of room and limited to two small quiet dogs? Crazy. Living in 200 square foot apartment condo and limited to five malamutes? Give me a break. Can't legislate common sense.
- 3 dogs I would say is the maximum before their noise can get out of hand.
- In today's world, where more and more people are being squeezed into households, where families are blended and people have roommates to make ends meet, you have to be flexible. We've squeezed people in like sardines, so why not pets?
- dogs are pack animals and do well with pals. A household can have multiple dogs, as long as they have care and training. If the dogs are provided with food, shelter, vet care, exercise, then that is what is important. Possibly home inspections if a household has more than a certain number of dogs.
- seems reasonable to me. not pack.
- every ind. is different. some, care for 1 dog, others more, excellent food, excellent vet care. we are all individuals. if animals are healthy, happy, fed, then the numbers should not matter. If the city decides to lower the # of animals, then you need to GRANDFATHER the people who have more.
- More than this I find it hard to believe that they are being properly cared for with the huge costs of vets.
- For the majority of people who understand canine behaviour to a greater or lesser degree, why should there be a limit. For the few individuals who are acting in a commercial capacity, there needs to be different rules in place. Don't penalize the majority for the behaviour of a minority.
- Dogs require training and love and this would be difficult with more than 3 dogs
- 3 is plenty. SO much hair, animal waste and time. How can you properly care for animals when you're outnumbered.
- "Generically limiting is an odd question" In a 800sq ft condo (1) in a 8000sq ft home - 2 or 3. Dogs need room.
- It is NOT the amount, it is the care!!!! I have seen people with one dog no care. People who love dogs provide above and beyond, no matter the amount of dogs!!!!
- For the majority of people who understand canine behaviour to a greater or lesser degree, why should there be a limit. For the few individuals who are acting in a commercial capacity, there needs to be different rules in place. Don't penalize the majority for the behaviour of a minority.
- 3-4 at the most. Total pets is a better number. two dogs is reasonable 3 is pushing it and 4 is not fair or normal
- I do not think there should be set number defined in the bylaw. As long as the dogs are clean, well behaved, well cared for and do not cause a nuisance then it should be left to the house hold to determine the appropriate number.
- Depends on the size, 3 large, more small
- every household is different. treat them as such. if you are considering capping the # of animals, then you need to take in all those animals that are over the requirements in your care, your expense etc... animals are happy/healthy/fed/well taken care of, then grandfather those.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I look at this in two ways. For guardianship of pets, I feel the limit should be lower, maybe 3 or 4. IF they are a rescue then the number should not be applied.
- It depends on the person and the dogs, some people can handle a large number of dogs or maybe fostering dogs in addition to having their own. I do think that anyone under 18 should be required to have a responsible co-owner for the dog as well as anyone with mental health challenges and seniors.
- Depending on size of house
- It's hard to unlove a dog once you adopt it, and its easy to love more than one. I think the size of your home and time to look after them is what limits the number.
- If all dogs are being cared for (with all previously stated responsible ownership needs being met(, it doesn't matter the number ex: fed/watered, clean, healthy, stimulated, vetted
- Ok, I have 1 dog in a good-sized house. That is a lot of work to have a well trained, well-exercised dog. 2 gives them companionship, I struggle even with 3 as 3 dogs can create trouble. After three: what kind of space do you have for exercise? The more you have, less likely you can train them well
- If you have more than 3 cats and/or dogs, consider that there might be something wrong with you. The ability of an owner to provide an appropriate environment for their pets generally goes down accordingly with the number of animals living in that environment.
- The number of dogs in a household should not be of concern to the city provided all animals are liscened and being looked after responsibly.
- I don't really care as long as the dog owner is responsible and the dogs are taking away of their neighbors rights.
- Under 10. If the owners are responsible then it shouldn't matter really. If they clean up after the dogs and care for them..
If laws change then those houses/rescues/fosters with multiple dogs should be grandfathered into account so they are not punished by having to give up a dog
- Seems reasonable - 4 seems like too many to keep under care and control while out and about, and I can't imagine having the opportunity to walk them individually.
- Too many would be hard tontrack
- It really depends on size and how big your household is. 7 small dogs would be fine, but 7 large dogs might not be.
- Hard to control more than one dog at a time nevermind 3. But it depends on the dogs.
- 6 or so would be a hard limit, but it depends on whether you are a licensed breeder and live in a ranch or in an apartment. Very different.
- I just think more is a potential for unwanted pack behaviour which can make it more likely to be unsafe for people and other dogs. costs of pets need to be taken into account. Many people cant properly care for to many more dogs then this. It's unfair to the dogs in most cases.
- It really depends on the size of the dogs, how well trained they are and on how responsible the owner is. A good owner with 4 dogs can be a better neighbour than a bad owner with one dog.
- as long as they are well cared for no limit should be imposed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I'm a senior and have two small 10 lb dogs and we had a large dog 65 lb but we have an enclosed yard and dogs had obedience training and did attend off leash park. I believe it's the size of the animals and the space available for them & that they are pets not breeding animals.
- Far too many people have a large number of dogs, that then don't have the time to provide responsible pet ownership. This includes sport and competition breeders. Their dogs are not getting properly exercised or have the proper enrichment.
- Strongly believe that there is not enough time in the day to exercise, and provide proper enrichment to more than 3 per household. Even with people that compete in sport, they should be limited to the number of dogs.
- The city of Okotoks has a three dog limit and it works for them. The amount of calls bylaw, Calgary Humane and the Police make to irresponsible pet owners and breeders is staggering. After three it is reasonable to assume the level of care is incrementally declining.
- Dogs need socialization each day, a playmate or 2 at home helps engage them and teach them social skills as well. While some people are great owners, exercising and providing quality care to multiple dogs take time and money. I'd be concerned for the welfare of the animals with higher numbers.
- This really depends on the size of the dogs, and how much noise they make. One dog can be too many if it is barking/howling all the time.
- I have no problem with lots of dogs, as long as they are cared for properly, fed, walked, etc.
- I put 5+ but I really think 5 should be the max. Airdrie has 3, and I think that is too small. I foster, and sometimes you can have 2 resident dogs and 2 *temporary* foster dogs, or even 1 resident dog and multiple puppies. I think 5+ dogs is not manageable, but 3, 4 and maybe 5 is.
- Depends on size and owner being responsible for their animals.
- Two small dogs. Dogs over 50 pounds only 1 per household.
- Owning between one and 3 dogs is reasonable unless you are a registered breeder. I don't think most people provide enough attention to their dogs when there are more.
- 2 per Adult in the house.
- Most yards are not that big to have any more than 2 dogs running around plus anymore than 2 are not just pets anymore. 2 dogs ensure they have some interaction and companions while owners are busy working or not at home.
- It completely depends on the owner. As a general rule maybe 3 but it shouldn't be difficult for responsible owners to have more. Maybe a different type of license or test could be in place?
- Not the city's business. Responsible dog owners can have many dogs. The city shouldn't set a limit they should just set the criteria for it to be safe.
- I don't mind an owner having numerous dogs so long as they maintain healthy welfare, and their yard is maintained. Some breeders for example will have multiple dogs, and that is ok as long as they are well cared for.
- It depends on the size.
I wouldn't care if somebody had five little dogs or five cats but five big dogs not a chance.
- If they are being taken care of and aren't causing issues, it doesn't bother me.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

If rules are to change. The city must grandfather those already in homes. The city and rescuers could not handle the amount of pets that would be required to be rehomed. The cost to the city would be devastating.

- 3 dogs can be easily handled. More than 3 becomes very difficult. Only caveat is if they are a breeder.
- However many they can take care of and keep healthy.
- Most dogs, even small ones, need space. Dogs are expensive to take care of and require a proper commitment by the owner. I think two, for the dogs company and owners is sufficient and responsible.
- 2 dogs/responsible adult. 2 dogs is a reasonable amount to have control over and to be able to fully supervise. Average house has 2 adults.
- My sister has 3 chihuahuas and a cat. 4 animals seems reasonable....or make an exception for new pups, (make a time limit) until owner can find them new homes.
- The number of pets in a home does not make a difference if they are well behaved and under control. The owner is responsible for their care and the care of the community and their pet in the community
- Many dog owners foster dogs & should be allowed (if they have space & can give proper care) to have any number they'd be comfortable with. It is a win-win situation to overcrowded shelters & socializing dogs for purposes of adoptions.
- Reasonable amount of animals without being too limiting in terms of space noise and waste.
- Limiting the number of pets is not reasonable, owners ensuring their pets are cared for, fully licensed, vetted and in control is more important. To ensure a functioning community.
- If you are not a breeder, it's reasonable to have 1 elderly, 1 middle-aged dog & 1 puppy as a succession planning option. I use them for security & protection, family companions & for help w/ my health. More than 3 is more suited for an acreage. I currently only have two, a 3 and an 8 year old.
- I've owned dogs for over thirty years and have almost always had two. Three is still a reasonable number to walk, clean up after and be a responsible owner. More than that runs the risk of neglect, all be it unintended
- it is just the right amount.
- Higher numbers can result in increased noise issues and can increase inability to properly and sustainably care for the animals.
- A manageable number
- Plenty when you live in the city. Lots have more but bad owners are awful but constantly barking dogs are worse
- Obviously, it clearly depends on the pet owner(s) themselves. They must be responsible and have their dogs spayed/neutered, licensed, regular vet checks.
- Three is manageable especially for a working household who is limited to the amount of time they can spend with a dog
- Most people who have multiples are serious dog people and they can handle that many. Plus a lot of people have 2 and that still allows people to foster/house others



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If responsible pet ownership guidelines are followed why is a reasonable number required?
- Ultimately it depends on the size of the house and the time the homeowners can give. A large ranch with a big family can have more dogs, but a typical city home should have 3 max. Honestly it should be 0 or 2 though as most dogs I see are left alone all day while the owners are at work.
- 1-2 if large ; 3 if they are small like a cat. All choices made due to space constraint in an urban area
- Its easier to control them when outside. More than that and at least one will be neglected and for example feces not picked up
- There are many households in our struggling economy that have more than one family living in them, there are people that foster dogs for rescue, so therefore 4 is reasonable.
- One can have several dogs and be excellent pet parents. Government should never mandate what we have in our own homes
- I just think that is enough, especially with all the poop in the backyard.
- The exception is if puppies are born. No reason for three. Just sets a limit.
- I think if you have 3 or more dogs in your household you should be required to provide proof of employment and/or that you have the means to properly care and provide for that many dogs
- One person usually can only walk one dog on a leash
- Depends on house size and if the dog gets exercise and is kept in a clean place.
- Four- Five is fine, as one could end up with a fifth through chance or circumstance, but more than 5 would be excessive unless They had adequate space.
- I said two but I think it depends on the size of the dogs. Large dogs are harder to control in certain situations. One person is not going to control two or more dogs when they want to chase other dogs or wildlife. You see dog walkers out with 5 or 6 dogs of all sizes and no control of any of them.
- This depends on the dog owner, some people can't seem to be responsible dog owners for just one dog, while others can have several dogs that are all very well looked after and behave well in public. I would be strongly against putting a specific number of dogs per household.
- I have 2 dogs and it is a lot of work to train, care for and maintain their optimal health. I can't imagine having more. I think the majority of people would choose 4.
- I think that as long as pets are properly cared for and have an appropriate amount of space people should be free to have as many as they like. I do understand that providing limits is a way to manage the chaos though so 3 in that way may be more reasonable.
- As long as the owners take care of the animals, are not damaging the home, do not pose a health risk, they are well looked after and are not a nuisance to the community, what right do we have to tell them how many pets they should keep. The only exception would be extreme hoarding situations.
- There shouldn't be a restriction on the number of dogs as long as they are adequately and responsibly cared for. The current bylaws with no limits should remain.
- As long as they are happy and well care for good on them
- No more than three dogs to ensure all have a good quality of life. Including training time and proper excessive which can be hard to do with more than 3 pets



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It varies so much by the size of the space, large or small dogs, number of people in the household to monitor dogs. To put a blanket statement on the number of dogs allowed/household seems extreme. There are responsible pet owners with numerous dogs/pets.
- Temperament of the dogs and financial situation are factors. Having companions can make a home happier for all concerned.
- Depends on size, temperament, number and other types of animals present, number, age and condition of people present, type of knowledge and training of owner, size of home and land available and proximity of neighbors. May require a special license for households with more i.e fostering
- Two dogs is a reasonable maximum under any circumstance in a city. Residents who use dogs as business, or desire more than two dogs should relocate to a rural area.
- Maximum of 3 is because usually after that point you cannot properly supervise your dogs. As a result they are usually untrained. More than that number should be reserved for breeders only.
- Being a CKC member I know people who breed and have multiple dogs. As long as no complaints there shouldn't be limit. If I have multiple dogs and I take care of friend's multiple dogs then this puts me over limits. It's all about responsible dog owners
- It's still a manageable and affordable number
- N/a
- A lot can depend on the number of people in a household - 1 responsible person in a household per 2-3 dogs. 3 is what I believe one adult can manage if dogs are well trained.
- As long as pets are properly cared for there should not be a limit
- I believe the limit should be based on size of the home, size of the dogs, and financial capability. If you can't provide a healthy sustainable home then your amount of dogs should be less.
- That seems like a very reasonable number.
- Seems reasonable.
- Less likely to display pack behaviour and be super loud for neighbours. More than 3 would be super hard for one owner to wrangle/handle should they get out.
- I do believe it depends on the person, some people are really good with dogs and can have 5 and be fine. But 3 is a good number of dogs to avoid them being neglected and the house being overwhelmed
- 2 or 3 depending on the size of the house.
- 1-3 seems reasonable because it is more likely that the dogs are being taken care of properly, and that people can be sure to afford all of the things that come with being a responsible pet owner.
- Two is manageable. It is easy to walk and control two dogs. They tend to keep each other in check.
- 4 dogs is more than enough to have in a city. Walking 4+ dogs becomes a challenge that the general public do not have the skills to handle.
- Dogs are pack animals so typically more than one makes for a better environment for the dogs. Once there is more than 2 typically competition for Alpha starts to increase.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- anyone currently caring for more than the allowed amount should be grandfathered, providing the animals are being properly cared for
- I have seen owners with more than 1 dog where care is not given.
- More than two dogs of any size becomes challenging to keep track and control of on and off leash.
- Pets are expensive.
- one is ideal, but two would be a maximum for within the city. Many people can barely manage a single dog effectively and add dogs to entertain each other versus actually looking after their dogs. More than two and waste in yards creates problems as well as noise.
- I don't think this matters. We're happily maxed out at two dogs, but there are irresponsible owners with one dog, and highly responsible owners with 6 dogs; might be show dogs, competitive sport dogs, etc. What should matter is how the animals are cared for.
- This would vary on the size of dog and the size of house. But usually two adults reside in a household allowing them to walk one each while out in public. 5 dogs for 1 person seems a lot to manage
- It would depend on the person/s ability to care for more than one dog and that the animals are spayed and neutered.
- Two is enough. Company for each other.
- I don't want to live next to someone with more than 3 dogs, especially if they are not well behaved.
- Depends on house type and dog size. Also how the person can handle the dog.
- Greater than 3 dogs becomes difficult to manage
- I think reasonable dog owners can choose how many pets they want
- Some dogs (especially rescues) may benefit from living with a pack of dogs
- 4 is as much as I think 1 person could manage. Assume minimum household size of 1. Allow for special assessment and consideration (ie: keeping a whole litter of puppies could lead to 7+ dogs but if the household was managing this well they could be allowed to keep them)
- For me this is a reasonable number however depends on the situation. Have a larger home, live outside the city have the ability to care for more dogs. Ability to afford food, vet care etc.
- An average family of 4 can each have their own. More than 4 can become a cleanliness and management issue.
- There are many responsible pet owners who can manage/afford taking care of 3 dogs. If people have a reason to have more than 3 dogs, they should pay more for each licence and require a special permit .
- No limit provided the animals are looked after and not allowed to roam.
- I strongly believe that Calgary should maintain their no limits on pets. Although I only have two dogs, I have had up to five and been able to manage it just fine. You will lose out on the licensing fees from responsible pet owners and hoarders and other won't care if there is a limit or not.
- Dogs need engagement and exercise. I think it is incredibly difficult to walk more than three dogs at a time, keep them under control and pick up after them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- More than one Dogs the owners might have hard time controlling them specially if they are big breed dogs. Usually the owner would take both the dogs or all dogs for walk at the same time.
- Max. two dogs per household because dogs need a partner.
- Owners should be able to own multiple pets until the animals health becomes a concern.
- A reasonable number is the amount where one can properly take care of the animals.
- 4 pets maximum. (Does not include fish)
- There are too many dogs in Calgary. Everyone is bringing in rescue dogs from all over the world.
- Able to maintain cleanliness and noise without being overwhelmed
- It really depends on the size of the dog and size of the home. Larger dogs require more space etc.
- I dont think a dog walker should walk more then 4 dogs and most people can not be responsible for one dog let alone more nor do they have appropriate space time and energy for more dogs if they have more space up to four. Which I think should be the max for a dog walker
- Any more than 2 dogs, dogs end up packing up and can cause issues.
- In an urban environment it doesn't seem reasonable that dogs would have enough personal space if there were more, unless they are very small dogs. But I don't really know enough about dog ownership to fully understand the situation.
- The perfect owner can have more than 4. Irresponsible people should have none!! 4 is not too many at all for responsible people.
- Depends on the size of house, size of dog, how much access the dogs have to exercise, impact on Neighbor's (do the dogs bark constantly, not pick up waste, ect)
- Up to 5 dogs can be reasonably live in one household, especially as more people rent houses together and want to keep their pets. More for houses, maybe 3 for apartments.
- Key word is "reasonable". Two dogs keep each other company when the owner is away. Another consideration is the size of the animals. More than two Corgies might not be a problem, more than two Great Danes might take over the back yard.
- One person can only handle 2 dogs at a time.
- I'm going high, because of rescue organizations. They can sometimes have quite a few, before they go to foster homes or to their forever homes.
- It really depends on the size of the property. 4 dogs would be fine if they have a lot of space, but excessive in a cramped townhouse.
- more than two could result in behaviour and of aggression if they are in a large pack.
- We have owned up to 3 dogs at a time. I believe you need to have the proper outside space and inside space to provide the dogs room to roam. You also need to be able to care for the pets and the yard not to cause your neighbours stress or make them not enjoy their property because of yours
- They are naturally pack animals and do better with their pack(people or other animals) but 2 seems reasonable in the city. It's more manageable for the owner too.
- The number of pets allowed is a not really the issue- if they are fed, healthy, quiet, not crowded. 6 Rottweilers in an apartment or 6 Yorkies in a 4000 sq ft home? A 'specific' number doesn't address the size of the dog with respect to it's home or care. A 1-dog house could be neglected/abused



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The owners can't really control more than that
- avoid pet hoarding, health, behavioral and financial stress issues in an around the home.
- It completely depends on size of yard, and house. Some households should only have one, while others could easily manage 5+.
- Can dogs be manageable and not a nuisance in an urban setting ? Can yard be maintained ? Is adequate time spent with dogs, walking, playing etc. No one wants constantly chained up barking unhappy dogs in their neighbourhood. They end up angry and loose.
- Three dogs is a reasonable number for one person to handle.
- Three is sufficient because a dog should have a buddy and if one is super old and near passing they should be allowed a third.
- I don't care how many dogs people have and neither should the city
- The average person can walk two dogs at once. Any more than that and it is impossible to keep them from getting tangled it is also impossible most times o keep them going forward.
- If a rescue or foster they should have all they need as long as animals cared for with food water and outdoor exercise. Love
- Two can be managed by 1 person responsibly.
- Three is a large pet family, for owners who want that, but not so large that it's a problem for the neighbours (barking, pet waste etc)
- any number is reasonable as long they are well cared for and don't bother the neighbors with barking/escaping
- Noise. Ability for someone to care for more than two dogs; i.e., proper daily exercise, financially, size of yard/house.
- I think 5 is plenty. While I personally don't want that many, I foster for a rescue and sometimes people need short terms spots for dogs, also homes for moms at rescue with puppies would go over that limit yet are necessary.
- Depends on size, 3 dogs is a lot of dogs, require a lot of time and attention to be properly cared for
- Depends on all the circumstances. Dog size, how the person manages whatever number they have and how well the animals behave. You can't cookie cutter one number.
- One or two dogs makes sense. Three would be a maximum. Fiur or more and I begin to wonder why the household requires so many. Risk of unhealthy, unloved, inadequately cared for dogs increases as the number of rises.!
- 2 is reasonable, 3 is max, as long as they are all getting the exercise/care they need
- I don't think pets should be limited "per household". People with 1 dog can be terrible owners with a poorly-behaved animal, and people with 5 can be awesome owners with wonderful dogs.
- 3 is a handful and wonderful but lots of responsibility and if you cant handle putting in the time, then you shouldn't be able to have them. Far too many people get pets then release, let go, give them up not realizing all that is needed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- One is great, if need two the rationale so they have company could work. More than that would be allowed in that space if in the zoo and compared to natural habitat expectations. Why need more than two? Can't think of a reason.
- Unsure. Would need consideration of reduce foster homes that temporarily have more then this. And homes with new puppies and Mom. Four adult dogs seems tough to manage. But I suppose it also depends on the size of the (human) household.
- More than two means breeding, which should not be allowed in the city. More than Two dogs constitute a pack, and most owners can't control packs.
- In a regular in-city neighbourhood 2 sounds appropriate per household, on acreages it should be 5+
- Fosters could have puppies and such .. 4 is also a good number as some ppl dog sit
- Depending on the size of the home and the owners. Dogs should be trained, under control and the owner must be able to fully provide for ALL their needs and requirements if the owner wants multiple dogs.
- I have a multiple dog household and if you are responsible there should not be an issue
- Urban environment. People should by a priorityover dogs
- Too many dogs become a nuisance to neighbors, possibly too loud and smelly.
- I work at the humane society and know many people who successfully care for and manage many dogs in their homes, I would say a limit of 6 would be reasonable for most people since anyone breeding should be registered with the city so allowed only short term increases to that number.
- As long as dog waste is cleaned up in visible areas and the number of dogs doesn't create a lot of noise (barking and whining) in the neighbourhood, the number of dogs doesn't really matter - it's the impact of having dogs and that needs to be addressed by the owner.
- The more dogs, the more potential for noise that will disturb neighbours, also if you are not responsible and clean your yard, the amount of waste from more than three dogs can become overwhelming in the warm months. You may have two and as one ages, introduce a pup, then when one passes you have 2
- Limiting the number is not going to prevent hoarding that's a mental health problem. If they are all licensed and well cared for we should not be limited.
- If I own the house I don't see why the city should impose this rule. Intervention on number of dogs should only happen when there's excessive noise, or concern the animals aren't taken care of. There are too many shelter animals that need homes so if I can take care of them why shouldn't I be able t
- do not judge everyone the same. as long as animals fed/cared for/vet/vaccination/spay/neuter/licenced, then ok. If u want cap, then GRANDFATHER animals over max amount. Animals over max amt must be licenced/spay/neuter to get GRANDFATHER exemption. Not spay/neuter owner apply for breeder licence
- We have an issue in the Clearwater Park area near Elbow Valley. Dog walkers are walking upwards of 15 dogs off leash in the river Valley daily as well as the City Park area nearby. For folks walking one dog this could result in a dangerous conflict. Pack mentality is dangerous for dogs and people



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Size of property and the dogs is important here as well as the owners financial and time resources to adequately meet all of their needs. Considering the small size of urban properties it's unreasonable to accommodate a large number of dogs properly on a small property
- ability to properly care for the animals
- A neighbour walks three dogs and sometimes doesn't notice when one of them has defecated on someone's lawn because the other dogs are playing. Too many dogs and it's hard for the owner to properly monitor and/or control their behavior.
- any more than 3 dogs should have to have a special license to ensure they are being well looked after
- There shouldn't be a limit to the amount of dogs allowed in a home as long as they are cared for, trained and the community is not impacted by waste
- This is a questions that is somewhat complicated because of; size of home / yard, size of pet, number of kids in the home, etc. I would place a limit that for any household within the city to a maximum of 2. Otherwise it has the potential for the yard to become odorous and unsightly.
- Enough so that multiple families living in the same home can each have two (for example). Four dogs can be taken care easily. Avoid hoarding. Four two dogs means each one has a playmate.
- While I would not own 5+ dogs, I don't think the city should set limits on ownership unless their is evidence of neglect or failing to follow bylaws
- There should be no limit on number of dogs in a household if the owner is able to responsibly care for all dogs.
- Control of animal and companionship.
- 5 is about a reasonable limit, but this must be open to interpretation also, there are rare but logical reasons why someone may have more temporarily, and an officer should take some factors into account.
- It shouldn't matter how many pets someone has, but how well they are cared for. The people I know with more pets are the best pet owners. If a limit is made, owners that already exceed that limit must be grandfathered so pets don't become displaced and families stressed or torn.
- It does depend on the size of the house and yard, but you should be able to have as many as you can safely house, feed and care for.
- Dogs also need canine company. I believe more than that is excessive.
- Some dogs need company so 2 is a good amount. Lots are not made to support more. Also having more you are a lot likely to keep track of them while at a dog park.
- A person can just as easily be a bad owner with 1 pet, or a great owner with 5+
- Any more than that can be a problem for neighbors - 2 can keep each other company and be better able to be controlled
- Dogs need proper care, excerise, food etc.
- I am an animal foster with a registered rescue. If I could... I would buy a large house and take as many in as I could care for (meaning not just food & shelter - but individual care, love, training, exercise, rehabilitation etc.). That may only be 3. Or it could be 8. I do not think a number can be



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Anything more than 2 are difficult to control during a walk
- Up to three for small dogs and likely up to only two for large dogs (ie over 60 pounds). The more dogs the mostly likely for there to be noise disturbance for neighbours.
- In the past I had 3 dogs, all well cared for and exercised regularly and well trained, up to date on vet care and licensed. 3 dogs was no issue for a diligent owner like myself, I believe I would feel comfortable with 4 even, 5 might be max. I dont think you can properly control and care for 6+ dogs
- I feel that a single owner can provide the proper love, attention, and care to 4 dogs. I feel that 1 owner is able to walk 4 well-trained dogs at once.
- It depends on space within the home and time of the individual that owns the pet. If someone has little time and little space 1 small dog would be enough where if someone has a very large home and 4 dog and plenty of time to dedicate to them i don't see why they shouldn't have 4 dogs.
- As long as the owners have enough house for them all, can afford all their care, and exercise them enough. It should be case by case.
- Should be depend on size or dogs, size of house/condo and energy level for dogs
- I believe it all depends on the owners! If the dogs are exercised daily and there needs are being fulfilled daily,there should not be a problem! I know some people that cant take care of one dog or shouldn't! I don't believe this is a fair question! This really depends on responsible owners!
- I think people should be aloud to have as many animals as they want as long they are being cared for well.
- I think two. It is easy, enough room, can afford, easier poo pick up less dogs better care of them.
- Responsible pet owners should not have limits. Exceptions for medical care, foster/rescue homes
- Rescue organizations strongly rely on fosters and there are occasions where one foster may have several dogs coming and going. The main issue should be about responsible caretakers, if the dogs are well cared for there should be no limit.
- I believe that it is a person's right to own as many pets as they wish as long as the animals are well taken care of, licensed, neutered or spayed and healthy, and if heaven forbid we did get a limit on pets in a household the people that already have more then the limit should be grandfathered.
- Any number as long as properly cared for.
- I think as long as the animals can be safely and appropriately provided for then there doesn't need to be a concrete limit set . Plus those who have home rescue or breeding should not have set limits for their business. And of course not a nussiance for surrounding people
- Walking multiple dogs in the city and suburbs is necessary; with multiple dogs it becomes more complicated; interaction with other dog walkers is inevitable and dogs need to behave accordingly to avoid problems for all parties
- Depending on the size and behaviour of the dog. Dogs tend to be more of a risk animal with behaviour such as aggression and nuisance barking.
- some people have multiple dogs and are taking good care of them, while some have only 1 and the dog is in poor condition



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I feel the household should be able to maintain, provide and care for their pets. If they are unable to provide for a single pet they should not consider getting another.
- Should be a limit of 2
Any more than 2 can become a nuisance
- 3, if there is a yard, 2 if there is no yard.
- I think anymore than 4 would require an acreage because there is not enough space in city household for more than 4 dogs.
- What is important is whether the dogs are healthy, happy and cared for responsibly. A specific number won't achieve this — for some people, one may be too much, and for others 5+ May be not a problem.
- Depends on the size and type of dog and owner and the household. I think there should be some rules that can be enforced regarding the expectation of the health and environment of the animals. However, I would say it's hard to justify more than 7/8
- Variable, it depends on the owner. As long as the dogs are all well-cared for and the owner is adhering to the responsible pet by-laws there should be no limit.
- It's less about a number, and more about care of animals. If they are well cared for (physically, psychologically), and do not bother others (neighbours), then there should be no maximum. But for the majority of people, 4 may be the limit of what they can provide for.
- I believe that if the household is properly taking care of their animals that the amount they can have could be higher. I believe that animal breeders should have a cap on the amount of animals they can have.
- I think many people can be responsible with multiple pets. There should not be a limit.
- Barking, shit control, out of control dogs...unless they are inside dogs like cats
- Too many dogs are hard to care for and may not get the required attention.
- It would depend on the yard/training/quality of care provided.
- I think exceptions should be foster homes for animal shelters and the size of the dogs.
- Some dogs need company, so two might be okay for some households (depending on size and breed). One dog is probably more than enough for most households.
- Not the city's right to decided how many pets one can have if the owner is responsible. Limiting this mean you will literally be killing rescue dogs at shelters waiting for foster. My dogs are loved, cleaned up after, exercised properly. Why don't you decide how many kids I can have while you're at i
- Because of animal rescue and foster homes. If the city caps the number of animals the city should grant the grandfather clause.
- I don't know, it really depends on the household? I don't want to see people hoarding dogs, but a responsible pet owners with the capacity to give some lovely dogs a nice home should be able to judge what they are able to responsibly handle
- I don't think the number is important as long as they are cared for properly. Spay/neuter, good food, appropriate exercise, no excessive barking



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I do not think a number is appropriate for the law. It should be about appropriate care of those animals in the home; not a restriction by quantity.
- It would be too difficult to regulate this type of bylaw without infringing on a person's right to do what they want in their own home. A competent, conscientious owner can take care of multiple animals while a "bad" owner might have difficulty caring for one.
- 2 dogs allows the dog to have another dog friend while still allowing proper time and attention can be given to each dog for training and care
- Depends on size of house and type of dogs. This is a free market!!
- This can vary per household. If people are responsible, the number isn't the issue
- I think that you can be a poor pet owner with one dog or with 5. The number of dogs will not affect being a responsible pet owner or not. Animal hoarding is also not controlled by by laws because there are many animal hoarding situations even with the 3 dog limit currently in place.
- Depends on skill level of owner.
Some should not have an animal some should have more.
- Depending on the size of home, size of dog, and number of residents, I think no more than 3 dogs per household should be allowed. For the health, well-being, and associated costs of all. The dogs can play and interact with one another, but a ratio of 1:3 for humans should be safely manageable.
- Three seems like a manageable number of dogs. In most city locations with adequate maintenance and clean up, you could keep three dogs without issue. It does depend somewhat on the size of the dogs also.
- Limits do not do anything good! I honestly cannot comprehend why, when Calgary has been an industry leader without having limits are considering it now. Good owners can have 1 dog or multiples. Bad owners can have 1 dog or multiples... there is no correlation on HOW MANY.
- All depends on size of house and size of dogs
- reasonable number to be able to meet the needs of each dog while living in a city environment.
- There is no proper number. Individuals manage dogs differently. Some people can handle 1, some people can handle 8 without blinking so a limit isn't fair
- Dogs that are well cared for should be allowed. Quantity is irrelevant in a loving caring home.
- Depending on size of animal as well as size of house a limit should not be added
- There is a large difference between owning 5 chihuahuas in an apartment and 5 mastiffs. There are several factors to be considered when evaluating this and I am not sure all can be legislated.
- If a person is responsible, even more than four dogs is okay. If a person is not responsible, one dog can be too much. Each case is unique.
- Exceptions for puppies?
For adult dogs, more than 3 seems excessive. Even 2 seems like plenty in a household.
Barking is also a problem with multiples.
- Depends on the circumstances. Rescues are helping and should be able to continue to help.
- Depends on the size and energy of the dog(s) and what the owners can handle. Plus there should be stricter penalties for families who surrender pets when they have a new baby.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 10 maximum on a temporary basis. Some owners breed pets so have more than 5 for short periods. Most owners can determine themselves the appropriate number that is affordable and can be taken care of in their space. Hoarders and puppy mills would be the exception to the rule.
- I think a person should be allowed to have any amount of dogs if they have the means to take care of their needs (feed, walk, spend time, train and socialize). I do think people who have more than 5 dogs should be given a once a year home visit to ensure dogs are well cared for.
- anything more than one should be a rare privilege
- I own 3 dogs and usually have a foster dog. My dogs are extremely well trained and well behaved. There is literally no poop in my yard. I am a working student also. If I can afford to feed and train my dogs plus a foster, then I think others can do the same if they choose to have that many dogs.
- Any more than 3 cannot be controlled by an owner. No one should walk more than 3 dogs.
- I believe that people have a right to choose. Just like we don't police the amount of children you have. Some people can't manage 1 pet while others can. It is all individual.
- I don't think it's fair to the dog if there are too many of them in the house. a litter of puppies should be excluded from that count though.
- Number of dogs per household has nothing to do with responsible dog ownership. Someone can be a very responsible dog owner with 10 dogs and someone can be an extremely irresponsible dog owner with just one.
- Dogs are companions for each other but more than that would become smelly and noisy for neighbors which would not be fair.
- Unless you are living on a ranch/farm there is no way you have enough space for them to run freely nor do you have enough time to properly care of the dog.
- Dogs require a lot of space, attention, and care. If an owner had multiple dogs they would be less able to ensure that each animal is safe, healthy, and well cared for.
- Who needs more than 2 dogs?
- Depends on the size of the house, the owner and the funds to care for pets.
- The number is very dependent on the owners. If they have time for their dogs and walk them and have the financial means I don't think the number matters
- About half the people on my street have a dog and the dog parks are full. Yards are small so little room for many dogs.
- I don't believe the city should restrict the number of dogs per household if the dogs are well behaved and treated well and doesn't disturb anyone
- I believe that a person should not have to put a number on the amount of dogs per household. If you are able to love them, give them what they need, exercise them and treat them as if they are your children, then that is what truly matters
- Calgary yards aren't typically not very big. Anything over 3 pets seems unfair to the pet. Would also worry about barking from more than 3 dogs per household
- This depends on the household and I don't think there should be an imposed limit.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think it's entirely unreasonable to ask anyone what they think a reasonable number of pets per household is. 1 dog may work for some families. 2 might be perfect for another. 4 might be a wonderful completion to a pack of rescues.
- Depends on the person
- There should be no limit as long as the dogs are properly cared for and loved. Perhaps a home visit or something could be beneficial to make sure animals have the quality of life they deserve. In my opinion and experience, animal neglect can happen regardless of whether you have 1 dog or 7 dogs.
- To allow fostering and rescues to do their job
- 4 if you breed, 3 if giant breed in high density population neighborhoods with small yards..acreages...hard to say...unless a breeder I can't see having more than 6..depends on number of people in household
- I don't think there should be a limit. Don't punish the many because of a couple of horrible pet owners
- I've fostered puppies with various rescues and it's important that pups stay together with their mom for the first 8 weeks of life. I feel a responsible dog owner Can make the decision on how many dogs is to many within reason. This should be grandfathered in if the owner has several dogs already
- No set number in my opinion. Every household is different and has different abilities to deal with their responsibilities. 1 dog may be too much for one household whereas 15 are ok in another. The right number is the number that the household is willing and able to properly care for.
- If you are fostering for a rescue organization
- If someone has a tiny breed it's probably ok to have quite a few dogs. Depends on space and behavior I would guess.
- Too many animals often comes from hoarding and leads to abuse or neglect of the animals
- The number of dogs should be based on how responsible the pet owner is. If a pet owner is in good standing and the dogs do not disturb the neighbours then i don't have any concerns with them having multiple dogs.
- 3 max, know some household that manage this number, if one dog misbehaving then 1 owner can manage it while other household member can hold the 2 other dogs. That is if a household means more then One person.
- I think that is a personal question. There are households with 6 dogs who manage that beautifully and were able to give homes to those dogs who would not have found a home. For this one I have to trust rescue agencies and breeders to do their due diligence. Our home is currently a 3 dog household.
- It really depends on space available. An apartment should have less than a large house with a backyard
- If I can look after and care for up to 4 dogs, keep them healthy with immunizations and sterilizations. Keep them on leash or in my yard, not roaming freely
- 3 is a lot of dogs. One or two is better.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think it would be difficult to manage more than 5 dogs and I worry about situations where dogs have been hoarded. There are responsible owners and there are not. I think you should have to apply to have more dogs and prove that you are a responsible pet owner. It is also very expensive.
- If the owner is a responsible dog owner and the dogs are all licensed, and well taken care of, then there should be no limit. And current multiple dogs in a household should be grandfathered in, despite any potential new bylaws.
- I have 4 dogs without issue. The success of this depends on owner engagement, size of space for animals, and size of animals
- Part of this depends on the size of house. Larger homes three, condos one.
- Any more than two, is probably too much dependant on why you own them. Examples, breeding and show dogs.
- It depends on the person & how well they take care of/provide for the pets. If all are trained/well fed/have water/get adequate exercise/are fixed/house is clean/not abused or neglected/loved/see a vet when needed, then I'm not sure there's a number. Unless it's a hoarder situation, that is not ok.
- It's not about the # of dogs, it's about being a responsible owner
- No bad dogs - only bad owners. Limiting amount of dogs isn't the solution.
- Leave the bylaw as is. This is misleading as there are no current numbers.
 - The definition - sentient beings
 - However many can be responsibly cared for
- - Numbers are irrelevant, management is important
 - Across the board bylaw save sufficient
 - Need more enforcement
 - Do not put a number on animals on a household
 - External organizations to monitor breeders/trainers
- Crowded
- Because it's like a family
- Cat regulated
- 4 is too many (too chaotic). 3 is reasonable. Harder to watch if more than 3
- One dog is good but two dogs are better! They can play with each other.
- 3 or less. More than 3 is more difficult to manage. I believe the quality of life of the dogs will decrease if there are more of them in 1 household.
- as a landlord I allow 1 pet max size 10 kg
home owners can have 3 licensed pets
- There should be NO limit, as long as Dog Parents are looking after their dogs well, are controlling their dogs and following all dog rules.
- as long as the household can provide appropriate water, food, medical care the number of animals shouldn't matter - it all depends on the owner being responsible
- I do not think that a limit should be set. I do agree with the current bylaw that all dogs and cats should obtain and maintain a city license



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- As long as neighbors don't complain about barking etc and the dogs are well behaved, there shouldn't be a limit.
- Responsible owners could have 8 and it would be fine. Ignorant person could have 1 and be a nightmare. It's not the number - it's the owner. Make enforcement real to weed out bad owners not impose blanket limit with no rational connection to harm.
- Depending on the size of the pet versus size of house.
- Animals help the mental stability of people. For every person living in a household should have access to a companion animal
- I think there should be no limit based on per household. You may have a family that has a big enough property within the city limits that 5+ dogs is reasonable. Foster's = saving a life. It should be based on what someone can handle.
- I believe it depends on the size of the house, yard, and people. There shouldn't be a low limit. There should be a maximum without a license, but that should be closer to 10 dogs or more.
- I think if you are responsible and financially able to properly care for many animals, then you should be allowed to have as many pets as you want. People who want to breed irresponsibly or hoard animals will do so regardless of the law
- This question cannot be answered without considering the household. I could very easily handle 5+ dogs, but my space is too small, so i have 2 small dogs.
- I feel that the number of dogs you have does not reflect whether you are a responsible dog owner. You either are or aren't. Hoarders have a clinical illness and having a restriction will not stop this behavior. People that have more dogs will only licence the # allowed or not at all.
- It doesn't matter, as long as the owner is providing proper care and is respectful of their neighbors & community
- Multiple dogs require an immense amount of care.
- People love their pets but in the city people really can't properly manage a pack of dogs at the off-leash park, etc. Also for neighbours that can be a lot of noise/smell of waste. One person has less control if they are walking 4+ dogs so it is a safety concern.
- I am a multi dog owner. I have really great dogs and I love the fact Calgary had no limit. Responsible ownership is key and if you do change to have a limit please let those who are grandfathered in to keep their pets in their happy homes. I've had 6 dogs for 4 years now. They are amazing happy dogs
- This should NOT be a hard and fast rule though. Some homes are huge, with an extended family sharing the home. If they can and do take care of their animals and do not cause real issues for the neighbors, city officials should not confiscate animals people love . So, appeals should be allowed.
- This is entirely dependent of how the animals are kept and maintained. Is it 5+ massive dogs or little rat dogs? Are they licensed? Are they socialized and friendly? compliance to health and safety should be taken into account. A blanket rule is unfair to responsible pet owners.
- For the health and safety of the animals and the discourage backyard breeding.
- Personally 3 for me as that's all I can handle but I have friends who rescue and shelter dogs who have no homes and may be euthanized so I would say 5 + for them. I dont believe there should be a



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

limit as long as you are responsible about how you care for these animals. As long as it's a clean environment

- I don't think that's anyone's business but the households
- 3 because one can sit on the love seat, and 2 can fit on the large couch. more than 3 will already be a handful to take care of, as well there is only a certain amount of yard per house.
- The reasonable number of dogs per household is the amount that can be fed, exercised, and stimulated happily - this is a personal evaluation for each household based on their economic ability, energy levels, commitment to training etc
- Depends on the size of the house and space that is being lived in (yard), and the abilities of the owner to train, spend time with and take care of the dogs. A good dog owner will know how many dogs are appropriate for a given space and how many they can reasonably care for.
- The amount of dogs that can be cared for well is not universal, and should be considered on a case by case level.
- 4 seems reasonable
- It depends on the household, size of home, etc. Also whether the owner is able to care for them.
- Maximum 2. Reasonable number for owner to responsibly walk and care for.
- The reasonable number of dogs you have should really be relative to the size of your house, yard, size of the dog and your ability to afford/care for those dogs. If I live on an acreage, 4 large dogs might be reasonable, whereas if I lived in a 1,500 sq ft house, 2 small dogs might be reasonable.
- More than this means not enough time and attention for each dog.
- Beyond a couple of dogs the probability of annoying Neighbors goes up.
- Dogs are pack animals and enjoy the company. 2 is a reasonable number. 3 is still OK. 4+ it would be hard to take care of that many animals in one household. Dogs take work.
- Small dogs, 4 is maximum per household. Large dogs, 3 is maximum per household to let them lead a human and quality life.
- That's enough to monitor. also there should be a limit to dog walkers Some have more than 10 and they don't even pick up
- I can't give a good answer as I think it depends on the household size, economic situation and time able to spend with the dog.
- More than that is difficult to manage, leading to barking while in the yard, or being more difficult to keep under control when walking
- As long as a household is able to properly provide (food, shelter, water, exercise and mental stimulation) for the number of dogs, 4 seems a reasonable number to me.
- It depends on the size of house and yard as well as who the owners are as pet owners.
- More than 3 is hard to control and can be annoying for neighbours. If an owner can be proven to control and properly feed and care for more, then maybe a special approval by the City can be given.
- This is a very personal choice and I don't think the City should limit people. However, if people have 4 or more dogs they could require a special license.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Rescue organizations and foster homes need to be able to house animals
- I don't think that an arbitrary number is the right answer. It's about the health and wellbeing of the animals and the condition of the home. Some people are good pet owners with only 1 pet and some are great with 6 or 7 or more. This should be about responsible ownership, not a number.
- three and above is a crowd
- More than 3 is too much for most residential property sizes here in Calgary.
- It's a manageable number to keep in mind as neighbours that share their living in a community minded manner. Min., neighbour difficulties and accessing resources for resolution.
- I have 6 dogs and 1 cat. I still foster & there are small and large dogs & a cat, I can help a foster learn to accept all sizes and cats. It's a valuable service. I would hate to have to "give away" my dogs if a rule was suddenly 2 this needs to be grandfathered in. Do house checks on multi pet home
- It really depends on how many adults live in the household who can control the dogs, the type of dog, and how much space the dogs have. Too many dogs might encourage a pack mentality among them.
- Size of lots, cleaning up yards, seems reasonable
- However many that person can handle. We don't have a child limit and they are far worse
- It is the owner's choice how many they have. If they are responsible for 8 and aren't an issue it's none of the city's business. It is our God-given right how many not yours!!
- 2 large dogs or 3 small dogs is more than enough.
- I have 5 dogs but I think max 5 dogs is good enough. If you have the space and time I think 5 is enough.
- It depends entirely on the competence of the owner and their ability to keep the dogs clean, well-nourished and well-socialized. One yappy dog can also be louder than 5 or 6 well-behaved dogs.
- Two are company for each other and sometimes another family dog needs a new home. Well-behaved, non-barking dogs...no problem.
- Two would be a maximum. This is a City. Dogs are pack animals and will behave as a pack with the lead dog when that is their environment
- Depends on the house and the dogs. The safety and care taken of the animals and any children present in the house is of the utmost importance.
- Two seems a reasonable number in terms of providing proper care.
- Owners can not control more than 2 (and if they are large dogs, 1)
- Dogs and the dog industry add to the carbon footprint of mankind. With the amount of money people spend on their dogs, we could put that money to good use to save human lives in other countries.
- I don't think there is a right answer because some houses have more people or owners know how to handle multiple dogs but for others even one is too much.
- Reasonable depends on the household. If someone has the financial and special needs for many animals, they should be allowed to have as many as they want. Also it is a given that the animals should be well-cared for no matter the number.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Most families cannot handle more, let alone afford their proper care.
- I am involved with dog rescues and at times I have had a couple large dogs at a time. I also feel people should be allowed to have a few dogs but a limit needs to be in place to ensure that hording is not an issue.
- I believe there should not be more dogs in a household than 1 person can properly handle. I do not believe that 1 person alone can safely handle more than 2 dogs at one time. Also more than 2 is starting a pack.
- Two is a manageable number.
- Health to all the living things in the house have to be considered too many become too hard to handle.
- The # of dogs depends on how well each individual can provide for their dogs mental and physical well being.
- To ensure animals are properly cared for and picked up after.
- Space outside to provide reasonable exercise. Being able to properly and efficiently care and love for your pets is the most important. As soon as a pets quality of life is compromised due to multiple pets that is not acceptable.
- There shouldn't be a limit especially when it comes to fosters or rescues, it's not fair that they have to be limited because then a lot of those pets will go without being adopted for longer periods of time. And won't have the socialization they need to be adopted.
- dog owners who currently have multiple dogs should have a grandfather clause if limits are set Also counts should not include foster dogs.
- I think three dogs per household is a reasonable amount to handle and care for responsibly.
- It's about what an owner can handle, their space and budgets can handle. 4 or 5 small/tiny dogs can be comparable to a couple of big dogs.
- There should NOT be a # limit. It should be on a qualitative assessment - to the point that the person can healthily manage their dogs, without posing risk to others. Having a # limit will just encourage people to not license their dogs to avoid issues & will cause harm to rescues/fosters.
- I think it is what the owner can handle. I have two large dogs and could easy have more. I see people at the off leash with 4 and 5 all behaved. I struggle to understand why the city can dictate how many you can have. I see one lady pulling 5 little dogs in a wagon or sled and has others running.
- This is mainly for people who foster for rescues.
- If someone can reasonably take care of multiple dogs then they should be allowed to.
- I don't think it matters how many dogs a person has in their home, so long as they are taken care of.
- I think the reasonable number is the amount that the household can afford to register and care for. This refers to both money and time.
- Aslong as the dogs are being cared for appropriately then it is up to the family . We don't limit children, we shouldn't limit pets



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A lot of people have personal pets and foster as well. If they are being cared for and aren't being a nuisance then number doesn't matter
- I don't think it's the number of dogs that's the issue, it's how well they're being cared for according to commonly held standards. There are people that can't look after 1 dog adequately and others that are dedicated to providing the best care possible to multiple dogs.
- Disagree in this being policed if the dogs are safe and well cared for. No hoarding circumstance.
- depends if you are a responsible dog owner with dogs licensed, loved, and cared for.
- Depending on size of the dog and size of the house maximum 4 would be a reasonable number. I wouldn't like to restrict the number of dogs as 4 small dogs could be cared for well in one household.
- Many people can afford to take care of more than 5 dogs
As long as you have the space, \$, time & love there shouldn't be a limit!! Those with big property and land can easily accommodate 5+ dogs, not to mention you can bunch all breeds together.
5 chihuahuas is much different than 5 German Shepherds
- Depends on size of house, size of dog
- As long as there is health and safety in consideration a person with 5+ pets can be a better owner than a neglectful person with one pet.
- I believe that the number of dogs is directly related to the affect on the community. If you have 10 well behaved dogs that are not causing a nuisance / disturbance or mess in the community. The qty should not be an issue. 1 dog can be just as disruptive if the behaviour is questionable.
- I do not believe in a dog limit. As long as the owners are licensing their pets and they are being taken care of properly there should be no limit.
- As long as animals are well cared for, how can you limit it? What are the concerns?
- I believe that in most circumstances people who have multiple animals are able to take care of them. If the animals are well behaved, licensed and their owners follow the rules, I see no reason to change the current bylaw
- I think dogs are social animals and having two could be good for their mental health. But I worry that more than two could lead them to start developing pack behaviour, ie hunting or chasing down wild animals, other dogs or cats, or even people.
- It depends on the size of the dog and the owner's experience and training.
- If there are no complaints from neighbors you should have as many as you like plus there are breeders so litters you can't count
- I believe that the more dogs the merrier as they are pack/social. If the owner is responsible and educated and providing all of the necessities for the dogs to live a happy stress free life, then there shouldn't be a limit providing they maintain training and socially responsible Dog ownership.
- This is a hard question to specifically answer; I guess it would be dependent on the size of the house, how clean/responsible in regards to cleanup of the dog waste within your yard. But there should be a specific number for persons to abide by.
- I don't believe the city should dictate. Should be based on the square footage of indoor and outdoor space in the home/property.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Why do you need more for an inner city home.
- There should be no limit on how many dogs one has in their household as long as they are responsible. Someone who is irresponsible should not be allowed to own a dog in the first place.
- Why do people need more than 3 dogs? Seriously, why? Barking and the volume of waste are multiplied when there are multiple dogs.
- As long as all the dogs are spayed/neutered and have regular vet care, I think people can own as many animals as they can care for.. Unless it is a hoarding situation which is mental illness, not responsible pet ownership.
- animals are social creatures and prefer to socialize with their own kind as well as human interaction. Pets need to have a companion. Two is best but in an environment where there is an ailing or aging pet, the third pet can provide comfort. Try not to split up siblings may end up with 3.
- It should be proportional to the size of the property and how close the neighbours are. Too many dogs in a small space is not a good situation for the dogs, the owner and the neighbours.
- As long as they receive vet care, training, are licensed and have a safe and clean environment and follow responsible pet ownership. This also allows for fostering which is critical, as well as caring for family and friends pet while on vacation.
- fed up being judged like we are all abusers, neglectors, starve our animals, abandon them. treat us are individual. this is not suppose to be a dictatorship country. starting to look like it. I do not want restrictions on #s of animals I have. My money, my vet bills, my food bills. not yours.
- A limitation of two seems unfair however many people are unable to upkeep more then three in an urban setting
- Rescue organizations have foster families that care for up to 10 dogs at a time. "Reasonable number" is not a rescue-inclusive question. Outside of fosters/rescues, 3 is a reasonable number.
- I don't agree with limiting the amount of dogs someone has period. But if you do, There must be an exemption for breeders, rescues, and fosters.
- I would expect that people living in single family homes would typically have a fenced back garden to accommodate up to three dogs, as well as more than one person in the household and multiple family members taking care of that many animals. However, it should be less than three in other dwellings.
- Dogs are different sizes and temperaments. If someone wants to care for more than 5 dogs and the dogs are calm, or are seniors/ have health issues, they should not be limited unless there is a valid reason for restriction (temperament, history of illegal behaviour or lack of care, vicious dogs, etc.
- 2-3 is plenty if it's within the city. Out of town could have more.
- this questions is difficult as it depends on the type of dogs in the household. If the dogs are being well cared for and under control there should be a reasonable limit.
- Company for each other but not overly populated.
- 2
- if you can afford the dogs keep them under control dogs like packs there are a pack animal



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends on the size of the house and the size of the dog. Number of people in the house to care for the dogs
- Depends on the situation. The cost of feeding them is probably a limiting factor. Nothing wrong with six small quiet dogs that are no bother to anybody. I wouldn't want a government to dictate the number of dogs to me!
- Many people have their own pets, but do an honorable thing such as fostering dogs in need. These dogs are then temporary and go to adoptive homes. I don't condone hoarding situations however, where ownership exceeds 5 or 6 dogs.
- No limit. Owners with multiple dogs are most often the most involved and least disruptive as they are consistently responsible owners. Most issues surrounding dogs come from homes with only 1. a limit will not prevent hoarding issues as that will happen regardless.
- I don't believe that there should be hard number, 5 Mastiffs is a big difference to 5 Pomeranians. Also, if all animals are give the appropriate care and attention there should be no restriction. There should be tougher laws regarding neglect and abuse instead, especially for hoarder situations.
- Noise in back yards, poop pick up often not carried out, noise when owner is out, people controlling 3 dogs when walking
- I don't think we need to set a number, as it would depend on the size of the dogs, and how big the property is. Think of when a dog has puppies. Unless maybe set a high limit after which The City would be allowed to assess the situation to see if the animals are being cared for properly.
- We have had many dogs and the most we could reasonably handle and enjoy was two — three in a pinch
- Most rescues are foster based. I have seen people with 2 dogs who are not well taken care of, and I know someone with 8 who are some of the best cared for dogs I've ever met.
- One dog is more than enough for most families to look after properly.
- Depends on household, care and level of control over the number of dogs...you can have 1 really bad dog or you could have over 5 really well trained/behaved dogs in a house. This questions - how many per household is reasonable is not the right approach to answering the problem.
- I have 6 and mine are all well cared for. Mine are small, I don't think I could handle 6 big ones. I don't think a limit is the answer, most people who don't care for their dogs properly or allow them to roam only usually have one or two. Yiu never hear about 5 dogs escaping and at large
- Vet costs and animals can quickly become out of control - especially if they are not spayed/neutered.
- It is NOT the number that matters but the level of care. Please don't waste valuable tax dollars monitoring this superficial measurement. I have known many multi-pet owners who are absolutely doting with the animals in their care. Limits encourage less licensing and increased stigma for kind people.
- I do not think it is up to the city to decide how many pets I am able to care for in my own home. My pets are not and have never been a nuisance. I also foster dogs so they can live in a home environment before adoption. I am a responsible pet owner so this should not concern the city



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The number is not important to anyone but the owner taxpayer. If a person breeds animals there are number fluctuations at various times.
- It depends on the size of the home and yard, and the number of people in the household to care for the animals. It's silly to assume that a person in a 500 square foot apartment with no yard should have the same limit as a homeowner with 2000+ square feet with a huge yard.
- Putting limits does not mean people are going to be responsible that is an individual choice so I do not feel it should ever be limited
- it truly depends on the size, breed and temperment of the dogs
- For those who foster dogs or pet-sit might need to have more dogs at any given time. As for permanent pets. 4 should be enough.
- There should NOT be a limit provided they are properly taken care of. There are people with 1 dog that shouldn't be allowed to have it. There are people that have 10 that could have 20
- I wouldn't want that many but I think it is not excessive
- It's not the number of dogs, it is how they are taken care of
- This reply depends on how much space is in the house/yard as well as size of dog. I would have a max of 2 dogs at my house but my friend's house could easily have 3/4.
- As long as the animals are under control and cared for properly numbers don't matter
- Why should the city li.it how many dogs i have if i am responsible and take care of them properly
- I do not believe that limiting animals is the answer. I have had neighbors with MULTIPLE pets that are not a Nuisance to me. Yet a Person 3 houses down had a Dog that Barked non stop and a Dirty yard! I would say that as long as they are cared for the number or breed is NOT important.
- It is none of the city's business how many pets I own as long as I am a conscientious dog owner, obeying all laws and not causing issues for the dogs or neighbors
- Company for the other pets, two cats and two dogs. Often it's succession planning getting younger pet when your senior pet is in it's last years.
- People seem to be constantly losing their animals which is ridiculous so perhaps having less might make them more responsible
- 3 or less. Hard to care for more than that.
- Depending on the size of the household and income... someone can have 5 dogs. But, on average, I think that 2 allows for proper care (vet bills, food, attention, walks).
- This number is reasonable if housed with a responsible pet owner. Beyond that number it would be difficult to provide adequate training and exercise.
- Too much dog poop in a yard otherwise
- As long as dogs are being care for and not neglected....and people are not allowing dogs to be nuisances to neighbours
- So long as the dogs are being looked after it should be up to the owner to decide what is the right number for their household!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends on the house hold and how conscientious the pet owners are. Some households should have 0 pets while others could responsibly have 10. Putting a number limit punishes conscientious pet owners because of problems caused by poor ones.
- I do not believe an arbitrary number would be a reasonable limitation as there are many responsible owners that are able to care for 5+ dogs within the existing by-laws, conversely many irresponsible owners are are incapable of caring for and controlling as few as one dog.
- Two per household should be a maximum. Two allows company for the dogs welfare.
- hoarders and care issues
- If people are properly caring for their pets they should not be limited to a small number. Grandfather in existing pets is this must go forward
- Too many owners already don't take care of their premises when they have one dog - the more dogs, the more likely this is a problem.
- Each person and home is different. Some people can't handle one dog while another can give 10 dogs a perfect life.
- Given home and yard sizes, and individual pet needs and costs for vet care, food, etc - a house in the city should be limited to four. Owners shouldn't be breeding either
- The number is less relevant than the owner's ability to care for their pets or ensure they are not disturbing their neighbours, but regardless once you get to 5+ it seems excessive for city living, and there is almost no way your home is not the source of a lot of noise.
- People who want large numbers of dogs should live in the country. In the city, a small number of dogs is easiest to keep calm, quiet, and under control.
- just seems like a reasonable number.
- 2 is just a number. I think this varies by household, the ability to care for an animal responsibly, with adequate space, proper conditions and in accordance with bylaws.
- I have had 6 when fostering- it was hard to stay on top of pet waste and to adequately walk them. Therefore on an ongoing basis I think more than 4 is likely to cause problems with neighbours and be unfair to the pets.
- Depends on the house, but I can't imagine any more being easy to care for or manage. It depends on size of the dogs and house as well.
- There is no legitimate reason for there to be an unlimited number of pets in a household. 'More than 5' just becomes 'more than 10', and then onwards until there is a hoarding situation.
- Depending on the size
- It depends of the size.
- Two dogs can keep each other company, any more then it can lead to control problems / pack mentality
- It's a lot of work caring for dogs. It also can get very expensive.
- It isn't about the number of dogs in a home. It is about being a responsible pet owner an quality of care. Puppy mills and hoarding cases need to be addressed separately.
- cost, cleanup, safety in walking



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It could be three depends on household and how responsible owners are.
- I don't think this is a fair question. One would be too many for some people and 5 + would be more than reasonable for others. What about educating people? What about having a mandatory online course or in person written course prior to obtaining a dog with a reduction in licensing fee for those
- I don't feel this is fair or right for bylaw to dictate an exact number. Every household is different. The health, proper care and love the dog is getting should be most important. Some dog owners are happy with 1 and others can afford to have 6 financially and safely. That right should not be taken
- I believe as long as they are responsible pet owners, they should be able to have as many as they can properly take care of
- Owners know how many they can take care of and pay for as long as they aren't hoarders or puppy mills.
- I'm not saying everyone should go out and get 5+ pets but it should be a choice.
- It really depends on the size of the property, the size of the dog, and the capacity of the owner to take good care of the pet(s).
- we have two right now but at one time we did have four. they were all looked after and loved and did not fight or hurt anyone
- We have 3 dogs who are well trained and respectful.
- Depends entirely on the number of adults in the household and the size of a dog. If there are 2 people walking them every day then you could likely handle more dogs, if they are all small, also easier to handle on a leash.
- I think more than 2 dogs could be an issue to control. We live in close proximity to our neighbors and need to be considerate of their right to enjoy their homes and yards without the annoyance or mess of our pets.
- I don't believe there is a perfect number, it depends on the household set up but I do believe the more dogs the more chance that they are not being properly cared for and dangerous conditions may arise
- Except for very young puppies, two dogs may be mutual company but more are a small pack.
- I actually do not care how many dogs someone has, as long as they are licensed and well taken care of. And owners are being responsible when it comes to the ownership of dogs, they are exercised, not being a nuisance to neighbours, and yard is clean, and the dogs are well vetted, immunized, etc.
- It's about how animals are taken care of, not how many. Lots of people can easily care for numerous dogs very well, others can't manage even one.
- I think there should be a ratio of adults to people 2:1. 2 dogs per 1 adult in the household will help ensure proper care and responsible pet ownership
- Depends on house size and appropriate space for dogs to live in
- As long as the animals are well taken care of, fed, healthy, etc. It shouldn't matter how many pets an owner has, as long as they keep the pets out of trouble, follow bylaws, and keep the animals healthy and happy.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs are natural pack animals and shouldn't be restricted to
- 2-3 is a good number. Any more and it becomes a full time job to care for your animals. Any more and usually they become neglected and just become hoarded.
- I know multiple responsible owners who own a 5 or more dogs. There's no reason to have a limit of dogs on responsible owners - changes need to be made in terms of those irresponsible people breeding unregulated dogs
- There are rescue Fosters that adopt and care for several dogs very very well that would otherwise be euthanized. I think the exception should be made in this case.
- Animals are family and as long as they are cared for and taken care of, who cares how many they have
- Consider people who foster animals to provide safe environments for them during the rescue & adoption phase. As well, dog walkers & their business. You can't impose rules on how many dogs people own; I'm aware of the fact that there are hoarding situations, reality is THEY don't register & neighb
- 2 dogs per household is sufficient. If a household chooses to have more than 2 dogs then the household needs to be registered as having more than 2 dogs - or - registered as a foster home, and also registered as a member of a registered foster organization. Commercial agencies need to be licensed.
- If you are a responsible owner you should be able to have as many as you can handle
- As many as people can reasonably look after, feed and exercise
- If you have a heart to open your home to many dogs, care for them, in sanitary, positive environments, then you should be commended!
If you are not able to care for yourself, and your animals then one is too many. Don't stop the rescuers and fosters from doing good. Instead stop puppy mill breeders
- As long as a person is a responsible pet owner, it should be up to them how many dogs they have.
- I think that 2 dogs per household is reasonable for the amount of space and exercise that dogs generally need.
- 4, for owner owned house with proper fenced yard. This should be judged on an owner's behavior and responsibility. ie an irresponsible one dog owner can be more of a problem than a responsible multi dog owner. Perhaps it is time to license/permit the owner more so than the animals
- Freedom of choice
- I really think it is difficulty to answer as a household could be a studio condo or a detached dwelling with a large yard . That is the relevant question ,
- It depends on a case by case basis. Some people can have 7 dogs with each and every one taken care of wonderfully. On the other hand, someone could have 1 dog and be neglectful.
- Depends on size I guess, but 4 big dogs would be my max
- As long as I can look after the number of pets I have, i.e. cleaning up after, feeding, health visits to a vet, clean living space for both human and pets alike it should be my business
- With the right amount of room no limit



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Don't like any of the answers Numbers depend on breed, owner control and ability to give a safe, healthy environment to each dog. Some shouldn't have even 1 and others could have 6 and do fine. I would suggest 1 per responsible adult in the house.
- People should be allowed to have as many dogs as they see fit, as long as every animal is safe, well taken care of and has optimal space and time for exercise.
- Because dog owners are not keeping their dogs quiet as the bylaw states they should. The fewer the better. Plus, greenhouse gasses - pets have a GHG footprint too.
- It isn't the number of dogs, it is how they are cared for. Many people that just have 1 don't care for them and should have none!
- I think as long as owners are responsible and take good care of their dogs there should not be a limit. There are people who can look after 5+ dogs no problem and there are people who can barely look after one. It is about an individual's ability to care for an animal, not how many they have.
- It depends completely on the owner besting responsible. Some owners cannot take care of ONE dog properly; others are amazing with five. I'm concerned that those who foster dogs as well will be affected by a limit.
- I think if an owner has their dogs registered with the city, is ensuring all its needs are met, is not a danger to others, the owner follows all bylaws it is NOBODY'S business how many dogs they have. The irresponsible owners will be irresponsible with 1 or 20 dogs.
- Too much noise in the daytime when owners are not home and the dogs are in the back yard.
- I believe having the number of dogs that you can handle and take care of appropriately. People whom are fosters for dogs tend to have several dogs in there homes. Not all of the dogs are their own. We are doing a service to help these animals find homes. We can handle them just fine.
- # of animals in home does not correlate with quality of care given. Those that should be limited aren't going to abide by laws that limit them, a limit would only cause good owners to stop licensing & to feel like criminals in their own home. Most with 3+ are more responsible than the average with 1
- I have 5 dogs that are all very well behaved. Don't discredit people that have multiple dogs and assume they are hoarding. Most of us take better care of our pets than most humans do their own children.
- Most people know if they can only handle 1 - 3. Other people are great with 5 or more.
- You can't limit each household to a definitive number. Many, many households volunteer for animal rescue groups and they cannot be bound by a number unless they are not included in this.
- per household unless citizen can prove that the are fosters and temporarily have extra pet(S) for a period of ?
- I actually don't think the city should determine how many are too many
- Depends on physical space and size of dogs, also capability of owner to care for the dogs. If you can provide them an adequate home and exercise, why does anyone have the right to limit you?
- Shouldn't have to set limits but average price of a dog should comes into play and owners knowledge,
- With 3-4 dogs, one person should be able to control on their own and break up any fights that may occur if educated.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- To me it is not about the number of dogs. Many responsible pet owners have multiple dogs who are well trained, and many have one dog who is not. Expectations should be about training, behaviour, etc. not number.
- in my experience, more dogs equals more noise. dogs also require more care and attention. square footage of the home.
- smaller number = easier to control
- I have had 1 and 2 dogs at different times. I think 2 should be a maximum inner city.
- quality of life for pet, owner and neighbors
- Four seems excessive. It is difficult to maintain training, yard maintenance, and noise levels with each additional dog added.
- Really it depends on the size of home, number of people and type of dog(s).
- I don't believe a limit on the number of pets making a difference to animal health and well-being.
- This really depends on the size of the pet and the ability of the owner to care for them
- I think a limit somewhere between 5-10 allows for pet rescues volunteers to have their own pets plus foster pets.
- It's just a "me" thing. Who am I to say that having a 3rd or 4th dog would be a problem?
- Beyond 3, they can become a disturbance to the neighbors.
- This should not be the city's responsibility
- I don't know how anyone can properly spend the right amount of time with them beyond this.
- walking two dogs and picking up after two dogs is easily manageable more than that I feel it is not. especially when they are running around in an off leash park.
- To ensure animals are under care & control of owner.
- higher numbers are harder to control when off property, greater risk of barking while owners are away (noise for neighbours)
- Dogs need room to move and have to be walked/run. I personally don 't think you can properly care for more than 3 dogs. Also, 3 dogs pooping in a yard would get stinky fast.
- I think that there are people who can handle a more than average amount of dogs, and that there shouldn't be a hard limit on number of pets as long as the owner can properly care for them.
- Illegal puppy mills can hinder the ability to properly take care of each animal.
- Cost and the ability to provide proper socialization and attention.
- There is no logical reason to own more than two dogs, and the only reason for that is so they have each other for company
- We have to be careful because some people are fostering animals and that would be different - don't enforce the number 'rule'.
- This is very specific depending on size of dog, size of home and size of yard
- Dogs are very active and it's not fair to the dog if the owner has too many pets to give enough time for activities & walks to each.
- I think that number can vary based on the willingness and ability of the owner to provide proper care and training.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't feel this is a fair question. Some households can maintain multiple dogs without issue, where some can hardly handle one. I don't believe it is fair to set limitations here. If an owner is responsible, they should understand their capacity.
- 1 or 2 are great. Some dog people are really good at training and keeping their dogs happy and healthy, these people can handle more. Once over that, I am concerned for health and sanitation
- As long as there are responsible adults in the household to take care of the pet, their needs, proper exercise, there really shouldn't be a limit. 2 is plenty considering the costs of owning a pet.
- We have one dog and have considered possibly having 2 as a maximum at some point. I feel 3 or more is inappropriate in an urban environment and selfish.
- A responsible breeder may have puppies, young adults, other dogs being shown either by themselves or for others, adults and usually a couple of pets. This often equates to 8-15 dogs. It is perfectly feasible for this many dogs to be kept in one household and be cared for in a responsible manner.
- There are a lot of times one of the dogs is getting elderly and they bring in a third for the dog that is going to be left behind when the elderly one goes. They may also just enjoy three dogs or more
- We don't need the government interfering in our ability to choose how many dogs we can have but if you set the limit to 5, that shouldn't cause very many people to be out of compliance and would prohibit hoarding. Growing up, we had 4 dogs in our house and it never caused anyone any problems.
- A responsible owner can well look after multiple dogs and an irresponsible owner can not properly take care of a single pet so it should be up to the owner how many pets they choose to have so long as they are well cared for. It should not be up to the city to make that decision on their behalf.
- Because we live in a crowded city I do not believe the majority of people have the house, yard space or income to properly provide for more than 2 dogs. It's not fair to the dogs.
- They do better with a buddy
- I am a registered breeder of purebred dogs with the CKC and under federal regulations.
- 3 dogs are good enough for a pet home. However, if a person is passionate about dogs, example a breeder then they can have more as long as they can accommodate appropriately.
- The quality of care to each dog, training, good manners for polite canine citizens is more important than number. Responsible pet owners make sure their dogs are trained, exercised safely, contained indoors and out, well-cared for. Irresponsible pet owners can have one dog who is worse than six.
- Three of your own big a possible dog sitting situation can possibly arise for family members.
- I don't think a reasonable number can be labelled to fit everyone. I show and breed dogs and so I may have more than 2-3 at some points. But they are trained and I work with all of them
- Responsible owners and breeders should not be limited. Puppies under the age of 4 months should not be included in the total number per household. Bylaws with heavy fines targeting irresponsible behaviour such as not picking up waste, running at large, barking are a better alternative.
- If the household is able to contain them safely and hygienically then it shouldn't matter how many dogs you are allowed to have.
- There shouldn't be a limit on the number of dogs so long as the bylaws are followed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I feel 2 is adequate for the average pet owner. They need to be walked and worked with to insure their well being
- I am a hobby breeder that stands behind my sale agreements and is always willing to take back any dog I have produced. There needs to be an allowance for temporary increases in animals due to new litters or (rarely) dogs returned to breeders.
- I think the number varies based on the experience of the owner and level of responsibility. For example, you can have a household of 7 dogs of which all are trained, don't bark etc and you can have a household with one dog who is left out all day, barks non-stop etc.
- People should own the amount of dogs that they can afford to care for. Serious dog sport people own dogs at different life stages - puppy, young adult, peak career, mid-career, retired senior, etc.
- Number of dogs owned has no bearing on responsible ownership. A person can own just one dog and be irresponsible.
- There can be instances where people own 2 dogs and then foster dogs. Four dogs in a household I see as manageable even as a one person household as long as the owner is responsible-maybe City should have an owner class on proper pet ownership
- Responsible ownership is about care provided, numbers have zero relation to this.
- I don't feel there is a reason to restrict the number of dogs per house. I think 99% of people have a pretty good idea of how many dogs they can comfortably fit in their house/yard, depending on their situation.
- Numbers do not indicate responsible ownership. Do not put a number on it if you cannot enforce it. If numbers are used for profiling then define the profile instead and be prepared to enforce it.
- As long as your dogs are cared for, healthy and your yard is not filthy and smelly it should not matter how many dogs you have. Some people have dogs and also foster so there may be a higher number of dogs at any given time. Restricting will only cause more dogs in shelters.
- Too many ppl have animals they can't afford. Noise issues, waste issues. Exceptions should be made for breeders but only up to 12 (?) dogs or so for a brief period of time. No hoarding or breeding large quantities of animals
- Many reputable breeders are able to properly maintain a larger number of dogs for a successful program. Some pet owners do not adhere to the same humane rules as reputable breeder. The city could have a breeder registry so that CKC registered breeders are identified and allowed more dogs.
- For regular pet people 1-2 dogs is probably lots but especially in and surrounding Calgary there are many responsible and reputable breeders that would be severely inconvenienced if there was to be a limit put on how many dogs you can have.
- As long as the dog is Registered, tested, trained (responsible owner/breeder) shouldn't be an issue.
- Circumstances vary. Breeders and fosters number of dogs vary from time to time. As long as the dogs are kept in a safe environment and not a nuisance to others it should be discretionary based on the circumstances. Also said household must have the ability to care for and house the dogs safely.
- 3 for pet home and more if a rescue or a breeder



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Hoarding cannot be tolerated. I believe a person's skill level must be considered. Not everyone is capable of managing multiple dogs. Some are incapable of managing 1 dog. Responsible ownership needs to be emphasized. Reputable breeders need to be able to care for their charges and returns without fear.
- I think it depends on the person and their situation if someone can afford to look after and exercise properly. Numbers don't matter. Someone can have 1 dog confined in a yard parking all day or running loose. That is more a concern to me than numbers.
- As long as owners are responsible and the dogs are well cared for and no signs of abuse or over crowding in the space there should be no limitations.
- It all depends on the household, the owner, is it a rescue, ages of the animals.
- This is how many I have at and could appropriately manage.
- I don't think there should be a limit as long as the dogs are well taken care of.
- It isn't up to the city to determine how many dogs are allowed in a household. As long as the pet owner is responsible and the dogs are well taken care of that's what matters.
- This depends on the owner. 2 would be my limit for most households. However reputable breeders would have to have at least 4. There should be checking done to ensure breeders follow CKC standards for housing.
- Dogs require exercise, grooming, attention and space to roam. If all members of the household work full time it is difficult to meet these needs of the pet. However if the household has the time to devote to caring for dogs then more can be managed.
- I do not think it is the role of the municipality to determine this for citizens. If a person has the resources to care for 5 or more dogs then that choice should be left up to them.
- It is more important the care they get not how many. Some can have 6-8 well behaved and looked after dogs. Others can not look after 1?!
- Each household is different and can manage different numbers of dogs safely, cleanly, while still giving the dogs an enriched life.
- 2 unless you are a breeder
- Dog does not get enough attention if there are too many
- Too many would create too much noise and smell.
- hard question- probably 3-4. Exception should be made for responsible breeders and those who foster. All should be under control and trained.
- If all dogs are being well trained and cared for then the number shouldn't be an issue. It would be beneficial to assess each case individually as one bad apple rots the bunch.
- There are many responsible dog owners with many pets for various reasons (breeding, fostering, etc). They are excellent and responsible owners.
- I think it depends on the owners but it is unfair to limit people's allowances. It has been proven that those with multiple dogs are far more responsible than those in single pet households. So long as individuals are following all bylaws and are responsible in their care numbers should be secondary.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs are costly and require effort and time to care for, feed and exercise. They can be very noisy if just left in the yard. More and more ppl want dogs now, so as a society we have to manage space, noise and waste constraints. Nobody "needs" 3+ dogs. I can see 2 dogs, to keep each other company.
- A lot of people rescue and foster. Six would be my top number. As long as they're well behaved and follow the laws, I don't see an issue. Address individual cases.
- Dogs are pack animals, they thrive in pairs. Should a person have enough resources and time for more than 2 they should be allowed to responsibly own more. Should only be allowed a larger number than 2 if in a house, not apartment or condo.
- Numbers mean nothing. It's about the care and owner involvement with what they have.
- If you are actively involved with your dogs you do different sports with different dogs
- If you have a background in dog behaviour/training then having multiple dogs is a non issue. First time owners and people with no precessional dog background should be capped at 2.
- i know people who rescue dogs and they are good with 4
- I don't think it's the number of dogs- 1 or 2 dogs can cause more of Disturbance in the community then 4-5 well mannered and trained dogs it's not the dogs it's the owners who need to be trained. Some dogs are more catlike and don't bark others like terrier breeds will bark at the wind.
- I think most families can reasonably care for 2 dogs, however some people with additional training (veterinarians, dog trainers etc) should ne allowed exceptions
- So long as licensed and monitored. Not left outside when owner not home so they become bored and barking.
- If you are responsible and can financially care for 5 or more dogs and they are not being a problem then it should not matter how many people have
- 3 is a great choice, a small, manageable amount of dogs. However, this number should not apply to registered Canadian Kennel Club Breeders
- Responsible, licensed pet owners.
- I myself have 4 dogs and they are very respectful. no complaints from Neighbours ever. I am involved in Dog Shows, and I just like the companiionship of my dogs.
- As long as the dogs are not disruptive, and dog waste is picked up, I don't see a problem with up to 3 dogs or possibly more.
- As long as the owner is providing excellent care, ie. feeding, housing, vet check etc and is not being a bother to neighbours etc it is their choice. If I had to pick a number I would say 8 would be considered a good number.
- Anymore than 3 dogs in a home is extremely difficult and costly to handle in a big city. Also proper sanitation can become impossible with more than 3 dogs live in a home. For the owners and other citizens safety, a limit should be in place already.
- There are far too many variables (house location, size, size of yard, breed of dog, size of dog, etc) to put a restriction on numbers. Also it would be impossible for breeders to comply.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Most people can't handle walking more than two dogs, or if you go to the dog park (which I do everyday) you can't look more than two properly.
- This is needed for registered breeders and people who foster. If dogs are taken care of, safe, trained and getting vet care and not running free in the area then having 5+ dogs is not an issue. Licensed
- Two dogs are manageable as pets. More dogs should be allowed if owner is a registered breeder.
- There is no reason for people to own so many dogs, except in the case of a breeder and there should be an exemption for breeders for dogs under a certain age with a business license
- This should depend on the ability of the person to care for the animals. I have had up to 6 dogs and they were all licensed and had vet visits as needed and a large fenced yard to run in.
- The city shouldn't be dictating
- No right to dictate
- I can safely and effectively house train and manage 8 plus dogs. My neighbor can't handle even 1.
- Depending on the home, a breeder for example, could easily have 5+ dogs in their home as a responsible breeder will look after any of their dogs as needed.
- Responsible breeders have litters of puppies and at those times they might have 15 plus dogs. But once the puppies are placed in homes then the numbers go down.
- I have a problem with limits since it's too broad an idea. Some people can care for one pet properly, while someone else can easily manage 10 or more.
- depends on the owner's ability to properly care for. And by care for i mean give the animals proper care, cleanup after and ensure they don't bother others. Those things are more important than the number of animals.
- I don't feel number matters when each animal is being taken care of and all needs being met.
- I think any more than 3 especially if large breeds would become. Overwhelming
- The number of dogs alone isn't what's important here. It's how they are cared for and whether the owner is being responsible with them!
- Depends on the size of dog as well as the person's ability to properly care for multiple dogs. The number shouldn't count.
- Reasonable to manage and care for 3 or less
- Responsible breeders are often working through generations of dogs for breeding to improve the breed, it also can force people to get rid of senior dogs or restricted to help with fostering dogs. Number of dogs does not mean neglect, many people can handle multiple dogs. Property sizes vary too.
- 4 is an okay number for the average household if there is a caretaker around to ensure proper time is spent with dogs. This does not apply to breeders or rescues who dedicate all their time and livelihoods to dogs, I think experienced people could accommodate more animals.
- This question is difficult to answer because some households should not even have 1 dog. Others can handle (properly care for - food, vet care, attention, training ect.. and with no effect on neighbours) more than 5.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- animals are a part of life; breeders and others usually have vets involved and take care of animals; people pay taxes on home
- Depends on living situation
- N/A depending on the persons competency and how well the pack gets along I don't think this applies is in anybody's business.
- More, if a temporary situation (less than 3 months) such as caring or fostering.
- Number is irrelevant if animals receive proper care & housing.
- The number of dogs someone owns does not determine the quality of care. It's a personal choice that should be left up to the dog owner.
- If they are responsible why should it matter how many dogs are present in the household.
- As long as your dogs are well kept, no need to limit the number of dogs
- MD I'd Rockyview limits 3 dogs and this is a rural municipality
- 4 - 5 adults with an addition of 1 litter of puppies twice/year that will be rehomed for show or companion. Greater numbers than these could result in inadequate attention and care.
- I dislike living in a nanny state. I think the City can investigate when there are complaints instead of blanketing a city of a million+ people with more rules.
- The number of dogs in a household is irrelevant--people can be irresponsible with 1 dog and responsible with 10. The criteria is responsible dog management.
- I think it really depends on the size of a household vs size of the dogs, so I said 3.
- Three, unless they are a registered breeder with valid Canadian Kennel club registration and and all dogs are registered with ckc and licensed with municipality.
Most pet people cannot properly look after more than 3 dogs.
- If you are a responsible dog owner the number of dogs does not matter. If you are a responsible breeder the number of dogs does not matter. If you look after your animals properly - the number is irrelevant.
- One alone would be lonely.
- THis is for a CKC registered household. We often keep our breeding male or female until they die from old age as they have become a part of the family. We will then have two or three younger pups to add to our breeding program
- There is not one acceptable answer to this question. "Reasonable" and "household" are both highly subjective. Some owners are capable of managing numerous dogs responsibly without creating any disturbance. Others are not.
- Many responsible owners manage multi-dog households very well, at the same time being respectful of neighbours. Limiting the number allowed does not guarantee an owner will look after the health and welfare of their animals and be respectful of neighbours. Not fair to limit!
- I do not like that the government wants to tell me how many pets..of any kind.. I "should" have. Stop it.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It should be up to the individual, what would be as reasonable and the circumstances. As well as being kept on the owners property. An example: 6 Yorkies in a mansion is very different than 6 Great Danes in an apartment which is different than 6 Golden Retrievers on five acres.
 - This doesn't matter at all you cannot put a number on it. What matters is that the number of dogs are being cared for... I have seen people with 6 dogs very well cared for and 1 dog badly cared for.
 - It actually should depend on the owners and how responsible they are.
 - The majority of people with more then 2 dogs are going to be experienced dog owners .
 - I think the current bylaw is acceptable. As long as they are registered and accounted for.
 - For small dogs no more then 10 for bigger or medium size dogs no more then 4
 - Every household is unique and should be allowed to determine what is a suitable number. I own two, and more than two wouldn't be suitable for my household. They might be for someone else, however.
 - If people are responsible owners, can properly care for theirs dogs, and are respectful of their neighbours, it should not matter how many they own.
 - With the exception of foster care, I think it is difficult to provide an adequately healthy and enriching life for more than three dogs at a time.
 - It's should be on individual basis. It should depend on dogs behaviour is. If I can control 20 dogs and not have issues. This should be fine. If people can't control one dog then they shouldn't have one.
 - I believe there are many owners who can reasonably handle 5+ dogs better than many owners who only have one dog. Every complaint should be on a case by case basis.
 - This all depends on ownership. Good responsible owners should not suffer for bad owners
 - Owners choice
 - Most dog owners will have 1-2 dogs, some small dog owners will have more.
 - If the family is providing proper care and exercise for their dogs and are not breaking any noise bylaws, the number should not matter.
 - Dog owners walk behind my house and by the time there are 3 to 4 gathering, there can be 8 to 10 dogs running around. A dog pooped 5 feet from the owner and he did not pick it up, too busy visiting.
 - We own three well behaved dogs and have had as many as 8 when we foster. I don't believe that there should be a limit as long as the dogs are not suffering
 - Friends on individual circumstance. Some people should have 0.
 - I think as long as you can care for them properly, vet them and feed them a healthy diet then it should be allowed.
- If they are polite and not causing issues with the neighbors as well. There is no problem.
- The economy, the amount of work and maintenance a pet needs
 - Many people are responsible and knowledgeable in pack behaviour and have multiple dogs without issues.
 - License Breeders should be exempt. Otherwise 4 should be okay.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Some people can manage larger numbers of dogs. I personally have 10. Some people can't even manage 1 dog. It comes down to the proper knowledge of dog care and their needs as well as caring that they aren't nuisance to neighbours
- That's up to the individual(s) who live there, and it shouldn't have anything to do with the government.
- Number of dogs does not determine conditions dogs live in or behaviour of dogs.
- I would consider a 3 dog limit to be for most pet owners. Most people would have the time/finances to train and raise and provide adequate veterinary care for 3. There should be a separate designation for breeders of CKC registered dogs that would allow for increased numbers on a case by case basis
- It is highly dependent on what an individual is able to provide, not only financially but in the way of time, training, enrichment etc
- If they are well behaved and not a nuisance people should be allowed multiple dogs. One dog can cause more problems than multiple dogs can if the owners aren't responsible
- I don't feel the dogs will get proper care and attention when there is more than 2 per home.
- I appreciate that Calgary doesn't currently have a dog limit.
- I do not support dog limits. This does not ensure the dogs are well cared for or well behaved. As long as you have adequate space and can properly care for your dogs a limit should not apply. Studies have shown that limits do not ensure responsible dog ownership.
- Responsible owners who can provide the proper care and who license their dogs should be able to have as many dogs as they want.
- I think the current rule is reasonable
- If there is enough space, and the dogs are respectful, trained well and taken care of, they are fine with 3 dogs.
- If you can afford to keep your dogs and provide care and everything they need than they should be allowed to own up to five. And if you're a breeder you would have more than five dogs as well.
- every owner has a different number of dogs that they can reasonably care for appropriately. A working person the is at work 12 hours a day should probably have none. A couple that works form home and sets their own hours could care for 5 or 6, without the neighbours realizing they have that many.
- whose business is it how many dogs someone has? mind your own business
- We have 4dogs we live next to an offleash and walk min.1hr. 2to3 times a day
- For many reputable breeders the need to keep breeding stock is a nessecity. Good reputable and ethical breeders live in cities and the ability to continue to preserve these breeds means breeders and dogshow exhibitors will need to keep more pets in the city of Calgary
- Breeders should have a license and annual CHECK of their kennel/set up to ensure the number of dogs and licenses are equal. This includes neuter and spaying. This will ensure proper breeders are breeding under city rules.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends on the circumstances and also the amount of care they have for their animals. Lots of rescues are put into the same home and therefore it should be up to owner. Responsibility is up to the owner and if not taken care of them they be removed and/or surrendered.
- More than that and they become a pack and their behaviour changes.
- Many people have at least 1 dog, nice to have a companion for that dog as most dogs are left at home for 8+ hrs a day.
- No household needs more than 2 dogs ... any more than that and they should be considered a shelter or breeder.
- Really after 3 I would assume your a dog breeder or trainer of some kind. It takes a lot of work to take care of that many animals. After 3 I would wonder if a person/couple can take care of that many dogs.
- I think the average household should be allowed 3 without question however an individual working in the dog industry (breeder, trainer, performer) should be allowed more. Definition of "working in the industry" means achieving income through dogs.
- The "reasonable" number differs from household to household. One person can manage 30 dogs, while another struggles to keep one under control. Personally I know what my limit is and I won't cross it. If the dogs are becoming a problem, then the owner needs to be addressed.
- I have 4, all are well cared for and loved like family. Restricting the number won't stop bad behavior or animal hoarding. It just penalizes people like myself. Some owners are not responsible at all
- 2 for sure, but perhaps 3 depending on size of house.
- Problem is not how many dogs a person should have. It's how capable they are of properly caring for the number of dogs they do have. Each person has different capacities. Some people can take great care of 6+ dogs, while others can barely take care of 1.
- Care of pets should be the deciding factor on how many can be kept. I've seen people with 6 pets take better care of their pets than some people with only 1.
- As long as there is responsible ownership, and the dogs are appropriately cared for, there shouldn't be a limit.
- Number shouldn't matter as long as the dogs are being humanely cared for and that owners are following the bylaws including registration.
- As long as the dogs are well cared for why is it the city's business about what's going on in someone's home when they are following laws and maintaining a clean and manageable household. The amount of dogs that one person can manage varies per person.
- Any number of animals depends on the ability of meeting the animal's physical and mental needs. Some family's can only do this for 2, some can provide for 5.
- The number should be reflective of the CARE the pets are receiving. I know folks with 4 or 5 dogs that are INCREDIBLE human parents and very responsible.
- Honestly a number won't dictate how well those pets healthy, mental health are taken care of. It's education on what animals in general need.
I have multiple dogs and I know each one needs a certain thing to make them happy in life. So I meet those needs



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- In regards to barking, mess that may smell if not regularly cleaned up I think 3 is reasonable
- For the average pet home this is plenty
- This is for big dogs as more than this becomes a pack.
- The amount of cats allowed per household in Alberta is 6. I strongly believe it should be the same for dogs given that the owner is responsible. Additionally, for small breeders I believe they should be allowed to house their dogs in their homes.
- I expect no limits on pet ownership from the city and for enforcement to be related to noise and safety only.
- As long as all animals are properly cared for it shouldn't matter!
- Not too many, enough for one person to handle while out walking.
- If the dogs are cared for properly then the number is irrelevant. ONLY if the dogs are not getting proper care should the number be a concern.
- I have 6. I'm not sure it benefits the city to have a cap on number of dogs in a household.
- Only fair for the dogs to have ample room and hygiene.
- Most household have 2 people. 2 people with 2 well trained dogs each should be very easily manageable.
- There are many responsible owners who own multiple dogs and have the ability to adequately care for them. Responsible preservation breeders come to mind for this 5+ rule as well.
- Responsible people can control their dogs. Humans that are involved with dog fighting don't care about the dogs. Those are the people you need to go after and leave the responsible breeders / owners alone
- I think it should be based off what someone can handle, and as long as the animals are cared for I don't see it as a problem
- I have worked in animal control, it is about HOW someone cares for their pets, not the numbers.
- Each home is equipped to hand different amounts of dogs. If the dog is tiny (Yorkshire terrier) than multiple dogs are viable, if that same house has Irish Wolfhounds, then the numbers would be less. Some households are breeder homes, and could have a litter of puppies, where does that fit?
- If you are a dog breeder you should be able to apply for a kennel license
- I support reputable breeders. And those breeders have multiple dogs to ensure their program is diverse and improves the breed. Backyard breeders tend to have one or two dogs, with no concern of strengthening the breed. This results in more dogs in shelters. Rescue/Foster owners may have 5+ aswell
- N/a
- up to 3 dogs, but at least 1 has to be small. no more than 2 large+ dogs.
example: 1 pomeranian and 2 border collie.
example: 2 labs.
- With exception of a Ckc registered breeder I think 4 is a reasonable number.
- Depends on the house and owner. Typically, tough to be master for more than two pets without professional backing.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 2 dogs is a good number in the city gives a playmate as well as owner not being overwhelmed by dogs
- It depends on the size of the dog(s) and also if the owner is taking proper responsibility and providing care for all the dogs.
- The reasonable # of dogs is dependent on the care received. Some people can care for one pet, and some people can care for multiple pets. The number of pets does not define standard of care. Owners must provide care per their law, regardless of quantity of pets.
- I think more dogs require more open space and could potentially be very noisy.
- It is less about the number and more about ensuring proper care and training is provided
- Hard to say because the size of house matters and so would finance
- We currently own two dogs. One of them suffers from separation anxiety and needs to have another doggie companion to help keep her balanced. In a few more years, we'd like to bring in another puppy so that when it's time to let our older dog go, our younger one isn't left without a companion.
- Depends upon the size of property and ability of owners to care adequately for these animals and the reason why they have so many.
- Considered reasonable in many towns, cities.
- Dogs are easy to care for and look after their own bathroom responsibilities outdoors. Dogs act more domesticated than other animals.
- This depends on competency. I think after 2 dogs people should have to take a pet safety course to add more dogs
- Depending on how many people live in the house. Are these sport/working dogs? A lot of people like myself have more than one competition dog. But I also live with a roommate who has a dog as well
- People should not be limited to the number of pets they can have so long as they are financially capable and the pets are well cared for.
- I don't think anyone should dictate how many dogs I can own. Some people can't care for the one dog then there are others that are amazing handling and caring for a dozen. It's really a matter of time, space, dedication and finances.
- Unless a recognized breeder 3-4 is all most can handle
- Most responsible dog owners I know have at least 3 dogs. They attend many activities and events with their dogs, and it is a lifetime hobby. There is usually an up and coming pup, a working dog and one or two retired team mates. They are not house pets that sit around all day, but provide therapy.,
- This all depends on size of dog breed and training. 5 well trained Great Danes will have less of an impact than 5 barking un-socialized Yorkshire Terriers. Numbers nor size should be a factor rather the impact on the neighbourhoods.
- Responsible caretaking of animals should be the only restriction
- I think this number should be based on how many the individual person is able to care for. 5+ dogs in a crappy house is not equal to a home where the dogs may do sports, activities, well fed and vetted.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The number of dogs doesn't have a reflection in whether or not you are a good dog owner. If u suck at dog care you'll be just as bad with one animal as you are with more
- This is if they are strictly pets. Don't know how to evaluate for breeders.
- It's up to the owner to decide how many they can look after well.
- Three is a reasonable number for a household to adequately look after
- Not sure anyone needs more than 2 dogs
- in an average home 3 dogs is more than plenty. Average being a home with a backyard or outdoor space suitable for a dog.
- Each household is different. If the animals are cared for and the owners follow all the other rules, I don't see why the city should have a say in how many pets a person has.
- I believe the average household can handle 2 at most, even the most active families would have difficulty handling more than that, aside from some minor exceptions.
- A maximum of 2 to accompany each other if u can afford more then they should provide their notice of assessment. These will prevent owners to own what they can afford like owning a credit card but spends more than how much they make
- I can't say to that. An amazing dog owner that has well-behaved/socialized dog could have lots and be fine. It's the inexperienced or ignorant dog owner where one dog is too many....but how does that get monitored? And as long as noise and smell are kept in check -?
- It should be a personal choice. If someone can care for and not neglect more dogs than another person, then why would we deny a home for the dog? Too many in shelters.
- A person can care for 5 or more dogs fine while his neighbor may not care for his one dog. We cannot base owner ability by number of pets alone.
- Reasonable number to be able to spend quality time on them.
- 3 seems to be a good limit to how many a person can control at once. It's not too many for either small or large breeds (given the person has the space).
- There should not be a limit, each case varies. I have a huge yard and am home all day so I can manage 6 dogs and care for them properly and ensure their needs are met. Limiting the number of dogs won't help ensuring their needs are met, setting a limit has no use.
- For breeders, I think it is perfectly reasonable to have 5+ dogs as that is their income source. I think as long as they don't make too much noise, it's perfectly fine. I don't think there should be any restriction
- Depends on the resources and time you have to care for them and train them. If you have 5 well behaved and well cared fir dogs it isnt an issue. If you have one dog tied up outside or that bites people, its an issue.
- It depends on the person in question, I like to have 3 dogs at a time, they wear each other out and they're not lonely. Then there's reputable breeders that usually have 3-5 breeding stock plus eventual pups. If the animals are well cared for and UTD on vaccinations I don't see a problem
- 5+ is excessive for the average household, but as some that competes in dog sports, 3 feels limited at times



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- However many are loved and cared for properly.
- This is ambiguous. This depends on the individual and their household, what they can afford and what they can manage.
If the limit is 1 and I want to foster another dog, what happens then?
- I know 2 responsible breeders who house more than 5 dogs and they are well cared for and no complaints from neighbours or issues to that nature. If monitored and rules enforced when necessary no reason as to why 5 or more dogs is unreasonable.
- In the city - makes sense due to ability to ensure they get proper exercise, noise issues, cleanliness issues
- Personally I don't believe the number of dogs is necessarily the issue. If they are receiving great care and well looked after why should there be a specific number. My children all have their own dog which is great for teaching responsibility And greAt therapy to help boost moods
- It's not the number of dogs, but the behaviour and actions of the dogs and dog owners.
- Every home is different. Some cant take proper care of one dog, others take amazing care of 10.
- I believe people should be allowed to have more lenient restriction if they are properly able to care for and manage their dogs. There should not be a cap on how many animals per house hold if they are well kept. Should not concern anyone if the animals aren't problematic
- 5 tiny dogs are entirely reasonable for some owners, while even 1 may be overwhelming for another. A household may be a 350 sq ft condo, or a 5000 sq ft house. So many variables to restrict by 'household'.
- Although a household may be financially or intellectually able to handle more than four dogs. In an event of emergency or situation, 1 person may be able to still handle 4 but not more than 5. Also wonder if size of environment can be a factor.
- Dogs have evolved to play in pairs and not groups, thus allowing even numbers makes the most sense. Exceeding 4 dogs requires massive time commitments to ensure all dogs needs for care and adequate stimulation are met, unreasonable for most people.
- Depends on size of dog, size of property, number of dogs a person wants, if a person is involved in dog activities-
- As long as the animals are well cared for, someone should be able to have as many as they can handle. This number can differ between people due to finances / time / energy so I don't think there should be a limit. If someone can only handle 1, no problem. If someone else can have 12 happily, that's ok
- I don't really think this question is appropriate. It depends on if an owner is capable of properly caring for multiple dogs. It is only unreasonable to have multiple dogs if you can't take care of them properly.
- I have a large he
And my dogs have always been licensed and I am a registered breeder with CKC so when my bitch had
Uppies I would have as many as 5 or more with my two or three adults and the puppies until they went home. I have [personal information removed] never had a complaint and



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 3 dogs in a home allows for all dogs to get the attention they need and the training they require. However I don't think it should be based on home I think it should be based on square footage. I would never allow 3 dogs in 500 square feet but 3 dogs in 1500 seems reasonable.
- I currently have three dogs. I spend a lot of my time and energy providing adequate exercise and activities for them. If I owned more than three dogs, the quality of all of our lives would suffer.
- too many and it gets difficult to control. neglect may result.
- As long as dogs are well cared for, rules are followed and yard and house is clean then it's no one else's business.
- If you can care for the animals (spay/neuter/vaccinate/vet visits) and you're not annoying your neighbors, go for it.
- 1-3 dogs seems reasonable in a household in a big city. Size of home would definitely impact the number of dogs, smaller the home, less pets. More pets means more possibility of bothering neighbours whether dogs are in the house barking or outside in the yard. We must live together as a community
- I think if you can properly care for dogs and can licence and have their shots than the number of dogs are up to you. But if you do not licence or provide medical care for them you should not have them.
- Two hands, two dogs. You need room and money to care for them appropriately. Two are company for each other, but more and you may have fights.
- pending on how many 'responsible' pet owners in the house I don't believe one person can manage two dogs at one time. Dogs have their own minds and agendas and people don't always want to listen or can not get the animal to listen
- That's enough dogs for them to be company to each other. Any more dogs than that seems excessive.
- For those of us that spend our days and our finances on the multitude of dog sports there are to participate in some of us enjoy having more than 1 or 2 dogs to play at a time,. I have friends in other municipalities that do not license their dogs as they are over the limit, we can license all here
- I do competitive sports, one dog is retired, 3 are active, 1 is a puppy still learning. Why should I be limited in my dog fun if I am responsible by licensing and training them to be the best they can be
- This is a very individual question. There are many people who are incapable of or choose not to care for one dog appropriately whereas there are others who have 5+ dogs that provide exemplary care.
- I don't care about the number, as long as they are cared for. Similar to deed not breed, it's not the number, it's their care.
- This is a slippery slope. I have had multiple pets in the past, and have friends who have multiple pets. Whether it's one or more, they all need to receive the care they deserve. There are plenty of owners of single pets who should not have even one.
- I chose this because this is not a simple question to answer. It totally depends on the household and the family dynamic that exists in the home. Some people should not have dogs at all and some should be able to have as many as they wish.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I live in a duplex and share a wall with a woman that owns 12 dogs for illegal breeding. We have had noise/smell issues with her animals for 2+ years now. She has a court order to keep her dogs quiet, but we continue to hear barking inside and outside our home, and continues to breed illegally.
- For those that foster, having other dogs in the house helps with behavior issues, etc.
- do not cap. judge everyone separately. do not judge everyone the same. just because there are people who abuse, neglect and abandon their animals, does not mean that the rest are all the same. concentrate on the ones that are abusing, neglecting and abandoning their animals only.
- every home can handle dogs differently , a magic number does not guarantee a safe environment. The loudest dog on the block can come from a single dog home while the neighbor has 8 sport dogs and they are never noisy .
- I can't imagine how you would care for more than 3 dogs unless you were a dog daycare and this was your full time job.
- Most yards in the City of Calgary are quite small. Dogs need space to run.
- If they are small dogs maybe 3. Too many dogs can lead to excessive barking from our experience.
- As long as they are well cared for and kept inside I have no concerns about the amount of animals
- If the person pays property taxes and owns their home, no one should be able to dictate how many pets they own, as long as they have the means to take care of them and are not abusing them.
- In some households three dogs would even be too much. I think three is a reasonable number unless you have a dog sitting/grooming/shelter business. Dogs certainly play off of each other so when they are excited three can be a lot for one house. This is simply my opinion.
- I have 9 dogs I'm responsible for and they are well cared for see the vet 1 time a year for check ups ect , I don't leave waste When I'm walking them ect
- I don't believe there should be a cap on how many dogs in a household but their should be better regulated laws on backyard breeding
- some dogs are more manageable with a dog companion and some are family offspring with puppies that need to be included, etc..
- We have responsible breeders in Calgary who may have 5+ dogs
- Who cares? As long as they're healthy and the owners are respectful to neighbours, it's not your decision to limit who owns what kind of animal, whether they have kids, or 25 vehicles.
- If the dogs are properly cared for housed exercise it is not someone else's concern within reason how many dogs there are within a household some people aren't able to look after one properly others can look after half a dozen without any issue.
- this is a number that is easier controlled as in a pack things can get out of control
- Depends a bit on the number of people in the household. Don't think that it is manageable for one person to keep control of more than 2 dogs consistently.
- Everyone can be different. Time, cost, resources , training, behavioral work etc, food, vet attention/cost, attention all dictate the ability of the household to care for the pets properly. Unlike children where nature limits the number that you can have and care for. A limits is needed 6 perhaps?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Please allow me and my pets to enjoy our lives in peace. Our neighbours have never complained.
- I think u should be able to have as many as u can responsibly handle.
- maximum 2 large dogs. And 1 small dog. I say this because if you have a large dog you will need a friend for it, and if you have two large dogs you don't have a lapdog, someone might want a lap dog to cuddle. But for sure no more than two large dogs and no pit bulls .
- It depends
- More dogs would be considered ok if the person is a dog walker or their dogs don't bark excessively and upset the neighbours.
- This should not be an absolute number. A distinction needs to be drawn between animals owned and fostered. And, perhaps a ratio of adult:pet residents in the household.
- Most people have only one dog. Allowing up to two dogs seems reasonable. It becomes more difficult to control more than a couple of dogs.
- I believe if you are a responsible dog owner (able to take care of the dogs, train them, keep them under control, etc.) you should be able to have as many as you choose. Why should someone else dictate how many dogs you can have if you are a responsible dog owner & your dogs are not a problem.
- Depending on the size of the dogs, but mainly for large to x-large dogs, 4 is a good number. Especially if the one owner takes all 4 dogs out to an off-leash park at the same time, you want to make sure the owner is able to monitor all at the same time.
- I have 4 dogs in my house. Me and my family are more than capable of handling this many dogs. I believe the reasonable number of dogs per household is subjective and should not be dictated.
- I think pets in the home are dirty. I dont like it because their feet are bare on public roads and their bums are dirty. I prefer people dont have dogs or cats in their house. I believe that animals need space to roam and the city is too confined for them. I think a small shedless dog might beok
- I don't care how many dogs someone has as long as they aren't being neglected or bothering neighbors
- a second dog is fine for companionship and playmate if you have the means to properly care for 2 dogs
- depends on the size of the dogs. One person should be able to control all dogs when on/off leash.
- depends on living conditions - back yard or condo - size square feet - and also how many are allowed to be legally walked at once. /expense of proper care
- Three is a manageable amount of dogs to have. I do think that those who currently have more should be grandfathered in so they don't have to get rid of any pets
- It depends on the household and their financial ability to be able to provide and care for the dogs, this includes vet care.
- 2 is plenty foe any household.
- It depends on the owner and familys skill set by saying one we effect rescues and breeders. Some people can handle non and somenfar more



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It will vary for each person, however reasonable should be based solely on the needs being provided for said dogs. Some households have unique living arrangements that have multiple dogs under one roof but different owners. Some are rescues, some are working dogs, it varies too much to number.
- How many dogs in a household should absolutely not be decided by other people unless that specific household has had animal-related charges in the past.
- Dogs are a benefit to those they live with and interact with. Responsible pet owners with the financial resources to do so can easily take care of three dogs.
- concentrate on the people who abuse. look into the off-leash park emails on the city of calgary, a woman took puppy to off-leash park, puppy was overwhelmed and shut down, woman grabbed puppy and threw him on the ground. that is who you would be looking for, not people who take care of their dogs
- This is a difficult one to answer as those of us who are well experienced can train and control up to 6 dogs, however, I have met plenty of dog owners who shouldn't be allowed to own any as they are totally clueless on canine behavior and treat them as "children" (poor dog).
- I really feel it depends on the household. How big is the property? How much yard space do they have? I don't like having catch-all restrictions unless it's very clear about the circumstances (for example, maybe the restriction is based on square footage of property, etc. - and income for care).
- As long as the owner is responsible, the number should not be restricted. However, knowing most people are not ideal pet owners I think 3 is a reasonable limit. Also condos should not be able to restrict size of dogs or number beyond bylaw limits - restrictions should be behaviour based only!
- It depends on the family; are they able to maintain a clean environment, afford proper nutrition and veterinary care, exercise and training, license their dogs and avoid the pets being neighbourhood nuisances. Some homes should only have one dog, whereas others may be able to properly care for 4.
- Most dogs do better with companion and many families have 1 big dog and 2 small
And our backyards in Calgary city limits are not big enough for more than 3
- A reasonable amount of dogs is three unless your dog has had puppies. This is so you can provide all there needs and so the dogs won't be overwhelmed by each other, have the resources they need to be happy and feel free to be themselves.
- I feel when you get into multiple dogs (3 or more) control and training tend to be an issue
- In a home with no children and perhaps one or 2 adults (or more if roomates), 3 dogs is not a difficult number of canines to care for if well enough behaved and not rowdy in nature.
- Depends on individual house hold, income, ability to care properly ie. spay/neuter, vaccinate, medical care, etc.
- For inner city living lot sizes are small and there should be a size restriction. For those with acreages or living outside of the city, you could have more dogs as long as in both situations, you have the financial means to support and care for them.
- Most people cant even control the one dog they have let alone two with then pack up on every dog as they are not trained in the first place

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I actually think one dog is enough, but two seems like a reasonable limit.
- People should be allowed to have as many dogs as they want as long as they are all cared for
- I considered this question to be the same as having children. Any more than 4 is too expensive and is much more challenging.
- 4 dogs allow owners to foster dogs
- Dogs can be intrusive to neighbours, both indoors and out. Three is a reasonable number to keep under control and avoids developing a pack mentality.
- For the least responsible owner
- I think it depends on the household. Very few people actually manage a single dog properly, even less can manage two properly, and it takes great animal skill to properly manage 3+. But, it can be done by educated/trained individuals and so the city cannot apply blanket rules.
- Dogs are being allowed to overrun a lot of natural areas in the city. Decreasing the number of dogs per household might at least help to address this (as the city does not enforce existing laws).
- We have seen that most people can't control more than one dog be it charging fences as people walk by or barking at all hours of the day or night. I notice some fences don't seem high enough or strong enough to keep dogs inside and protect walkers passing by.
- Each require individual space and care
- Depending on the size of dog and home 2 would potentially allow for enough space and personal interaction between a dogs and humans. Perhaps dogs like to have a roommate too?
- We have a neighbor with 5 rescues. We already have waaayyyyy too many dogs, why are people "rescuing" more from other places!!!! Actually I love dogs & other animals but the contamination & lack of sleep is affecting our health!
- Whatever number someone is able to care for. Some people should not have any pets, while others are capable of caring for many.
- I don't think there should be a limit - it depends on an owner's ability to care for the dogs. Few could handle 5+ dogs but it should be determined by an owners ability to care for the animals. What about individuals who foster dogs?
- Three dogs is outrageous, smelly, noisy etc. Two is pushing it.
I'd like to see dogs banned from the city. They are vicious, kill wildlife, are dangerous to children, and are noisy and affect the peaceful enjoyment of one's property. Dogs should not be allowed outside ever alone on a deck or elsewh
- If all dogs are altered, properly cared for, trained and not bothering your neighbours.
- To allow for better training and following commands. Less is more.
- I think this is a more complicated question then just a number. If you have 8 dogs and they are all well looked after (i.e annual vet check-ups, neutered and socialized) I would have no issue with that many dogs.
- 1 to 3 dogs is manageable for one person. One individual can manage to walk three dogs at most. I would say it is more appropriate to consider the size of the dog. 1 extra-large or giant dog. 2 medium-sized dogs, 3 small dogs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- More than 3 is irresponsible and often a problem for neighbours. Yards are too small to have more dogs than that.
- The impact of dogs on our City parks is huge. Cause soil erosion, trample vegetation, compact soil, kill mature trees and all vegetation with urine, chase and kill wildlife, push out other stakeholders and groups from using parks which are good for mental and physical health. Ecoli pollute our river
- Depends on the size doesn't it? Your question must be better posed.
- Excepting when a litter is being weaned and moved to new homes
More that two dogs are hard to keep well behaved. They are pack animals and as the pack increases in size I think the pack identifies progressively less with the owner. However, I'm sure there are expert owners who can manage more.
- As long as all dogs in the household are provided reasonable care, including yearly vet examinations.
All animals in the home should be spayed/neutered.
- Define "per household" please. one house...a duplex...a fourplex? If 3/household is that per lot or does a fourplex get to have 12? Are fosters or visiting dogs included in the "household" limit? Can't pick a number unless I know criteria for "household", what about proper breeders vs backyard types
- Dogs require enough room, ideally a yard. Too many could cause a nuisance in the yard.
- How big is the house? is there a yard? How many people look after the animals? Are these large animals? small? well trained? rescued from desperate lives? The law should be kept as is and allow for as many animals as can be responsibly looked after , not a specific number
- The number should be calculated by the number of people in the home looking after the animals e.g. Three animals per person responsible. So six if there are two people in the home.
- Two so they can keep each other company. Two is plenty of companionship for a person. They don't need 3. Three poop a lot more (Hygiene). Three hunt as a pack and put people at risk and other smaller dogs and animals. Why would anyone ever need more than 2 except if they are puppies?
- Limit to 3 to manage noise and space in the yard and waste collection. If people want more than three they should be able to apply to have more where it would be considered on a case by case basis.
- One dog tends to get in more trouble than two dogs. My personal limit would be two dogs but trying to leave some room for people that want more. Three seems to be the most that one person can generally handle at a time.
- Owners should be allowed as many dogs as they can properly provide for. All dogs should be vaccinated, fed, sheltered, exercised, spat/neutered and monitored/treated for behavioural issues.
- It depends on the size of house you have and how much time you have to make sure it's needs are met.
- Likely varies and depends on owners ability and financial and other means to care for the animals. Lots of multi dog/cat/pet households that are 5+ with very responsible pet owners.
- Old dog and a young dog is the farm model. Provides companionship to humans and dogs.
- More than 2 (or 1 large dog) can be an issue for owners to pick up poop after (depending on dog size) and definitely is a problem for owner to control and monitor.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 5-6 for dog walkers. However, ownership should be limited to 3. An additional exception would be for those who are fostering rescue animals.
- Dogs can vary in size, almost all have similar responsibilities. 3 dogs would keep the average owner from getting over-burdened due to unexpected circumstances. It would also be nice if the city mandated that one of those dogs has to be a dog adopted from a registered shelter.
- I understand that dogs are social beings... but to a point. Having more than two dogs (or any pet that is put outside on a regular basis) would result in a serious nuisance to neighbours and likely become a health issue inside the home.
- The number also depends on the size. Nobody needs more than 2 Great Danes. I don't care if someone has 5+ chihuahuas.
- If it is not obvious, pet ownership is a privilege. Anything more than 2 is an irresponsible indulgence that compromises social harmony, threatens health and safety.
- It doesn't matter if you have 1 dog or 5. A person can mistreat 1 dog, while another cares for 5 exceptionally well. If you are worried about anymore than one or two dogs, state that you will do welfare checks on anyone owning more than 2 dogs
- This really depends on the type of household (apartment, house), the size of the lot & yard, the proximity to neighbours.
- It entirely depends on the dog(s), the owner(s), and the location. Perhaps an equation can be formulated that considers size/type of dog, square-footage of dwelling, exterior property, and the owner's history/capabilities.
- Sometimes a dog needs a companion as well.
- This depends, of course on the owners, but having too many dogs leads to the stench of dog poop in people's back yards, which drifts over the fence, and also noise from barking.

Reasonable number of cats' rationale

- Again, dependent on size of residence.
- Cats are not pack animals and prefer a solitary existence. Too many cats affect their standard of living.
- I don't think there should be a specific limit. It depends on the home situation and so many other factors that can't be predetermined. It should be about the owners ability to adequately care for their pets that matters and not an arbitrary number.
- Because cats typically stay inside they would not be a bother to the public.
- As many as can reasonable be cared for by a household. Again, some are perfectly capable of owning quite a few while some should never even have one.
- I'm not really a cat person. I can't imagine someone needing more than 4 cats.
- See above.
- This is hard to say and not so fair to generalize. As long as cats are treated with dignity, respect, have enough of space and all their needs are met, one can have as many cats as they can take care of. You don't control a household's number of children, so the same goes here.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends if they are indoor or outdoor I think. If outdoor, 1-2 because they can be a nuisance to the community. If indoor maybe 2-3.
- I don't think it is okay to necessarily limit people from owning more than 2 cats, but this feels like a reasonable number
- Meow Foundation lets you test your cats with others before adoption. No more than 3 litter boxes per home, svp.
- Cats are easier to care for than dogs, but too many can get out of control. Having more than 4 can become unsanitary in smaller homes, or create a higher likelihood of fights between cats.
- The number of cats should be based on one's financial situation, living environment and space require.
- That they are actually in control of the dogs with them and that they are picking up after their dogs.
- If the cats are being cared for appropriately I do not think the city should be mandating how many cats per household.
- Cats like interacting with other cats
- two cats act as companions when the owner is away during the day (work) or vacation (even with a cat sitter)
- I am not particular on cats in a household as long as they're not in my yard. It's nice they have a friend at 2 and it seems better hygienically to not have a ton of cats.
- See answer above. It doesn't matter how many, it matters whether you let them roam, take care of them, etc.
- More than 3 cats in any household that isn't a breeder seems excessive? If there are more than 3 cats I feel like there is a higher chance for a cat to be neglected or a problem missed.
- making sure that you can afford food/vet bills
- There should not be a limit on how many cats an owner can have, so long as the owner is able to provide a safe and healthy life for the cats
- No More than 8
- 5. I believe the number should be 5, unless the household applies for a special exemption (for example, a breeder)
- Three adult cats is a reasonable amount of animals to keep track of. Again, if the owner is a reputable breeder, there could be times that this number is exceeded.
- I'm a dog person. I don't dislike cats, but I prefer dogs. Again, cats need care and attention. No one needs to have a house full of cats. Two is plenty.
- Indoor environment only.
- Cats tend to be more solitary. A large number of cats in one residence might not be the best idea.
- I do not have any issue with the number of pets - as long as they are being cared for, fed, veterinary, etc.
- Same as above
- Are they taken care of?
I guess it depends on the size of the house



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- As above for dogs.
- I have no issues with number of pets if they pets are cared for with proper feeding, exercise, medical, and licensing.
- I had four cats at once in a 2 bedroom apartment, but as I am responsible pet owner they did not cause problems for my neighbours and were all in good health.
- The average house could likely comfortably accommodate this many cats.
- cats come in a variety of sizes and care requirements. Forcing an arbitrary limit is unfair.
- More cats means more chances of unwanted breeding
- As long as the pet is well taken care of, the number should not matter.
- Same as above
- 3-4 cats - the likelihood that someone with more than this does not provide appropriate care/oversight increases when there is more.
- I don't care as long as they're indoor cats that are being cared for properly
- Think of the feces produced,
You should be charging for more that 2 per address!
- Same as above
- Same as above for dogs.
- Cats are smaller & don't require that much space. If indoor only they provide good company for each other. I feel the cost of ownership of 4 cats is probably the same as 2 dogs.
- This is not a limit, just an average number per household.
- Seems like a reasonable and managable number but Calgarian should be allowed to keep as many as they want as long as doing so doesn't negatively impact any other Calgarian and the health and safety of the animals can be maintained.
- As long as the cats are kept inside and well looked after I think it should be up to the individual.
- Same thing with cats. It is the responsibility level of the people who matter not the number of animals.
- Cats are not social animals and often don't bond with other cats so it creates a stressful household. Unless this is a foster situation, two should be plenty.
- Same as above.
- If people can properly take care of their cats and have the resources necessary, who cares how many they have in their house. it's their property and they should be able to do with it what they please.
- If the animals are being well cared for with a healthy environment then it should be up to the individual to determine the number of animals.
- Same as for dogs. Each person should know their limit. If they can't provide the necessities and properly care for their animals, there are laws in place to deal with that.
- Same as above
- The costs associated with owning a cat can get expensive.
- Same as above.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Two cats are plenty (being an owner of 2 cats), unless there is a litter. It allows one to have a cat companion, if needed/wanted.
- Again, as long as they all are being cared for appropriately, why should anyone decide what they can handle but the owners themselves.
- It all depends on the number of the household (humans :)) the size of house. and even maybe income of household they can provide for that pet. There is no right answer.
- More than that would compromise the ability of the owner to handle them.
- Not a cat owner, cannot say.
- Equal to dogs.
- Unless you have a large household you should not have more than two. They are very independent in nature and need place to breathe. Any more would in my opinion affect quality of life.
- Same as above
- Not necessary to hoard animals.
- 6
- same as with dogs
- Ditto
- As long as people keep their homes clean and pets healthy, I don't care.
- Same as above.
- Have as many as you want, but keep them inside your house and away from me.
- I think this all depends on size of property. Small property - 3 cats max. Larger property - 10ish. As long as cats stay indoors, I don't really care.
- If an individual is responsible, there should not be a limit. Limits are there to control individuals that are not responsible. As long as the cats are healthy and cared for, it should be up to the individual
- Cats are independent creatures and used to roam but nowadays they are confined to inside a house which I consider cruel.
- I think a max of 4 cats or 5 pets in total is reasonable.
- at least the one cat will have a companion..if people are so passionate about cat(s), go volunteer at the shelter(s)..again we live in a city, close confines, not a farm/acreage...
- Cats are highly independent. Truly any number of cats is reasonable if the owner can manage. What is better than a fixed number, is owner testing. If the human can manage 100 cats, go for it. If any of the cats become a neighborhood nuisance, the maximum allowable drops to zero.
- I personally wouldn't want 5+ cats in the house but again it's more about responsible ownership not just number of pets or of a given species.
- 2 cats per one person. Otherwise care and time lacks.
- Will vary by the household, and ensure that cats (pets only) are well cared for, the home is clean and sanitary, and that people and cats are safe. While I would never own more than 1-2 cats, I don't see why someone with the space and time to care for multiple cats shouldn't be allowed to.
- No cats her but same as above



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not a cat person at all so have chosen not to answer. But again it comes down to being a responsible pet owner.
- Since cats use a litter box, more than 2 cats create unhygienic conditions.
- Same as above
- Cleanliness needs to happen.
- I don't believe that this is a fair question. Factors need to be considered including size of house, number of residents caring for the animal, size of yard/exercise area, financial resources.
- No limit
- I don't like them.
- Why do they need more? Less is more.
- Same as above
- Same as above
- Same as above. But spay neuter is important to ensure they don't become an overpopulation.
- One animal also lowers the possibility of unintentional breeding
- Have as many as you want. INDOORS.
- As long as the cats are being properly contained to the owners property, fed, vaccinated, and with vet care there should be no limits. Decisions should be based on quality of care not based on the number of cats in the home.
- Same reasons as above. The number is slightly higher as cats are lower maintenance in terms of exercise and socialization than dogs, and therefore more cats could be properly cared for with the same resources.
- An owner can typically afford the feeding/grooming/veterinary care & licensing fees.
- it isn't the number of animals you have, it is how you care for them.
- As above.
- As long as the animal is well taken care of and not a nuisance, there should be no limit.
- Same number of cats as residents in the household. 2 adults 2 kids 4 cats. Again can apply for more subject the discussions with neighbours.
- It completely depends on the cats and household.
- It is dependent on the individual and what they are able to handle. The animals welfare must be taken care of and safety of the public understood.
- Again as long as they are cared for properly and follow bylaws it shouldn't be an issue
- Cats are more difficult to control and roam.
- These are living creatures and we owe them some of our time.
- After 4 the amount of litter boxes required would be hard to manage
- Don't think this needs to be limited.
- Cats require less hands on attention. ie-cats rarely need to go fir a walk outside every day like that if a dog. Two to three cats is found by experts as ideal and more can cause stress upon other cats
- Cats are easy to care for and can be quite good in a multicastr household.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cats are chill. I don't have them but I know people who have many and they are well loved and cared for.
- Cats like to be the "one in charge".
- Cats need space and are less so pack animals.
- I believe that as long as the members of household can adequately care for those animals they should be allowed to have them, perhaps special permits could be considered for breeders and such. I would put a limit at four but with puppies being exempt
- Depends on the house
- Any more that three would be a challenge
- 3 is enough for one house.
- Depends on any negative affects on neighbors or property value
- same as above for multiple dog homes.
- I'm not sure there needs to be a limit if the cats are kept inside and kept clean, healthy and safe. Again, I think responsible ownership is more important than the number of pets.
- You don't know how the personalities of cats are going to interact so you
Have to be careful 4 is a good number to stop at
- Many people can safely and happily house many cats without any issues. Providing an appropriate environment for animals is totally dependent on the pet and is impossible to limit.
- Two indoor cats is enough, otherwise they start wanting out all the time.
- Same as above.
- Depends on whether the people keep them inside all the time. No need for a cat to be loose outside. Speak from experience.
- Again it depends on the size of the house. I find cats can be messy so too many cats can wreck a house.
- Owners tend not to neuter their cats so less is best.
- While cats are solitary, they can enjoy the companionship of another cat. The house needs to accommodate cat traffic and needs—catification and super highways. Also it starts to cost to keep cats in good health. 3 cat boxes, toys, playtime, as much canned or raw cat food vs kibble. Good vet care.
- Same as above
- No more than 2 more per adult caregiver.
- Allows for breeders/ show animals
- no real comments again taking good care etc.
- Having a pet is a privilege, people should be happy having one. Loose cats kill songbirds. This is a fact.
- Cost factors.
- two cats is enough. There is no reason to have more than two cats per household.
- Cats should not be allowed to "roam free" and be a nuance to neighbors.
- I'm not a cat person.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cats are low maintenance and don't need a lot of space, but their health and hygiene gets more difficult to manage as their numbers increase. Three is as many as most people can maintain.
- Same as above.
- I don't care how many cats are in a household. if there are no complaints and the owner can provide appropriate care it doesn't matter how many cats there are.
- Again depends on the household. I grew up on a farm with over 20 cats! But in a house in the city that's excessive!
- PROVIDED THEY ARE NOT ALLOWED TO ROAM. ZERO CATS IF OWNER THINKS THEIR CAT SHOULD ROAM.
- Cats are more independent and more could do exist in a home.
- If the cats are indoor cats and they are being well cared for, there shouldn't be a limit.
- Dogs or cats should be the same.
- Again as long as they are contained and not disturbing others, who cares?
- I don't really care, but no more than 3 as long as they are kept indoors
- Same as above. You can have 5+ spayed or neutered cats all indoor and licensed. Or you can be my neighbour who has one cat that he lets roam the neighbourhood. Number does not make you a good owner.
- Too many cats on a property can cause problems for adjoining property owners when the cats stray off their residential property to defecate in other people's yards, or dig up other people's gardens. Also there have been too many cases of large numbers of cats living in filthy conditions in homes.
- Easier to keep indoors and under control.
- Same as for dogs
- One, deep on the size of the home, two.
- No reason
- Same as for dogs
- To control the amount in household to prevent over population
- Completely depends on the person, their finances, and the amount of space, etc.
- As above
- See above
- Again in order to provide adequate husbandry and simulation to all cats in ones care takes time and can become costly, especially vetting which is not something any pet owner should ignore. Ppl should live within their means.
- Same as above
- Cats evacuate their bowels indoors, spray if not neutered. If neglected, the house can become very unclean qu
- No explanation just think that's pretty reasonable.
- Same as with dogs.
- Same as dogs
- Depends on how they are kept



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same as above
- Same as above
- If they are indoor cats have as many as you grossly please .. outdoor cats just add to nuisances of the area as to many owners don't have to follow the rules
- Cats are not outside and can live companionably indoors.
- Responsible pet owners should not be limited In number of pets on site as long as bylaws are followed. There is no limit on number of children per household, nor should there be for pets as long as owners show responsibility for their animals behaviour
- Any more than 3 and it's going to be difficult to keep home safe and sanitary.
- two would be my max, why have more? if people want more than 2 then special licenses should be issued and fees increase and yearly inspections to the home and care of the animals.
- If people need more than two cats, they may have some insecurities and embedded emotions of loneliness they need to address with a therapist.
- They really only need 1 other companion but are fine being independent
- 2 is manageable & provide adequate companionship for each other & their humans.
- Depends on size of home and property, level of care and quality of life in the home that the owner is able to provide.
- Can be friendly grouping, siblings, fosters etc but not neglected.
- I don't think we should limit the number of cats per household- if you own your property and have the resources, you should be able to have lots of cats. I also know many loving, responsible owners with 5+ cats (I work in vet med.)
- It's none of the city's business if the animals are licensed and behaved.
- As above
- Same reason as above.
- cats are more solitary animals
- Any number ok as long as they are well cared for, kept inside house or yard, and don't disturb neighbours. Restrictions should only apply to those who have abused cats or allowed them to disturb neighbors (ongoing).
- As long as the amount of space in the home suits the amount of dogs, there should not be a limit as long as the dogs are healthy.
- Same as per dogs
- Quality of the environment & life is the most important aspect of pet ownership.
- As long as they're kept inside, cared for, and house is maintained, it's nobody else's business.
- Seems reasonable. You have other issues if you need more than one cat.
- Cats kill birds
- Same as 5
- The more cats in a home the more likely they let the cats outside. Tey than roam the neighbourhood and poo in our flowerbeds
- Multiple pets usually leads to unsanitary conditions fostering the spread of disease.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Why does anyone NEED more than one cat? They kill songbirds.
- See previous
- Same as above
- if the cats are contained then there is no issue with higher numbers
- As above, I don't think limiting numbers if numbers are being taken care of well helps.
- Well is said 2 for dogs and cats are smaller so 3 seems bout right.
- Same answer as dogs above
- Same as above.
- Similar to above
- Same as above for dogs
- No real limit on that either as long as they aren't outdoor cats as they say.
- Depends on size of residence
- I think more than 3 likely becomes a problem for the cats in terms of space and getting along (unless it is a mother and her kittens)
- Not a cat fan
- see above
- 2 animals of any kind is plenty.
- any number as long as they have a healthy living condition. are well looked after with the proper food, cleanliness and health checks
- Same as above
- As long as they have space to roam and well cared for and the owners are responsible, I see no reason to restrict pet numbers
- Again, provided all of the animal's needs are properly met and their environment is nice and clean, many cats do well in large groups.
- Same as above. It depends on the individual.
- If the owner has been adequately trained and has enough space for the dogs
- As long as they are healthy and the property is clean and the cats are well cared for I don't think it should matter.
- I've met plenty of people who cannot manage 1 dog and met plenty who can easily manage over 20. There are plenty of bylaws in place to address someone not taking care of their dogs. Why punish the ones who are? It won't be the violators who will be affected. Replace dog with cat
- Cats are very low maintenance compared to dogs.
- if the animals are well cared for, have medical treatments when necessary, aren't stressed, this is ok. #'s dont affect quality always. some are overburdened with 1 pet + dont treat their pet well, or someone who has the means to care for 5+ animals well. less cats on the street in my opinion
- Same as above
- As long as they are litter trained and not posing a health risk, cats are pretty low key but I do believe they need to be neutered/spayed so it doesn't get out of hand.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- For a house, in an urban setting, 2 gives a companion to play with, while 3, you will tend to get 2 ganging up on one. I like 2 as a minimum if you have more than 0. 2 is not a limit. I've seen cat foster houses with 6 cats operating well. Limit should be on conditions, not an arbitrary number.
- Don't like cats
- Cats are territorial and will fight. Cats will spray to mark territory. Cats are smelly.
- Same as dog..
- I think it should be a matter for each household to decide the number of cats they wish. I think a maximum of 5-6 is not unreasonable.
- Animals do best in pairs usually but a household should not be limited to 2 IF they are cared for, controlled and loved.
- The natural problems of a litter box, even with the auto ones harder to maintain.
- 1 or 2. Same as above.
- Cats are less needy. They tend to do their own thing and don't encroach on other people.
- A household may very well be properly responsible for half-a-dozen cats... another household may not take proper care of 1. I don't want an arbitrary limit.
- Breeders exist and will have easily at least 6 cats in their place at any given time (2 parents and 4 kittens minimum)
Or some private owners have a cat who has kittens and they keep them all
Private animal daycares also exist
I think there's too much nuance to set a definitive amount
- The size of house, type of house, nor the number of people per household is stated; so an appropriate answer cannot be given.
- Some cats need a buddy but two should be max
- 3 is manageable with indoor cats, indoor cats have better health so not as costly
- Too many cats and smells can be horrendous and cat's are territorial so it's more of a suggested thing depending on the cat
- Cats like all creatures need companionship. Exception 8s when a female has a litter of kittens, then the allowed number should increase until the kittens are weaned.
- Depends on the size of the residence BUT the owner MUST abide by the bylaw and keep them inside. Methinks that the cost of kitty litter would be sky high but it's their choice.
- Again a reasonable number that can be managed.
- Any more and you might become one of those "crazy cat people".
- No reason.
- Depends on the responsibility of the owner.
- Sanitary reasons.
- Let responsible ownership speak for itself. Deal with issues as they arise on a case by case basis.
- Not a cat lover.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends on how they are cared for. Ten cats can live together if they have proper litter facilities and appropriate medical care/vaccinations. The problem is that people with mental health issues don't follow the rules. I don't know that responsible owners should be penalized. Should be case by case
- More than 2 cats, may be unmanageable of one dwelling. Can get messy, and unsanitary.
- See above
- People don't seem to keep them indoors.
- Same.
- 1-2, depending on cat. Cats are solitary animals and most cats would actually prefer to live without others - the idea that they "need a friend" is often misguided. Plus, you need one litter box per cat + one - few people would be willing to own more than 2 litter boxes.
- To avoid cats running out the door roaming and getting lost or killed.
- They should be kept indoors.
- Calgary seems to be a place where people with mental health problems end up filling their houses with numerous pets because they know there is no limit.
- Same answer as the above for dogs.
- Most people don't adequately house their cats. Should have, for litter boxes, the number of cats +1 for litter boxes. Also need to be able to monitor for medical conditions and provide veterinary care as needed.
- Same as above.
- People make the mistake of multiple cats for companionship. But cats are not pack animals and are actually stressed by sharing space with another cat. I wish more people were aware of that. They may seem okay, but one way the stress is observed can be obsessive marking of territory.
- It is not about how many cats are in a household, rather, that they are cared for and under control and there is respect for neighbours.
- I often read that there are high volumes of cats in rescue looking for homes. Limiting household numbers to a couple of cats would make it harder for rescue cats to find homes - or the owners would not license their additional cats.
- If they are under control (not bothering the neighbours) and you aren't cranking out kittens every week, you should be able to have as many cats as good animal husbandry practices can sustain.
- I think it is again about providing reasonable care
- Prevents animal hoarding
- This depends on property size and ability of the owner.
- Cats are not social animals. They are okay on their own.
- Safety and hygiene
- Same reason as for dogs
- Same reason here. Maybe 3 cats but definitely not more than that. Cats seem to be the favourite for hoarders.
- Cats are easier than a dog and need less dedicated care and attention.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Similar thinking to the dog number, and again it comes down to being responsible... ideally would want to prevent a hoarding situation.
- Same as above - there is no need for more than that with the mess
- No restrictions as long as they are cared for
- same as above, I think people can self monitor; but hoarding needs to be identified and stopped
- Cats should be registered with the city and kept inside, period. A responsible pet owner will care for 5+ cats as well as 1. And irresponsible pet owners won't. You penalize responsible people by limiting pet ownership because some people are irresponsible.
- The same answer as above
- It depends on the size of the house, but I think two bonded pairs at an absolute maximum for permanent residency is a ton.
- Depends on the owner(s)
- It is dependent on house size, owners capabilities, cat size. We should not be legislating maximums, we should be legislating ownership abilities. You can't care for and manage x amount of cats? You should not be able to have that many.
- 4 is enough for vet bills.
- I don't care on amount. I care on how they are housed. Keep them on your property or on leash and stop the free roaming as it's costing me dearly health and money wise and I don't even own a cat.
- Allows cats to have a buddy while not being an added burden on the household.
- It really depends on the home and who lives there and their management style. For some people 2 cats is too many, for others they can handle 5 or more better than some owners handle 1 pet. It should be up to the home owner as long as cats do not become a nuisance and are kept on the property.
- Cats are not as domesticated as dogs. Dogs are content with the owner(s) as partner and friend. Cats require another cat for companionship.
- Again, if you are mean or a neglectful cat owner, 0 is appropriate; if you're clean, caring and can afford to take good care, number shouldn't matter.
- Depends on a household, but it seems hard to manage a household with more cats - not sure there should be a limit and certainly higher numbers can be cared for well with good planning and lifestyle.
- Three is enough cats to have companionship, and can be kept in a reasonably-sized Calgary household.
- How many pets does a person need?
- Same as above answer
- More than two are justified only when there are kittens.
- Most homes can only really accommodate 2 cats need for space and attention. Perhaps a larger number based on a larger home? More than 2 cats and often they are being allowed to roam the neighborhood and urinate/defecate and hunt.
- Responsible pet owners should be able to choose the number of pets they own.
- See above



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No opinion. Again, as many as the owner can responsibly accommodate.
- Same as above
- See above.
- This is a number which the owner can reasonably manage.
- It completely depends on the size of the household and the owner's ability to care for the cats.
- Cat people are strange, I think even if you made a bylaw limiting number of cats, it's likely to be unenforceable and difficult to even monitor.
- Same as the above. Size of animal/house/yard, all factors to consider. Of course if you're letting your cats outside unleashed all the time, you shouldn't have any at all.
- Shouldn't be the gov't's role to regulate numbers, rather enforce issues when they arise (which has nothing to do with numbers of pets).
- Again 5 or more is just to many
- See above answer.
- As long as a person is financially able to care for their cats, and the animals are living with healthy, safe conditions and are not being nuisances to neighbours, there should be no limit.
- Too many cats leads to unsanitary conditions, financial constraint, not enough proper time spent with each cat to ensure proper behavior training. Noise levels increase and the possibility of dangerous situations increase.
- This should not be dictated by the city.
- Same as above
- If house is clean and pets are healthy. And fixed.
- as long as owners provide adequate care, enrichment, and are not bothering others, there should not be a limit
- again if a person is taking good care of their animals and they are in a clean safe space all is well
- see above answer.
- They are not supposed to roam free so in theory I should never even know who owns cats or not.
- Hygiene.
- Depends on the owner. If you work with cats then I have confidence you know what you are doing. The average person though can handle fewer.
- Too many owners allow their cats to roam, destroy wildlife and defecate everywhere. The less cats, the less roaming.
- Manageable for members and keeps the cats healthy and happy.
- This would seem to be an adequate number.
- litter boxes get smelly
- Lions aside, cats don't naturally live in groups. Studies have shown it can be stressful to them. 4 sounds reasonable
- I believe that having over 4 cats in a home would be unreasonable as it would be difficult for an owner to provide adequate attention and care to any more animals at one time.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If the animals are well cared for, vetted frequently and in a clean, healthy environment multiple cats can live together easily and most tend to do well in a group
- The cats can have a companion but not enough to create a nuisance
- Unfortunately my opinion is that it varies depending on household make-up and income. Responsible pet owners need to be able to afford upkeep (vet, food, groomers) and need to have enough time to give to their pets.
- Less noise risk to disturb neighbors.
- If kept indoors then as long as they're cared for I don't see why there should be a limit.
- Same as with dogs, as long as the cats are cared for and aren't a nuisance there is no difference than having 1 cat versus cats. I know many families in Calgary with multiple cats that are responsible pet owners and I also know people with 1/2 cats that are causing issues by letting their cats out.
- Clean up after more than 2 would be a lot of extra waste
- Same as listed for dog.
- As long as the animals are cared for and trained appropriately and the house is clean, the number should not matter.
- more cats = more odours.
- Depends on a number of factors.
- I had 5 cats once and they would pee in unwanted places. Undue stress on the animal. Two - they keep each other company without being territorial.
- Anything beyond that cannot be properly controlled and cared for by owners.
- Again, it depends on the owner and the care they take of the animals
- Cats are far more easy to care for than dogs, and often also have more difficulty being adopted. It wouldn't make sense to me to enforce a limit on the number of cats per household on the general public for that reason.
- Same as above
- Larger numbers of cats is likely to lead to neglect.
- This depends on the individual. People who have cats for breeding, or show, may exceed this number of animals while still providing adequate outlets and care. If you move to put a limit on the number there needs to be an exemption process for people who have multiple cats for this purpose.
- Not as much a cat lover as dog lover here. Cats and their litter boxes can be a tad aromatic... 2 seems smelly enough. LOL
- Depends on the home and the reason for all the animals and whether or not the owner/s have the capacity to care for this number of animals in a clean and healthy environment and that the animals are not neglected or suffering in any way
- as indoor animals, they do not annoy neighbours
- beyond this would be very hard to keep the environment clean and to safe living standards
- The number of animals in a household does not relate to how good an owner is caring for them.
- Reasonable



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think cat behaviour is not well studied enough, their social structure is very complicated and we do not understand it well enough to keep them happy. To Void aggression and elimination behaviours issues
- The number of cats you have had zero bearing on how responsible you are. I have several friends with 10+ cats who are extremely well cared for, kept indoors, etc.
- Same as above, needs to be left up to individual owner. Some people are able to handle a larger number of animals than others, rules need to be followed and animals need to be kept in good health
- Cats kept inside don't bother neighbours
- see above comment
- Same as above
- A litter of kittens may put this over. Adult cats 4
- This would be cat specific and would depend on the happiness & health of each cat in the home. More cats = more inter-social problems with them.
- I don't feel there's an issue with multiple cats as long as the animals are treated properly
- This lets the cats have some feline company and prevents the owners from being branded as crazy cat people.
- As above. Aside from hoarding issues if the animals are cared for and not causing any issues.
- See above, minus the noise issue.
- See above.
- Again: situation specific.
- similar animal waste issues can start to impact neighbors if too many animals are allowed.
- same as above
- Should be handled on individual basis.
- As long as the rules are followed and the cats aren't bothering anyone it isn't the city's business
- Again its about how the owner cares for the pets not the number of pets.
- Limiting the number of pets can reduce the possibility of neglect/abuse and help prevent hoarding of animals
- Cats do their own thing so there is no controlling them unless you are a responsible pet owner. If they are indoor cats and remain on a leash when outside then have more. I would think 2-4 cats is plenty
- More than 5 in a house when not a foster is too many to properly care for but they are easier to care for compared to dogs
- As above
- One is a companion for the other.
- I t doesn't matter how many you have, it matters if you are taking good care of them. Also, a litter of puppies or kittens can't count.
- Depends on size of home.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Two or three, again depending on size of home, ability to care for. For cats or dogs, consider wellbeing of a lone pet vs having a companion.
- As long as indoor- and well taken care of
- This totally depends on responsible ownership.
- As long as cats are kept inside or in the owners yard and properly cared for.
- I don't feel a limit should be implemented as many I individuals have multiple cats in their household and make sure they are well cared for exercised, trained and non disruptive to neighbours.
- Again, if not a trainer, breeder, etc., more than that becomes a care problem.
- Cats require an adequate amount of personal space In a home. Multiple cats require multiple litter boxes.
- As long as their animals are being cared for properly and not neglected or abused, it's up to an individual to decide how many pets they have in their household.
- Not your business as long as they are being cared for.
- As long as people can feed maintain and properly take care of the animals it should not be an issue.
- Cats being indoor pets shouldn't be restricted at all. Well cared for cats can live in large colonies and societies. Again, hoarding is not responsible pet ownership.
- Same explanation
- Same as above for dogs.
- Cat litter! Cat urine has an extremely strong smell and is a landfill environmental nightmare. 2 is good for company of the Cats.
- I think a responsible owner can have multiple animals that are well cared for and trained and there should be no restrictions.
- There should not be a limit. Hoarders will find a way around the law, and limiting pet ownership only faults responsible owners/breeders
- Sorry not a cat person so don't really care
- I believe 4 cats can be cared for adequately with some effort and planning. More than 4 would be challenging for many households and unfair and stressful to individual cats within a household as cats are not pack animals and can be territorial.
- as above
- Again, if you're a responsible pet owner, you go to extraordinary lengths to ensure your pets' well being and that they are raised in a safe and sterile environment.
- There should not be restrictions on the number of dogs, but harsh penalties and ownership bans for people who mistreat their animals, regardless of numbers.
- AS LONG AS THEY ARE BEING TAKEN CARE OF PROBABLY AND NOT BOTHERING THE NEIGHBOURS. AS IT DOES NOT MATTER IF THERE IS 1 CAT OR MANY
- The reasonable number depends on the size of the house and household. No more than 2 cats per adult.
- Not sure why anyone would want more than 1 cat as I imagine they fight. But 4 seems reasonable. Any more and you become a cat lady.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 2 or 3 cats is pretty normal, 4 is a lot, after 4 it's weird.
- Same as above with dogs.
- Should be subjective based on financial viability And whether they are "outdoor" cats or not. If you have 5 cats and let them roam free, what's the point. If you don't want them in your home, have less cats.
- I would have preferred zero as an option. I don't support keeping pets in urban environments.
- Any number as long as proper care is provided, there is adequate control of noise during quiet hours per noise bylaw and waste managed on a regular basis.
- It also depends on situation in individual case and cat's personality.
- Even though they exist inside a home, too many become difficult to manage.
- same explanation as above. Whelping homes require that pregnant animals coming into care are able to deliver and nurse their offspring until they can be adopted. Creating limits can suffocate foster/rescue efforts, but are also useful for by-law for those not involved with foster.
- Size, breed and temperment are a big factor in this - the number is reflected in the ability of the owner to control & keep them from being a nuisance to their neighbours.
- People should not be restricted from having as many cats as they can provide excellent care to. This can vary by the household and so shouldn't be regulated by the government.
- Many people let their cats out of the house so limiting the number of cats per household would reduce environmental impacts.
- It depends on the house for size of the house, yard etc. An apartment vs a mansion, the size of the animal should be considered as well as the area in the home designated to the animal(s). Realistically most people will not have more than a couple.
- Cats are more independent and therefore do not need as much attention, however, they are still social animals that come with a lot of responsibility and thus need attention from their owners.
- As long as the animals are healthy and happy, it isn't the business of anyone.
- Cats are easier to care for than dogs and don't (or shouldn't) go outside. Still, to many animals is not healthy for the animals.
- i wouldn't want any more than 3 because of potential for hoarding, breeding.
- Cats need space and too many would be hard to have. If they are well taken care of and don't wander more is fine but one or two seems a good amount to me. I don't think the LIMIT should be two, just a good number. The limit should be how many you can responsibly take care of.
- Cats should be an indoor pet.
- Why would someone need more than 3 cats. Not many people are responsible pet owners to begin with and the more cats you have the more difficult it would be to care for them all properly
- As long as they are being well cared for health wise (fed, watered, clean litter boxes etc). Cats are smal
- I'd be okay with a higher number if they were never loose outside
- The number is irrelevant as long as they are being adequately cared for
- it all depends on the area of the house and the availability of back yard space.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends on the household. Some people are bad cat owners, and should have no cats. But if they can properly care for all the animals in their home, then who cares??
- See above.
- As long as each dog is being cared for, fed, safely contained/controlled and socialized properly, there should not be a limit on dogs in a household.
- Some cats like companionship - >2 becomes unwieldy, difficult to maintain cleanliness and sufficient attention to those cats
- Same as above
- Too many cats will end up with poor quality of life for the animals, and increase the likelihood of feral cats which are bad for the environment.
- I know a few people with 3 cats, but again more than 2 starts to feel excessive and unnecessary.
- They like company.
- Cats generally do not need as much space as dogs. Similar concerns about available space determining number of cats. Also depends on how many other pets are present.
- Two indoor cats should be the limit.
- Not a cat lover and cats don't like anyone
- If the owner is responsible then any number is fine
- Same as above
- Same as for the dogs. Need to maintain a hygienic environment and have well-behaved pets that don't roam around outside. Consequences or removal if this is not upheld.
- More than two is difficult to manage and I would question how well the animals are being cared for.
- Same as above. Taking good care of the animals, ensuring they are not a nuisance etc is not determined by the number of animals. It is determined by the owner. Hoarding is a mental illness that will not be addressed by restrictions.
- Same as above - but this also depends on how many other dogs and cats are in the household and what other pets are present.
- as above. Unless the house is HUGE, the cats would not have a lot of alone space
- Cats often need a companion to keep them entertained, especially if they are indoor cats.
- Owners of pets need to be able to properly take care of them. Though I feel 2 is reasonable, I guess it depends on the owner. We cannot say folks can only have 2 kids per family?
- 3 maximum for cats that are outside/inside cats. 2 for all indoor cats due to exclusive litter box usage.
- Same reason as for dogs above
- Same answer as above if you actually ensure licenses are purchased the numbers will take care of themselves
- See above for dogs. Same applies
- I once had two cats and they were never outside or roaming loose. more than 2 and health hazards start to occur for people and the animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cats, especially indoor cats, don't take up as much space as most dogs and can adapt well to cat colonies when introduced properly.
- I don't think there should be a limitation on pets in a household. The limitation should be whether the pets are well taken care of (e.g. whether vet care is provided to all animals), and that they don't constitute a nuisance or hazard.
- Cats can be isolated or sociable the amount isn't that concerning as long as the owner can care for them properly.
- Same as above.
- manageable number where you can still track of training an allot quality time knowing there's a 2 pets=1 adult ratio in the household.
- Cats require less time and attention to be happy and healthy. They're easier to care for, and so long as all their needs are being met the limit should be higher. Still, a cap should be in place to help ensure proper care and prevent hoarding. Perhaps a limit based on space should be considered.
- As long as they are kept inside it is the prerogative of owner although the average household does not have enough space as animals do need their personal space.
- Just a guess. Some companionship for pet.
- Cats are fairly easy to care for but you should have ample space, toys, and adequate litter boxes, usually 1-2 per cat
- Anything more and the welfare of the animals inside the house can be concerning
- Again, as long as the owner is properly caring for them, who cares how many there are?
- Not a cat person
- Responsible pet owners can have a large number of well cared for animals. It's not about the number it's about the capacity of the owner, even 1 is too much for some people.
- Multi cat households are generally not as sanitary - it causes for people to not want to rent to multi pet households because of the fear
- See above answer.
- Unless breeding, 2 cats per household is reasonable to love and care for
- Again, as long as they are cared for, there shouldn't be a limit.
- They are company for each other but they don't take over the house.
- I'm not really a cat person
- Again, as a cat owner I don't believe one can properly look after more than 2 cats at a time.
- I had 5 cats at once. They were strictly indoor cats, all licensed, up to date health/vaccinations by vet, all spayed, followed bylaw. Every cat owner whether with one or 5 cats must abide by those expectations.
- This is the same as the dogs. If the cats are cared for mentally and physically then more than 3 is fine. Hoarders will hoard whether there is a limit or not.
- while it doesn't really matter so long as the cats are inside I don't think it is reasonable to assume that anyone with more than two cats is keeping them contained on the premises at all times.
- I don't know much about cats, I assume breeders have lots of them and it's somehow ok



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- My answer is the same as with dogs
- If and only if they are 100% indoor cats
- Average house hold size.
- Then you become a cat lady!!!
- I dont really have a reason. Just seems like a number that is still reasonable to clean up after, afford vet bills, groom etc
- 2 or 3 cats are lots for most people to take care of. I would say only 2 but if one is getting sick or elderly sometimes a person will get a third just so when the other passes the one that would be left alone will have another one as a friend.
- Seems reasonable. Keep a kitten. A little family.
- Level of care and control by owner
- Cats require less socializing but, a household must be able to financially support the animal at all times.
- I don't like the idea of restricting the number of cats per household, it discourages pet adoption for experienced and responsible owners.
- See above
- Maybe a better question is to ask how many kids in a family is reasonable.
- Is there house large and the cats are elusive? I don't really see an issue as long as it's not hoarding.
- Same as above
- I assume cats are easy
- The average house can accommodate 3 or even 4 cats as they sleep most of the time.
- If the owner is responsible and the pets are healthy, safe and cleaned up after numerous cats can live in a house happily.
- I don't think there should be a limit so my choice is the same as what I said about the dogs. As long as said household can prove they are taken care of and not causing any issues with surrounding neighbours.
- I don't have a strong opinion about this
- Cats are chill and can enjoy each other's company
- As long as cats are in even numbers (research shows they do better in even numbered groups than odd) I'd cap it like dogs at 6 to discourage the hoarders or bad kitty breeders.
- I have 2 cats
- 3 is plenty, similar reasons to above. Proper care is essential.
- Responsible pet owners can manage multiple dogs. Dogs are pack animals and limiting never works to address hoarding issues. Focus on mental health to prevent hoarding.
- I think it is entirely on a case by case basis. Someone with a large house with lots of land can accommodate as many animals as healthy.
- If they have more than that they are more likely to let them loose in the neighborhood.
- If cats are happy/ healthy, neutered and have enough space and enrichment, and enough people living there have time, energy and funds available, no limit needed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends on how responsible the owner is.
- Cats are territorial.
- Provided they are indoor only and are cared for physically and emotionally, this should be up to the owner. Especially since there are too many homeless cats and rules on pet ownership and animal rights are seriously lacking.
- If the cats are all healthy, have space, have clean litter boxes, are kept inside, etc limits should not be imposed
- Cats are frequently not pack animals as dogs are.
- Again you don't need an army
- Government should not dictate and infringe on animal ownership rights. If they are cared for it is of no concern to public welfare.
- Depends on the household and the cats. A big house could have more but a one bedroom condo can't have a lot. There's no one answer to that question.
- Unless it is a large house, this is an appropriate number of cats to allow them to socialise, and have appropriate eating and litter box areas. One litter box per 1.5 cats. 3 cats, 4 litter boxes.
- It makes no difference to me.
Be a responsible owner
- Indoors cats are not a threat to the public and not a nuisance. They should still be micro chipped!
Mandatory!
- No one needs more than two
- Cats are a bit more low maintenance but 4 should limit hoarding
- same reason as above
- Ensure adequate care for each
- I hate cats zero would be best.
- They are smaller and do not require as much space, but 4+ cats is cost prohibitive for providing medical care, and should have # of cats +1 for litterboxes, most people do not have room for this many.
- Cleanliness
- Fewer cats are more likely to have all their needs met just for economical reasons. One is not always the best or healthiest choice for the animal(s). Many do better with a feline companion and that brings the bonus of two cats having been homed with it.
- I don't know much about cats but 3 seems like a reasonable number to be able to properly care for cats in terms of cleanliness and maintenance.
- Companionship for the pets, as well as company. Are pretty independent to be in the house while at work. More cats need good homes.
- Second verse same as the first. Given the average nuclear family (4.5 people) it seems reasonable that each person should be responsible enough to care for an animal. Families like this would bond with their animals and each other, thus strengthening their ties as a family unit.
- Again, numbers don't dictate care and cats are awesome so the more the merrier!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 2 pairs. Is fine if they are properly cared for
- Many cats like to be in a “colony”. They don’t require walks like dogs for that leash control to be an issue. But too many can lead to a sacrifice in well being if the owners can not afford them. That is an issue. So definitely not 5+
- Cats are solitary animals. So long as the animals are not being harmed and are being properly taken care of, they’re not bothering others, who cares.
- If a cat is being locked outside it’s usually by one person. And they only have two hands.
- As long as the animals are taken care of in a responsible way, 5 cats is also fine.
- I fully own that I don't really enjoy cats
- Same answer as above! Number of animals is irrelevant as long as they are being taken care of. It should be based on the human not the number of animals
- 1 is enough especially for people who reside in apartments condos or any type of condensed housing. They shouldn’t be allowed to wander. 2 is acceptable for properties with private yards. I have tripped on my neighbours wandering cat at the top of the stairway in our building.
- I see no reasonable argument for more.
- Disease and stress management. In an urban environment, it does not make sense to have a high number of cats as they are not working animals (mouse hunting)
- no specific reason
- I do feel there should be a cap on cats per household but this is due to health concerns, for the people as well as the cats living there. They have different living habits than dogs and the environment is effected (indoor elimination).
- I think of cats like small dogs so 6 cats maximum unless you are a breeder, then 8.
- However many they can responsibly take care of.
- Because cats don't go for walks, there doesn't need to be a limit or it can be higher, perhaps 10.
- Really depends on the house and the people who own the cats.
- I don’t have cats so it’s hard to say, but if 3 dogs is reasonable, then 3 cats should be reasonable as well.
- Same as for the dogs.
- 1 per adult
- Same as dogs.
- Once again it depends on the household. This should not be regulated.
- Again in order to prevent any hording problems there should be a restriction of 4 or no more than 5 maximum. Any more than that would smell disgusting! Some cats are better with company, but not my cat...
- It really depends on the size of the household. As long as all of the pets are well cared for and spayed/neutered, I see no problem. However, I am opposed to backyard breeding due to ethical concerns.
- Depends on how big your place is and your mental health. And if your fostering or rescuing.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Plenty of stray cats in shelters. Please make it easier for them to go to families who have space for them.
- Depends on size of home. In a one bedroom condo no more than 2, otherwise more is fine. Cats are quiet and usually indoors.
- Hoarding situations are sad and difficult, but I believe they are also somewhat rare. I don't think there should be any household restrictions because I believe people are capable of properly caring for several animals at any one time. Such is the case in fostering situations with local rescues.
- as above
- Same as above.
- Why on earth would you need more than one? Explain why there should ever be more than one in a household.
- Same as dogs - hard to know what's happening with each cat if you have too many.
- Same answer as for dogs
- Again, maximum but I cannot speak to another's lifestyle.
- Seems a reasonable number.
- Same as above. People think cats are easier to take care of and think they can have more. I think that as quantity of pets goes up, quality of care goes down.
- Cats are easier to take care of than dogs. This rule should possibly be considered as a ratio of caretakers to animals rather than a hard limit.
- Smells
- Most pet owners have 2 pets. Allowing for 3 cats creates room for those who foster animals and help the shelter system. Once you go over that number then the issue is the animals' health.
- Same as above. If you would like to have more than two cats then you need to apply to own more than two.
- I really don't know. Whatever would be respectful to your surrounding neighbors, and if they animals are taken care of properly.
- Calgarians who choose to foster cats, breed cats need to be accommodated.
- This depends on the overall size of the residence. Beyond two animals, the home is much harder to keep clean, and damage to property increases. Health concerns due to poor cleanliness also increases. People are often gross, throw an animal in the mix and it's compounded.
- most cats in this area are outside cats whether the bylaw says so or not
- If the cats are strictly indoors and well-cared for, there should not be a problem with +5 cats in a household.
- Same answer as in 5) above
- Depends on the capacity of the owner to care for them properly without disrupting other people.
- One per human; varies on household size.
- Reasonability should apply.
- Often 2 adults in a household, pets often like a pet companion
- 3 cats is enough responsibility for one owner.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- - see above. I don't have a problem with setting the bar high (ten, for example), but the city needs to have a limit over which they can move against an irresponsible owner
- Consistent with dog count vote, less opinionated for max cat count especially if kept indoors
- Same as above. And I stand by my idea for discounted, multi year indoor cat licensing.
- As long as the cats are kept indoors, and are neutered and spayed they can be together in larger numbers. Waste is contained inside a litter box, and cats aren't noisy and don't create sound issues for neighbours.
- Cats are boring and don't do anything.
- too many situations of cats overrunning a house causing health issues for the owners, the cats and the community.
- Depends on how responsible the owner is
- I think it is a slippery slope when people start to accumulate cats. They think they can fend for themselves and therefore not properly take care of them therefore they become the public's issue.
- Same as above without the cats being able to go outside
- Arbitrary number. I don't know what's reasonable. Should it depend on square footage of the residence? Like, 400 sq ft per cat?
- Same as above. Not about the number but rather the care they receive
- Max number of cats per area, not household. Higher density areas would have way too cats if each household were to have multiple dogs.
- I chose 4 as 5+ could include ridiculous numbers like 67 cats, but I think it's reasonable to ask that people have under 10 cats. There should be at least one more litterbox than the number of cats in the home, so I have a hard time believing that people with more than 10 cats are responsible.
- almost the same as the above answer, cats do not need space to run and play
- v
- More than 2 can increase risk of noise and smell impact on others
- Same as above
- It is expensive to care for more animals through their whole life. More animals become harder to control and monitor.
- Same as dogs.
- I'm not actually sure...
- However many dogs the owner can take proper care of.
- The number depends not on the house hold but on the available space. Having 5 cats in a small apartment doesn't make sense, but in a large single detached home no issue. As long as they are under control and not a disturbance/ health issue why have a numerical limit?
- If you feel like you need more than one cat, you might want to talk to a therapist about figuring out what's missing in your life.
- Similar issues with ensuring cats are kept in a clean environment and that they aren't wandering the neighbourhood in larger numbers.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same as with multiple dogs - If they are healthy and happy animals it should not matter how many live together.
- It completely depends on the temperaments and behaviour of the individual cats, as well as how much physical space is available in the household, as well as the owners' ability to provide adequately for their husbandry, medical needs, mental enrichment needs, and physical exercise needs.
- Again, the reasonable number of cats is the number that can be appropriately cared for - proper medical attention (including spay and neuter), food, water, living environment, socialization and housing.
- Personal choice
- Available indoor space.
- Same response as for dogs
- As long as they are indoors, with the appropriate number of litter boxes, you can have more cats than dogs. There will probably not be as many noise complaints for cats as there are for dogs.
- I don't need cat ladies in my neighbourhood. One pet is plenty. Cat hoarding should be illegal.
- Again responsible pet owners will look after multiple cats.
- depends on the size of the house....cats need their own space.
depends on the care provided by the owner/s
depends on whether the cat can go outside into an enclosed safe catio environment
- More than 4 adult cats approaches a level where health of the cats becomes a concern and it's imperative that the city curtail hoarding behaviours of some owners especially with cats, for the safety and welfare of the animals.
- Again comes back to the owner being responsible for their pets fully at all times.
- See above.
- Zero was not given as option here
However, this number is a function of how responsible the pet owner is and the behavior of the animals
- Cost to keep too many animals is high. No reason to have too many animals in an urban area.
- Please explain to me why I need to explain my choice.
- Cats are awesome and more is better. However, the household has to be able to demonstrate an ability to provide enough food, attention, and litter boxes for their cats.
- As long as the cats needs are being met, they're lower maintenance than dogs, and some people love to have many cats. Above 3 is getting a bit much though.
- There is a point where taking care of animals is off set by the individual amount of animals
- Too many can lead to bad care for the animals.
- Two cats may keep each other company.
- If you need another for your existing dog ie to transition ok but beyond that it seems like a lot to me
- Cats stink. Any more than 3 in your house and we can smell your cats on you when you leave the house.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Because there is more distinct possibility of cats fighting due to the territorial aspects some cats have especially toms and that you need to have an ability to spay and neuter any cats to make sure there is no serious damage to the other cats living in the household
- I hate cats so no comment!
- Depends on size of house.
- Ppl can't control their cats as it is.
- Any more than that and your house would start to stink... (I have cats; I know!)
- As above cats like companionship - but anymore than 2 is a kennel, not a home.
- Cats need their own space in order to avoid territorial/behavioral issues. Some cats do well with a companion but others do not.
- It depends on the household
- It depends on the size of the household and economic status. There is no one size fits all number of animals that should be allowed. If you have the space and means to keep many cats, it should be your choice.
- they are always hanging around outside on other peoples property
- Cannot explain other than there are people who let them breed and before one knows about it, there are enumerable numbers in one house,
- There needs to be a limit on the number of animals permitted in each household. Too often do people have excessive numbers of animals (e.g., 30+ dogs) and the welfare of those suffers. This will also help identify hoarders.
- Same as above, 1 animal per adult in the household.
- We do not live in a nanny state. If an owner can responsibly care for multiple cats, it should be their prerogative. If they fail to responsibly care for multiple cats, the penalties should be significant including the potential seizure of the animals.
- Same as for dogs. Two cats are companions to each other.
- Cats are community-based animals and do best when they are not solo animals.
- Cat are cool and don't often cause issues for others in the community.
- Depends on household members, level of care able to be provided
- Same.
- Same as above.
- Indoor cats are quite happy if they have others to play with and socialize with. Again 4 in an apartment wouldn't work, so space is the issue really.
- Two max if allowed to roam (despite bylaws). If the cats are kept strictly indoors or only allowed access to the outdoors via "catios", the number of cats kept may correspond to the owners financial ability to keep them properly, e.g. provide food, sanitation and regular and incidental vet care).
- These must all be licensed and kept indoors.
- I do not see how a family can care for more than 3 cats at a time. This means by maintaining and keeping a safe, proper living environment for both cats and humans in the house.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A single, competent adult should be able to adequately care for up to 4 cats at any given time without distressing naturally territorial cats.
- Same as the dog question.
- As with dogs, it depends upon the size of the house and the size of the cats, as well as the ability of the owners to provide for, and clean up after them.
- Should be none of the city's business unless there is a care issue.
- Cats are harder to keep inside, that's why having many cats is harder than having many dogs
- if they can afford to have numerous cats and they are well taken care of, vaccination/rabies etc.. no restrictions. must be all spayed/neutered unless if they are a cattery and registered with TICA, CFA etc.. and licensed by the city
- You didn't offer 0? :-) Same as above....ability of owner to properly care for the animals and keep property clean.
- Cats do their own thing but you need to regulate the and keep them indoors. If they go outside, they need to be on a leash. You force dogs to be on leashes, why not cats as well. Cats are more dangerous than people realize and there are more stray cats out in the public than stray dogs guaranteed.
- It's none of your business how many cats I have
- Anything over 2 makes you a crazy cat person lol
- You might have 1 or 2 older cats and then bring in a baby kitten. If you can afford the responsibility, why not?
- Space, reasonably manageable by 1 or more people, quality of care that is able to be provided, reduced improper breeding
- More than four is complicated and can you really look after all of them.
- Again, not including registered breeders
- My response is similar to the one for dogs.
- More animals can cause damage
- I don't think their can be a blanket number because cats and households vary in size
- I think 2 or 3 would be adequate again for the cost of licensing, food, vet bills.
- not too many and not too few
- Same response as for dogs.
- Overcrowding stresses animals. The ability to manage health, waste, noise, odour and debris decreases as number of animals increases.
- Same kind of reasoning above, but also coming around to cleanliness. Cats are a lot dirtier in the house than dogs typically are and you should have 2 litter boxes per cat which takes up a lot of square space and you need to ensure that every cat has someone to seek safety in needed.
- Cats are quiet. If they aren't roaming outside and have enough litter boxes then there's no harm done
- Is the owner capable of caring properly for the animals? Do the cats stay indoors or have they become a nuisance to neighbours?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- One cat per person in the household, plus one cat (e.g. 3 people means 4 cats). This is to ensure that the people can provide the care and attention required for the animal.
- Arbitrary
- 2 will at least keep themselves company whilst owners are absent.
- same as pervious statement
- This is an individual choice. The City of Calgary does not get to decide this. It is the pet owner's responsibility to meet their animal's needs.
- Same as above.
- Concern with animal safety after 3, as well as nuisances to neighbors, birds,
- Number of litter boxes should be number of cats, plus one. 4 boxes is a bit crazy. If someone can keep the litter boxes clean, I guess go for it.
- It depends on the owner. There are currently laws that address hoarding. No need to increase municipal red tape. The city would be better off simply better enforcing current bylaws.
- Same us the above
- I believe 2 is reasonable for the average household. It allows for an owner to provide companionship for their cats. In some instances more cats are probably totally reasonable.
- if they are indoor cats and well looked after, I believe the choice is that of the owners, i had three cats at one point and it was a lot of work and responsibility.
- litter box pet. anymore may be hazardous to the owner
- People who want more than 3 cats may have difficulty understanding healthy boundaries. They need help in making healthy limits on pet ownership.
- Just means more cats on the street
- Seems like a reasonable number to afford to feed and maintain for the average person
- I feel that one household should not have more that ten cats
- Again, square footage of home and as long as they are well cared for and kept healthy...have 30 if you so choose.
- I think it's nice if you are able to have 2 cats so they can keep each other company. Any more than 2 I think would be excessive.
- I would like to say 1, but I think if I had a cat I would probably want the option of another.
- (Depending on the size of the home) If >4 cats more likely to have inter-cat conflict leading to unwanted behaviours (often house soiling) leading to surrendering.
- Same. Most families have 3 kids... 3 cats is about right.
- Depends on situation
- Do we limit the amount of children that can be in a household? As long as you can take care of them and ensure good health this should not be a question.
- I have no reason why you would need so many cats.
- same as previous answer
- Similar to 5, but less agressive animal by nature
- Cats do not get along with each other ... there is no reason to bred ... SPCA has lots



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- same as above.
- Nobody needs more than 2
- I don't think a hard limit is the right way to approach the issue. For some owners, 2 animals would be too many; others could responsibly take care of a much larger number. Only in individual cases of irresponsibility should a limit be imposed.
- again, totally subjective - how much space to they need, temperament, owners ability to care for and manage all equally as attentively
- Increasing the number of adult cats in the household increases the likelihood of inter-cat aggression and subsequent house-soiling as a result of that aggression.
- I think cats are somewhat solitary and need their own space. Plus people seem to have a tendency to hoard cats.
- Two cats can provide companionship for each other when owner is away.
- They can keep each other company.
- Same as above response.
- Two cats per adult in the household. My household has two adults.
- There is nothing wrong with the massive accumulation (same may call hoarding) of cats. it is entirely normal.
- More than 4 cats is a burdensome number to have in a single household in terms of appropriate care of the animals.
- Belief that there is a reasonable number of animals one should have is naive. There are many individuals who can care for large numbers of animals to a high standard. Putting a restriction on number of pets will not prevent poor owners from not caring for their pets
- Prevents hoarding
- I don't like cats. In truth, it could be many. It is the quality of the owners, rather than the quantity of cats.
- Depending on the amount of space a person has, as long as all cats are well cared for and the person is able to provide a safe environment I don't see an issue.
- Individuals should decide what a reasonable number of cats is, not the city. All cats should be raised responsibly.
- the number of Cats a person can manage is dependent on the home, and home owners life style/fininal needs. The number is not as important as requiring the cats receiving proper care.
- who am i to limit what a person can resonantly keep? i don't know their capacities.
- same as above
- Some people foster and own.
- Cats are easy to look after but they must be neutered.
- It's none of my business nor anyone else's
- I debated between 2 and 3. Cats are loners. Since most cat owners keep them indoors the number of cats in a house can stay well hidden and not healthy for the cats. I could see certain exceptions



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

being made for short term/foster cats thought. I have a cat and feel she would hate more than 2 others

- 3s a crowd
- Size of property
- depends on size of house.
- Cats escape more than dogs and are less controlled. 2 is lots
- I think 4 cats should be the max for pet households as it allows them to care for and maintain healthy dogs within a reasonable amount. I believe if you want more you should have to obtain a licence from the city to do so, including breeders as sometimes kittens stay with them over the age of 3 mont
- - Same reasons as for dogs
- if you own two cats, you would know the answer
- Assuming it's a family of 3. You should never let the pet outnumber the people in the household. In a worse case scenario (i.e cat fighting, fire, etc), each person can grab one.
- If you follow the rules the number shouldn't be an issue.
- Too many is hard to manage
- Cats kept indoors and cannot make a lot of noise
- Same as in 5). The city can provide statistical data but there should be no limit.
- I don't understand why anyone would want to own one cat. More than 4 is just insane.
- Space and responsible ownership is more important. I feel that three is a reasonable number to take care of while keeping a home liveable.
- This seems like a reasonable number to take care of.
- Again, all depends on the size of house, yard, how they are taken care of and provided for. If any animal is suffering, then it should be adopted.
- See comments above
- See above, but cats are more sedentary and self sufficient and there is little or no yard waste.
- I would say just 5 or 6. I know how much work multiple pets can be and I honestly know that the attention needed is quite a bit.
- more than three cats are hard to properly control and monitor and ensure that they don't try to get outside
- Providing the owner is providing a safe and clean environment and the animals are healthy then it is a personal choice.
- I don't see a need for a limit as long as all animals are properly and humanely cared for
- Same as above
- Animals - cats, dogs etc. take time, money and effort. Bigger the number of animals, bigger opportunity for issues to arise.
- Depends on the owners ability to care for the animals.
- Same as above. One is good enough for me and cats are smaller.
- Again, the most important issue is someone being able to care for all their pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- if you have space and the ability to care for X amount of cats why not
- As a guidance counsellor, I have always found that if a kiddo has anymore than 2 cats in their house, they smell.
- Independent animals, small, quiet
- I have had 5 indoor cats with no problems. I'm not sure they all appreciated living in such close quarters but I made sure they got exercise and affection and kept the litter boxes clean, clean, clean. I know of one person who has 8 cats, which is too many for her but might be ok for someone else.
- They are disgusting and don't belong on the streets.
- Cats must stay inside (or on a leash) and do not make noise therefore having more than one is less disruptive to neighbours than dogs which are constantly outside
- Cats have to remain inside more than 2 cats is unsanitary in a dwelling!
- 2 cats can coexist fairly peacefully & provide company for each other. Getting into higher numbers starts to get into unhealthy pet modes
- Cats are generally smaller and require less exercise than dogs
- Cats need friend
- See above. Same goes for people with cats.
- Again, depends on the person, I have had 4 with no issues. I also know of a lady who's had 7 and everything was clean, they were well fed and healthy and happy
- More than 3 cats are hard to give proper attention to . When on leash, 3 cats fan be controlled. More becomes a challenge for untrained owners.
- Cats are loving animals and all have such different oersonalities
- Number isn't relevant, but how responsible the owner is is relevant
- You need to have as many pets as you can afford. Having two provides company for each other
- Some people support volunteer for rescuing pets. We should not limit groups like these.
- Cats are also good pets but can also become a nuisance if they are let out to roam.
- One to two.
- Cats keep to themselves mostly. Less of a hazard if more. They use litter boxes unlike dogs. Dont bark.
- Again the number truly is not the issue- are they being cared for properly and in a safe environment.
- Cats should only be on the property, and don't make much noise, that feels like a reasonable amount
- If the cats are indoor animals and properly cared for, then owners should be able to provide several cats.
- Three seems to be a happy number of cats in a home.
- It gets super smelly after two in my opinion, and I guess landlords can restrict vs the city but would be nice to be less when it's an animal that voids and defecates inside
- Three animals are enough for the average household to manage time wise as well as economically. Again it depends on how many people in the household are active in caring for them and the economic situation. I don't believe there should a legal limit imposed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same as above
- If there is enough space and all cats are treated well, then there should be no limit to how many cats people should have.
- Too many cats can be hard on the inside of a house. Not everyone would have 1 litter box per cat. Yuk!
- See previous
- Same as above.
- I think that people should be allowed to have as many dogs as they like, providing that they give proper care and clean up after them. Make sure they are not pests in the neighbourhood.
- This is an average, I believe animals should not vastly out number people. I think other cities have a +1 animal. So if there are 4 people in a household you can have 5 pets
- I think for the standard household 4 cats are reasonable. I think a lot of people may start to neglect their cats if they own more but this is not true of all households.
- They should have the adequate room to live in the home comfortably
- If all the cats are under control and indoor then it should be up to the responsible owners discretion.
- Same as above. If your cats aren't roaming and being a nuisance and you're happily caring for them, I don't see why 4+ cats is a problem.
- It's about cleanliness.
- Cats are less demanding than dogs. More than 3 and there can be behaviour issues.
- I don't have cats but I believe it should be a choice
- Really depends on how good the owners are. Problems could be dealt with under other parts of the bylaw without limiting people who are responsible owners of many cats.
- Indoor cats can provide companionship and stimulation for each other. Does not interfere with others. Maintenance is a similar demand on the owner as for one.
- I had 3 cats and it can cause issues with territory and behaviour. I'm not saying it would affect anyone but the owners but I think sometimes people need help controlling how many pets they have.
- Same as above
- Cats like to have a companion
- Not a cat person. As long as cats are taken care of then get more if you want.
- Small animals take up less space and are lower maintenance
- Some people can be very responsible for swaths of animals, and others can't hardly care for themselves lol! I do not believe in limits.
- Depends entirely on size of home, and experience, lifestyle and means of the owner
- Again - same opinions as with dogs ... based on owner history and experience
- If the cats are cared for and well behaved it's not an issue
- Cat litter filling up garbage trucks. Making messes in neighbours gardens.
- Again, I don't believe numbers is the issue. Some people can care for multiple cats well and others cannot care for one.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cats are inside animals thanks to the city's bylaws. If the space is big enough, there shouldn't be any restriction (maybe no more than 8) on the number of cats. Additionally, cats are relatively low maintenance compared to dogs.
- Again I think this depends on the person. You can potentially have 10 cats and take wonderful care of them. Some people only have one cat and they don't care for them properly. I would not set a limit for those who have the capacity to care for them.
- Reasonable based on the ability of an adult to manage and care properly for them
- Same as per dogs. Cats seem to present a larger problem with more incidents of people keeping huge numbers of cats, which cause stink, health concerns, and noise. A concrete number might make it easier to enforce problem homes. More humane for the pets as well.
- Also no need to determine how many cats people can afford or care for
- This is a tough one. If they are all indoors, it doesn't affect others. But there needs to be proper care.
- Same as above.
- Indoor 2 to 4 is fine. They don't make noise and they're inside. If their outdoor cats, which they really shouldn't be, then I think one or two.
- Same reasoning as for dogs.
- I don't think anyone really needs more than 4 cats in their house, unless they are a rescue or breeder or something similar.
- Same as my explanation for dogs.
- Cats can live indoors, and are smaller animals so 4 would be an appropriate number as long as they are fixed.
- Houses are different sizes. There are already rules for maintenance of property, enforcement cost, freedom of choice. Deal with problems under existing regs rather than adding more invasive and costly regs
- Same as my answer for dogs except for the barking issue.
- Depends on the size of the household. Cats generally need another cat so 2 - 4 is a reasonable number. However, some condos are small and do not offer the space for appropriate exercise for cats. Since they must be indoors, owners need to ensure they can get appropriate exercise.
- As above
- Unless there is an imminent danger to the animals or the owner, I don't think there should be a limit. People take things to the extreme so it should be monitored. As long as a happy caring home is provided. Maybe cap children instead.
- I have no opinion on this
- I don't believe that people should be told how many cats they can have. There are responsible folks that have multiple cats and irresponsible folks with 1 cat. It comes down to the owner, not the number of cats.
- All should be spayed and neutered. Owners must be able to care for all animals in their home. No kitten-millers or backyard breeders. No breeding permitted.
- Lots of purring on laps but totally manageable number.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If someone can afford their care and vet bills theres no reason for a limit
- Again size of home , etc etc
- Again bylaw discretion
- To control the amount of poo and smell.
- Depending on the size of house and how many people are in the household to help care for the cats. I chose 3 as a reasonable middle option but I think more would be fine in a very large house, for example.
- For 'most' people I think this is a reasonable number.
- Depends on the owner.
- Cats are easily scalable.
- Cats are never reasonable.
- That is a guideline. It depends on how big the home is, what people can afford, if the cats are a bonded colony or not, and if the cats' needs can be comfortably met.
- One per is ample.
- While there are always exceptions to the rule - my observation is that much more than three cats in an average household creates compromised sanitary conditions and or management of the cats' behaviour.
- Proper care of pets would be better if less, no more. Only a vet office can take care of many at the same time.
- After 4 I think without them being spayed or neutered may cause them to be put out on the street
- Three because litter box is manageable, and the cost is affordable
- Really depends on the size of the house
- Socialization, smell, feces,
- I don't think the city needs to impose limits. Obviously hoarder situations are a concern, but those are a rarity. The city doesn't have the right nor the ability to determine if someone can or cannot adequately care for 1 dog / cat or 10 dogs / cats.
- Cats raised together can remain friends and they enjoy another's company. I also like the ability for cats of different ages to be in the same home so when one passes, the remaining cats are not alone.
- It is people choice to determine how many animals to live with. Unless the SPCA or other investigatory bodies deem they are living in squalor and need to intervene, people have the right to live as they choose.
- Cats are not pack animals. They are independent animals. They do better by themselves typically. Therefore cat ownership should be limited as many behavioral issues such as inappropriate urination can develop when there are too many cats in a household, this leads to unnecessary euthanasia of cats.
- Again, it comes down to resources that the cats have access to. I would also say a review would be acceptable if you have 4+ cats.
- Same as above.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- As many as they can properly care for
- As long as they are taking care of shouldnt matter
- Number of animals is not the issue. It's the care of them. Someone can care for 6 better and with less nuisance (noise/odour) than someone with 1
- Same as above
- Not a cat person
- I don't care as long as they're cared for and not a nuisance.
- The stay inside and as long as they are well taken care of and not being guarded and have baskets, toys, food, water and love, it's fine.
- As long as all the animals are provided for physically and mentally and the owners have the means physically, emotionally and financially to provide for the animals through out their life span. And as long as the animals are not a nuisance to the community the limit should be lifestyle dependent
- People should have to right to own the amount of pets they are capable of taking care of
- I know nothing about cats but one of my friends has two and it seems a fair amount
- This is too broad. It's unreasonable to just choose a number when there are many factors that would impact this decision. How big is the home if there are five or more dogs? Five cats in a one bedroom apartment is very different than five cats in a 5 bedroom home.
- Cats are pretty independent so 1 or 2 is fine
- I think more than two is to many for a healthy house. If someone wants more than that, they should move to the country and have them in a barn
- It depends on the size of the house.
- Too many cats needs homes.
- See explanation above.
- Cats are a lot easier to own. However, we don't want people to have too many. However, if a person has dogs and cats, then it would be maximum of 4 pets total amount.
- Any number that can be properly cared for.
- 1 if the bylaws are respected (maybe 2 so they have company if alone much of the day).
- One cat per person in a typical family.
- Same as above.
- Same as above except for cats.
- Because cats poop indoors 5+ could be excessive for health reasons. Again if cats are cared for and have enough space then it's discretionary, case by case.
- So many cats need homes. Better to have lots in a home then over populating shelters. As long as regular maintenance is done and cats are taken care of.
- Three or more are too many in an urban setting.
- Same reason as dogs.
- More animals means that owners are less able to control their animals appropriately.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I'm a Realtor, I see hundreds of houses, I've never been to a house with more than two cats that didn't stink of cat and litter box, I can't imagine what four would smell like.
- Not being a cat owner, it would be harder for me to comment. However, cats are also costly in terms of vet bills and too many animals in a home can lead to cleanliness issues for some people.
- Only for companionship
- Cats are pretty self-sufficient, but I still don't think people should own more than 3.
- Per above, if animals are healthy and cared for and neighbours aren't being disturbed by smell, or animals at large, I don't think there needs to be a limit.
- Same as dogs. I find space is more of an issue for cats. Maybe it should be based on sq footage?
- Same as above
- Too many cats especially if roaming outdoors is a nuisance. Again welfare of animal is important.
- Provided they remain indoors at all times, two is plenty.
- See above
- It honestly depends on the situation and household. 4 or 5 cats is ok if well taken care of. The 5+ is vague. That makes me think of people who have 20 cats living in horrid conditions.
- While they are smaller than dogs typically, I worry about hoarding cases where animals may be neglected or mistreated. I don't see a reason to have more than 4 cats in the city.
- four for the health and wellbeing
- This is an educated guess, having not owned cats.
- As an animal rescuer, no limits should be placed so long as pets are taken care of and living conditions are good.
- This would be assuming they are indoor cats who don't leave the property.
- Same as above.
- As above response for dogs. It could be 3 if the owner does not allow the cats to leave the house unleashed, and provides enough mental stimulation and interaction with their cats.
- Crazy cat people
- The same answer as above, don't let your cats wander and have the means to look after them and not let them be a nuisance to neighbours.
- depends on size of home, number of adults in home, time people have to interact with the cats
- don't know about cats, but don't they usually loner-type animals and require more personal space? Too many cats would just create stress on each of the cats.
- Cats tend to wander around
- Cats have big litters of kittens. Can easily surpass 5 if it has babies.
- Again, depends on amount of space but if there is space and the cats get along it's fine
- Above
- Cats are self sufficient creatures, as long as they are properly fed and cared for they pretty much do their own thing and do not occupy that much space
- My choice depends on the owner and the care they take of their animals.
- Cats are smaller, quieter and easier to care for.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't know anything about cats.
- Same as above.
- Again, some people are responsible and take care of their cat(s). Some don't, it is depending on the situation.
- Two for companionship, more than two are a pack and aren't suitable for inside habitation.
- It again comes down to responsible pet owners. If people can provide the care, life and attention necessary, they should be able to have 5 or 20. Cats are small, quiet and live mainly indoors, so present no problem or threat to the community.
- See comment regarding number of dogs. Same applies for number of cats.
- I don't believe a person can responsibly care for more than 3 pets at a time.
- More than 3 and there is a greater possibility they are not cared for by a vet
- Same for dogs
- Not a cat fan. If inside then okay. Cats should be monitored the same as dogs. Licensing etc.
- Above
- A cat should have a friend.
- Keep them in your household! Seriously, it's neglect to think they can roam the public freely.
- It is a reasonable number.
- kittens not included until they are 8 or 10 weeks old, condos and apartments often restrict numbers
- If the animals are safe, cared for, well loved, and provided with proper diet, medical care and exercise I don't particularly think a numerical limit is necessary. Hoarding cases can be dealt with separately.
- No need to encourage crazy cat ladies (or 'people')
- Personal opinion. I have 1 cat and that is enough for me.
- As long as cats are being taken care of and prevented from roaming around, it doesn't bother me
- No more than 4 adult cats - special permission can be granted.
- If kept inside like they are supposed to they are companions for each other.
- Same as above.
- Cats...that is plenty!!
- If the cats are let outside to roam, then one is too many. If the cats are inside and they have clean litter boxes and are well looked after then 3 is lots. Otherwise it becomes a hoarding situation.
- Same as above, regarding dogs
- The amount of dogs in a household should depend on the owners ability to provide quality of life for the animals
- Similar answer to dog count. Depends on space and on the ability of the owner to maintain a hygienic home.
- I chose this amount because again it balances the ability to control and provide care, with ownership. If people can't care for their animals it burdens the City and other agencies with that care. By having a numbers limit it reduces both public and private liabilities.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Decreases the burden on animal shelters and having to put them down. They too are living beings and should be given an opportunity to feel special like any member of the family.
- With one cat, breeding, fixing, control, and safety is optimal. I worked for the Humane Society.
- Two are enough and easy to control. All must be indoor cats. This does not include licensed breeders and the occasional and temporary kittens.
- Space and care for an average family
- Do people need more than 2 cats?
- CVMA reports inaccurate pet ownership numbers. They claim that Canada has 8.2 million dogs. This isn't likely if the U.S. claims that 67% of households own pets.
- Same as above. As long as the pets are being well cared for and are not agitating others no reason why not
- Some people have the time and resources to care for many animals and they should be allowed to do so
- n/a
- Same as for dogs.
- Pets need space and care.
- Once again each individual case should be considered ive seen people able to care for multiple animals
- Same as for dogs
- Cats are easier to care for, and don't make much noise. Maybe 10+ issues could arise.
- Same answer as above.
- This is entirely dependent on the household. How many humans are in the house? How big is the house? Are the owners taking responsibility and litter box training their cats? are the conditions clean?
- 2 cats is the maximum a person could deal with should they fight or become aggressive.
- Too many cats in Calgary
- Most people are incapable of caring for multiple animals. While there are exceptions to this, I feel this would help reduce the number of animals being re-homes or surrendered
- Same as dogs
- Same as above, so long as they are well cared for and have a clean home and are vaccinated.
- As above - if the owner is a responsible, knowledgeable cat owner, and the cats are properly housed and cared for, the number is not a problem.
- Most family should not be outnumbered by their pets.
- Similar to dog ownership. Three with in the bounds that there is enough people to provide for each animal. Including playtime engagement.
- As long as the cats are adequately fed and cared for, with excellent veterinary care and safety, then a household can have as many cats as they want.
- Same answer as above



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depends on the home. If you live in a large home with a large yard and the space and means for many cats it should be allowed.
- I think it depends on how many family members there are and how large the household is. More than 5 cats is obviously unreasonable in an apartment but could be very doable on a large property.
- I don't believe there should be a limit on cats either. People with 1 cat can be more irresponsible than those with 5+. Hoarding situations won't be stopped by restricting number of pets. It shouldn't be able how many pets but how responsible the owner is.
- As many as can be responsibly looked after by the owner
- No real reason. More might be acceptable but less than 100. (Not supporting crazy cat people.) Also as long as they are not running free.
- Cats are easier to care for than dogs
- I believe that three cats are easy for a single person to take care of and control, and most houses have enough space for each animal. I don't believe in putting a limit of three cats per household. Pet limits should be put in place on a case by case basis based on quality of care.
- If cats need to be indoor, four would be an adequate number to care for them, and give them enough space (as cats are not social). Plus, cat litter gets smelly fast.
- Who are you to judge how many dogs someone has? As long as they are all loved and cared for. If you can love and care for them all, go for it. Be responsible. Know what you can handle.
- Cats need less than dogs for the most part. But people who have more than 3 cats usually have issues around the cleanliness in their homes.
- Cats should have the same rules as dogs. Keep them in your property and maintain control.
- Don't really have a reason!! If they are all indoor cats then it would really be up to the owner if they can handle financially the cost of looking after 3 cats and if they could deal with the cat litter odour!!!
- There should be no limit
- Same as above
- Please see question 5 explanation.
- See above.
- Same as above for dogs. And to add, some people foster pets temporarily so this will also control how many to foster without putting too many limitations on the number of animals.
- Proper attention to cats could lack if there is more than 3, anymore than 3 could be a health concern for both the owner and cats.
- We are getting too many animals in certain areas of the city and the number of interactions with non owners is increasing.
- depending on the breed and space available
- I don't care about cats
- Same as above.
- Cats are small and some often hide away in the house and they're not seen or disrupting anything. It's important to make owning cats and dogs easy so they can be adopted and have a good life with a good owner.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They are predominately house bound so have a few should be ok and not too much trouble for person to care for.
- Same as above.
- Again, as long as the cats are kept inside in a clean area And allowed outside in a secure enclosure only, fed and watered, spayed and neutered unless owner pays for a cattery license to breed, I am good.
- Same as above. I only say less because they aren't naturally pack animals.
- If one house can have 4 dogs then a house should be able to have 4 cats as cats are smaller and usually require less attention. Animals are in need of homes. If people want the animals they should be allowed
- See above regarding dogs.
- 4 max. If a cat hoarding (like more than 6 or 7) is discovered, someone needs to go in and remove some. It's a sickness that people need help with.
- My husband's family had five cats, because they were a blended step family in a large house. They had n+1 (so six) number of litter boxes and 5 food and water bowls per cat. It was fine.
- Cats are much easier to care for. They do not need to go outside for walks. As long as the owner is providing food, shelter, vet care, and love, the number should not matter. Possibly do home inspections if a household has more than a certain number of cats.
- same as above. everyone is different.
- I find many people with multiple cats will let them run the neighborhood and they don't live as long with vehicles.
- Until cat guardians in the majority demonstrate proper guardian behaviour there should be a restriction to 1 cat per household. In future, when proper behaviour is demonstrated this limit can be expanded.
- Less work for cats
- 2-3 cats. Same reasons as dogs.
- Same as above
- If the cats are inside and are taken care of, why would the amount matter.
- Until cat guardians in the majority demonstrate proper guardian behaviour there should be a restriction to 1 cat per household. In future, when proper behaviour is demonstrated this limit can be expanded.
- 4 is getting into the crazy realm
- each household is different, treat them as such.
- I look at this in two ways. For guardianship of pets, I feel the limit should be lower, maybe 3 or 4. IF they are a rescue then the number should not be applied.
- Again, it depends on the person, their age and mental capacity to care for the cats.
- House size depends
- Depends on the size of your household and your ability to look after them.
- Same as above



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I would say none because I find the fact they dig in their litter box then go on your table, counters, or bed quite disgusting. Again, it comes down to being able to manage, maintain, and care for the animals. dogs or cats, more than three this gets more difficult
- Same as above.
- Same reasoning as above.
- I feel that cat owners even take less responsibility for their cats allowing them to roam the neighbourhood without any concern for the cats coming on to their neighbours property. On the block of 3 ave NE there are about 6 cats that all roam and often come into my backyard uninvited.
- Under 10. As long as they are kept indoors I don't care how many cats you have.
- Gotta be fair with dogs ("my dogs are as small as cats, why can cat-owners have more cats than me).
- Too many too much work
- Cats can get out of control quickly.
- 0 is not a selectable option.
- Cats are easy, it's okay to have a few! Many need companions.
- I just think more for cost so you can care for them properly. Not sure to much on this since I don't own one but just picked a good middle number. They need to be kept within the property though or on leash like a dog.
- same as above.
- as long as they are well cared for no limit should be imposed.
- Crazy cat lady is a true fact. There never seems to be enough cats per household. The reality is that care, health, food is a requirement and animals being neutered. There are more cats then dogs so if more cats are allowed this might help with the animals in the shelters.
- Same as above. It is reasonable to hold people accountable to caring for their animals. Three is reasonable to care for and provide for both physically and medically. Anything beyond that gets into a grey area around the ability to properly care for an animal.
- Same as above, good for keeping each other company and having a playmate.
- They don't take up a lot of space -- but they do need care and attention. The number is less relevant than the impact the cats have on the home itself (is it clean/safe) and on neighbours (noise, disruption, etc).
- I have no problem with lots of cats, as long as they are cared for properly, fed, etc.
- Again, max out at 5.
- same as above
- Anymore than 2 become just possessions and not pets.
- Same as above but to a lesser degree.
- Not the city's business. Responsible dog owners can have many dogs. The city shouldnt set a limit they should just set the criteria for it to be safe.
- I don't mind an owner having numerous cats as long as they are healthy and well cared for.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I'd say five the maximum But it depends if there was more than one person living in the house. 5:1 ratio
- With 2 cats they would have company but I would not want them to roam. They poop in my gardens and kill songbirds. Only indoor cats please.
- Same as above
- same as above
- However many someone can take care of and keep healthy.
- Cats also require space and proper care is considerable. Two should be sufficient for both the company of the cats and the owner.
- More than three and it's hard to properly care for the animals
- I have lived in a residence with 3 cats and one Med/lg dog. It worked very well. No issues.
- The number of pets in a home does not make a difference if they are well behaved and under control. The owner is responsible for their care and the care of the community and their pet in the community
- Same as for dogs
- Reasonable amount of animals without being too limiting in terms of space noise and waste.
- Limiting the number of pets is not reasonable, owners ensuring their pets are cared for, fully licensed, vetted and in control is more important. To ensure a functioning community.
- I consider cats different because people are not so dependent on them for help & protection. If the cat owner lets them go outside as many do, and more than 2 cats, equals unhappy neighbours. I try to produce food for my family and I don't want cat feces in my garden soil, thank you very much.
- Cats are territorial and need their own space. Many find it stressful to live with more than one, two at most
- 3 are just enough.
- Higher numbers can increase risk of proper care.
- A manageable number
- Easy to look after and cause minimal issues
- And they must be kept inside the house. Put on a harness if allowed out in their OWN yard no one else's!!!!
- 3 is Affordable with the vet fees in Calgary so outrageously High it would cut down on disease and abandonment and more people may be responsible and put up catios
- Cats don't tend to like lots of other cats
- If responsible pet ownership is met why does a number need to be applied?
- Cats are smaller in general and require less social interaction with the dogs, but I still thing every creature deserves its own amount of space that is clean and comfortable. More than 3 seems excessive unless the space is very large and the homeowners are very exceptional.
- Cats are clean & really just sleep all day
- There are many households in our struggling economy that have more than one family living in them, there are people that foster cats for rescue, so therefore 4 is reasonable.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- See above
- Cats are easier to manage because they don't need walks and can stay indoors.
- Reasonable limit.
- Same as above
- This should be presented as a range. 5 is fine but 8 might be too many. It depends on the living space and persons capacity to care for the cats.
- As long as the owner does not allow them to roam free, keep them in the house or yard, like dogs. No pet should be free to roam the community
- same as above
- Same reason as the time, energy and money it takes to responsibly care for a pet. I doubt most people would agree.
- Same as above
- As for 5
- There shouldn't be a restriction on the number of cats as long as they are adequately and responsibly cared for. The current bylaws with no limits should remain.
- As long as they are well cared for good on them
- Same response as above.
- Cats can be social animals too. They keep each other company.
- Same as above it depends on persons ability to properly care for and manage the total number and types of pets vs a specific number.
- Same as above
- Supervision issues
- Depends I. Owner if they are indoors and well kept them fine. I am against cat houses with 18 unfixed cats. But this is not responsible ownership
- It's still a manageable and affordable number
- N/a
- As long as pets are properly cared for there should not be a limit
- I believe the limit should be based on size of the home and financial capability. If you can't provide and healthy sustainable home then your amount of cats should be less.
- That seems like a very reasonable number.
- Seems reasonable.
- Same as dogs, 3 is a good number because the cats will have a better chance of getting along
- 2 or 3 depending on size of house.
- See above response for dogs.
- Two is manageable. You can give the attention needed and they are not competing for it.
- If they are kept indoors, and on property, as long as they are cared for I believe that's the owners choice
- Cats may be independent but are social animals so should not be left alone.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- anyone currently caring for more than the allowed amount should be grandfathered, providing the animals are being properly cared for
- None
- More than two cats becomes a lot to keep track of for health and wellness purposes
- No comment
- Keeping cats in doors or at least in your own yard is important. Same reasons as two dogs: people can't seem to properly look after one and add others to entertain/provide company for the other. More than 2 and people seem to struggle more with proper care.
- I don't think this matters. We have no cats due to allergies, but there are irresponsible owners with one cat, and highly responsible owners with 6 cats; might be show cats, emotional support cats, etc. What should matter is how the animals are cared for.
- Same as above I think 2 is fine I think going above that is getting questionable
- same as dogs
- Two is enough. Company for each other.
- Cats are not as bothersome as dogs, in general. The number should balance with the expected costs to care for the animals.
- Again goes on house size.
- Greater than 3 cats becomes difficult to manage
- Personal choice
- Cats can form communes easily and are lower-effort than dogs. I think 10 per household would be the ideal limit.
- Ability to afford food, vet care etc.
- Cleanliness/odor can be a larger issue with cats as they do not normally go out to use the bathroom.
- Same reasoning as for dogs.
- No limit provided the animals are looked after and are not allowed to roam.
- I strongly believe that Calgary should maintain their no limits on pets. You will lose out on the licensing fees from responsible pet owners and hoarders and others won't care if there is a limit or not.
- As long as they are not at large outside and are cared for properly.
- Cats usually stay home.
- Cats always run around outdoors.
- Owners should be able to own multiple pets until the animal's health becomes a concern.
- A reasonable number is the amount where one can properly take care of the animals.
- 4 pets maximum. (Does not include fish)
- Same as dogs, ability to maintain cleanliness of home and prevent roaming/escapes
- I don't care for cats ;)
- I don't think most people have the space for more cats if they do then more but the average house is only big enough for two
- Any more than 3 cats and there becomes hygiene issues



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- We have owned cats and after 2 the smell increases and personal space among cats becomes problematic.
- Again, depending on the owner, the number can be more. Responsible people are perfectly capable of looking after a small zoo !!
- Depends on the size of home, other pets in the home, the availability for proper waste management (enough boxes per cat)
- Any more and the litterbox situation gets crazy.
- Strictly due to care and the number of cat litter boxes as I believe all cats should be indoor cats.
- I don't know. Never had a cat
- As they have to be inside, or leashed outside, I'd say 3 is probably max. Unless you have a large home.
- Cats don't need a whole lot of space to be happy so more per household seems ok to me. If they are all roaming the neighbourhood, that's a whole other bylaw to deal with.
- better managing.
- I believe you need to have the room and space for the animals to keep them happy and not to cause any undue stress to the animals or to your neighbours.
- Seems like a reasonable and manageable number for a city household.
- The number of cats is not really the issue-if they are fed, healthy, quiet, not crowded or neglected. Perhaps there be a cat/square foot bylaw, probably better, as cats are pretty much all the same size not like dogs, so easier to calculate.
- See above
- avoid pet hoarding, health, behavioral and financial stress issues in an around the home.
- Again, this depends on the home.
- Have managed three Cats in the past, mainly indoor pets. Cleanliness. manageability and proper care are the key factors.
- Cats are smaller and if kept indoors four is a reasonable number.
- Same as above
- I j
I feel that two pets per household are plenty. They are company for each other. There has to be an exception made for fostering helping homes
- Unless a rescue or foster then as long as animals are cared for well
- Two can be owned responsibly.
- any number is reasonable as long they are well cared for and don't bother the neighbors with escaping
- Same as dogs.
- I think 5 is plenty but may need exceptions for foster homes especially those with mama and kittens.
- 3 cats is a lot of cats to care for
- Too many cats create smells quickly. But again depends on how well the owner looks after them. No cookie cutter number.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- See above
- 2 is reasonable, 3 is ok too.
- I don't think pets should be limited "per household". People with 1 cat can be terrible owners with a poorly-behaved animal, and people with 5 can be awesome owners with wonderful cats.
- pets like space, just like we do. Pets can also be expensive, shots, food ect. Many have them roaming, without knowing the dangers to them and others.
- One is enough, but two if the rationale is need company. More than that would not likely be condoned in a zoo if looking at density needs for the specific animal and its behaviours etc. In any case - taking care of them is another reason; two is difficult enough.
- Cats do not disturb neighbours, so the number does not need regulated. .
- Whatever makes ppl happy as long as the animals are taken care of properly
- Depending on the size of the home and owners. All owners must be able to fully provide for ALL their needs and requirements if they went multiple cats.
- As long as owners take responsibility for not letting cats roam unchecked and animals are neutered / spayed
- Cats don't front generally bother other neighbors, but two would be enough.
- Same reason to keep it fair they should be the same at 6 in my opinion. That is already alot but some families can manage vet care and enrichment for that many. Any more and things are getting a but out of hand and likely not comfortable for the cats or people.
- I don't really care how many cats people have as long as they don't poop in my yard.
- It really depends on the owner and how they are taking care of the cats - are they letting them roam free? Then they shouldn't have any. It is hard to judge but I think there should be a cap. Would also help landlords who do allow pets have the city behind them. Same with dogs.
- The same as for dogs. Limiting numbers will not prevent hoarding.
- As long as they're in the house and not running wild on the streets!
- same as above.
- Depending on space and financial considerations, as long as they are adequately cared for and sterilized, multiple cats could be accommodated.
- ability to properly care for the animals
- I believe cats need less supervision than dogs and hence have selected a higher number than my selection for dogs. However, I think if someone lets their cats roam free outside, four would be a reasonable number.
- I don't like cats
- I think two would be manageable by most people however, any more than this has the potential for the animals to be neglected, the yard to become an eyesore, and neighbors complaining or worse.
- Same as for dogs. Avoid hoarding. Each has a playmate. If multiple families reside at one house, they can each have two.
- While I would not own 5+ cats, I don't think the city should set limits on ownership unless there is evidence of neglect or failing to follow bylaws



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be no limit on number of cats in a household if the owner is able to responsibly care for all cats.
- Control of animal and companionship.
- Officers discretion. If someone is keen on rescuing cats from shelters, has a proper facility, and exhibits proper boarding, that may be the best environment for a number of cats
- It shouldn't matter how many pets someone has, but how well they are cared for. The people I know with more pets are the best pet owners. If a limit is made, owners that already exceed that limit must be grandfathered so pets don't become displaced and families stressed or torn.
- Same reason as for dogs.
- Same as above
- so that the animals are not alone i say two.
- As above.
- Two can keep each other company but any more seems unnecessary
- Two cats make for two very happy cats.
- I am against HOARDING. Before I adopted my first cat a year ago - I would've said 2 or 3. Now I say it doesn't matter as long as it is not a hoarding situation. They must be cared for, individually loved, and rescues.
- Less impact to the public, so this isn't as important.
- The more cats, the more likely the pet owner will have difficulty in managing their pet waste, resulting in strong odors, health issues and possible decrease in neighbouring property values.
- I believe 4 cats in most houses is no issue at all. I worry about cats reproducing and turning into a hoarding situation. Depends on owner, I have a friend with 8 cats, all licensed, healthy well cared for, clean tidy house and a cat patio built for them. No issues.
- Cat's are relatively easy to care for and I think that any reasonable person who desires to have 4 cats would easily be able to provide them with the care and love they would require.
- It depends on space within the home and time of the individual that owns the pet. If someone has little time and little space 1 small cat would be enough where if someone has a very large home and 4 cat and plenty of time to dedicate to them i don't see why they shouldn't have 4 cats.
- Same answer. As long as they aren't neglected it should be up to the owner how many they can take care of.
- Cats will have more smell and do not get out for exercise as per dogs
- All depends on the owners! As long as the cats are healthy and happy, there shouldn't be a number!!
- Same as above.
- If a pet is being given full attention and looked after properly, that can only be done to the fullest degree when concentrating on a single pet.
- See response to #5
- As above, as long as the cats are well cared for, there should be no limit (within reason), ie: not 100, a hoarding situation
- Same answer as before



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Again as long as they are well maintained and looked after ,vetted and are not a nuisance to anyone
- Cats should be kept indoors, and I believe that as long as there isn't a hoarding issue, an owner is capable of dictating how many cats they are capable of caring for. Many people also foster cats for rescues and limiting numbers could greatly affect that ability if they also own cats of their own.
- for territorial purposes
- Should only be 2
- Dont need as much space as other animals
- Depends on the size and type of dog and owner and the household. I think there should be some rules that can be enforced regarding the expectation of the health and environment of the animals. However, I would say it's hard to justify more than 7/8
- Limitless, again depends on the situation. If all animals are happy, healthy, and basic needs are met as well as the owner adhering to all of the responsible pet by-laws. The owner can have as many as they can responsibly care for!
- It's less about a number, and more about care of animals. If they are well cared for (physically, psychologically), and do not bother others (neighbours), then there should be no maximum.
- I believe that if the household is properly taking care of their animals that the amount they can have could be higher. I believe that animal breeders should have a cap on the amount of animals they can have.
- I think many people can be responsible with multiple pets. There should not be a limit.
- They are inside so do not bother anyone. It is forced pet responsibly ownership and i am ok with it
- Too many cats may not get the proper attention
- Depends on the quality of care that can be provided.
- Would be fine with more IF the owners maintain regular vet visits of all cats, to ensure there is no poor hoarding situation. I would cap it at 5.
- Same as my answer for dogs. Foster is imperative and limiting will kill animals. There are bad apples, but why limit and penalize those being responsible and trying to make a change in the world.
- Because of animal rescue and foster homes. If the city caps the number of animals the city should grant the grandfather clause.
- Same answer as above! Depends on the house and the owners!
- I don't think the number is important as long as they are cared for properly.
- I do not think a number is appropriate for the law. It should be about appropriate care of those animals in the home; not a restriction by quantity.
- It would be too difficult to regulate this type of bylaw without infringing on a person's right to do what they want in their own home. A competent, conscientious owner can take care of multiple animals while a "bad" owner might have difficulty caring for one.
- 2 allows the cat to have a cat companion, while ensuring proper time and attention can be given to both animals
- Depends on house and size of cat. You have no place in this.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- This can vary per household. If people are responsible, the number isn't the issue
- Same as above, really. For the health, well-being, and associated costs of all humans and animals residing in one household, 3 should be manageable.
- Cats need space, separate litter boxes. It seems like a reasonable number to safely accommodate and care for.
- Again good owners and bad owners. Doesn't matter how many they have provided they are controlled, contained and cared for.
- As above, ability I meet needs to each animal beyond basic care.
- Unfamiliar with cats so picked the middle ground
- Same as dogs
- Depending on the amount versus size of the house as well as capability to care for
- Size of the cats, space available, income all impact how many animals can be cared for and I don't think this can be legislated
- If cats are indoors and the owner is responsible and can afford the cats , I don't see why it would matter to neighbours.
- Same as dogs, except the noise isn't a problem. Cats can also be kept inside, unlike dogs.
- Depends on the size of the house since there should be a cat box for every cat plus an extra one. And if the owner is able to commit to changing this amount of litter boxes every day and if they can afford the up keep of a clean litter box.
- More than 4 tends to turn into a hoarding situation unless they are reputable breeders.
- I think a person should be allowed to have any amount of cats if they have the means to take care of their needs (feed, walk, spend time, train and socialize). I do think people who have more than 5 dogs should be given a once a year home visit to ensure dogs are well cared for.
- Same as above really. Many cats are better in pairs and especially when fostering kittens.
- There's no reason to own more than 3 cats.
- See above.
- same as dogs
- Number of cats per household has nothing to do with responsible ownership. Someone can be a very responsible cat owner with 10 cats and someone can be an extremely irresponsible cat owner with just one.
- Cats can be companions to each other but not overwhelm with smells and sounds.
- Cats are quite easy to care for as they do most of it themselves. Just remember to feed, water, and change litter and you're set. As long as cats get along well and it's not stressful for them.
- Cats require less attention than dogs, have less potential to cause harm/public destruction and they don't require regular walks, so people should be allowed a higher number than dogs. Too many though and the health, safety and well being of the animals would be compromised.
- I have to say cats are funny because they can be chill or crazy. Anything over 4 is not really being a good cat owner. we are passing into hoarding at that point and that is dangerous.
- Cats are easier to care for.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If the cats remain inside the number of them per household does not impact me. Number should be determined based on healthy environment for the cats and their needs.
 - Same as above
 - I believe that a person should not have to put a number on the amount of dogs per household. If you are able to love them, give them what they need, exercise them and treat them as if they are your children, than that is what truly matters
 - Who needs more than 3 cats?!
 - Cats often escape and are Difficult to catch or fall prey to wildlife. Reduce the risk of feral cats.
 - Same explanation as above. It's unreasonable to expect every single calgarian to fit into an average when not every since city member understands individual circumstance.
 - No specific number as long as they are cared for, loved and have quality of life
 - For fosters and rescues
 - Too hard. Depends on space and people in household
 - Cats are easy. They stay inside
 - If they are cared for, and provided for, and are inside Spayed/neutered cats, why does it matter if they have several?
 - Same as above. It is all about how many people are able to properly care for.
 - Again depends on the space available. Maybe 2 in apartments, but 6 or 7 in a large home would probably be just fine if they are well tended.
 - need to be good standing.
 - More of a solitary animal, smaller in size, indoor for most people
 - Again this is a person to person question and rescue agencies and breeders should be responsible for their due diligence.
 - not a cat person
 - 3 is a lot of cats. One or two is better.
 - Same as above.
 - They are a good company for each other. An extra litter box and maybe another can of food is all you need to keep them happy.
 - I don't have cats
 - Too many irresponsible owners out there. Too many they are apt to be wreaking havoc on the city (and peoples gardens) and causing more problems than it's worth!
 - Same as above.
 - - If they're well taken care of, it doesn't matter
 - - I don't have in the neighbourhood but maybe elsewhere?
 - - Same as above
 - - more enforcement
- NOTE: More clarification on municipal versus provincial regulations on vicious dogs
- Hair & Furniture
 - Because they're a family uinit



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not regulated
- - You can have more than dogs
 - Easier to watch
- More than 4 cats can increase the chance of diseases and infections developing and being passed around.
- one pet for rental 3 pets for homeowners
- There should be NO limit, as long as Cat Parents are looking after their cats well, are controlling their cats and following all cat rules.
- as long as the household can provide appropriate water, food, medical care the number of animals shouldn't matter - it all depends on the owner being responsible
- See above
- Same applies to cats as dogs. See above.
- The number isn't relevant. The care and conditions are. See comment above.
- Animals help the mental stability of people. For every person living in a household should have access to a companion animal
- Same as dogs
- Same rational as for dogs
- I think if you are responsible and financially able to properly care for many animals, then you should be allowed to have as many pets as you want. People who want to breed irresponsibly or hoard animals will do so regardless of the law
- i would say none, but 2 is reasonable- sometimes they need a friend. 3 TOPS.
- same as above for dogs
- See above
- Multiple cats require an immense amount of care.
- If the cats are cared for and abiding by the rules of staying on an owner's property then they can have as many cats as they'd like
- As long as they are cared for and not living in bad conditions. Then why not?
- This should NOT be a hard and fast rule though. Some homes are huge, with an extended family sharing the home. If they can and do take care of their animals and do not cause real issues for the neighbors, city officials should not confiscate animals people love . So, appeals should be allowed.
- Depends on the owners. Are the animals in good health? Home in clean and sanitary order? Unfair to responsible pet owners for blanket rule.
- For the health and safety of the animals and the discourage backyard breeding.
- Again personal for me as I couldn't handle more then 2. But if someone is responsible and it's a clean caring environment I believe they should be able to have 5+ more. Some people are just trying to care for these animals who would otherwise be homeless.
- Not your business to decide
- cats need space to roam.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The reasonable number of cats per household is the amount that can be feed, exercised, and stimulated happily - this is a personal evaluation for each household based on their economic ability, energy levels, commitment to training etc
- Depends on the size of the house and space that is being lived in and the abilities of the owner to take care of the cats.
- The amount of cats that can be cared for well is not universal, and should be considered on a case by case level. If there is a restriction imposed those with more cats than allowed should be grandfathered in.
- Cats are perfect pets as long as you are not a hoarder, you clean up after the cats and do not exceed 10 with multiple people living inside the home owning the cats.
- It depends on the household, size of home, etc. Also whether the owner is able to care for them.
- Reasonable number for owner to responsibly care for.
- Same answer as above.
- same as above.
- Assuming the cats are kept indoors at all times this likely matters less than dogs, but how many cats does one person really need?
- Cats are pretty self sufficient. They are solitary creatures though, and need food, human company and litter. Having too many cats in a household would create unsanitary conditions and the cats would not be well taken care of.
- To lead a human and quality life.
- Why more?
- Same answer as above
- Same as with dogs, as long as all cats can be feed and sheltered appropriately, and the owner has time to provide exercise and mental stimulation, 4 is reasonable. And keep them inside!!!!
- It depends on the size of house and yard as well as who the owners are as pet owners.
- same as for dogs, above.
- See previous note.
- Again, this is a question of the pet owner and their ability to properly care for 1 or 100 pets. Can they financially and physically care for the animals in their home? Is the animal or human health at risk?
- Why would anyone need more? See above
- Cats needs space to be cats. More than 3 can create more conflict I think.
- Same as above.
- Same reason as for dogs. should be grandfathered in for homes with more. Gives rescues access to multi pet homes and I's hate to give up animals because of a number - do multi pet home visits.
- Again, it depends on the owners.
- No reason just seems reasonable.
- As many as they want if cared for and kept indoors
- Their god given choice not yours!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That is enough.
- Same reason
- Same as above - a competent owner can reasonably keep many cats. In incompetent one would be problematic with even one cat.
- Company for each other. I am not a cat person....
- Cats are less social animals.
- Depends on the house and the cats. The safety and care taken of the animals and any children present in the house is of the utmost importance.
- Two seems a reasonable number in terms of providing proper care.
- Again there is not right answer. Who can say? The city should not be telling me I can have 2 dogs and 2 cats or what ever animal. most people are smart enough to know just the few are not.
- Reasonable depends on the household. If someone has the financial and spacial needs for many animals, they should be allowed to have as many as they want. Also it is a given that the animals should be well cared for no matter the number.
- Proper care of animals is costly and many cannot afford the necessary expenses leading to their I'll health and well being.
- I feel it's more reasonable to have a few cars at a time but limits should be in place to reduce hording and ensure animal welfare
- For proper care and attention to the cats
- Two seems reasonable inside a home.
- Cleanliness and disease.
- As long as owner can provide everything the cats need both mentally and physically, I don't see an issue.
- same as above
- quality of life for the animal
- They are just the same as dogs they need fosters and if there aren't enough fosters there it's going to be tougher on the humane society or brick and mortar rescues to hold them all.
- Grandfather clause should be there for people who currently have multiple pets.
- I don't have cats, but I think three could be manageable.
- If the cats get along, and are well cared for, what is the problem, and why is it anyone else's business, esp the City's?
- There should NOT be a # limit. It should be on a qualitative assessment - to the point that the person can healthily manage their cats without posing risk to others or to the animals. Having a # limit will just encourage people to not license & will cause harm to rescues/fosters
- Same as my previous answer. As long as they are well cared for and they are. It a nuisance the city should not dictate.
- For people who foster
- I don't think it matters how many dogs a person has in their home, so long as they are taken care of.
- Same as above.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- As long as the cats are being cared for appropriately then it is up to the family . We don't limit children, we shouldn't limit pets
- Same as above
- Same reason as above. If someone has the means and time to properly care for multiple animals at once, then they should be permitted to, provided they aren't using them for breeding purposes.
- same as above
- Same as above
If you have the time, money, space and love!!
- Same as above
- As long as there is health and safety in consideration a person with 5+ pets can be a better owner than a neglectful person with one pet.
- Same answer as above.
- As long as animals are being taken care of properly and being seen by a vet on a regular basis and licensed there should be no limit
- As long as animals are well cared for, how can you limit it? What are the concerns?
- Same as above. As long as they're not roaming around and their owners are responsible for them, the current bylaws are just fine.
- Two is enough for the cats to provide company for each other. Any more could lead to behavioural issues, such as toileting outside the litter boxes.
- Again, it depends on the owner and whether they can provide a good environment for the cats.
- Same as above
- Shouldn't be a limit as long as all cats are provided for a few from any stress or suffering.
- See above dog comments...same for cats.
- I don't believe the city should dictate. Should be based on the square footage of indoor space of the home/property.
- Why do you need more for an inner city home.
- Same as my reasoning for dogs.
- Why do people need more than 3 cats? Seriously, why?
- As long as all the cats are spayed/neutered and have regular vet care, I think people can own as many animals as they can care for.. Unless it is a hoarding situation which is mental illness, not responsible pet ownership.
- highly social creatures that require interaction with their own kind. Pairs of anything is always better than having a 'third' wheel that will cause stress.
- It should be proportional to the size of the property and how close the neighbours are. Too many cat in a small space is not a good situation for the cats, the owner and the neighbours.
- Need to be cared for in a clean, safe environment, licensed, vet care, follow responsible pet ownership, spayed/neutered and not allowed to roam the neighborhood. Again not allow excessive numbers.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- if you cap #s of animals, then grant the GRANDFATHER clause so that the extra animals are protected under that clause. how wld u like it if all men and women were judged the same? all rapists, women abusers, thieves, con-artists, serial killers - that is what you are doing. I don't appreciate it
- Same as above
- Two is plenty for a non-rescue-oriented household.
- I don't agree with limiting the amount of cats someone has period. But if you do, There must be an exemption for breeders, rescues, and fosters.
- If it's a single person, in a small space, I would expect that they would have a maximum of two cats. However, if it's multiple people in a really large home, then three or four seem appropriate. However, if people have both dogs and cats, they should be allowed fewer animals; e.g. 2 dogs & 2 cats
- If someone wants to care for more than 5 cats and the cats are calm, or are seniors/ have health issues, they should not be limited unless there is a valid reason for restriction (temperament, history of illegal behaviour or lack of care, vicious, etc.
- 2-3 should be manageable.
- Same
- 3
- cats are independent creatures and like there space if you have lots of space 3 should be good
- I don't like cats.
- Many people have their own pets, but do an honorable thing such as fostering dogs in need. These dogs are then temporary and go to adoptive homes. I don't condone hoarding situations however, where ownership exceeds 5 cats.
- No limit. Again, should only be limited by the owner's mean's and abilities. a limit will not prevent hoarding.
- I don't believe that there should be hard and fast number. If all animals are give the appropriate care and attention as well as no nuisances there should be no restriction. There should be tougher laws regarding neglect and abuse instead, especially for hoarder situations and repeat offenders.
- These are kept indoors
- Same explanation as for dogs - it's not a set number but more about have a trigger after which The City can visit the property or re-assess the licences. If cat has a litter of kittens, obviously the number could shoot up to 10+ cats quite easily.
- Generally, one cat is enough, but some people may have two (brother/sister cays, etc)
- Again, the number of cats dictate the owners level of competence.
- We are a multi cat household. My cats are well cared for and licenced. As long as the cats are in a healthy environment, well cared for there is no reason for 5 or more 20 or more is a bit much, because then they are not being mentally cared for
- Cats require less attention (mostly) and like company. Any more, and owners may not be providing appropriate care.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- This question - how many cats per household is reasonable is not the right approach to answering the problems. It depends on household's capacity, ability, and know-how to care for and provide a healthy life for their pet(s)
- I don't have cats but same as above
- Vet costs and animals can quickly become out of control - especially if they are not spayed/neutered.
- It is NOT the number that matters but the level of care. Please don't waste valuable tax dollars monitoring this superficial measurement. I have known many multi-pet owners who are absolutely doting with the animals in their care. Limits encourage less licensing and increased stigma for kind people.
- Again it is not up to the city to decide how many pets one can care for.
- Doesn't matter / none of your business - they don't go outdoors
- It depends on the size of the home, and the number of people in the household to care for the animals. It's silly to assume that a person in a 500 square foot apartment with no yard should have the same limit as a homeowner with 2000+ square feet.
- The number of pets does not have any indication of how responsible or irresponsible a pet owner will be
- cats are unique and their situation and numbers are the same. i =
- For the home reason as dogs. But for permanent pets. 4 is enough.
- Provided they are properly taken care of then who cares
- see above
- Same as above.
- As long as the animals are under control and cared for properly numbers don't matter
- Cats usually don't get along well with other animals
- Previous answer pretty much Same.
- It is none of the city's business how many pets I own as long as I am a conscientious cat owner,
- Cats should be kept indoors or supervised outside by the owner at all times.
- Not necessary
- Playmates are fine for 2, but the smell and hair get to be a lot.
- I am not a cat person
- Human safety.
- They stink if there are too many
- So long as they are not put out at night to run at large same concept if they are being looked after then it should be up to each individual household!
- Same as #5
- Same answer as above. I do not believe responsible pet owners should be penalized.
- Two allows for company for the animals.
- hoarders and care issues



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If people are properly caring for their pets they should not be limited to a small number. Grandfather in existing pets if this moves ahead
- Same as above.
- Again same as above. As well if you limit you will end up forcing people into not registering there pets a lieing due to that I do being used against them.
- Given home and yard sizes, and individual pet needs and costs for vet care, food, etc - a house in the city should be limited to four. Owners shouldn't be breeding either
- If outside cats, they should be limited to 3 because of owner's inability to contain them, monitor them for pet waste pick-up, etc.
- Cats dislike living with other cats, unless they are siblings. Having multiple cats in a household causes stress for the animals.
- just seems like a reasonable number.
- 2 is just a number. I think 2 is just a number. I think this varies by household, the ability to care for an animal responsibly and in accordance with bylaws.
- As above- more than that seems likely to cause problems for both neighbours and be unfair to the pets.
- as long as they're in the house, they generally don't make noise either, as long as someone is caring for them properly there would be no issue
- There is no legitimate reason for there to be an unlimited number of pets in a household. 'More than 5' just becomes 'more than 10', and then onwards until there is a hording situation.
- No real science behind choice but just seems that 3 each would be a reasonable number that a person could responsibly care fo as far as paying for food, vet, toys, boarding but also being able to pay enough attention to all 3 and provide regularly exercise to all 3 (which would be 6 pets!).
- They have to be kept indoors. One litter only
- Cats do not need a companion
- Same as above
- If they are indoor and carried for.
- space, cost
- Except if a cat has had kittens. We do have a problem with wandering cats.
- Again, when is too many for some + 5 + is more than reasonable for others. Trying to put people in a box set your system up for failure
- Same answer for dogs
- I believe as long as they are responsible pet owners, they should be able to have as many as they can properly take care of
- More than four tends to multiply quickly for cats.
- I'm not saying everyone should go out and get 5+ pets but it should be a choice.
- It really depends on the size of the property and the capacity of the owner to take good care of the pet(s).
- i do not have any cats just the strays that people do not want



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There needs to be one more litter box than cats in a house to avoid the worst of cat behaviours which lead people to boot their cats outside or surrender them. Cats also need space, and the safety of not being in a hoarding situation. They should always be neutered if not used for breeding
- I don't believe there is a perfect number, it depends on the household set up but i do believe the more cats the more chance that they are not being properly cared for and dangerous conditions may arise
- as above
- Once again, I think if cats are licensed, well taken care of, vaccinated and vetted annually to prevent spread of disease then it should be to the discretion of the owner.
- Same as above
- Again, proper adult to cat ratio should be 2:1. Depends on house size as well to discourage hoarding situations
- Again, must have reasonable space to live comfortably
- As long as the animals are well taken care of, fed, healthy, etc. It shouldn't matter how many pets an owner has, as long as they keep the pets out of trouble, follow bylaws, and keep the animals healthy and happy.
- Too many people let their cats outside
- 2-3 is appropriate. Any more and you're just hording animals and taking a lot of time to care for them.
- I volunteer with animal rescue and we often adopt animals that have a hard time finding forever homes. It's not unusual for people involved in rescue to have multiple cats.
- Same as answer above.
- Same answer as above
- Again, you can't impose rules on pet ownership and if they are hoarding, maybe someone will know (harder with cats than dogs) and neighbours will report.
- Same comment as previous.
- If animals are well looked after it's not City's business
- If you are a responsible owner you should be able to have as many as you can handle
- As many as people can reasonably look after AND have altered.
- As long as a person is a responsible pet owner, it should be up to them.
- Except for fostering situations, I believe that 2 cats per household can get along, and have enough space.
- 6 max. Cats if properly looked after and reasonably contained to the property are not much of a problem.
- Freedom of choice
- Cats in your household are your responsibility and do not effect anyone else .
- It depends on a case by case basis. Some people can have 7 cats with each and every one taken care of wonderfully. On the other hand, someone could have 1 cat and be neglectful.
- Seems reasonable



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same answer as above
- Cats aren't as needy as dogs but I still think that 3 cat per responsible person is fair in general. If people can prove they can handle more than they should be allowed, same as for dogs.
- People should be allowed to have as many cats as they see fit, as long as every animal is safe, well taken care of and has optimal space and time for exercise.
- Again, it isn't the number if they are properly cared for!
- Same reason as dog answer above. Many people can look after multiple cats and many cats prefer to live with other cats. There should be an expectation that as long as owners are licensing their cats and being responsible owners, they should not have an arbitrary limit set on how many they can have.
- Same as above. If owners are responsible, number doesn't matter.
- I don't care how many cats someone owns if they're not letting them roam outside, are following all bylaws, and are providing for all their needs effectively.
- two is company.
- I don't own cats so I do not know what to say exactly. I believe three would be enough. Keeping cat litter boxes clean and keeping the smell out of your home would definitely be an issue. I have been in homes with several cats and their homes smell like cat urine and ammonia.
- See above. I have 4 dogs & foster dogs & cats. My neighbours love visiting them & I keep everything clean & quiet. The dogs get 2 hour daily walks; if they bark at all at home or in public I redirect them immediately. My foster cats are indoor only & have their litter changed twice daily.
- Same as above - some people love cats and others are fostering or rescuing these animals to find loving homes. Again does discredit multi animal homes due to some bad seeds!
- As long as they are properly cared for. Some can handle 1 - 3. Others can care very well for many more.
- See above
- It depends on the person what is reasonable. 4 is a fair amount for the average city home.
- Same
- I actually don't think the city should determine how many are too many
- Depends on size of house and ability to maintain a healthy and clean environment.
- Cats smell
- For sanitation reasons and not wanting too many in one space that could cause harm to each other
- See above.
- cats are quiet and require less care
- avoid escalating numbers where hoarding can happen
- quality of life for pet, owner and neighbors
- Cats are a bit different and I am a cat person, 100%. However, this does depend on size of home, personality of cat(s) but it also comes down to the cleanliness and treatment of the animals. Cats are good at taking care of themselves but I believe ppl take advantage of that and neglect them.
- I don't believe a limit on the number of pets making a difference to animal health and well-being.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The ability of the owner to care for them
- I think a limit somewhere between 5-10 allows for pet rescues volunteers to have their own pets plus foster pets.
- It's just a "me" thing.
- This should not be the city's responsibility
- I don't know how anyone can properly spend the right amount of time with them beyond this.
- two cats are easily maintained more than that your vet bills are higher and cleaning up after them is more work.
- To ensure animals are under care & control of owner. If fostering, depends on the size of the home.
- more difficult for owner to properly care for higher numbers
- I think that there are people who can handle a more than average amount of cats, and that there shouldn't be a hard limit on number of pets as long as the owner can properly care for them. There are people who take wonderful care of many cats and people who are unable to care for just one.
- Same as previous
- Cost and the ability to provide proper attention.
- I don't know really -- but too many of any animal in a house can become difficult to clean-up after.
- Same as comment above
- I think that number can vary based on the willingness and ability of the owner to provide proper care and training.
- Not a cat person, not fair for me to answer this question.
- Same answer as above
- A responsible breeder may have kittens, young adults, other cats being shown either by themselves or for others, adults and usually a couple of pets. Because of the nature of litter boxes, you may not be able to keep as many cats as you could dogs, but with proper management could still have a numbe
- As long as they are kept indoors they should be no bother to neighbors
- Same reasoning as above. Setting limit at 5 gives most people the freedom to have the number they want while prohibiting hoarding.
- A responsible owner can well look after multiple cats and an irresponsible owner can not properly take care of a single pet so it should be up to the owner how many pets they choose to have so long as they are well cared for. It should not be up to the city to make that decision on their behalf.
- I do not think most people reasonably can care for more than 2 cats but I do know many that have 3. I do feel that 2 is a better choice based on vet fees though.
- Buddies help stave off boredom
- If I can have unlimited dogs, same should go for cats, however... cats indoors or on leash! Just like dogs. Tired of them pissing on my deck and digging up my garden.
- Responsible pet owners make sure their cats are well-cared for, have a number of litter boxes, have safe space to exercise (such as catio outside), and do not harrass wildlife such as birds. Irresponsible cat owners can have one roaming cat who is worse than several contained cats.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No preference as I do not own a cat. I do believe if dogs are licensed cats should be as well. They should not be able to roam at large unless on rural property doing a job just as a dog may.
- Again up to the person. Not everyone should have 5+. But if you are responsible and taking care of them
- Number is not as important as responsible ownership. Kittens under the age of 4 months should not be included in the number count to not penalize responsible breeders. Roaming should be fined as it the animal is not under control and will eliminate in other peoples gardens and flower beds
- Must be safe and hygienic
- Same response as the dog question. However, more needs to be done to ensure cats aren't roaming off of their property.
- 3 is adequate to care for.
- I don't have cats due to allergies but if I did, they'd be coming from responsible breeders and cat breeders should have similar rules and allowances.
- As per above.
- People should own the number of cats that they can afford to care for.
- This is a manageable amount of cats for a one person household
- Responsible pet ownership has zero relationship to numbers.
- Once again, I feel that people generally have an idea of how many cats they can comfortably care for and house, depending on their yard/property size.
- Same as dogs. Responsible owners are everywhere. An irresponsible owner is not defined by a number!
- As long as the animals are cared for, well kept and not living in a dirty home, it should not matter how many pets a person has. No one should tell people how many pets they can/should own as long as the animals are not in danger.
- The smell, the fact that they are allowed to roam free and crap in my yard. Loose ones attract coyotes.
- Same idea applies as with dogs, created a city breeder registry.
- Unlike dogs cat reproduce at a much faster rate and people are often careless when it comes to the spay and neuter of cats. A pair of cats can produce close to 100 kittens a year and when people abandon their animals it is adding to the stray cat population which is already large enough.
- As long as the dog is Registered, tested, trained (responsible owner/breeder) shouldn't be an issue.
- I do not have cats, but again cleanliness and ability to care for them (both physically and medically as required) is the first priority when it comes to numbers.
- I really dont care unless the number undermines the powers ability to care for them and that they are inside cats
- Cats need companionship. Too many can create health issues and if allowed outside, cause inconsiderate deposits at the neighbours. Roaming cats are not pets.
- Same answer as above for the dogs. As long as cares for properly numbers don't matter to me.
- Same as previous.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Because if they are all fixed and healthy, and stay inside, it's no one's concern.
- Same; have two
- I don't think there should be a limit as long as the cats are well taken care of.
- Same as above. As many as is appropriate for that specific household. The city shouldn't have a say unless there is concerns for animal welfare.
- Too easy for cats to become feral
- Cats are very individual like people. Some like to be alone and others like company and a playmate. Cat owners should try to accommodate the cats preference.
- Please see my answer regarding dogs above.
- Same as above..its about their care, not how many there is.
- Cats are much easier to care for than dogs.
- The smell is too much for a small place
- Two many cats stink
- Too many may be smelly.
- hard question. it depends upon the owner. as long as the house is clean and the cats are well cared for, the number does not really matter
- See above answer.
- Nobody needs more than 2pets
- Six. Hard enough to manage, especially as indoor animals.
- Cats are indoor animals (unless bylaws are not followed) some cats tend to mark in houses, especially if the house has too many cats and not enough clean litter pales (rule of thumb 1 box per cat) no one wants or has space for 4 or more boxes
- If the cats stay on it's own property, are well cared for - does it matter how many someone has?
- More than 3 is hard to keep sanitary.
- I know there are people who rescue and sometimes households are combined due to economy
- Indoor cats or outdoor cats- it totally depends on the owner and how dilegent they are about cleaning up and looking after their animals. Some people 1 is even too many.
- More is not necessary.
- Too many cats have a tendency to not get along but also need to be kept inside and licensed.
- Same as above. As long as cats are not let out to roam and are kept as indoor pets
- Cats need to be kept indoors unless leash trained to be outside.
- cars can do a lot of damage to a house and are also a danger to wildlife.
- Again I believe it is up to the owner how many cats they want, as long as they are well cared for
- Anymore than 3 cats in a home is extremely difficult and costly to handle in a big city. For the owners and other citizens safety, a limit should be in place already
- For some of the same reasons as above. As well cat's don't go out in public so sort of a non issue. It's apples and oranges. I really hope the intent isn't to use this stat to play with the numbers
- Need to be cared for, safe, vet care, in a clean environment and not roaming free. Also needed for registered breeders. Licensed



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Two cats are sufficient for company for each other, unless a registered breeder.
- I haven't met anyone with more than 4 cats whose home didn't stink like ammonia from the litter boxes. If that can't even be managed properly, that leaves doubt as to the quality of the rest of their care.
- The city shouldn't be dictating
- No right to dictate
- Again I can't stand cats but a friend safely manages 10 plus. Everyone is different
- Some people offer caring homes to cats in need. It is not hard to imagine several cats looking for shelter and being cared for by one individual
- A solid fence can contain dogs. No fences can contain cats and many cat owners say that their cats need to be outside even though there is a bylaw starting otherwise.
- See above.
- Same as above
- As long as all needs are being met number should not matter
- Same as above any more than 4 would become overwhelming
- Same as my answer for dogs.
- Same as above except for size. Cats should not be allowed to run outside untethered.
- Reasonable to manage and care for 3 or less
- Same as dogs. Providing the animals are well cared for, there shouldn't be an issue
- Same as above.
- See question about number of dogs
- cats keep down mice etc. people like animals their a part of life, again people pay taxes and buy their own home, as long as their taken care of and not using neighbours yard for crap...people can build cat runs in yard
- Not a cat person but other people can be
- None of our business!
- Number is irrelevant if cats receive proper care & housing.
- The number of cats does not determine quality of care. It is a personal choice and should be left up to the cat owner.
- Cats are disruptive and messy. As long as they are kept indoors or outdoors on a leash, more would be fine. But people do not abide by those rules and let them run loose.
- Mouse control
- Indoor cats fixed this is a reasonable household size to maintain care for.
- As above unless a reputable, responsible breeder of PUREBRED cats for conformation.
- Why are bylaws opinion/survey based. Shouldn't it be fact based? Like review other cities that have limits and don't have limits. Anyone can have an uninformed opinion.
- As above--responsible management of the animals is the crucial fate.
- Again, It depends on the size of the household. 3 is my middle ground answer.
- three seems to be reasonable when dealing with veterinary care and other needs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responsibility - period. Someone can have one cat and not look after it properly. Other homes can have multiple cats that are looked after!!
- If I had cats myself, that would be my limit.
- Because cats multiply so fast. Cats carry many germs.
- Same answer as above - but for cats.
- However many a responsible owner can easily manage re the animals' health and welfare.
- I do not like that government wants to regulate my decisions and limit animals I feel I can be responsible for. Stop it.
- It depends on the circumstances, as long as they are in and on the owners property.
- I have seen homes with 6 Cats very well cared for, people 1cat badly cared for. Given that a cat has 4/5 kittens you cannot put a number of 5 cats total as this would put foster carers at risk and would impede efforts for stray feline population control.
- It depends again how responsible the person is.
- Same as for dogs
- Same as dogs
- 4 cats is enough if they are fixed and go in and out side.. If cats are strictly inside and fixed 10 is fine as long as kept inside
- Same as above for dogs. Small hobby breeders are of great value in producing quality companion animals, and they must have multiple animals to breed properly. Leave animal numbers up to the owner's discretion provided they are being properly cared for.
- Same as above for dogs as long as the cats are not free to roam the neighbourhood.
- Same as above.
- Same as dogs
- Same reasons as with dog owners. Same rules. Keep those cats indoors and not free roaming. Stiffer fines for reoccurring offenders.
- Again. Good responsible cat owners
- Owners choice
- If the owner is providing proper care and sanitary conditions with proper mental stimulation, then the number should not matter.
- I would rather see cats roaming around and keeping the mouse population down. Cats must not roam (by-laws).
- Cats are not a high maintenance animal and do not require a heavy amount of care. Cleaning waste and hair are the biggest issues. Most people can reasonably do this
- Same as question 5
- I think as long as you can care for them properly, vet them and feed them a healthy diet then it should be allowed.
If they are polite and not causing issues with the neighbors as well. There is no problem.
- Same as above
- If cats are kept contained the number is irrelevant.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- This is providing they are indoor cats as per regulations. Licensed breeders could have more.
- Cats are [removed]
- If they are indoor only and their needs are met why should anyone care how many a person has. Now if they are allowed to run wild then there is a problem.
- Again, up to the individuals. Not my business and it's not the government's business either
- As above
- Again, has to do with ability of owners to care for that number of animals.
- It is highly dependent on what an individual is able to provide, not only financially but in the way of time, training, enrichment etc
- Should not be allowed to roam outside
- I don't feel the cats will get proper care and attention when there is more than 2 per home.
- See above.
- Same reasons as above.
- If proper care and licensing ensues, have as many cats as one likes.
- same as above
- Same as with dogs, they have to understand how many litter boxes to have and how often to clean the litter boxes.
- If you can afford to provide the animals with proper care and housing than you should be able to house five or more. There is a major stray cat problem in many cities and if someone can take care of a few than it shouldn't be an issue.
- see above
- whose business is it how many cats someone has?
- Cats like other cat company and most stay indoors
- Same as dog breeders.
- Breeders should have a license and annual CHECK of their kennel/set up to ensure the number of dogs and licenses are equal. This includes the neuter and spay.
- Depends on the circumstances and also the amount of care they have for their animals. Lots of rescues are put into the same home and therefore it should be up to owner. Responsibility is up to the owner and if not taken care of them they be removed and/or surrendered.
- After that number it becomes difficult to care for them and keep their litter clean.
- Nice for cats to have a companion for company.
- no more than 2 and they should have to remain indoors so as to not be a nuisance to neighbors and their property
- Same as previous.
- I think the average household should be allowed 3 without question however similarly to my opinions re dogs tho rare, an individual working in the cat industry (breeder, trainer, performer) should be allowed more. Definition of "working in the industry" means achieving income through cats.
- Same as above



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Restricting the number wont stop bad behavior or animal hoarding. It just penalizes people like myself. Some owners are not responsible at all whatever rules you put in
- 2 for sure, perhaps 3 - but again, the size of house comes into play because *city* cats should not be allowed to roam freely outside.
- Same for dogs. See above.
- Care of pets should be the deciding factor on how many can be kept. I've seen people with 6 pets take better care of their pets than some people with only 1.
- Same as above.
- Same as question 5
- Any number of animals depends on the ability of meeting the animal's physical and mental needs. Some family's can only do this for 2, some can provide for 5 or more.
- The number should be reflective of the CARE the pets are receiving. I know folks with numerous cats that are INCREDIBLE human parents and very responsible.
- Again it's not about how many it's about if those cats are being well cared for.
- Personally I don't find cats as annoying as barking so I care less about the numbers of cats as long as they are properly cared for. I wish they could roam free honestly because they were great at keeping the mouse population down
- Also this is plenty of pet cats for one household
- Cats in the house are independent and not an issue to others. over 10 you may have issues.
- Breeders and responsible cat owners
- Same as above.
- As long as all animals are properly cared for it shouldn't matter!
- The amount of cats are a different story than dogs. As long as the cats are being treated well and having thei litter box maintained, the amount isn't too concerning for me.
- If the cats are cared for properly then the number is irrelevant. ONLY if the cats are not getting pepper care should the number be a concern.
- As long as people are following the rules and not allowing cats to roam, what does it matter?
- Hygiene
- Anything more than 4 I don't think 2 people would be able to give proper attention to each animal.
- Same as above about dogs.
- Same as dogs
- As long as they are being cared for, I don't see the amount being a problem
- Same as above.
- If the cats are completely indoor cats, then the household needs to decide how many cats that house can handle. On the other hand, if those same cats get to run free in the neighbourhood, then the numbers need to be lower, as then they are a neighbourhood issue
- Solong all cats are well taken care of & free of neglect, I have no issue with how many cats someone owns.
- N/a



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- 4 would not fit in an apartment though. cats do not require as much active training as dogs. cats should have more than one litter box/food/etc.
- Typically, tough to be master for more than two pets without professional backing.
- No reason
- Most cats are not 'completely indoor' animals and most people let their cats out to roam the neighbourhood.
- Same as above reply.
- Not a cat person but think two is a reasonable for anyone.
- Again space and money make all the difference
- Same reason as I stated for dogs above. Some animals need a companion.
- Cats are harder to care for... clean litter boxes, food, natural instinct as predators.
- Cats are easier but there is no controlling someone with poor cleaning skills. A cat requires more cleaning than a dog (ie. Litter box)
- People should not be limited to the number of pets they can have so long as they are financially capable and the pets are well cared for.
- Same answer as above in the dog question
- Unless a breeder of quality felines and kept indoors, then there could be 4-5 individuals.
- As long as the cats are not allowed to roam free and are licensed the same rules should
- See above
- As above
- The number of cats doesn't have a reflection in whether or not you are a good dog owner. If u suck at cat care you'll be just as bad with one animal as you are with more
- This is for strictly pets. Unsure of what would be appropriate for breeders.
- It's up to the owner to decide how many cats they can look after well.
- Three is a reasonable number for a household to adequately look after
- Not sure anyone needs more than 2 cats
- Svery family is different this answer is only for me and my circumstances. I have a home where 3 cats could live comfortably and thus that is the amount that should be kept.
- Same as for dogs. If all the cats are cared for, are in good health and all of the by laws are followed I see no reason why the number of animals should be limited.
- Again, the average family could handle two before it gets out of hand.
- Same as above
- Same as above. As long as the cats are well cared for, inside cats and not an odor or noise nuisance...? But their is hoarding for pets so their needs to be some limit for cats (and dogs)
- *same as above/dog
- It all depends on the owner. I have had 6 cats at one time, all were happy, got the food and care needed, etc.
- Waht does it have to do with a dictatorial city as long as neighbours are not unduly affected and cats are well looked after?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Reasonable number to be able to spend quality time on them.
- Cats are less demanding than dogs. Thus it is possible to have more cats than dogs in my opinion. But I think once you have more than 4 you get into crazy cat person territory. And its harder to care for them all.
- How ever many you can properly take care of, again I have a 2600sqf home and can happily take care of 5 or more cats.
- I don't think there should be any limit on the amount of animals a person has as long as they are well taken care of.
- Same as above for dogs. Its about the resources the person has to ensure they are well cared for and not neglected.
- Again this depends on the person in question some people like dogs others like cats, they should be able to have as many as they want providing each animals needs are met.
- Same as dog, 5+ is just excessive
- However many can be loved and cared for properly
- Again, depends on the person and the household.
- Many cats are allowed to wander neighborhoods unattended and most of the time have no info or collar attached to them so there should be stricter limits on cats
- Same as above
- As long as they are well looked after, should a number be assigned?
- Again, it's not the number of animals, but their behaviour and actions and those of their owners.
- Again, its situational. Size of home, and responsibly cared for ie spayed and neutered etc
- Same as above. Cats should stay indoors only because they destroy native wildlife ecosystems
- Same as above for dogs.
- Cats and dogs are behaviourally different. Commonly, cats may need more room to adjust, vs. Dogs have quicker pack mentality to live along with each other if given the right training and indroductions, cats too but they need more space than dogs most times.
- The rule stated by feline behaviorists is that you should not exceed one cat per room in your home thus this should be based more on the size of a homestead to ensure a happy feline. Cats aren't as demanding of their owners and can be more easily cared for in larger numbers then dogs.
- Same as above
- As long as the animals are well cared for, there should not be a limit.
- I don't really think this question is appropriate. It depends on if an owner is capable of properly caring for multiple cats.
- Don't have cats
- Again cats are easier but still need attention.
- See above.
- too many and you become a cooky cat lady.
- As long as the house is large enough to give cats enough space as they are territorial. Smaller homes should have less cats.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If you can care for the animals (spay/neuter/vaccinate/vet visits) and you're not annoying your neighbors, go for it.
- See above.
- I'd ban cat ownership. My neighbourhood is overrun with feral/stray cats despite the City's many rules. Cats kill untold numbers of wild birds (billions globally). The individual's right to cat ownership is less important than everyone's collective right to not see nature destroyed
- Same as above. Level of care is more than most comprehend. I don't believe one person can handle more than two fairly (to both animals and themselves, never mind neighbors etc)
- That's enough cats for them to be company to each other, but I just can't see why you'd need more than that.
- If you are a cat person and follow the bylaws why limit
- If you are abiding by the by laws why limit the number
- If they're well cared for it's not my business.
- I don't care about the number, as long as they are cared for. Similar to deed not breed, it's not the number, it's their care.
- This is a slippery slope. I have had multiple pets in the past, and have friends who have multiple pets. Whether it's one or more, they all need to receive the care they deserve. There are plenty of owners of single pets who should not have even one.
- Cats are social creatures so having a play mate in the home is helpful to behavior. All cats should be indoor pets only.
- For cats to feel comfortable and have minimal stress they need safe places to retreat when necessary. When I think about the average home size (1500 sqft) 3 cats I believe would feel comfortable in that space.
- Cats don't need other cats as they are not social animals.
- no capping on number of animals in a household. same as above
- numbers do not define a family's abilities to care for their animals - limits do not change the community except to take away a well educated and earned title as the most pet friendly city in Canada
- Cats care is more than most people realize.
- If there are too many it's difficult to keep the home clean.
- If cats stay indoors it doesn't really matter. If they are allowed to roam then 0.
- As long as they are cared for and kept inside I have no concerns about the amount of animals
- Invest in resources to help with animal hoarding or animal abusers instead of dictating how many pets a responsible pet owner should have.
- Animals require attention and even though cats are small they do shed and use a litterbox. Again, I say three as a personal opinion based on thinking the upkeep of having more than three cats could get to be unsanitary but I do not feel strongly about the number.
- I don't own cats but if the owner is responsible it shouldn't matter



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Again no cap but all cats should be fixed (unless their are health concerns) and no back yard breeding
- I would need to write you a book on this and a litter needs time following birth as well.
- Again there are breeders
- Who cares? As long as they're healthy and the owners are respectful to neighbours, it's not your decision to limit who owns what kind of animal, whether they have kids, or 25 vehicles.
- Again it boils down to being able to properly provide for the animals and not being overrun with them or living in filth.
- This is a good number for companionship of the animals
- Everyone can be different. Time, cost, resources , training, behavioral work etc, food, vet attention/cost, attention all dictate the ability of the household to care for the pets properly. Unlike children where nature limits the number that you can have and care for. A limits is needed 6 perhaps?
- same answer as above
- cats are a nuisance and spray and smell there's no reason to have more than two cats.
- Same as dogs.
- Same as above
- I think any more than 4 cats in one household is too many, as they each need their space and in a smaller 1-bedroom apartment, that would be too cramped for more than 4.
- "reasonable" is subjective and I don't think giving people a 1 - 5 selection is a "reasonable" thing to do.
- cat hair is disgusting. people should vacuum everyday and clean their catbox daily.
- Don't care how many as long as they are healthy and aren't bothering neighbors
- size of home / expense of proper care
- See answer as for dogs.
- Non of our bees wax. If the house is clean and cats are health how many cats in a home is not up to us. Nor dogs frankly
- The same would apply to cats, as long as they are appropriately housed, cared for and maintained there is no set limit that can apply per household at it varies on each persons abilities to care for pets.
- How many cats in a household should absolutely not be decided by other people unless that specific household has had animal-related charges in the past.
- same as above, concentrate on people who neglect, abuse and not care. then follow-up to ensure they never can have another animal.
- Same answer as above. Some people are quite capable of looking after a number of animals well, others aren't. I don't think the answer lies with the number of animals, but instead with the quality of care and training.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I really feel it depends on the household. How big is the property? don't like having catch-all restrictions unless it's very clear about the circumstances (for example, maybe the restriction is based on square footage of property, income to care for the animals, etc.)
- Again, as long as owner is responsible, the number shouldn't be restrictive.
- Same answer as #5
- They are inside so no one but the owners should be concerned!
If roaming then neighbours do have a right to complain if too many from 1 house
- A reasonable amount of cats is three unless your cat has had kittens. This is so you can provide all there needs and so the cats won't be overwhelmed by each other, have the resources they need to be happy and feel free to be themselves.
- Large numbers of cats may create unsanitary conditions in the home
- Cats are easy animals to care for and maintain and clean up after. 4 cats are reasonable in a household with 0-1 children and 1-2 adults.
- I am not a cat owner, but I would say 3 in the inner city, and more if out on an acreage.
- Attention and I dont think most places are big enough for more
- I actually think zero cats is enough, but two seems reasonable.
- People should be able to have as many cats as they are able to care for
- Same as above.
- This is not an unreasonable amount
- Cars are smaller than dogs and not intrusive to neighbours when inside. Owner control still diminishes as numbers grow though, there should be a limit.
- For the least responsible owner.
- Similar note to above.
- Cats have little impact on the natural environment (as long as they're kept indoors).
- Most cat owners keep them inside so I don't have a problem with someone having a few cats if properly cared for.
- Each require individual space and care
- My choice of course doesn't include when your pet has babies.
- Whatever number someone is able to care for. Some people should not have any pets, while others are capable of caring for many. If someone is able to give animals a good home they should be able to care for as many as they can, given the current pet overpopulation crisis, especially with cats.
- I don't think there should be a limit - it depends on an owner's ability to care for the cats. Few could handle 5+ cats but it should be determined by an owners ability to care for the animals. What about individuals who foster animals?
- If all cats are altered, properly cared for and not bothering your neighbours.
- It's hard to integrate cats and can be stressful for them with multiple
- Cats are smaller.
- However many cats the crazy cat lady had from the Simpsons was too many.
- Unsure.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Random guess. Cats should be inside ONLY - so don't really care how many my neighbours have.
- When released outdoor cats kill millions of songbirds each year and most songbird species are headed toward extinction
- They are small.
- Its really hard to keep cats from going next door to defecate
- As long as all cats in the household are provided reasonable care, including yearly vet examinations. All animals in the home should be spayed/neutered.
- Again, define household. Cats being indoors would be a different issue than dogs as they would rarely interact with neighbours. Would also like to discourage irresponsible breeders/hoarders and such but encourage fostering.
- Hopefully cats would be kept indoors (for their safety and to avoid issues in the neighborhood, bird kills, etc), but I do not think there should be a high number in a household.
- As for dogs.
Furthermore, what if you have both dogs and cats? Better just leave the bylaw as it is with no fixed number of animals, just an obligation to be responsible
- 2 plus kittens that must be given away/sold by the time they are 1 years old. Hygiene can become an issue.
- Limit to 3 to manage waste collection. If people want more than three they should be able to apply to have more where it would be considered on a case by case basis.
- Cats are pretty solitary creatures. My personal limit would be one cat but trying to leave some room for people that want more.
- Number of cats should depend on whether or not animals physical, mental and medical needs are able to be met.
- It depends on the size of your household
- Likely varies and depends on owners ability and financial and other means to care for the animals. Lots of multi dog/cat/pet households that are 5+ with very responsible pet owners.
- Same as above.
- Tempted to say 1, but 2 is definitely a reasonable limit. Gets to be a problem re litter disposal.
- Again, for those fostering rescue animals, an exception should be granted. Cats should be licensed and not permitted to roam the neighbourhoods freely.
- Cats seem to be the #1 species that is discovered in pet hoarding cases. Having more than 4 cats increases the possible spread disease on surfaces through the household. Cats allowed to roam contribute to falling wild bird populations in north america so cats should be kept indoors, make 4 the max
- As per my answer for dogs, I understand that cats are social beings... but to a point. Having more than two cats (or any pet that is put outside on a regular basis) would result in a serious nuisance to neighbours and likely become a health issue inside the home.
- Maybe 1 per person in each household as a maximum. Enough manpower to take care and clean up after them all.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- as above
- A person can have as many cats as they can care for. However, you wanna have more than 2 cats, be subjected to an inspection once a year. Always have more litter boxes than you do cats, and be able to provide vetting for them. House checks would enforce this
- This really depends on the type of household (apartment, house), the size of the lot & yard, the proximity to neighbours.
- Let it be, unless complaints pile up.
- Cat may need companion.
- People can't afford to pay for the food and vet care for a large number of pets. If cats are kept inside, then the number of cats

Exceptions to placing limits on number of cats and dogs

- No exception for personal ownership. Animals require space, time for proper care, and money to purchase food and medical care properly. People should not be allowed to own more animals than they can properly care for.
- Home Breeders?
- Fostering or other licensed home pet care business.
- If the person has any animal bylaw infractions or charges there should be an imposed limit or ban.
- Polar expeditions. Unplanned puppy pregnancy. Licensed and inspected dog breeder.
- When an individual has more pets than space. When care becomes neglected.
- The size of a household and people's previous convictions or any violent behaviour (or such) records.
- Rescue or foster situation but they still need to follow the rules of the community and the dog parks
- There is no need to have more then 4 dogs living in a home unless dogs are licensed to other owners if i have my 2 dogs and roommate has there 2 dogs. i believe if one of us decides to get a 3rd dog its should be a exception.
- Fostering situation where there are frequent check ins on health and safety
- Responsible breeding
- I don't think there should necessarily be a strict limit. People should be free to have as many animals as they want if they are able to care for the animals appropriately (can afford to feed them, cleanliness) It makes sense for people to have more than one or two if they are fostering.
- If they are a licenced breeder -but not a puppy mill. Animals can not be caged and let put to breed only.
- none
- Never
- Fostering animals through valid rescue organizations and animal shelters. Service animals or emotional support animals. Reputable breeding operations.
- Condo and apartment living
- ? I household that requires 4 Service Dogs for the 4 disabled persons living in the home?
- The animals are in danger/at risk



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- any disruption to neighbours
- Grandfathered until the pets pass away. Sad but makes sense to not have someone give away their dogs. Legitimate, kennel club breeders maybe? Registered rescue centres? They would have to be strictly monitored I think or have some rules to keep it from getting out of hand that could be enforced.
- Obviously puppy mill and hoarding situations need to be recognized.
- Responsible breeders should be knowledgeable and capable of handling a larger number of animals. If an animal had a litter of kittens/puppies there should also be an exception to allow the babies to be properly socialized, but they should be re-homed before adulthood.
- non
- fostering, kennel care, doggie day-care
- in cases of the owner being convicted of animal abuse or failing to provide a healthy and safe environment for their animals, or in the case of an owner losing the ability (like through disability or financial means) to provide a safe and healthy life for their animals.
- If you were helping out an adoption agency
- There could be an application process for another dog in extenuating circumstances . I.e. if a family member/friend passes away and you want to adopt their pet but have already met the limit of pets.
- There should be no limit. Only a person who is unable to provide a clean and well-fed environment for their pets should be the exception.
- Breeder, rescue organization
- As stated before, if the owner is a reputable breeder (e.g. CKC member), then the limit could be exceeded when puppies or kittens are born. They will be sold in any case, so the number of adult dogs will remain the same.
- no exceptions.
- If you are a breeder, or a trainer, or if you are fostering animals until they can be adopted. But most importantly, the household must still be able to care of them fully.
- Rescues and fosters.
- Low income housing needs a limit to 1-2 non-caged animals per household.
- Pet sitting
- Yes, apartment and condo buildings should be supported to establish their own limits on animal type and limits per household.
- Puppies/kittens. If the female animal is pregnant, leniency on numbers until litter is weaned properly.
- I do not think there should be a limit on the number - unless the person has already demonstrated they cannot properly care for their pets.
- If you are pet sitting for someone and the dog/cat properly license to that other person.
- Fostering
- When cats or dogs are nursing kittens or puppies an exception should be made. Temporary permits to shelter strays may be appropriate.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The only case where there should be a limit is if they person has been shown to not have the ability to care for them properly.
- I think we need to consider those who foster rescues, or care for other people's animals while they are away.
- Recent litter of puppies/kittens. Larger homes/properties. A justified need for that many and proven resources to support them
- There should be no limit unless enforced as a court ordered response to a bylaw violation due to lack of care
- A persons capacity to care for the animals. Both mentally and financially.
- Someone that goes through training?
- None.
- Same as above as long as all animals are licensed and cared for
- if there are family/friends visiting and animals are staying at that location temporarily (
- Working animals - shepherds, pest control, guide
- Licensed breeder or bonafide rescue volunteer
- There should be a limit if person is fined, regularly does not follow rules, bylaws or anyone charged with abuse
- When there have been complaints about animal behaviour, feces, noise etc.
- Size of the house/yard. I don't feel 2 large dogs should be in an apartment but a large house with large yard could be fine for 4 dogs. If you have a business license providing pet sitting in your home.
- The pets are cared for well and under good control. Not a nuisance.
- There shouldn't be a limit on the number of animals in a household.
- Temporary dogs like fostering for a rescue org.
- I don't believe in setting definite limits.
- As above, in foster situations or on fenced acreages.
- I feel that owners who have been charged with animal abuse or neglect should be limited to number of pets (if allowed to have any).
- Breeders of registered animals, people who compete in dog sports or work with dogs for a living
- No exceptions.
- If people have demonstrated that they are financially unable to look after multiple pets, including vet care, then maybe it should be limited. When pets are diseased, underfed, not well looked after, neglected, they should definitely be limited in how many pets they can own.
- 1)Registered Breeders, not puppy mills.
- 2)land size- acreage vs, condo
- when owners are not able to take care of the minimum number.
- If you have a big house with a large yard and multiple rooms.
- The ability to house, care for (feed, veterinary care, proper socialization, exercise etc) should all be factors.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- “Exception” implies that a decision has already been made... If a limit was in place, CKC breeders or people who actively compete with their dogs will typically have dogs of varying ages in the house.
- If someone is known to be abusive, the number should be zero.
- Only when the owners have shown irresponsibility with their animals should there be a limit
- Foster situation, or temporary situation.
- To those who have a greater square footage of their property. Those who have enough time and resources to properly provide for additional animals.
- Perhaps a kennel license or something similar.
- The person asking for an increase must demonstrate they have the space, time, physical ability to exercise the animals responsibly and are responsible enough to care for more animals. Must not negatively impact neighbours (leaving dogs to bark/letting cats outside)
- The odour, noise etc interferes with neighbours ability to enjoy their outdoor spaces.
- Limited period of time such as a pet has babies.
- see above
- No exception.
- If the person already has more than the allowed number of pets, they should be able to keep them if they are properly cared for in a sanitary environment.
- No exceptions.
- Larger house. Large yard/yard is private. Dogs are very well behaved (not see or heard).
- If the person has a record of neglect or non-responsible care.
- foster care, breeder
- For a registered breeder who has puppies or kittens available only.
- Breeding of purebred animals.
- we can't think of any other circumstances for exceptions to the rules...
- None.
- See above
- House size, outdoor accessibility, amount of persons in the household. Clear care of household, property, and animals.
- When the dogs or cats are not kept in hygienic conditions, are not well cared for, socialized, fed, or given proper veterinary care. There should definitely be a limit on number of dogs or cats for those breeding, and I would support a ban on breeding at all unless a permit is applied for.
- Prior hoarding issue, landlord choice.
- Service animals.
- Dog sitting, new litters,
- If the person is a breeder registered with the Canadian Kennel Club then there maybe a need for them to have more dogs. Or if the City were to have a Breeders license where the limit may be exceeded.
- A responsible breeder.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If somebody adequately demonstrates that their pets are all well cared for and their house is maintained.
- Possibly space of the residence - large home, acreage?
- I don't believe that the number of animals should be limited unless the owners are unable to properly care for them. While I don't agree that 25 dogs is reasonable, I have lived in a house with 4 dogs where all were well cared for.
- No limit
- Shouldn't be a limit
- Nursing puppies, kitties
- Lack of care, being a nuisance to other people (aka unable to responsibly manage their pets), breaking laws regarding pets.
- When they are not being cared for properly, lack of medical care, living in filth, lack of reasonable space.
- If they are fostering animals, rescue, breeder, and get approval to have more for a specific purpose.
- When the house has a suite for tenants. When there is fostering. Training for service animals.
- One of each
- Perhaps if a loved one is killed & the animal needs to be re-familied.
 1. Emotional support animals
 2. Proof of exceptional care of the animals. I.e. vet references and history of animals in the home
 3. Breeders
 4. Rescues
- I am not sure. Being a shelter animal foster home probably. Breeding I suppose, but they would have to be a licensed and inspected breeder.
- If the person is on welfare/assistance (one pet is probably all they can afford and that way the indiv. & pet don't suffer from basic needs). More than 2 dogs is too noisy for the neighborhood.
- if the owner has been in violation of rules owning the animal(s). if they are not taken care of in a clean respectable environment they shouldn't be able to own any.
- Breeders, trainers, and other dog related businesses. People who participate in competitive dog sports with their dogs.
- Temporary situation
Death/illness of family members requiring transfer of ownership
- Inability to manage or provide the necessities.
- If they are not adequately taken care of or they are a nuisance. Some people should even have one pet.
- After neighborhood consultation and perhaps a site visit by a bylaw officer granting another license would be fine.
- I do not feel there needs to be a limit. Responsible pet owners will care for their dogs no matter what the city decides and the irresponsible people will do the same. The number of pets shouldn't be the issue, the level of care the household can provide should be appropriate for the number of pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- N/A
- If the animals were there already before a limit was placed. Service animals should also not be counted if a limit is given as well as emotional support animals
- none
- See #5 above. Experienced dog owners/responsible breeders should not be limited.
- A litter of puppies or kittens.
- When it's obvious they are not being well taken care of properly
- If you live in a farm-i.e.-some farms need more cats for mousing, etc. Some farms require more dogs for herding cattle/sheep/livestock above their dogs for home as they require working dogs as well
- There has been a reported and proven case of neglect. The owner is not able to provide reasonable care, and does not have reasonable control over the behaviour of their dog(s)
- I think there could be short-term exceptions such as caring for foster animals or supporting in a short term but not long-term
- If someone isn't properly caring for them.
- Service animals
- By special license, such as dog sitters, trainers, etc. Accompanied by bylaw inspections.
- Breeders and rescues though I think both should be regulated to some degree
- Very small pets such as Yorkies or shitzus.
- Never
- There should be no exceptions. That is why population is out of control.
- as long as all bylaws are followed I don't believe there should be a limit to begin with.
- When they are emotional support animals
- If there has been a record of abuse of bylaws. However, if the abuse relates to treatment of the animals, the number of pets should be limited to ZERO.
- If neighborhood is being affected or the health and welfare of the pets.
- If they are fostering or a registered animal rescue
- -breeders
- -foster homes
- -good owners
- -show homes
- -working dog homes
- -pet sitters
- -anyone who can capably care for an appropriate number of pets
- Multiple residents and rooms.
- Legal fostering.
- If the animals are being taken care of then some exceptions could be made.
- Breeder



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None. Both species evolved to roam and can put on the miles. We have an obesity problem with our pets. Some households are run by their pets, not humans. It seems too easy to get to hoarding animals, without any intervention until animals have died or are in terrible stress.
- If a number is going to be approved for bylaws, responsible owners over the limit should be grandfathered in. Also, animals that are assistance/service animals should not count in the tally.
- When they are registered as fosters with an accredited agency.
Also if the animal is registered as a service or emotional support animal.
- Puppies or kittens under 6m of age
- established problems with proper care, worries about negligence
- Official guide dogs.
- Fostering, large property.
- if the dog /cat has a litter, they should be allowed until a reasonable time in order to find homes for the young. or if caring for a friend/family while on vacation etc.
- If they have an acre or more of property.
- Registered and licensed breeders.
- I think the most important factor is space and ability to care. Maybe a standard of ownership could be drawn up as criteria?
- Depending on the number of adults. One on one ratio.
- Never. Too many animals is animal abuse.
- NONE
- Pets in foster care through animal rescue organizations. Rural properties.
- Not sure why you need to legislate a limit to numbers of dogs and cats allowed in a household. If the animals are well cared for and the immediate neighbours are not inconvenienced in any way, why should it matter how many animals there are? Do we limit children?
- Registered dog breeders with the Canadian Kennel Club should have an exception.
- Merging homes (marriage or common law) But must register with City for an exception which would expire and with understanding once an animal passes away you cannot get another as you are over the limit.
- Preservation breeders
Licensed Rescues
Trainers and competitors in dog sports
- If the owner has had previous warnings from bylaw and is constantly not following the bylaw
- Small breeders of purebred dogs. As we age as a society, many friends have made arrangements with friends to take in their pets. You may have 3 pets, your friend dies and you just re-homed her 3 pets. Keeps these pets out of the shelters.
- There have been too many cases of excessive numbers of animals living in over crowded, filthy conditions in residential properties in Calgary, and the city needs to bring in laws that will put an end to this terrible practise by irresponsible owners, and it needs to be stopped right now!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If had unexpected litter and can't find homes for all (not commercial), if one dog is quite old and want to bring in puppy to more easily adapt, temporarily looking after someone's pet (not commercial)
- IF you were breeding; family moves in; family passes away and leaves behind a pet(s) to care for; temporary fostering/training; emergencies (floods/fires etc)
- Working farms or similar environments in a rural area ONNLY!
- When there are multiple families or a new litter
- Only if there's a pregnancy
- Responsible breeders: one litter at a time.
- Should not be any circumstances..limit of two per household
- I don't like the idea of a limit.
- Dogs with puppies or cats with kittens until babies weaned and moved to new owners
- Noise, attached home or apartment, size of the home, if an owner cannot properly care for animals
- In a situation where they are a CKC (or other kennel club) breeder with registered pure bred dogs.
- If a household has a kennel license for breeding or rescue organization.
- The complete care of the animal. There could be one cat or dog in the household but is not being taken care of properly, or you could go the other way where there is more than the limit but the environment is cleanly and animals taken care of properly.
- When someone is in rescue and can prove it
- Registered breeders of CKC.
- Yes as for breeders or fosters they should be accountable to not be a nuisance it really is how they are raised and expected to behave. I would really like to see a change in the bylaw restricting dogs left outside when owners not home. Most noise complaints would be down
- If you limit animals you are infringing on my rights - try to limit people per house and boarders instead
- Not sure they needs to be unless the household has been investigated for abuse or hoarding
- If the home isn't big enough
- Where it is clear the animals are being abused or neglected
- Age of animals or families living in one home
- Rescues, registered boarding facilities/businesses
- Proven ability to handle difficult behaviours (or willingness to learn), temporary foster homes for pets, or day homes (kennels, short term boarding) where the amount of pets is down to 2 or 3 each night.
- if the person is in care to rehabilitate the animals or temp foster care.
- If they are a breeder or if they live on an acreage.
- CKC or other type of registered breeder. A home that fosters dogs/cats or emergency shelter
- I think when the person is in the animal care profession; trainer, groomer, vet, canine rehab therapist there could be an exception because they have the knowledge/ access to resources to care for multiple animals, that regular households do not I.e retail sales associate, doctor, general manager.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- For someone fostering or a mama who just had babies. Perhaps a time limit on how long the household can be over limit.
- Sliding scale-type, case by case scenario. If running a rescue or pet sitting, boarding, etc, be registered as a business.
- Fosters and rescues, registered breeders
- When you cannot prove that you can handle the financial burden and do not own your home- renting has a decent amount of extra instability
- If the bylaws are not being followed.
- If one is a service dog
- If the issue becomes a health concern, then less is better.
- licensed breeder
- For those who foster or rescue homeless animals from shelters.
- If the animals are healthy and cared for.
- Apartment, no outside space
- There should not be a mandated number of animals.
- Property size.
- Can't think of any.
- People should be grandfathered in - if they already had a certain number of pets they should be allowed to keep them, but if they are acquiring new pets over the limit that's not allowed. Maybe if your pet is dying you could be allowed to get a replacement pet before they die? Or don't regulate it
- Never
- See 5
- All. People should not have more than 3 dogs or 3 cats etc. The more animals allowed the less likely they may be well cared for and could have some individuals start collecting pets.
- None.
- Animal rescuers or fosters pets
- None
- Fostering, location within the city (rural vs downtown condo)
- No exceptions. One is sufficient.
- A licensed certified breeder.
- If there is a recent litter of puppies or kittens
- with a kennel permit, proof that the dogs are used in competition.
- I think a registered (CKC) breeder should have an exception
- If there is past history of the owner not providing humane conditions or they've received warnings from bylaw (barking etc.)
- If the owner is neglecting the animals and putting their welfare at risk. Or if they put the public at risk. Or if they are profiting off of them (using them for breeding irresponsibility or dog fighting)
- If more than one support dog is necessary.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The size of the house is really the only thing that should dictate how many you have, other than personal financial ability
- In all circumstances - makes sure that safety of animals and neighbours is considered, helps control or maintain those anomalies (breeders)
- Fostering, caring for other people's pets, sizes of animals in the home and number of people in the home
- Should maybe based off square footage of home and how many occupants in the house. Not sure of the right answer for this. Some people are equipped to own animals and some are not unfortunately.
- Animal foster homes
- Through application to the City with an explanation that a trained animal expert deems is an appropriate reason to allow more.
- Service animals or temporary fostering
- I am extremely concerned that the City proposes to enter a residence without probable cause and a search warrant. The City has no legal right to do so in a criminal case; there is no legal justification to breach the Charter to intrude into private homes over pets.
- Multi dwelling buildings should have a 1 pet limit and size limit
- If they are service dogs in a group home. Or a foster home with a litter of foster puppies.
- In the case of puppies or kittens born. But all must be adopted or sold by the time the animals reach an appropriate age. ie: 12-14 weeks seems reasonable
- abused,
neglect,
not proper living conditions, health checks, etc
bothersome (cats running free) (dogs left outside unsupervised, ie never allowed in house summer or winter).
- As far as more dogs- a responsible show breeder could be allowed more animals. The optimum word is Responsible! The majority of show breeders fall into this category.
There does need to be rules in place to prevent backyard and puppy/kitten mills.
- No limit require. People just need to follow the rules.
- None
- As soon as the care or living conditions deteriorate or can not be maintained at optimal levels.
- House size and or lot size. If you live on a massive property with room and resources, more pets would likely be acceptable. Also some people foster pets, so there should be some consideration toward that service. Also if your dog sitting or someone is visiting
- Only time there should be a limit is if an individual is unable to handle the animals in their care.
- If the space isn't adequate or if owner can't fulfill duties
- In smaller houses like apartments, condos, or basement suits.
- The bylaws are not broken. [personal information removed] More rules will not fix the problem , competent staff working with responsible pet owners is what is needed. [personal information removed]



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Situations where the pets are not being adequately taken care of, lack of food water or untreated medical conditions poor husbandry or abuse. Also hoarding situations.
- when the animals are well cared for and not stressed. this could easily be evaluated by a vet visit and/or animal behaviourist. Humans have 5 children or more, is this restricted? pets are family.
- If lots of complaints from neighbours or the owners are unable to care for the pets
- Rescue
Breeder
Temporarily housing for displaced animals
- Rescues, fosters, breeders, dog sitters
- Fostering and qualified breeders. Or pet sitters. Or exceptionally competent owners.
Frankly, if a numeric limit is ever put in place, it should probably ONLY be enforced when needed - if there is an excessive number, but the owner is capable, ignore the limit.
- Responsible Canadian Kennel Club breeder of purpose bred purebred dogs NOT backyard breeders of the latest designer craze who feed the puppy mill market
- Large property and distance to neighbours.
- Emotional support animals, or when the owners can prove they are able to fiscally take care of the animals
- If the pets are not in good condition
- Exception should be made if you are a breeder of pure bred dogs, have a registered Kennel Name and are a good standing member of the CKC. They are healthy and vet checked regularly and live in a clean environment, and do not cause a disturbance to neighbors.
- If a new family member/friend moves in and has their own pet (example, elderly parent moves in)
- Responsible breeders and catteries. Especially if they show because they usually have pets/retired dogs, young babies, up and coming youth and the actual breeders. If the animals are well cared for, maintaining hood standards and considerations given to their neighbors, it should be allowed
- Animal Foster parents, breeders, farmers who have the space
- A marriage that resulted in more living in one house
- If the person is a breeder or a foster parent to animals.
- I don't think you can quantify a limit, I think reports of too many animals in a house should be a strictly case by case basis so you're better able to grasp the situation and make a judgement call from their
- Yes we hear you loud and clear, you want to impose limits on the number of animals people should have. I resent the fact that you are using the format of a survey to get peoples consent for you to add more rules to our lives. we don't need this manipulative nonsense.
- An exception would be the birth of a litter of cats or dogs and time to raise the litter to a proper age. Also, dog breeders - who should have to register with the City.
- None.
- Fosters or rehabilitators. It would also be dependant on the housing of the pets and the care they would receive.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None unlike visitors who are from out of town I suppose but that's a limited time event
- See answers above.
- There isn't one. Why do you possibly need more than 2 dogs? It's not good for the animal to be housed with several dogs.
- If there are more than 2 people in a household that require guide dogs then the law can be waived on application.
- If you are a registered breeder with a new litter of pets waiting to go to a new home.
- I can't think of any. It's not about what is best for the person. It's about what is best for the animal.
- Proof that the owner can handle more than the limit allowed and an inspection of the home and space where the animals are kept. Cats should be only allowed indoors unless they are on a leash outside.
- When the animals are neglected and start to be in distress.
- Licensed by the city to own more by special exception. IE Foster family CHS.
- There should be no limit.
Vet records and ownership history should speak for themselves. Why would you penalize owners who have never been an issue?
- Dogs under 1 year of age, larger lot sizes.
- When cleanliness (health for people and animals is compromised) is below standards. Health and wellbeing and quality of life for the pets are below standards.
- Licensed breeder.
- There shouldn't be a limit. My property my choice. You can deal with it if there are problems ie poop noise etc but if I'm not hurting anyone or bothering anyone and my dogs are healthy and safe the city has no business interfering. Focus on responsible pet ownership.
- When they start interfering with the neighborhood
- Permitted on a temporary, short term basis after births of puppies or kittens or if visitors have pets or looking after another pet.
- For HEALTH TESTED breeding of purebred dogs (no doodles!). Proof of health testing and even CKC registration should be necessary to own more. No backyard breeding.
- Foster care - lots of foster care people spend money and time caring after animals waiting for adoption. They should be exempt as they are doing this for charity purpose.
- No exceptions.
- None. If you want more move somewhere else. Stop letting the minority dictate to the rest of us.
- Partially answered this above. I think many people truly have big hearts and the means to care for animals properly so why not let them. This is very different from people who horde animals
- Breeding permit, but the premises should be strictly monitored, and all records/financial/medical costs provided at any time.
- I don't know that there should be a limit. But rescues and fosters should have the ability to exceed one.
- Always a limit. People are crazy.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Housing type, suburban/rural/urban distinction,
- This question is very odd.
If a cap is put in place there should be leniency to those participating in exhibition or sport events.
- Anyone who has the finances, knowledge, and help to sustain numbers. Being a bleeding heart doesn't count. There are small hobby breeders that are fighting to save some breeds from extinction who are better than the average home with ONE animal. Not all homes or owners are created equal.
- If the individual is an ethical and humane breeder
- Individual permit applications. In city breeding operations should have to post on their laws just like suited properties or zoning proposals do and see how their neighbors feel about it.
- Hard limits should not be established as horders are already in violation of provincial laws regarding welfare of the animals. Adding bilaws will do little to prevent the situation from occurring.
- If there is someone visiting a household for a period of time less than 7 days.
- Unless they are a licensed breeder, None.
- If someone has acreage maybe allow more pets, but that too can lead to puppy mills/overbreeding to generate revenue. People should need a license to breed any animal for profit.
- Fostering, breeding, service animals
- Square footage of a space should be a factor.
- A person who has been convicted of a hoarding/mill crime, etc.. a person who has had multiple bylaw complaints such as noise, defecation, etc..
- When it becomes unmanageable. When the environment is not healthy for the community or animals.
- Fostering
- breeders should have some flexibility - if they are purebred animals.
- I honestly don't know the answer to that question. As long as a person can handle the removal of waste and control the pets I guess.
- Landlords should have the right to set pet limits. Owners that have complaints against them (noise/necessities of life care/ abuse etc) should be investigated and pets seized and future ownership limited IF they fail to meet care standards.
- Seriously you have my answer
- Daycare services, animals caring for a litter, temporary fostering, etc.
- Neglect
- You should be able to have as many as you can properly care for.
- A foster home for a dog or cat, the owner can afford it, the animals are well taken care of.
- Property type, living arrangements(like have a big lot, on a farm, or dogs used for a job and taken care of properly) community, persons age, money that can feed and care for them properly and fully. Should enforce animals to be insured. if accident happen in public there is accident coverage
- Show dogs; CKC, AKC, UKC approved breeders; if therapy or working dog is required for the house.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- When the quality of life of the animals is impacted or when the animals become an unreasonable nuisance to surrounding community
- Only if the animals are there for the purpose of breeding (i.e. Miniature Dachshunds) and the breeding is licensed as a business and approved to be done on that location
- if someone is temporarily fostering animals for an animal welfare organization, if the animal is a service animal, registered pet therapy animal, or emotional support animal
- Not applicable. Number shouldn't matter except based on a person's ability to be a good pet owner.
- An accredited breeding operation.
- When it exceeds the capacity for the owner to care for the animals and maintain good hygiene.
- Licensed businesses
- None
- If the owner is a "rescue" or "foster"
- If the owner has a larger than average home. Maybe special training on caring for more animals / breed consideration.
If there is any history of animal abuse, frequent "re-homing" on social media, or frequent litters (other than licensed breeders) the city should consider not permitting animals
- If city opens up a breeder application for multiple dog/cat ownership.
- People who have a history of neglect with animals and have been flagged with not cleaning up their yard spaces.
- Rescuing and fostering animals or an animal with babies.
- If proper care is not being provided, the space is not adequate or there is impact on neighbours that is not considered reasonable for city living.
- Registered and responsible dog breeders.
- None
- If it is a registered breeder, rescue or foster
- Low income housing (because of financial constraints to caring for animals).
- Designated rescue, foster, or service animal training household
- An owner should be allowed additional or fewer pets depending on the size of their home and their ability to provide proper care to the animals (e.g., food, water, vet bills)
- When there is any question to the care of the animals in the home. Potential hoarding situations, or homes where it is deemed that veterinary care is required and has not been completed.
So case by case,
- I would say no exceptions - but the one I would consider is a reasonable grace period if your animal has a litter. They should have time to find new homes for the little ones.
- If there have been charges due to neglect/abuse.
- If it's a foster home
- fostering or other SPCA type support... for limited time
- If fostering for a rescue agency



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If it is a multi-family dwelling or the household is clearly not set up for having a lot of animals living their.
- Physical disability or service animal, the home owner is a groomer operating out of their house, the home owner is a performer and uses their dogs for a job (like I do. I have 3 dogs.)
- There should be no limit. [removed]
- Foster caregivers, pet sitting
- Crazy people.
- any previous investigation into hoarding; any evidence of commercial activity.
- an acreage or a very large house.
- under 18, handicapped, and anyone over 70
- Owners with prior animal welfare convictions/charges.
- If the household is fostering or temporarily housing the animals and there is adequate space/resources to ensure the wellbeing of animals.
- If dogs or cats are having litters. Dog sitting. Need limits on times. Multiple animals lends to hygiene issues in the house, the yard and off leash area. Real concerns with dog walkers in off leash areas.
- Responsible breeder
- If owner can demonstrate they have an above average understanding of cat/dog behaviour and needs through their occupation or experience.
- A registered breeder who breeds and sells responsibly. Selling responsibly refers to vetting the buyers, contracting with new owners to spay/neuter and following up on the owners to ensure compliance of same and well being of the animal.
- If they are assisting rescues with fostering.
- If a service or therapy pet is required.
- fostering, houses with no neighbor complaints, breeding, no by-law complaints
- If it is temporary - part of a rescue organization with adoption as the goal, e.g. foster family keeping a litter together until adoption. Individuals can't take in untold numbers and say they're "rescuing" them
- For any guardian or foster home with a litter. In emergency circumstances such as a sick family member or sudden death in a temporary situation.
- Ethical, licensed breeders who may have many dogs/cats at a time. Foster homes for rescues that may be raising litters
- When the number affects the animals ability to be properly cared for.
- If someone is a licensed breeder or in extenuating circumstances. For dogs, they should need to have approval from all Neighbour a working a certain radius of their home
- Private breeders
- None.
- You shouldnt impose a limit. Its not up to the city to police every decision people make. If animals are looked after then why shouldnt they.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should not be a limit. Again as long as animals are being provided with proper care and aren't a nuisance there shouldn't be a limit. Animal hoarders will connote to hoard with or without a limit. Their acts of cruelty would fall under the APA for not providing adequate care.
- None
- CKC certified breeders. Certified being key here. To help prevent backyard breeding.
- If a person has shown that they are unable to provide adequate care for the animals they should be limited in the quantity. If a person has previously been convicted of harming animals they should not be allowed to own any.
- If there is proof they are competent breeders following all rules.
- Owners, house size, types and size of pets.
- If once has an older animal that will be passing soon. Could start off with a new one.
- None.
- When someone is fostering cats or dogs for an organization with the purpose of adopting them out in the near future (or whenever a suitable family is found)
- The size of the house and backyard, physical/mental ability to care for pets, children, financial capability, criminal history, and home-environment are all factors that should be considered when deciding the appropriate number of pets in a household. A one-size fits all approach won't be effective.
- when there is a litter of puppies or kittens, but the exception should have a time limit - maybe only until the young are ready to leave their mother.
- as 5 put not so if multiple litters are being bred at the same time. Or if someone is fostering or dog sitting for a short duration of time
- Previous history of hoarding.
- When a female has a litter... give them time to wean and adopt out the babies.
- Depends on the home and the reason for all the animals (are they breeding the animals in a safe and healthy environment). Do the owner/s have the capacity to care for this number of animals in a clean and healthy environment and ensure that the animals are not neglected or suffering in any way
- licenced breeder or temporary dog-sitting
- when there is kittens, dog sitting for a limited amount of time and fostering if it is within a few weeks time limit
- case by case
- Registered responsible breeders
- There should not be a limit! If one is put in place, it needs to be a high number, above 15. That would give people the ability to continue to have multiple pets, foster, etc . Also, existing animals need to be "grandfathered" in and there needs to be a permit people could obtain.
- I dont think there should be a limit, as long as animals are cared for and in good health. Calgary is known for being a dog friendly city and imposing a limit for people who generally take care or a large number of pets very well is unfair.
- New litters, for a period not to exceed 10 weeks.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If you cannot properly look after an animal restrictions should be applied
- Possibly for fostering if the animals can be properly taken care off and all of their needs met
- Verified foster home, monitored to make sure it does not become a hoarding situation.
- There should be no exceptions. The bylaws are put in place to protect the owners, pets and public.
- If there is a limit, I would like to see the option of a special foster/rescue license that could involve stricter standards but allow more animals
- If you are a responsible dog or cat breeder you should be able to have more.
- New litters should be allowed but only for a specified period of time.
- If there are no reasonable, ongoing complaints, no limits.
- If a household is operating a registered, licensed animal care business.
- Repeat offenders (ie dog bites, loose dog) should maybe be subject to limitations on owning ANY pets. Reducing the number of pets is unlikely to change the persons behaviour.
- You might consider making bylaws on basis of square meters per kilo or the like.
- never
- none.
- The number of pets in a household is not the city's business
- Many people with show dogs have multiple dogs, they are trained, well cared for and very rarely a community problem. Limiting pet ownership numbers will not stop those who choose not to follow bylaws and general animal husbandry rules, you are only punishing good owners.
- When there is a litter of puppies or kittens
If the household has a business license and is a licensed breeder or kennel
- None
- If you are registered as a foster home for dogs and cats. But you must be registered with an agency or somewhere!!
- Really depends of the size of the dog. Having an amount restriction is inane for dogs. You can reasobly care for more shitzus than dobermans. Have how many per sq ft or based on size.
- As above
- If the household is a qualified and licensed breeder. This still carries the responsibility to ensure that others living in the immediate area are not negatively impacted.
- Only if it is a foster home and the numbers are temporary
- Fostering rescues, whelping mothers, temporary situations.
- Maybe temporarily increase slightly to accommodate people who would like to foster animals.
- Lot size- house size
- Breeders need policing, licensing and monitoring. Anyone could be subject to inspection or investigation if wanting a large number of animals.
- Mental or physical incapability to care and afford the animals
- Size of yard and home, ability of the person to provide care in both financial and physical aspects.
- Breeders, trainers, groomers,



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Perhaps a case by case evaluation. Animal foster homes may need to have more dogs or cats in the household for short periods of time when necessary.
- Licensed/responsible breeding, daycare center.
- the ability to support, and care for should be the first thing to be considered.
- If there's an issue around animal hoarding, or abuse or neglect, then there should be a ban on having any animals.
- In situations of neglect.
- After a birth ...
- Application for exceptions should be allowed, the city could do reference and health checks to determine eligibility.
- Size of household. Capacity of owner.
- If the animals or living environment are unhealthy or unsafe. If the number of animals are impacting neighbours negatively.
- Acreage or farm scenario with more space for the animals and a possible need to have them.
- No exception for Cats (because of the defecation/amount of litter). For dogs, if one or more of the dogs is senior (older than 10).
- I do not believe there should be restrictions, but if there are the exception should be for animals in temporary care, such as foster homes for rescue agencies.
- Breeders, foster homes, most regular people. Should be no limit.
- if you cannot be responsible for all of them with food, vets visits, good behaviour, clean up from them and walk the dogs!
- With special licensing and strict guidelines regarding size of home and yard, barking, and commitment to training, ability to pay for medical care as needed.
- if they are not well-cared for
- Mental health issues, although how do you police that???
- Past history of animal abuse.
- If people cannot afford proper care they should not have animals
- **IF THAT PERSON HAS BEEN BANNED FORM OWNING ANIMALS**
- Legacy pets (as in family pets) , fostering and depending on the household/land size.
- As mentioned, blended families that move in together could bring multiple pets together living under one roof.
- Approved breeders, fosters, etc.
- Registered CKC breeders could have a litter of 10 puppies plus three adult dogs. Technically this is 13 dogs in one place, however the puppies would be rehomed.
- Structure type Ie. Shared walls etc. more animals means more noise potential.
However the size of the home should not matter. 3 100lb dogs don't need any more space inside than 3 20lb dogs.
- Each resident requires a service animal and the number of residents exceeds the dog limit.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Only where public or animal health is at risk due to the owner being unable to maintain sanitary and safe conditions.
- Foster homes that take a good care of animals, and very responsible and educated owners.
- Breeders could temporarily have more animals as long as it's the exception and not the norm.
- Explained above.
- Breeding and/or foster arrangements
- If they can provide a safe, comfortable home with the love and attention the pet nets and they can demonstrate that they are financially prepared
- Fostering, caring for litters of puppies or kittens.
- Fosters. I know AARCS, for example, uses fosters. If there are, for example, a pet who has a litter, then that should be taken into account.
- breeders with approval; people whose pets have litters and intend to give them away or sell them.
- If they are part of a rescue, if they have a huge home and can designate large spaces etc.
- An exception should be made for trainers and families associated with animal rescue groups (volunteers and foster families)
- service animals should not count in the tally
- If the animals are not being cared for properly and then only enforced on the individual.
- You mean to allow more pets? I'd say no exceptions.
- registered breeder, fostering or raising animals for a short amount of time, perhaps under a special licence from the city
- Limits are arbitrary and there are always special circumstances. If a limit is in place it should be allowed to be exceed if someone can demonstrate an ability to take care of more animals, feed them, give them medical care, give them attention and keep them controlled.
- I guess an exception could be made if there are puppies born and if required for a therapy pet.
- Animals are not well taken care of
- None.
- House size, number of inhabitants of care taking age and ability. Previous history with pets e.g. do they have offenses
- While a breeder has a litter of puppies/kittens
- There should not be a limit. If there are issues arising from an abundance of animals inadequately cared for, they are usually for financial or mental health reasons, which would not be prevented or resolved with a limit.
- it all depends on the area of the house and the availability of back yard space.
- When the welfare of the animals is threatened, or when the health of the people sharing the dwelling is threatened.
- Service animals and foster animals should be exempt
- If the individual has had a problem with controlling a vicious animal, or animal hoarding, or any form of irresponsible ownership in the past, there should be an exception to what I think should be the *lack* of a limit OR have regular visits from animal control.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Service dogs - e.g., if there are several members of household that need service dogs, more would be appropriate. There should be no more cats than number of adults in household.
- Exception should be limiting animals based on property size and analogy for owners to maintain proper standard of living
- In the case that the animal just had a litter, there should be a reasonable time period where the owner can distribute the animals.
That is the only exception I believe is necessary.
- No exceptions
- If you're volunteering for a rescue or foster agency and not causing any problems.
- registered breeders, service dogs
- Licensed pet related businesses that have specific rules and regulations that must be followed
- There should never be an exception. Unless they are service dogs. But real service dogs, like those that service the blind. Not ridiculous emotional support chickens. There should never be a reason to have chickens or pigs within city limits.
- I don't think it should be a hard and fast rule
- Improper care. Cruelty. Neighbour justified complaints re noise, smell etc.
- Breeders, or temporary homes for rescues animals
- If someone is a registered breeder
- Rescue/fostering
- Fostering, good homes, proper animal care provided.
- If the house is providing some sort of daycare service or is looking after a couple of dogs for friends/family.
- If the household has a large property with dedicated dog storage locations. Also in the case of a dog of cat having a litter until homes can be found.
- none
- A licensed breeder should be allowed more.
- when the owner appears to be unable to care for the animal(s) and they exceed 4 pets
- Owners of pets need to be able to properly take care of them.
- Puppies born or an owner with 3 dogs may be minding a family member's dog that doesn't live there full time due to travel, illness etc
- If the dog or cat is a mom that has given birth to a litter and there is a short time period while the puppies or kittens are being matured until they go to a new home.
- There doesn't need to be limits just ensure with enforcement licenses are purchased
- Limits should be in place with attached housing.
- reputable breeders should be allowed more as at times there will be a litter of puppies or kittens. with puppies you keep them for 12 weeks before adopting them out.
- Breeders would need to have an exception to the rule as long as they are actively breeding their animals. I believe a license should be required for anyone that intends to breed their pets, or that has an accidental litter from an unaltered female animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't think there should be a limitation of pets in a household, but e.g. temporarily pet sitting someone else's animals, fostering for a shelter or rescue, families of animals (e.g. adoption of bonded pairs, litters until weaning), households with several pet-owning adults.
- Apartment or small homes, inexperienced owners, and people who have a tendency to neglect or harm any animal.
- If someone is not a responsible pet owner they should not have any or have less. And rescue organizations should be able to have more if shown to be responsible.
- 2 pets=1 adult ratio in the household. (2:1)
- Breeder
- Guests who drop by for the day or weekend, visitors such as family staying for a little while but less than 6 months, birth of puppies/kittens, fostering for reputable rescue groups
- Fostering or adoption organizations, or if someone has proved they can hold that many smaller dogs (bigger need space). Or puppies that are to be rehomed.
- Shouldn't
- Foster families and adoptions often have multiple animals and limiting them could have a harsh impact on a rescues ability to operate
- Space, backyard size, breed size
- Reputable breeders, animal rescue services.
- Temporary rescue/fostering
- As long as people are responsible and look after the animals (vet, food, water, exercise, clean up waste, ensure no nuisance barking etc.), then they should be able to have more than the limit. But if they neglect any animals or bother neighbors or don't have the money to care for them then no more
- I don't think there should be a hard limit, only a way to report concerns about someone who is not providing the necessities for their pets.
- If someone receives a violation of bylaws then that could lead to a limit on the number of pets they are allowed to have in the house
- Proven ability to care for each and every pet appropriately.
I think size of pet should be considered as well - 3 large dogs are different then 3 small dogs.
If one is considered a service animal it should not count
- Owners being unable to properly care for their animals.
- Breeder only with required license
- There shouldn't be a limit.
- None
- If the owner demonstrates that they can afford more, take care of more, not allowing litters of kittens and puppies, their house doesn't look like a cat box or a hoarders'.
- Only in SHORT TERM fostering situations. I have 2 dogs and 1 cat. I will regularly Foster a dog for a rescue group for anywhere from a couple of days to a couple of weeks. It's definitely a big job looking after 3 dogs, which is my reason for only fostering on a short term basis.
- If someone is running an animal rescue out of their home.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

If they are caring for a friend of family's pet, along with their own.

- I believe a service animal, ESA or therapy animal should NOT be counted in the total number of cats/dogs allowed per household.
- When the owner cannot properly care for the animals
- when the person is raising them for future adoption e.g rescue agencies and volunteers
- For a responsible and licensed business.
- When fostering.
- Amount of square footage in the home, financial means to care for all the animals,
- Foster animals or other temporary situations.
- Would have to prove that you have the room, time, finances and a valid reason to have more than 2 or 3 pets.
- Size of house and yard and noise. But one dig can worse then a pack. Numbers aren't a good measurement.
- Breeding kennel properly supervised
- Short term boarding. Emergencies. When licensed as a breeder.
- Obviously, hoarding conditions where the health and welfare of the animals has not been maintained.
- Breeding programs; training programs; any owner's ability to maintain responsible pet ownership
- Dog sitting businesses, rescues or temporary fosters, or ability to prove you are financially capable and responsible enough to care for a greater number of animals
- Hoarding situations.
- Depending on size of land, where in the city they are. If they are a business (boarding) or fostering animals.
- Fostering, breeders for the short time there are puppies/kittens
- I don't think the city should have a limit
- When their home is a hoarding situation and there is neglect present.
- If they are a therapy animal.
- Unhealthy animals living in an unkept space. Vicious animals.
- Say there is a limit, an exception can be make if a household fosters animals for a rescue.
If there is NO limit, an exception made if the household has a history of animal abuse/horrible care, hoarding, aggressive animals, has 3+ bylaw complaints on any animal, or known back yard breeders.
- If owner can demonstrate proof animals are trained, exercised and mentally challenged appropriately. They also need to be fed and groomed properly. Sorry no sugg on how to qualify this.
- When there is a litter of puppies from a legitimate breeder
- Reputable licenced breeders, OR reputable animal rescue groups.
- Under no circumstances. It's the law.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If a cat or dog has had babies, 4 to 6 month maximum. Of course that could be up to 8 or so babies. Someone who is fostering a rescue, but IMO there should never be more than 5 dogs in a household. Maximum of 5 cats too.
- If it is unreasonable for the number of people in the same household to care for and clean up after that number of pets.
- No limits. They do not work.
- When it is not feasible to provide a healthy and happy environment for the animals
- Small or close buildings like condos or apartments. Also if the amount is over the limit of what the household could reasonably care for.
- When fostering a cat or dog temporarily.
- As stated above, when care is good, health and humane standards are met, no limits need be imposed.
- Size of house. Size of animals.
- When a good owner can demonstrate an ability and interest in caring for many cats or dogs. We need more people to provide homes for animals due to poor laws and unfortunate people.
- When the animals are at risk.
- Acreage/ large land area
 - Authorized breeder
 - Owner works at / owns an animal specific business that allows for the animal to be brought to work (aka daycare for dogs, training facility, veterinary office)
- Registered Breeding or foster homes.
- Animal fanciers and breeders
- Big house with a person who has the resources to take care of them.
- When it is a bothersome issue to neighbors.
- Size of property and/or house
- An application to the city to do so and an extra fee per year.
- If the animals are temporarily there like in a foster or rescue situation or if it is a large rural property
- When fostering for a rescue agency where there is a standard that is upheld
- i think it should be the opposite. impose a limit when problems occur, eg complaints that there appear to be pets that are in distress. then upon investigation, then limits can be placed. i challenge you to give me a good reason to over-regulate things like this.
- Fostering and animal rescue
- For AKC registered breeders and or registered fosters for recognized rescues
- If someone's pet has babies they may temporarily exceed the limit (although ideally pets are spayed/neutered).
- Maybe breeders. Should have allowance for more.
- There should never be an exception. Unless it is a service dog. This does not include emotional support animals because that is stupid.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If they are fostering for a responsible rescue and are temporary residents (does not include hoarders who just think they are helping). Or if the person can prove that they can keep a sanitary environment and give adequate vet care including all vaccines yearly.
- Trainers, fosters, specialized cases.
- I never said there should be a limit. That should be at the discretion of the owner
- Larger houses/yards.
- If individuals decide to foster animals through registered adoption agencies.
- If the guardians can prove that they have adequate resources to provide well for all of the animals (shelter & finances & knowledge of appropriate care). Some people could manage well with 3 or 4 dogs or cats and there are far too many of both in need of good homes for them to be denied.
- If the household has more than one person that is able to have the animals under control and be attentive to each animal. This ensures the animals are well trained
- A reputable breeder or a responsible owner. Do not judge people on a basis of how many pets they have. Even people with 1 pet can be a bad owner. Quantity of pets is NOT synonymous with bad ownership.
- Any charges of any abuse or misconduct in the care of any animals.
- If a person is unsuitable for pets, limit them to none. If a person is able to commit to many animals in an exceptional manner and the relationship is beneficial for all members of the household allow them to surpass the limit. Use common sense, and your best judgement (in other words be human).
- In the case of actual hoarding or animal neglect .
- Large outdoor space, training animals, fostering, running a business
- To be determined. Possibly rescue? Foster situation
- Farm, or somewhere that houses extra animals and has the space for the animals to run around.
- Fostering or rescue situations or pet sitting for a friend who is away. Otherwise no other situations I can think of would apply.
- If the person has history of animal neglect or harm
- For dogs :if they have done a recommended training class providing the adequate knowledge to have a well mannered dog .
- Only if they are breeding the mom and the dad. And their litter till they are sold or given away
- It would be beneficial if animal homes were inspected if there are more than 5 pee household to ensure there isn't a hoarding or breeding situation, or mental illness related to hoarding because those situations are unacceptable and either the animals or humans need help
- I don't really care how many animals someone has as long as they don't impact me and my family
- There shouldn't be a limit
- Never. Households don't need more than two large animals each (cats, dogs, pigs, etc) Its smelly & noisy. Less burden on disposal of all fecal matter. A limit would prevent mass abandonment after job loss. Rivers/lakes would be cleaner w/less animals peeing in them. Breeders should be on estates.
- Licensed breeders only should be exempt.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Income and ability to pay for adequate veterinary care.
- Size of the property. It's not necessary to have a big yard in order to give your dog a good life. But I don't think there should be more than 1 dogs in say a 1bdrm apartment ...
- acreages, large lots.
- See above. Breeders should be allowed 2 more than other residents, but require a business licence. People should be allowed to have 2 extra dogs/cats temporarily for the purposes of dog or cat sitting or training.
- If the owner has ever been caught and charged with neglect, abuse or failing to provide for animals.
- Due to puppies/kittens in a breeding facility: limit should be only for animals older than 6 months.
- There should not be a limit unless there is a good reason for it. Like the house being teeny tiny.
- Perhaps if a household is fostering the animals, then they could be allowed more. Or if someone is running a dog sitting/boarding facility out of their home.
- City approved animal establishments or temporary animal foster homes that have a strict screening process.
- Living in a condo or apartments
- Service dogs
- When breeding
- History of animal abuse or negligence,
Space constraints (size of animals vs house)
Mobility and ability to care for that number of pets.
An elderly animal hoarder with 15 cats and 9 dogs cannot adequately care for them despite feeling compelled to 'save' these pets etc
- emergency fostering, or pet sitting. unexpected litter...?
- Emergency situations that necessitate temporary shelter for other people and/or their pets
- For people with financial limitations, certain mental health problems, anger, rage, or abuse problems.
- Fostering, rescuing, person dies and you assume responsibility for the animal...
- Amount of animals in house hold and amount of space.
- Lots of space can accommodate more animals. If dogs are trained well, more may be ok but should be monitored.
- They prove they can financially afford more than two dogs or two cats or one of each.
- In fostering/rescue situations. There are many volunteers in this city trying to help abandoned animals find homes, and avoid overpopulation. I don't think there should be restrictions or difficulties for people fostering animals.
- permit or other means to demonstrate that the owner has appropriate training, the animals are not causing disturbance and that facilities are in place to ensure the health of the animals
- none whatsoever.
- People living on an acreage.
- Never an exception.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responsible owners who have passed training classes for each animal and whose houses are big enough to support many animals.
- None.
- Mentioned above, when family pet(s) are palliative, or when fostering homeless pet waiting for permanent home.
- If this going to become a bylaw households that currently have more than the allowed number should be grandfathered in. It would be unreasonable for someone to get rid of a loved pet due to a change in the bylaw.
- If they are a responsible breeder they should be an exception - sometimes this is a full time job which allows individuals more time to properly care for the animals.
- Never.
- Pet shelters such as MEOW Foundation
- I. Cases where you are rescuing an animal and find one that turns out to be paired to another animal. In cases where a house is reviewed and deemed capable of supporting another animal safely and comfortably through a review process.
- Owner is able to prove financial and maintenance ability to care for the animals and people who foster for a rescue.
- If the person is a certified foster parent attached to a legitimate shelter or animal rehabilitation centre.
- A course and a license/permit to own more than two. If my neighbour wants 4 dogs than I know that they know all the bylaws and have agreed to abide by them and would be responsible pet owners.
- I'm not sure.
- Calgarians who are in the "Pet-profession" need a reasonable mechanism to have more than 4 dogs and/or cats. Also, there should be provisions for temporary cases where a Calgarian takes care of friends' pets during Christmas holiday or for people away on an expat assignment; up to a year maybe.
- Larger homes/yard or smaller animals. The same reason you wouldn't put 10 horses in a pen designed for 1.
- new litters obviously temporary care of more than the allowed number for specified no. of days
- Dogs/cats under the age of 6 months should not count towards that total per household. Registered breeders should be allowed an exception.
- No opinion
- Not sure
- Accredited dog or cat breeders. Not backyard breeders.
- Landlords should be forbidden from restricting pet ownership -- see similar legislation in Ontario.
- Foster Homes who are registered with and fostering on behalf of a registered pet rescue charity or adoption agency.
- No exceptions
- More than two blind people needing guide dog



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If an individual was fostering adoptable animals.
- - there are lots of reasons someone should not be allowed to have large numbers of animals: hygiene, misery for the neighbours, etc., but most importantly, the animals themselves suffer the most. Whatever the reasons the owner has for owning them all, they simply cannot look after them properly
- No exceptions
- Breeding
- When SHOULD there be a limit then, is what you want from me. I think if you live in an apartment- it's valid to maybe not have eight dogs and eleven cats. Everything is within reason. Animal hoarding shouldn't be allowed [personal information removed]
- None.
- If there is feces everywhere and the own is not able to keep up with cleaning. If they cats/dogs don't get along with eachother. And/or causing harm to anything or anyone.
- If it's temporary - watching a friends pet for the weekend for example.
- anywhere within city limits as this impacts neighbors and the community
- If there had been any proven complaints by neighbours
- If someone is a decent reputable breeder they should be allowed. There should be a permit process involved and a home inspection done yearly.
- No exception. Reduce the number of dogs/cats to a reasonable level. [personal information removed]
- Breeders. They should have an exception and a business license.
- When someone is not able to take care of them.
- Rescue dogs by a responsible pet owner
- None
- Households that currently exceed the limit should be grandfathered in, but no exceptions after that.
- Condo, no space for dogs , foster homes for animals
- none
- -when there is not sufficient space in the household for the number of dogs
- -when the owners are not able to provide adequate physical and emotional care to each dog
- Puppies or kittens for limited time
- Exceptions would be puppies/kittens being born, rescued animals and fostering animals
- Rehabilitation or fostering for re-homing. Any other large scale homing and all breeders should be licensed and the excess numbers should be limited to a short number of times in a year (not every cycle of breeding available). Breeding dogs should be limited to 2 or less and bred once per year.
- Farms who use dogs for livestock cattle herding and farm work.
- no exceptions.
- Maybe for fostering animals.
- If someone is offering 'daycare' to animals and they are keeping a clean environment and not disturbing neighbours.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Service animals should not be counted in the number as they are a necessity to so many. They should however be required to abide by the same rules and regulations of all other animal owners.
- Perhaps if the owner has to submit to periodic random check-ins by bylaw to ensure all needs of the animals are being met and all of their documents (number and types of registered animals, etc) match what the municipality has in their system. Also, a licensing system requiring education courses
- If you must put a limit on # of animals in a household then the exception would be showing that additional animals could be properly cared for or in foster situations. I once fostered a momma and her 8 kitten litter - including my own cat that means I had 10 cats in my house, all were cared for.
- Temporarily if they reproduce.
- Temporary fostering perhaps
- I think all dog and cat breeders should be registered in Calgary (and in order to sell their animals). Registered breeders can have one litter of puppies/kittens, in addition to the adult dog/cat limit, at a time with all being re-homed by 6 months.
- See response for dogs above. Limiting pets per household is like limiting kids. If u choose to have lots and can look after them properly with love, space and health (food, shelter, exercise, no smell from them or their excrement) we shouldn't be restricting it. Health guidelines should be followed
- Foster care homes for pets, if there are more people to take care of the pets, if the house/property is large enough to accommodate more pets without complaints from neighbours, and any petsitting/temporary arrangements.
- None
- Obviously if a person is fostering for a licensed and regulated rescue organization, and they are a whelping home.
- Health issues of the pet or the owner, moving into the city with more than this number - almost a case by case situation.
- Old one on the way out.
- For people that are fostering strays.
- n/a
- When the animals have offspring and while the offspring are being appropriately weaned. There should also be a sort of 'respite care' policy so that citizens can apply to temporarily keep animals above the allowed number for another person in ill health or old age.
- Exception for support dogs / animals that are a necessity to the person emotionally wellbeing.
- Breeders and foster homes will have large numbers of animals. This is ok but they should register somehow with the city
- None
- Under no circumstances. The city should not infringe on people's freedom to own pets.
- Properties that are large enough to handle multiple animals and owners who are proven to be responsible.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None.
- The size of the house, and the ability of the household to provide care and attention to said pets.
- Fostering or having a litter.
- If basic needs and waste disposal is not being met. So cats urinating in the house outside of a litter box, or if they yard space for a dog is just full of waste.
- Case by case, if the owner can prove they can support and feed them
- Breeder, special license, special reason.
- There are no exceptions to the rule. If a litter is born then this household needs to be licenced as a business and I assume that other City regulations apply.
- Healthy for all in household
- Temporary or adverse circumstances ie You have three cats and your mom has 3 cats and then then your mom dies and you want to make sure her precious cats are cared for. Or if you want to take it upon yourself to adopt an old senior animal to let it ride out its final years in a home not a pound.
- Those who wish to foster animals until the find a forever home
- puppies
- Personal choice.
- Fostering
- None.
- ESAs, fostering/rescuing, petsitting and temporary housing, inheriting a pet from a deceased relative
- Only if it is temporary, guests staying, pet has had a litter that will be rehomed, etc. Actual breeders should need a business license though.
- If someone needed to take a friend's/family member's pet into their care. This would be preferable to having to surrender to a shelter.
- When the health and well being of the pet and or humans is compromised
- In large homes or properties with proper facilities for keeping many animals. In he case of home run rescues within the city.
- shouldn't be an exception unless u live on a farm
- No exceptions other then if a cat or dog have babies then they should be permitted to be in one home for a specific length of time that is reasonable to sell or give away.
- Breeders - but they must identify themselves as such and be monitored by bylaws.
When animals are less than 6 months of age.
- If a household is fostering or rescuing animals, they should require some sort of license and training. If licensed, these households would be able to have more than the limit.
- There should be no limits.
- There should be no exception. If one lived on an acreage or farm then you can have more, but not in a city.
- Exceptions should be made when people can demonstrate that they are responsible pet owners, or in the case of service/support animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Licensed breeders
- Ability to care for said animals. Everyone loves their fur babies, but many are unable to properly attend to their needs. Often impacting other community members.
- Rescue/foster homes.
- Some registered breeders may need 4 or so in order to breed responsibly.
- I don't think there should be a limit. I think if there's an issue, by all means, address it and give owners resources and assistance but the city does not know each household's personal situations and thereby isn't in a position to enforce limits. Please enforce the current bylaws first.
- Space and care. If you do not have the know how and the income to care for multiple pets, you shouldn't have them, some people think they are helping when in fact they aren't. Some people have 1 and can't do it right. It's a hard one. Apartments should have limits for sure.
- If the cats are kept strictly indoors or only allowed access to the outdoors via "catios", the number of cats kept may correspond to the owners financial ability to keep them properly, e.g. food, sanitation and regular and incidental vet care. This should not be interpreted to condone "hoarding".
- If someone is a licensed breeder.
If someone is temporarily taking care of the dogs or cats at their home (someone dog sitting or cat sitting): the limit should be based on the animals' home address where they are licensed.
- When dogs or cats are properly licenced, with the city, as support animals.
- Limiting number of pets per household is subjective to the size of the dwelling and the number of capable, adult caregivers.
- If you do not have space.
- Foster/Rehabilitation households where cats and dogs are often cycling through residency, and the 'fosterers' are more educated and focused on the animals
- Should be none of the city's business unless there is a care issue.
- I think that every household above 5 animals should analysed whether there are enough adults to take care of the animals and in that case, all adults should sign a contract saying that all of them are responsible for the animals wellness
- if the person has been charged/prosecuted by the law that they are cruel, negligent, have abandoned etc., then they should have a ZERO tolerance and be monitored closely. There should be a BLACK CHECK MARK on their DL to identify them so when they show their ID to rescues, they can't adopt.
- Based on ability to properly care for the animals.....if not then limit the number.
- If someone is fostering them for a business or the city but this needs to be outlined with that business.
- foster homes
- Animal hoarding, public nuisance, safety
- NONE
- None



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If the animal owner cannot provide health, safety and well-being then they should not have any pet(s). I am an animal lover and have the right amount of pets that I can afford. The public shouldn't be able to dictate how many animals a person owns as long as the pet is cared for properly.
- licensed breeder
- Limits imposed through the courts or if the owner is a problem - not being responsible.
- Registered breeders, exceptional sized houses, foster care
- When a parent or family member moves in with you so you can help take care of them, but they already have a pet.
- Transitional family, pet sitters.
- If there is no yard for the dog then there should be a limit. You should be allowed a number of cats per adult in the house.
- Perhaps depending on how many hours they would be alone, the cleanliness of the back yard should be taken into consideration also.
- perhaps a licenced breeder or foster home of a registered charity.
- Always this should be a case-by-case basis looking at the owner's capabilities and reasoning.
- If a litter has just been birthed, the pups/kittens can remain in the household until they are weaned. Then back to the limit.
- If the household is registered as a shelter or if it is a farm or a large home that has lots of space and multiple caregivers.
- None
- Being a responsible pet owner, working with a shelter/rescue or being a breeder
- If the owner is a licensed breeder not running a mill.
- licenced: breeder, dog trainer, pet sitter
- If you are fostering animals on a temporary basis.
- Why would people need to have more than 2?
- if there are a higher number of people in the household, size of the house/yard, special needs (service dogs)
- If the pet owner is unable to provide for their needs. In that case the SPCA should be contacted, not the City of Calgary.
- For cats none. Dog perhaps for health issues as seeing eye dog etc
- multiple individuals needed support animals, or possibly multiple animals being trained by a certified trainer for eye dogs, etc.
- Foster homes
- Animals owned for competition or breeding (which should be regulated). Owners that run a business focused around pets, such as trainers, daycare staff or shelter employees, where their lifestyle is centered around providing care might also require exceptions.
- Service animals should always be exempt.
- Fostering. Indoor cats and a home owner not a renter.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Previous or history of problems with pets, bylaw complaints, etc. We need to start going after owners who don't understand how to be responsible and not penalize everyone. Size of residence might also be considered.
- if the animals are not getting the necessities of care and owner can not provide for more than one.
- if animal is having babies. pets are under a certain age.
- Animals are starting to overpower the city I look at it is not a clean City more animals than children
- None
- Kittens or puppies
- Home and yard size. Bigger square footage should allow for more animals as long as the pets are well taken care of and not neglected (ie animal hoarding).
- Perhaps if you are fostering for the SPCA or one of the other agencies. That would be the only time I think their should be an exception to the limit.
- Limited timeframe fostering, or register as a business that adopts.
- Large property owners
 - Farm/acerage where animals spend a lot of time outdoors/in barns.
 - Registered breeders (to account for litters, not to allow more adult breeding animals.)
- If they are fostering animals. Time period after litters arrive. Number of people in the household (i.e. more people = more animals).
- If it is out of control.pets are not being taken care of.
- When the health and care of the animals can not be met.
- when its a problem for others
- Rare exemption. Unless the houses in neighbourhood are in acerages.
- None ...
- totally depends on care provided.
- Replacing one about to die if kids are in the picture
- Never
- If the owners are responsible, there should be no limit to pet ownership -- responsible owners will, by definition, self-limit.
- I think that there should be exceptions to a 5 animal limit if 1) they are running a not for profit/fostering/other aid type of work, 2)if they are a certified trainer/behaviouralist
- Certified dog trainers could be excepted, as could cat and/or dog breeders. (Note: I'm defining "household" as a home and its occupants as a unit. If a house had a separate basement suite containing tenants, for example, then each suite would be entitled to a maximum of 3 dogs and 3 cats.)
- Temporary circumstances helping out friends or family.
- Some additional considerations include type of residence, square footage inside the home, available yard space and available appropriate locations for litter boxes for cats. Financial ability of owner to care for animals is also important.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Can the owners look after them well enough so they don't become a nuisance to those around them. Many people buy breeds for the wrong reasons. Then the pets are neglected and become a nuisance to others. Come on City of Calgary, most dog owners have horrible attitudes about responsible ownership.
- None.
- If there is proof that the cats and/or dogs would be well taken care of.
- If a person is mentally ill, old, frail, or highly allergic to cats, they should be allowed to own and keep as many cats s they water.
- Living on an acreage, or if one house has multiple separate units for different residents to live in and have their animals separated from others.
- Breeding/commercial license.
- Kennel, breeders, competitive sports, working animals, responsible owners. Limiting numbers of animals has been shown to be ineffective in preventing bad owners from not caring for their pets.
- Breeder. Then they must be liscened as a breeder. Provide care, space and provide capabilities.
- Strict limits and bans should be enforced on people who have demonstrated poor ownership in the past.
- If a person is a breeder or fostering/pet sitting animals I could see this being a reasonable exception.
- City shouldn't have a limit as long as the pets are raised responsibly.
- Animals under 6 months or animals that are seniors.
- when the owner proves that they can not reasonably care for the animals
- caring for friends/family pets, someone who has enough support help to care for them.
- Foster homes
- Rescue and temporary situations should be exempt. All breeding operations of any sort should need to be licensed and subject to inspection by the city. No exception for the number of adult dogs. Breeding is no excuse to have an excessive number of dogs. Otherwise it is a kennel.
- Combined total should be less than 8. Max 5 pets?
- Breeders
- Fostering, babies, if they are cared for well there is no problem.
- if its a temporary situation and all animals are well kept.
- Service animals. Over 3000 square feet of space
- Breeders / obtained a licence to be able to care and obtain more cats or dogs thus allowing bylaw to check residence
 - - Appropriate licence/permit from the City, with a required inspection
- short term visitors
- Medical assisting dog (not therapy dog) should be excluded from the count.
- Rescue groups or emergency shelter.
- Licensed breeders or rescues



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It's the other way around. There should be no limit. There are some natural circumstances like when there is a litter that more than usual pets may live in a house.
- If there is some reason someone wants to own a large number of animals, they should be subject to licensing and inspections like a livestock facility or animal shelter would be. This would ensure the animals were being properly cared for.
- When the living conditions are kept in a safe condition and the purchase of an additional permit has been made. Neighbors should also be contacted.
- Service animals
- If animals are not properly taken care of - period. Also, the adoption fees need to come down to a sensible amount of fee - its a total rip off and therefore too many animals are not given a home. [personal information removed]
- Owner's willingness to care for and ensure animals are good citizens and not disturbing others
- No circumstances, unless it can be shown that there are proper facilities and resources to care for the animals.
- I cannot think of a exception, if Calgary were to put in laws regarding this ai do think that the ones that already have an over limit should be grandfathered in.
- license breeders should be the only exception
- I don't believe in specific numbers as a limit as mentioned above.
- Don't see a need for a limit. If one is imposed , persons who care for animals in their home should be exempt.
- The type of dwelling house someone lives in
- Past charges under the Bylaw or any provincial acts (especially hoarding)
- Service animals recognized by an accredited institution like PALS, or the CNIB and documented support papers from a physician and a mental health provider. You can buy 'service animal' vest on the internet. How do airlines decide what is a service animal or not. What have other cities done?
- Fostering rescued animals for short periods of time.
- When the owner clearly can't care for the animals they have, maintain their yard or residence or manage the noise of the animals they have.
- None.
- The city might decide to grandfather an existing owner, who would then reduce the number through attrition or they live on an acreage.
- The owners property needs to be appropriate for multiple animals which means space and fenced in.
- if space is abnormally large
- Within city limits, none.
- No opinion
- In Quebec, they made an exception for kennels and breeders so everyone just registered as a kennel or breeder and carried on. I don't think there should be an arbitrary limit set.
- Land size, dedication to full time care.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Multiple family buildings, cases where there are frequent neighbour complaints re noise or odour from animals and in cases with inhumane treatment of animals
- If the owners can care for the animals appropriately, and is able to prove extra animals are well taken care of, It would be fine (not unlimited numbers though, under 6 Perhaps.
- Shelter, acreage, vet.
- Breeding times / purposes and also rescue operations in which people temporarily take in rescued animals to heal them & find appropriate homes for them
- If they have a very large house and yard I could understand having more. OR if they foster as those animals are not kept long term.
- Fosters, people who train dogs/cats, people who temporarily have animals, registered breeders
- Double the number normally allowed if it is a temporary situation - maybe 72 hours?
There should be no permanent exception in a household (non-commercial) environment.
- If the person can't take care of the dog(s) or cat(s) they shouldn't have them.
If someone is in the habit of hoarding animals they should seek help from a mental health agency to prevent it from happening again.
- It depends on the individual
- The owner is a trained animal expert.
- Visitors, inability to look after animals,
- If you're to limit the number of dogs/cats, allow exceptions for people rescuing or fostering animals.
- I guess as long as you can look after them properly and have a big enough house then it should be left up to the owners how many you want
- Rescue organizations and volunteer
- If people are breeding animals and they have a permit with some oversight to ensure the numbers don't get out of control
- Temporary cat or dog sitting. Going to grandma's.
- When there is a nuisance like barking, feces. When there is a risk of the animal and the public's safety. Aggression involved.
- Are the dogs part of an organization being trained.
- If the household temporarily takes care of animals for shelters.
- Temporarily assisting others with dog or cat sitting. Be a competent pet owner and handler.
- When fostering or delivering/weaning infant animals
- Reputable breeders need to be allowed to keep larger number of animals to allow for litters of pups or kittens.
- Anything above 5 should be looked into, urban/rural perhaps are treated differently or size of home/condo. Animals quality of life needs to be top priority and if all are licensed it should be easy to track.
- If people have limitations regarding financial means, space and/or knowledge, they should limit the number of pets to the number they can reasonably provide for. In some cases that would mean no pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Maybe foster homes. But it should only be short term. (Less than 6 months)
- For all free, tax paying citizens.
- Only of owner can prove that adequate care is being given to all animals.
If a breeder must be licensed and inspected and limit on number of litters allowed per year.
- Acreages. If proper care is able to be provided to that many dogs.
- Foster for a short period of time. But requires a license so the city can inspect
- If a member of the family is able to care for the pets as a full-time job (meaning they are a stay at home partner) or if they hired staff. The size of the home also plays a factor.
- If the person is a registered breeder or foster parent to the animal. Also maybe a pet to person ratio in communal living situations?
- When the animals are not appropriately cared for or in distress.
- There should not be a limit unless a person has caused a problem. That individual should be limited.
- Licensed breeding. When land size allows for more animals safely and without bothering neighbors.
- If there are more responsible adults than the number of pets, and there is a very large space.
- Responsible Breeder of purebred dogs or cats, someone who actively participates in dog or cat events for the betterment of their breeds
- A person how doesn't treat animals well or has an animal hoarding history should be limited.
- When someone must temporarily take in another's pet due to that owner's ill health or death. There should be a grace period but then it should be adopted out.
- If there are service animals. If the animal has a litter that is being cared for prior to adoption.
- Breeding but with a permit to breed in my opinion is the only time.
- Charitable organizations/fostering situations, or businesses (so a self employed dog trainer)
- If any of the pets are a service animal
- When households don't have the means to take care of them
- inability to proper take care of the animals
- I don't think there should be a limit. Limits would only punish people who own multi pets responsibly. [personal information removed] I already know that there are plenty of very adequate laws to deal with neglect/hoarding no matter the number of pets. And this is with antiquated protection laws.
- There shouldn't be limits but if there are, then rescues, fosters, and breeders should have exceptions and should be monitored
- Genuine foster home or rescue.
- Unkept property and real public health issues
- Registered and certified breeder..not a puppy/cat mill...so premises should be inspected for the safety and welfare of the animals
- A pet fostering home.
- Based on house location and available space
- Non compliance with the bylaw



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think we should be able to get a multi-dog license that incorporates training (eg. CKC CGN testing, human knowledge and care (maybe a sign-off from a vet). I have multiple dogs because I do agility and therapy with my dogs. I have 1 in training (>age 4), one that is working (age 5) and 2 retired.
- If it is large enough and if there are enough people living there to care for the animals.
- Farms or very large estates where the room for animals is greatly increased.
- In any case where it is clear an animal is being neglected in any way. Or when a household does not have the financial means to cover the animals basic needs such as food, water, and medical needs.
- Max 4 animals.... Exception for 3 cats based on only 1 dog in household. But MAX 2 dogs. No exception.
- No exceptions.
- Obviously animal offenders should not be permitted any animals
- Fostering animals.
- Rescue puppies/kittens (note: this is not the same as breeding animals for sale - that's a business and should be managed as such).
- When there's extra fees to licence And there's space for the animals.
- Service animals shouldn't count against the total number of animals in the home as they are medically necessary equipment, not a pet.
- Rescues, foster parents for rescues, responsible breeders, and therapy animals or places like cat cafes.
- If the homeowner is a breeder they will need the ability for have more dogs in their house
- Only short term if family members move in or need help with their animals due to circumstances. As long as proper care for them is taken, and an appropriate amount of time frame exists (ie. less than one year).
- Health violations and property maintenance violation
- I don't believe in limiting however if an owner doesn't license their animals and there is a hoarding situation then some sort of limit could possibly be imposed.
- Foster care
 - Mother animal and puppies/kittens
- Registered breeder that has just had litters
- Multiple tenants
 - Large enough yard space
 - An inner city acreage should be allowed to have more than an apartment.
- Health concerns for the animals
- There should not be a limit on animals as it boils down to the owner and their sense of responsibility. There are people out there that shouldn't have 1 animal.
- Known hoarders should not be permitted to have more than two dogs and two cats perhousehold..
- Fostering homes. Perhaps an application for emergencies.
- If the person is on fixed income, assisted living, or if the home is ynfitted for the amount of animals being kept

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- When they are able to provide and that the home is maintained.
- When actions prove that the animals will be well cared for. With an application to exceed normal limits
- Medical and psychological
- It's not a city question. It depends on where the home is located. Is it a condo or a house or a property with land. You can't make a judgement of one size fits all. It doesn't work.
- A certified animal breeder.
- If the owner has been charged with animal cruelty or cant keep their animals under controll.
- Fosters for rescues.
- As long as they're well cared for, who cares?
 1. If a cat or dog gives birth to a litter.
 2. If someone is fostering puppies or kittens.
 3. You have a bonded sibling group who would be better off all living together.
- Support animal situations.
- if a pet has a litter - there will likely be more than the above number.
6 month grace period (sometimes people inherit pets and need a chance to rehome)
- Puppies or housing pets for adoption.
- No exceptions.
- Perhaps a permit for licensed breeders (could also help with ensuring quality of life for breeding animals) - true for more than just cats and dogs. And perhaps for those who are dog/cat sport or working animal owners (E.g. competitive dog sports, service animals, etc)?
- none
- If the person is a CKC registered breeder in good standing
- I think either way the city should have a limit. I know people with up to 15 dogs in houses. I think this is awful.
- If it's a temporary situation, like watching a pet for someone.
- New puppies or kittens, family emergencies, watching pets for friends or families while they are on vacation.
- Exemptions could be made for breeding purposes, but a separate licence should be in effect along with a time limit for having the pups and kittens off the premises. Also, exceptions could be made for those looking after someone else's pet on a temporary basis.
- There shouldn't be a limit. Only hoarder situations should be a concern and those aren't solved by imposing a pet limit to the general population.
- In the cases of breeding or perhaps showing.
- Passed experience with animal court, including squalor living conditions, animal welfare/abuse. Limitations imposed by stratas.
- If it is a large property, if they are a business which breeds pets and if they can prove they have the time/resources to appropriately care for more pets. Many people don't and pets are unintentionally neglected.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Case by case basis. If there is a good reason like the owner has permanent animals and foster animals. If they have adequate time and resources to provide for the animals. If there is a certain amount of free space for the animals. As long as the animal's quality of life is not hindered by crowding.
- When fostering with a registered organization.
- When they are deemed unfit to care for them or if they have 1 or more vicious dogs
- Size of household
- Exception for larger properties and the size of the breed - have 4 small dogs is more manageable than 4 large dogs (from a walking and space perspective)
- The only time limits should be imposed is if there is a history of not being able to care
- As above, if they are properly cared for the number of pets is irrelevant. One animal can be improperly cared for.
- Not sure
- Bigger property should allow more animals.
Fostering/rescuing animals but only in association with an established rescue.
- When they can't be taken care of. Hoarding, left in cages, no water or food or vet care.
- In no situation should the animals' wellbeing be over looked. If the animals are suffering due to over crowding or the physical/mental/financial limitations of an owner to care for a certain number of pets, then alternative arrangements should be made.
- I can see how if someone is a professional dog or cat breeder, there would be times when more than that many animals were living in a household. Maybe if there was some sort of licensing system for breeders or an exception for puppies/kittens until a certain age?
- If the owner is unable to care for and clean up after the animals
- For owners with specific permit and training.
- The size of the house and owner's skills
- Without context of the situation I am unsure.
- If pet owner is not providing the proper care to their pets
If pets are causing disturbances in the neighborhood or inhumane treatment of the animal(s)
- Hoarder houses should not be allowed any. There should not be an exception for more than two.
- Grandfathered in when moving from another area that allows different number of dogs so the owner doesn't have to give up
Their pet or chooses which one to give up.
- not sure. that would probably need to be case by case.
- Rural areas. A city resident finding or rescuing cats and dogs and they are unable to get them to forever homes through no-kill agencies.
- A limit should be a guideline.. and not attached to the "reasonable" number given above.
Applications should be required to go over 2 of any mammal though.
- Multi family dwelling.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- When the person who owns animals repeatedly ignores the bylaw, illustrated by fines or a quick City Admin canvas of surrounding properties prior to pet ownership (to get candid insight as to whether or not the person(s) can handle additional number of animals in a responsible and respectful manner.
- An acreage, larger yard/house. Fenced areas.
- Fostering, pet daycare
- Grandfathered only got owned pets and maybe extend the number to 4 if a person is fostering only.
- If you can't care for them then you need to limit the amount. You have. Clean up after them and feed them, ensure you can take them to a vet.
- Dog Breeders, kennels, but again as long as there isn't abuse or neglect one could have many pets with no issue.
- Not being taken care of.
- None. Households are not a place for breeding animals.
- If someone is fostering, or if it's some kind of emergency situation, or a dog just had puppies.
- Certified/trained rehabilitation homes for shelter animals. Temporary housing for vacations or owner inability to manage (3 month max).
- When owner can't provide necessary care or manage behaviour
- People could apply for a large pet household permit, have it renewed every five years assuming there have been no complaints.
- Limits could be exceeded on a case by case basis. Reasonable animal care would have to be demonstrated and reviewed annually. The animal homes in Calgary have been overwhelmed by abandoned animals due to cost and inability to care for them - but animals are also part of a family.
- Multiple people needing service animals.
- Scenarios of fostering, or pet-sitting for extended periods of time. Otherwise people should not be personally responsible for more than a couple animals.
- Not in the household, but there should be a limit on the number of dogs one person can bring to an off leash area. You can't watch more than 4 or 5 dogs all the time, while you are trying to pick up after them. Dog walkers and their unruly giant packs are annoying and can be a threat to other dogs
- When owner is unable to properly care for individuals
- None
- If rescued, fostered, or well managed and healthy and happy.
- None
- There should not be a limit on number of dogs in a household. Other indicators of invasiveness and animal welfare would be more productive avenues to follow
- Fostering, boarding, breeding, your pet became pregnant and you are taking care of the litter until adopted. NOT a registered breeder. You should need to apply for (free) license if you have already scheduled a date to spay your pet. But you receive a fine if you fail to show proof of spay
- Foster family's and size of the house. If a house is big enough to support more than 4 cats and dogs while maintaining healthy living spaces for all animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- temporary care, or end of life of the animal care etc, foster,
- Perhaps a temporary situation where someone is fostering a cat/dog in need.
- Rescues, foster, animal rehab, etc
- Special licenses to do so for small rescues
- People who have shown an inability to care for animals or not be able to manage a number greater than one should have that number restricted.
- Type of housing, size, ability of owner to care & afford the animals.
- Registered breeders who have litters (i.e. intend to sell the offspring)
- Litters, temporary pet sitting, family members pass away and best people to take animals already have the max
- If they're well looked after and owners can afford them, then let them be. If they're back yard breeding or living in deplorable conditions then they need to be removed and the owners be given a limit to how many they can have. It just seems wrong to have a bylaw on how many pets you can own.
- Farm/ acreage, or if it is a working animal.
- no need limit! just control about city fee for all pets in the house.
- if owner is a vet or vet tech
- if they have land space for the animals, or if they live in a house with proper facility to make sure each dog or cat receives equitable care.
- If you can not take good care of the animals
- If a pet has recently given birth, if there are multiple families/roommates sharing a space
- Breeders, baby sitting, size of living space
- If there are multiple family units/roommate situations
- Limits if owner is unable to care for animals: must be able to provide health, food, water, shelter, for animals and sanitation of property.
- Proof that animals will be well cared for and have adequate space. Temporary foster situations.
- Inability to provide for them properly
- Rescues, sanctuaries, new litters
- Fostering animals , temporary care, after birth of pups or kittens.
- If they are a licensed breeder.
- It is the people that don't know how to train or don't take responsibility for their animals once they have them that are the problem. Have people take training so they learn about behaviour before they are allowed to adopt, and then with the dog after they adopt.
- If they are service animals or on an acreage.
- Responsible owners.
- Inspection from health board, input from neighbour backing onto the owner's yard (biggest noise impact), both side neighbours and front neighbour of any portion of yard is across from neighbour (ie: neighbour's house faces side yard).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Fostering (for a rescue) a litter of puppies or kittens temporarily. Fostering (for a rescue) additional animals temporarily (perhaps increase limits by 1 in this instance). Breeders should be required to pay for permits.
- If the owner is neglectful and not providing proper care and attention or not following current bylaws. Pet limits should only be in rare and proven cases of neglect on a case by case basis.
- mental health concerns/frequent contact with social services should preclude one from being a pet owner without a vetting process
- If the animals are not being fed, cared for properly.
- Perhaps a foster situation where the animals are not full time residents but are temporarily in the home
- Breeding or business
- Hoarding multiple offenders for mistreatment etc
- In the event the owner is a breeder.
- Monetary value in the household. If you can't afford them don't get. It's all about good pet ownership and responsibility. Knowledge helps as well.
- No exception
- Being able to prove all will be cared for to the highest standard. ie all vetted, fed a healthy diet, no complaints from community, yard kept up,
- Never
- Outside municipal limits, within a reasonable number of pets for living situation and space. Cats cause health problems for even non-allergic people. none!
- When breeding puppies. When temporarily housing animals to support a crisis situation, such as the floor of 2013.
- newborn animals not included until they are 8 or 10 weeks old, condos and apartments often restrict numbers
- Fostering pets. Rescues. Hospice situations.
- Fostering/rescue organizations
- Unsure
- Service animals
- Within the city there should be some kind of restriction on owned dogs (that doesn't count fosters for rescues). People who have been marked as potential hoarding cases, abuse cases, etc.
- Space available, cleanliness (odours), noise. Dogs that bark need to be trained or kept inside. Non dog owners shouldn't have to suffer because our neighbours let them bark.
- If someone has ever been convicted or warned about improper animal welfare practices.
- None.
- none
- Maybe if you're a (licensed, inspected, responsible) breeder??? Or perhaps a trainer/provider of service animals??? Other than that, I'm hard-pressed to think of anything
- Responsibility



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Foster

- Temporary situations. However, not temporary in that dog day cares are run out of houses. If the house is on an acreage and the dogs have lots of room to play then that would be an acceptable exception.
- Noise complaints.
Unclean environment.
Not well provided for the wellbeing of animal.
- Properly licensed breeding facilities. Registered foster households
- If the pets are used in companion situations or if the space is large and the hygiene of the home isn't compromised.
- Perhaps under a licensed foster situation or where an animal has babies for a short term while homes are being found. More needs to be done to encourage spay/neuter.
- If there is an individual that requires a service dog.
- No exceptions. Calgarians with hearing, eyesight, and other impairments can get away with one pet.
- City-licensed breeders or occasional and temporary puppies or kittens or temporary pet sitting.
- Large house with lots of space or only small animals, if they went through a pet Care and optimal living course.
- The city should not be providing blanket limits on residents' decisions. Any issues created by irresponsible ownership can be dealt with through other means such as health of the pet and interference with neighbors or public spaces
- Rescue homes or foster homes
- Dog and cat breeding in farms is under-reported and unlicensed. Most impaired people can get away with having one pet. In Canada, many pets freeze in sub-zero temps and this is under-reported according to the Humane Societies.
- Owner has had previous issues with animal neglect. Owner has restrictions on home.
- Space should be a factor in regards to choosing how many pets should be allowed in house hold.
- Can't think of any
- If the people are unable to provided love food and shelter or if the animals are neglected
- Some sort of a "means" assessment
- If the person has a large enough property and the resources and intent to care for all animals for their whole lives, and it's not causing an issue for neighbors (no constant barking etc).
- Larger house or farm, proof that you are AMAZING at walking/running dogs.
- Service animals or professional animal trainers. Licensed Breeders as well, but only for litters of babies - aka 1 breeding pair only.
- None
- Individual should not be on welfare, they must have a job that allows them to support more than themselves, own their property-not rentals. Rescue organization/fostering
- Fostering, pet sitting



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- When people are breeding and have a litter for 2-5 months or when looking after a pet or pets for friends or family members for no more than 3 months consecutive
- Indoor only cats and animal foster homes.
- Where the dogs or cats are an ongoing problem to others in the immediate neighbourhood, OR if it is demonstrated that the owner is does not give them adequate care.
- Foster care, respite care, puppies/kittens, licensed care provider
- Foster homes, large households with large families to provide a high quality of life, service animals, and animal daycare/babysitting
- Size of property, number of human inhabitants, resources to care for same.
- If a person has shown that they are financially or mentally incapable of caring for their pets (inadequate veterinary care, unclean environment, not spayed or neutered) then a limit could be imposed by the court. Otherwise there should be no limit at all.
- Responsible breeding, rescue/ fostering, working or competing dogs
- Is there space and adequate support for the pet.
- If a person is fostering dogs for a rescue organization
- Proof the animals are all being cared for properly, trained, etc.
- Rescues, foster homes, responsible breeders and owners who are extremely responsible - provide proper care, compete with their dogs in dog sports, and are responsible pet owners should be allowed to have as many pets as they can reasonably care for.
- If the animals are being neglected or abused they should not be allowed to have them in their care
- Valid support animals.
Temporary care for animals that need medical assistance.
Temporary stay , animals being looked after well the pet owners are away.
- If someone is temporarily dog/cat sitting (I.e. less than two weeks) or if someone is a professional pet sitter/breeder and has the appropriate documentation and training to keep all the animals under one roof or if a mom has puppies/kittens and is still nursing
- Pet limits should be put in place on a case by case basis based on quality of care. If a household has exceeded the city limit of ownership, but all animals have a good quality of life and are under reasonable control, no act should be taken to enforce the bylaw of limitation of pet ownership.
- That they were already in the home, before the new bylaw.
- If your not caring for them and providing a loving home, then that person should have restrictions on the number of pets.
- Unsure where you put the line. Shelters and rescuers should have a short term allowance
- Not sure. Fostering? Even then I don't think there should.
- Fostering
- Not really sure!!
- Households with more than 2 people over the age of 18, households temporarily fostering animals, and breeders.
- There should be no limit



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responsible breeders or foster homes
- Any fostering situation in which an animal needs to a home prior to being adopted out. This relieves some stress from our shelter system.
- There should not be a limit.
- See above comment; when fostering pets for a rescue organization
- Proof of obedience training for dogs and the proven ability yo care for more
- If the cats are aloud to go outside.
- In multi family homes. Such as apartments and condos.
Also if there is other animals in the home.
- None
- if it borders the neighbours
- People with past problems with animal neglect and on the other end of the spectrum those who foster and appropriately rescue dogs
- Someone running a licensed pet care business. Exception during day, But overnight care should be limited to 4.
- Emotional support, having these pets prior to any law changes, responsible ownership
- When house is under a certain square foot and dog owners MUST have a fenced in garden. In Discovery Ridge their are a few with dogs and they don't have a fenced in garden for their pet to have some free time or play. They need to have fenced in play space ¬ let off leash to give them exercise
- Yes within reason.
- Breed and history of dogs or owner
- Not applicable
- Fostering!!!
- For breeders or foster homes (in which they have the experience to deal with so many cats and dogs)
- A combined number of cats and dogs should reach a limit to ensure a proper quality of life in the home is being provided. Not sure what that number should be.
- Animal fostering
- Common sense, which is woefully lacking in our society and no amount of legislation is going to create it.
- Responsible breeders, people who have had puppies or kittens until they can find a home for the rest.
- You guys are ridiculous authoritarians. You ignore blatant abuse but pick on responsible people. Sheesh. I guess you want to do a welfare check. But I think it should be complaint based.
- Licensed breeders.
- none
- pets are happy, well cared for, go to vet when sick, fed etc... as above, GRANDFATHER those individuals, as their pets pass away, their #s come down to what you require. Image how many



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

animals the city would be responsible for if you do not GRANDFATHER. Consider minimum of 10,000 in YOUR care

- Rescues and after giving birth.
- As stated above, why limit dogs and cat limits can be raised when guardians demonstrate proper behaviours.
- Large property, special training for dog/cats - vet tech, groomer, trainer, etc.
- none.
- Service animals.
- Foster based Rescues and and if a family already has dogs already. How would the city of Calgary take care of the overload of dogs? Not going to happen. What a expense! Where will they go to shelters and Rescues? Do not take a few bad apples and make everyone else pay for their irresponsibility.
- As stated above, why limit dogs and cat limits can be raised when guardians demonstrate proper behaviours. [DUPLICATE]
- under all circumstances, no one needs more than 4/5 animals in their house
- If the new rules reduces the number below what a household currently has. Old rules should be grandfathered. Not doing so would be devastating to families if they are forced to get rid of a pet. Rescue organizations should also be exempt.
- Large property/house. Someone is always home to attend to them. Rescue/fostering animals
- grandfather the people who have surplus, animals are happy, healthy, taken care of, vet etc... as their pets pass they can not add, that way their #s go down to the required amount and the City is not taking in thousands of animals to feed/care/vet/special diet/meds - lot of \$\$\$\$ out of your pocket
- If the household/person has a history of animal hoarding or have many complaints about the animals, ie: excessive barking, poor living conditions, etc.
- Anyone underage, over 75 or with disabilities/mental health challenges should be monitored on a regular basis.
- House size and cleanliness
- If the household is located where the animals won't bother the neighbours.
- If there has been previous animal abuse/neglect. Or the owner does not have the capacity to care for all the animals.
- if the owners have been fined for a vicious dog. They should either not be allowed to have a dog or only that one so that no other dogs fall victim.
- In a household that is licensed for the breeding of animals, in which case it becomes a business and should be subject to periodic inspections.
- If the city were to change the bylaw, they need to grandfather the number to current. Also there should be a clause re rescues and temporary (foster) homes to have flex in the number.
- depending on complaints, area, proximity to other neighbours
- If the owner is barely able to care for themselves let alone the animals then there should be a limit for sure.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If a limit is set, there likely shouldn't be any exceptions.
- None other than it being a vet office etc.
- Previous issues
- Unsure.
- Foster homing if experienced owners. No topic for this but dog walking services should be licenced if more than 1 dog walked at a time. I have observed a service (2ppl) walking 8-9 dogs at a time in a park and did not pick up any feces.
- When a family already has the amount before the bylaw comes into effect, and service animals shouldn't count.
- After a person has a certain number they city should require house visits by rescues or bylaw to prove this person can properly care for these animals before being able to get more than the limit placed on each animal.
- Other pets might be just visiting for a short stay.
- This should be reviewed on a case by case basis. Some people should have no animals and others can have many, but how to locate people who hoard cat/dogs. People believe their pets are their children & have the right to have as many as they want. This is a touchy issue.
- By special permit only and after proof that proper ownership is occurring.
- When there are babies that cannot yet be separated
- If there is a business license from a vetted breeder, then I think the number of adult animals should be capped at 3 and puppies/kittens should be permitted up until a year old.
- * Your bylaw officers have the APA in their appointment from the solicitor general. They could do more to help animals.
- For rescues and fosters helping save lives.
- Odour from the household, bad behaviour of animals observed and not improved after warning.
- Kittens/puppies being born - a reasonable period of time for the home/pet owner to arrange for homes for the babies.
- if temporary or short term.
- Breeders, rescue foster homes
- I think anyone with a prior conviction or history of animal abuse should be limited to less (aka 0), and perhaps someone can apply for an exception in the case of larger property or fostering.
- When they are being cared for _short-term_ by a responsible, experienced person.
- Licensed breeders
- None.
- Foster pets
- for registered breeders
- The owner is unable to feed, and keep the animal clean.
- None



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The owner has demonstrated appropriate knowledge of dog behaviour and is able to manage the dogs in the household and in public. Similar to the canine neighbour test maybe there could be a handling test for the owner.
- There should be no limit.
- Breeders should be an exception.
- Registered animal rescue and can prove they have the reasonable resources needed to properly take care of more animals then allowed
- As long as cats and dogs don't run around outside I don't care how many they have. Roaming cats kill songbirds and pee and poop in our gardens.
- If they aren't cared for.
- Known hoarder or someone with previously seized animals should not be allowed to keep more.
- Temporary, monitored care of animals in a fostering/adoption situation such as with an organisation such as PAWS.
- When fostering for permanent placement or during a recovery period from trauma, injury, surgery, etc.
- Closeness to city, suburbs can have more. Special licensing
- Fostering situations.
- When the cleanliness and care of an animal is at risk, is the only time their should be an exception. Changing the current rules to limit responsible pet owners in the number of pets they can have will cause a crisis within rescues and animal service areas of the city. Limiting will cause death.
- Only when the owners are found to be incapable of handling or supporting cats/dogs with proper nutrition, exercise etc.
- Breeding, service or working dogs. Private properties of a certain size may be suitable to have more.
- Only when there is a risk of distress to the animal should a limit be placed. Owners need to be responsible in their communities. Limiting the number of animals is not the solution and will cause stress to rescues and animal services. This will also cause death for many animals.
- There are reputable breeders and though most do not live in the city, there could be some in certain cases. Reputable breeders do so because they love the breed, they are trying to keep a breed from extinction or trying to preserve the purpose-bred characteristics and health of a breed.
- Licensed breeders, recognized foster homes of rescue animals. They're should still be a limit, but the numbers could be slightly higher
- no exceptions.
- Rescued groups who foster cats and dogs with litters.
- None
- None
- In the case of grandfathering of pets, pets brought into the home due to circumstances beyond family control. If the family receiving grandfathered dogs, but they already have 2 or 3 dogs, then by grandfathering, the receiving family will not bring in more animals until beloved pets pass on,



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Under no circumstance should a homeowner or a foster home be allowed to have more than three cats or three dogs
- If they already have them. If they are temporary ie fostering or pet sitting. If they run doggy daycare out of home and so temporarily more dogs.
- There should ONLY be a limit if there are problems with the animals & their interactions with neighbors and/or owner is not taking appropriate care of them.
- The space is very large, such as a farm or a ranch, or the homeowner(s) are around very often and are excellent at caring for animals.
- If the owner is not taking care of the animals properly (medical , food , exercise & sanitation needs)
- Fostering for rescues and people who already have over the household limit prior to the new limit being set should be grandfathered.
- If someone has been convicted of negligence or cruelty, they should NEVER be allowed to have any pets. EVER
- If someone is fostering rescue dogs, they should be able to have more since fostering is temporary.
- If the owner is a breeder. They should be a special license. There may be other circumstances I can't think of but a license should be required
- Breeders, boarders, trainers, foster homes.
- Farm or large acreage etc. If they dogs have the room ie. yard within the city and large house. For that breed.
- Farmers, working animals
- If the owners can provide proof that they can adequately care for the number of pets they have.
- Exceptions should always be considered. If someone is within 2 of the limit, and the animals are well cared for the limit should be irrelevant.
- Maybe if you live on an acreage, no exceptions in the city.
- I am strongly against putting a limit on the number of cats or dogs in a household. If they are well taken care of and well behaved then the number doesn't matter.
- None
- A temporary situation of a mother with a litter, or emergency fostering.
- When someone has been found to be abusing or neglecting their animals.
- Anyone who currently has more than the max amount at the time the bylaw changes should be grandfathered. Obviously as the pets pass away, they shouldn't be allowed to replace them if still over the max.
- If it has been proved that the person/s cannot adequately care for the number of animals in their care.
- If basic needs like food shelter basic grooming and health needs aren't met or abuse
- If the owners has proper means to provide training and exercise for the pets.
- If the individual responsible for the pet (based on the license) has received bylaw infractions or charges due to irresponsible pet ownership.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depending on the square footage of the house. If it's a apartment and they have 5 cats and 3 dogs, that might not be the best situation! But if the animals are looked after properly and they have the room and have 3 cats and 3 dogs for example there is no issue !
- Exceptions are for breeders. They can have more animals and if they are reputable breeders they know how to handle a number of dogs or cats.
If the person has been found to not provide proper care or has abused any animal they should never be allowed to have an animal in their care.
- Reputable breeders, documented rescue and fostering homes. Individuals who can prove they can responsibly care for all animals in home and not negatively impact adjacent homeowners and animals
- There should be no exceptions. Practically, socially, and environmentally two dogs or cats per household should be the maximum in an urban environment.
- Breeders, rescue organizations
- Breeder rescue home
- If a residence has an illegal suite, then making sure there is a distinction in the household between the two areas.
- Breeders
- A breeder who is raising and selling puppies. Or a person who has decided to raise a litter. One litter at a time
- Fostering animals
- If you can solely confirm that you are willing and able to provide a great quality of life then you should be allowed to have a higher number of cats and dogs in your household. Also the size of the living area should be quite large.
- a specific application should be made and the owner should be assessed for financial requirements and condition of the home of the animals.
- When there is a litter involved.
- If they are a licensed breeder or pet care service.
- A foster parent, someone who has proven their ability to care for the animals, multiple families (renting out the basement while the landlord or another tenant lives upstairs)
- If there is a licensed pet-related business that operates on the premises (e.g. dog day home, dog-walker, breeder, etc.) then an exception should be made as long as the bylaws are being followed and all humans and animals are safe and happy.
- If you are also fostering for an organization
- Fostering for rescues. Or if they have an acreage inside city limits.
- Licensed Breeders
- anyone currently caring for more then the allowed amount should be grandfathered, providing the animals are being properly cared for
- if a litter was just born and is being weaned, if multiple pets that are known to get along are over for a bbq (short period)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ability to maintain a habitable space for both owner and neighbours. No one should have to reside a home with excessive odour or crap.
- When there is a licensed business (ie: grooming or boarding). Although there would need to be regular, unannounced checks to ensure there isn't hoarding/abuse.
- Hoarding circumstances. When there are too many animals to be properly cared for, they need to be taken. Also, smaller properties; a townhouse or apartment are not appropriate homes for large numbers of animals, but a 1 acre property can easily accommodate quite a few. And again, quality of care.
- I think depending on the lot of Amount of space. Basically if for you have a big acre out back you have the means to exercisr and care for the dogs it's different
- Prior convictions on animal cruelty or hoarding
- If they are a licensed breeder. Residential homes do not need packs of dogs or cats. Any owner should have the financial resources to look after their pets humanely.
- If one of the pets has had a litter, then more allowed until litter is old enough to rehome, with timelines on how long can take to rehome. Perhaps people can apply for temporary exceptions, such as if they need to care for an animal of a friend or family member.
- Vicious animals, the owners healt and ability to handle the animals.
- Type of resident/size and density of community
- In hoarding situations
- If it is a Foster home for pets
- There should be an appeal process with a site visit to be granted permission for extra pets. They must be pets and not inventory. High penalties for people caught breeding animals after being granted special permission.
- Unreasonable noise or smell.
- Again depending on experience and house size
- If the home is used for fostering or rescuing animals. They should be required to be licensed for these.
- If the dogs are companion/service dogs.
- After an animal has a litter.
- no exceptions, instead put restrictions on those who cannot be responsible pet owners and don't punish those that are.
- Registered breeder
- If they are companion dogs you can have more of them as per the number of people needing their comfort.
- Owners have enough space and be able to take care of them.
- Limitations should be in effect when an owner shows irresponsibility or cruelty
- If there is a concern for the animals health.
- When the living space is too small for a lot of animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The pets have come to visit from other households and are going to return home. Pet sitting.
Temporary
Or one of the pets had babies and the babies need their parents care.
- There is now reason to have a house full of animals.
- Rescues
- Apartment vs detached house. Size of yard, size of house .
- Required Space or a litter has been had.
- Fostering situations
- Foster homes obviously. So many people are uncaring & there are too many unwanted animals because of this human downfall, the few Foster homes that do exist always have a multitude of animals. Unless the city can come up with mandatory spay/neuter LAWS, and/or a way of providing more foster homes
- Number of dogs or cats per adult living at a residence would make more sense. 2 each per adult.
Exceptions for litter of puppies/kittens until 6 months or 1 year old to find suitable homes.
- More people in the house ensuring all of the animals are cared for and under control.
- Foster families
- Rescue organizations and their foster families
- Temporary babysitting someone else's pet
- If the owners can easily show that the welfare of the animals is not compromised and their ability to keep the animals under control remains intact, I think anybody should be able to challenge a limit.
- if they are grandfathered
- I think that there can be exceptions for animal rescue groups that care for animals in homes prior to the animals being adopted. We have had several rescue dogs and it is great for them to be in a home setting. This is the same for cats.
- Unless they are a registered dog and cat sitting business
- Some people foster animals, to help reduce the burden of adoption centres and they may have need to have more animals at any given time. It's up to veterinarians, animal care specialists to decide what amount of space gives a pet a 'quality of life' in addition to food, shelter, love, health.
- Hoarding
- a litter is born and is awaiting adoption . but if we had spay and neuter mandatory for house hold pets we could start to manage stray , feral, roaming and over population of dogs and cats
- Base limit per square meter of home and yard, no two circumstances are the same.
- Past performance and problems with cats / digs seem to forecast future difficulties. Some people one is too many!
- If the householder is a licenced/registered breeder.
- If the owner is fostering or has a doggie daycare.
- There shouldn't be a limit
- The exception must be for fostering situations or whelping homes



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A limit on animals - if applied - should be grandfathered so current households with many animals don't have to give up any pets. Rescues and fosters should be immune as long as animals well taken care of!!!!
- Fostering/adoption, depends on number of residents in home. Some families have 4-5 adults at home in which all pets can be looked after.
- Temporary fostering
- there are so many animals there is inhumane crowding of space or unsanitary conditions. owner is unable to contain / care for / train that number of animals. owner has a history of hoarding/exploitation/abuse of animals. number of animals becomes a danger to people (ex. kids with allergies)
- Unless someone is a licensed kennel/breeder and can take proper care of multiple animals.
- When animals are not cared for, health & safety issues, causing issues for neighbors and of course hoarding.
- People who train/show animals as a career. People who foster animals
- Single dwelling and responsible reasoning when asking for permit.
- Perhaps 'service' dogs.
- when it's temporary-fostering homes for animal shelters or vet clinics, dogs being trained for therapy, etc.
- If the house needs a service animal along with house pets
- I don't think there should be a limit, but if the City were to limit # of pets, I think they should consider basing it on property size.
- neglect is seen, smelled and calls made by concerned public.
- If every person in the house needs a service animal and each animal is a service animal and there is also a person in the house who doesn't need or have a service animal so he/she can help the others with their service animals. Otherwise, no exceptions.
- Inadequate care or pets and/or causing a nuisance
- no exceptions.
- Therapy Pets
- Acreages, larger spaces should be an exception
- Foster homes .. maybe an urgent temporary thing where a person Needs to move in with another person due to a personal reason and their friend may already have animals (abuse, in between homes etc)
- Breeder
- Breeding purposes if the breeder is ethical and does not over breed. Personal rescuers caring for pets or people who have been through an approval process to ensure no animal is neglected.
- Where irresponsible breeding is taking place.
- Only when a dog has a litter
- When they are not cared for properly or become a nuisance to neighbors and the community.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- People who do short term foster for animal rescues, accidental litters I really wish people would just spay/neuter - can that be a bylaw?
- When it creates a hazard for the animals and their care.
- When puppies/kittens are born or if fostering for a licensed rescue agency
- Can't think of any.
- All licensed, vaccinated and well cared for.
- Foster care for rescue.
- GRANDFATHER clause for all households that have more than the max amt of animals.
- The well being and health of a pet should be first and foremost, is the pet getting good nutrition , all their shots , etc.
- If a cat or dog gives birth to a litter or (fosters through CHS for example) households caring for young animals until they are ready for adoption. A person owns a registered pet boarding or walking business (temporary or transitory dogs and cats)
- dog care business - the numbers are transient, not permanent
- None that I can think of at the moment.
- Maintain a healthy living environment, no smells or waste left around. a very good reason why they should have more than the limit
- None.
- Only in cases of neglect, abuse, or failing to follow other dangerous bylaws (vicious dogs, dogs at large, etc).
- n/a
- If a litter is born, time limit for re-homing
- Rescue, rehabilitation, unforeseeable circumstances
- If the limit is changed, families that exceed it must be grandfathered in. Homes providing pet daycare or foster animal volunteers should be exempt.
- If someone is Fostering or owns a pet that has recently had a litter. Or of dog sitting.
- Size of house/lot. Are the owners able to support the animals correctly.
- History of animal neglect, hoarding, etc.
- Special consideration if there are other family members staying in the home temporarily.
- If the owner has the proper space for the animals, proper food, water and vet visits, no smell and no noise.
- Fosters, rescues, "special circumstances" such as a person with a proper clean set up who is NOT breeding or buying - but rather adopting, saving.
- Not sure if there should be an exception....difficult to judge when to apply exceptions
- If pet owner is breeding the animals and needs time to arrange for the puppies/kittens to be old enough to be handed over to new owners.
- Rescue organizations or fosters. Puppies, although I believe dogs under 6 months dont need to be licensed anyway



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think that small apartments or condos would reduce the number of pets allowed. I also think that if a person lived on a very large property the number of pets may be able to be increased.
- In a household that has more then the new limit we should GRANDFATHER the people that have more than the required number. That way it will protect the animals that are already in a home with caring families.
- Service Animals should not count towards limits
- Reputable rescues! They should be monitored every so often for the animals well being!
- When someone has a history of mishandling their animals
- Maybe grandfathered in. But, I don't think there should be.
- Only if a temporary situation where one is looking after dogs or cats for other people.
- Medical, foster, rescue, situations. Responsible pet owners should not have limits. Are you prepared to examine EVERY situation on a case by case scenario???? You cannot have a one size fits all!!!!
- Rescue organization fosters only.
- Well for one if these animals were already there before this law they should be able to stay, and if an animal was a service animal ect it should be an exception
- If there have been prior issues with animals in the home from neighbors, vets . If the person is on income assaistance as limited income can affect the care of numerous animals at once and ability to afford food and vetting . Rental buildings, low income housing should have limits
- If the household is involved in breeding somehow, or providing services that require dogs/cats
- I believe currently owned animals must be grandfathered in if number limits are imposed. People should NOT be expected to get rid of current pets if their numbers exceed any newly implemented laws. I also believe exceptions should be made for households with both owned and fostered animals.
- if it includes a vicious dog, if the handler has been convicted of any violence acts
- unable to provide adequate care for pets. If household is over crowded and issues arise
- None
- If they are not taking care of the animals reasonably or allowing the animals to interfere with others who are permitted on or in the space.
- Trainers
Foster homes
Adequate space
- Unless they are fostering for rescues.
- If a limit exists, there should always be an exception for a rescue or fostering situation. If the rule changes, households which would find themselves suddenly over the limit would need to be given an exception. An animal should never be abandoned from a loving home in order to satisfy a new rule
- Depends on the size and type of cats and owner and the household. I think there should be some rules that can be enforced regarding the expectation of the health and environment of the animals. However, I would say it's hard to justify more than 7/8



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Shelters/People that Foster Animals
Any case where animals needs are not being met (hoarders).
- It's less about a number, and more about care of animals. If they are well cared for (physically, psychologically), and do not bother others (neighbours), then there should be no maximum. Especially if the person is a dog trainer or responsible breeder, they may have more dogs than average.
- If their needs are not being taken care of.
- Never
- It's a large house with a large backyard and enough people in the household to care for the animals
- Fostering should not count towards number of dogs/cats, as quality of care can be monitored by organization.
- Animal foster homes associated with an organization (ie. AARCS, Meow Foundation etc.)
- Exceptions will likely lead to more issues for bylaw to deal with. Might want to have an exception for looking after someone else's dog, but that should be temporary (two weeks or less).
- FOSTER AND RESCUE
- Exception should be granted to animal rescue and animal foster homes, and exception should be granted to homes with licensed cats.
- If the owner has a history of animals abuse, they should not be allowed to have ANY animals at all. Or if the home is an extremely small space, a limitation would make sense.
- Foster situations and breeders, private daycares.
- When the animals are properly taken care of. IE: larger estates, co-living homes where multiple people pay rent each might have one animal they care for.
- Foster animals, puppies/kittens
- If the owner can demonstrate they have the time or the money to ensure the animal will recieved the attention it needs
- There shouldn't be a limit. If they are on private property you have no place to stop them
- Farms or acreages can have more
- I don't agree with a limit on the number of cats or dogs in a household. as long as the dogs are well behaved and mannered and the owner is responsible.
- When health of animals is in jeopardy. Deemed by living space, size of yard, owner level of training,
- If they are in a foster program, with a recognizable rescue group; if there is an emergency such as fire, flood, etc, where individuals need a place to stay for a period of time for safety concerns; if there are puppies under the age of 8wks old, who are too young to be weened.
- If someone has been deemed unfit of caring for a pet, has mistreated animals or subjected them to harm or neglect.
- Rescues. Breeder license.
but individual owners should not be limited either.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None come to mind. My answer to the above questions for “reasonable” would not be exactly the same as “maximum” as different people have different lifestyles and capacity to meet animals’ needs.
- Owner disability, not being able to properly care for the basic needs of your animals (eg. Hoarding)
- When there is proof of animal abuse or neglect.
- When someone has been charged with animal cruelty or neglect they should have limits
- If a person has a history of not claiming their animals, animals running at large or aggressive animals I think a limit should be imposed.
- Proof that the animals are treated humanely, conditions are clean and not a concern for animal or human health, the pets are well cared for, and they are not a nuisance to others in any respect.
- Puppies or kittens on a short term basis.
- The only circumstances should be if the household is a registered charity for homeless pets or a boarding facility.
- Temporary litters or rescues for only a few months.
- I think more than 10 dogs that someone OWNS and is licensed (not fostering) should be limited, unless there is a reasonable explanation as to why they have that many dogs and to ensure they have the means to care for them properly.
- No exceptions
- Foster homes which need to be approved by the rescue organization and have a temp license per foster animal. Same with reputable breeders. I think this could reduce backyard breeders also. I would have no problem registering/licensing my foster animals.
- None.
- Anyone who has had a hoarding charge or animal abuse incident or an aggressive animal. Limits should then be imposed.
- Litters or if someone is taking in a pet temporarily
- The ability to provide a safe, secure and healthy environment for cats/dogs should be the only factor which impacts the number of animals in a home.
- Fostering.
- If you are merely fostering a third animal for adoption. If you have a legal suite.
- Larger home and backyard/green space. As well as prove the ability to care for all of them and show that they are not stressed with other animals.
- Those with more than limit should be grandfathered if they had more before limit was set.
- Emergency short term animal shelter relief.
- If someone is a vet, or a dog trainer. If your training is in animal care you should be able to own more because its your career and you know what you are doing and most likely will take great care of any pets you own.
- ?
- If the cap exceeds what an owner already has the pets should not be taken away unless they are not being cared for.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None unless a breeder and the pups or kittens are living there temporarily.
- If the animals are mistreated and it is a hoarding situation
- If it appears that an animal may be neglected the household should be reviewed to determine whether the owner can care for their pets
- Foster homes for pet rescuers
- Fostering, training
- Foster situation
- All dogs currently licensed with the city at the time of the change should be grandfathered in. There should be a warning period for people that have not realized how important licensing was in the past. Ex. 90 days to register all animals in house before changes go into effect.
- Temporary
- Housing size
- If people move in together with existing pets
- If the rules are to be changed, those who already have more pets than allowed should be grandfathered in. Also foster animals should be exempted from the household limit
- Grandfathering and fostering/rescues
- Number of people vs number of pets in households
- Complaints.
- Fostering should be an exception. And if you already have several pets I don't think they should be taken away. That's wrong to dictate people's fur-kids.
- There should be no limit.
- Hording
- Homes which foster animals.
- Doggy day care (temporary residence), or a business reason where certification is required?
- if they are a nuisance, noisy or if there are odours that may disturb the neighbours.
- Litters. On an individual basis consider- eg. a family may suddenly need to take on a family's member pet to care for, being with people the animal knows is likely the kindest thing rather than being placed for adoption as family already at max number
- If a cap is put in place, reputable breeders, animal foster homes, merging families that already have animals, inherited pets of loved ones who get placed in care or for another reason cant care for them
- Hygiene, not being taken care of properly, unable to control animals,
- Responsible breeding
- if unable to care for them
- Kittens or puppies and their parent(s) up to weaning age.
- An approved application process to prove that you are a responsible pet owner. Ie. you have not to let from bylaw, pets are healthy and up to date on vaccines, quality of life of the animals and finally appropriate space for the animals.
- Hoarders. Abusers. People who have been convicted of abuse. People who have very small places to live. People who do not have the financial capability to care for their pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Size of occupancy/ number of residents
- For dogs, size of house & backyard
- Breeders and those that show their cats/dogs.
- When the animals are not properly & well taken care of. If it is a hoarder situation. If the person is abusing or neglecting them, or using them to breed for profit. If the house is not suitable. If the person has any history whatsoever of animal abuse. If they can't afford to properly provide.
- Hoarding is a disease. This is where the inquiries about #'s of pets are coming. Some curiosity/discussion around underlying stereotyping against people who have large #'s of pets. There needs to be a place to call without judgement. The SPCA used to have a "holding area" where you could drop off your pet. Would like to see this return.
- - Prior offences
 - animal cruelty
 - Neglect (court proven)
- If they are in a farm or a huge house with multiple adult caretakers.
- temporary rescue, commercial reason, or medical
- Someone verified not to be of sound mind.
- If living in apartment/condo's - per the buildings guidelines
- I do not believe that the city should limit the amount of animals. Their current bylaw is one of the most forward thinking and well respected bylaws within Canada.
- Fostering, rescues.
- If or when a litter has occurred, only until the litter is rehomed. When fostering short term
- Fostering families for the animals
- If the family is unable to provide a safe loving home for the pet.
- Humane reasons. People should be able to get a license for excessive animals that get approved only if they can look after all the animals safely for the community and humanely for the animals.
- I think its a case by case issue. There are people who can properly take care of multiple dogs while others shouldn't/can't properly take care of one.
- size of the home v. size of the animals. - if we're talking about placing a cap on ownership, this needs to be grandfathered in.
- no exceptions this should not happen.. Rescues, breeders everyone. Not in agreement of restriction
- Previous charges under the RPO
- When the dog or cat had had a litter. If there is more than one adult in the home.
- If they are not properly cared for, if there is a history of negligence or issues following bylaws, or the limit could be argued to be exceeded if a person lives on the edge of town or has a large lot (perhaps more dogs in that case would be allowed)
- Maybe limit a person from having 30+ dogs... if that person has had multiple dog fights or the animals are not getting the care they need and deserve.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If the people take care and love the animals and the neighbors are not being affected, it should be allowed.
- How well they are kept is the key. Are they a nuisance to the public? Is the owner responsible by keeping yard and house clean?
- Rescue organizations that foster animals.
- If someone is a shelter worker or volunteer where these animals have no other options and the person is responsible they should be an exception. Or if someone owns their own home and has a yard etc. That should be an exception because it's their property and their lives.
- I still don't think it is your business but emotional support animals and fosters of animals. All you are going to do is have people not tell you the number they have. I don't know what you people are thinking
- depending on size of home. (if in an apartment, there is less room and NO yard. this is unfair to the animals.
- Fostering and rehabilitation
- Extenuating external circumstances. Loss of a loved one and inheritance of a pet that pushes a person past the limit (for example).
- Multiple family members or roommates living inside the home and owning the pets.
- It depends on the household, size of home, etc. Also whether the owner is able to care for them.
- No exceptions.
- Animal hoarding and health/wellbeing and cleanliness of the people/animals/residence in relation to the number of animals. The number of animals being a nuisance to neighbours.
- none
- I can't really think of anything that would justify an exception. Temporary situation?
- Licensed sanctuary's or rescue organizations. Animal foster homes (short term care)
- Foster rescued dogs and cats.
- If they bother the neighbor, or they are not being cared for (spayed neutered etc
- see above
- In the case of a registered breeder. A breeder should have to provide proof that they are in good standing with a recognized association, to help eliminate 'backyard breeders' in the city.
- It depends on the size of house and yard as well as who the owners are as pet owners
- Temporary fostering, or temporary rescuing.
- see previous comment
- No
- I dont believe that a limit is the right answer. You may discourage registration and promote poor behaviour like hoarding. Focus on health and wellbeing. Can you commit to caring for the animals and humans in your care? Financially and physically. Check ins with owners may help?
- Breeder on a farm
- Property size and home size.
- Not in a city our size.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Mostly, because in neighbourhoods that advocate for community life; it includes those of all ages and with all abilities; which begs for some to have a great advocacy to support.

- When you receive complaints, if a check on home is done and animals aren't treated well. When current owner has multi pets and there have been no complaints registered. Don't want to euthanize animals do to a number that is not representative of how the animals are cared and loved for.
- Pet sitting, when owners have to relocate and need to find a home for their pets, when the household proves it has the resources to support more pets. Really, I think the owners should be licensed, not the pet.
- Not sure if dog breeders need to be licensed as any other business. If a home owner wants to breed dogs there should be a public consultation process. We have a breeder across green belt. Do not know if they had a process to follow or need a business license.
- Grandfathered households: I wouldn't expect people to have to give up pets if a new limit was in place. Service animals: on the off chance that a number of people in a household need service animals.
- There should never be a limit. Separating families without just cause is disgusting. I can't go around taking peoples kids away just cause i dont like them. Stay out of my yard.
- You think those who have more than a number you decide are going to get rid of them then you are fooling yourself. You have no right to touch anyone's pet cause you changed your bylaw
- Fostering/rescue agencies/pup sitting
- The history of the owner should dictate. There will be some who, through prior neglect, should not have a single animal. Responsible breeders could have multiple animals in the same household without issue.
- When Family members move in with a pet, or families are taking in a pet because of death/ nursing home etc.
- I cannot think of one unless it is a temporary situation
- If an animal has a litter, if they are a foster home for pets. If they are taking care of a family or friends pet for a vacation, hospital stay, forced relocation, death in the family, etc.
- Cannot think of any...
- If some one has had a problem in the past
- First, they should be grandfathered in. No person should have to deal with their animals being taken away. Also, if they can prove they have the financial means to care for the animals, and they are in good health and condition, there should be no limit.
- A person whose pet has had a litter, making temporary increase in numbers.
- If someone has a rescue situation or puppies. (Breeder) assuming at all times the best welfare of animals
- Households that foster dogs.
- If a dog gives birth to a number of puppies they should be allowed to live in the house until they are weaned from their mom



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Hoarders, those with problem animals, those who create issues in their neighborhood with their Animals.
- not sure
- Large property, and hired help to care for animals properly
- Rescues and registered fosters if they have the man power and resources to help them in their own homes then they should be allowed to.
- If the dogs or cats are seniors above the limit they should be exempt..
- Whether or not they are taken care of properly. Nothing else matters. The City needs to let people live their lives, and as long as no human or animal is being neglected, butt out.
- None
- Fostering, rescuing, if they already have the pets. But there should NOT be a limit on # of pets. It should be a qualitative assessment based on quality of life of the animals and if it's having an effect on other people.
- Again I don't think the city should dictate how many a person can have. Maybe a selfish answer but I am a responsible pet owner and if I can afford it then I should be able to have them.
- Rentals and income
- If they are not following rules or bilaws
- If limits are in place - fostering animals
- There needs to be greater penalties and charges imposed on people who prove they are incapable of caring for pets - people with history of animal cruelty, neglect, etc. They should never be allowed to own or care for any pets.
- If their is a bylaw complaint about the household regarding noise or cleanliness
- There should not be a limit
- There shouldn't be a limit on the number just for the sake of having a limit in the first place. But if there were, then the exception should be for fosters/rescuers.
- Hoarding and threat to health and safety
- if an owner is not responsible and does not license or register
- Fostering animals.
- Shelters should never have a limit! And as I said depends on the breed. I could have 5 little chihuahuas around in a average house and decent yard without any issues.
Now 5 larger dogs I can't.
And I know that.
Depends on the individual
- Size of property, type of dogs - size of dogs
- If a person has neglected an animal, cannot provide for one, is charged with animal cruelty then the number of pet should be limited to none.
- Perhaps is multi unit apartments or townhouses.
- People who do Foster for rescues
- Why should there be a limit of they're cared for? A

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If the owners have surrendered animals for any reason or if the owners live in an attached home or condo the limit might need to be reduced
- if someone was temporarily fostering animals for a rescue organization, like Pawsitive Match.
- Previous issues with unsafe conditions or ability to responsibly look after the animals in the home
- If the space is not sufficient or if any of the needs are not being properly met by the owner.
- If you reside on a small acreage you are only allowed so many animals, so why shouldn't that pertain to persons living within the City Limits. An exception would maybe be if the animal is pregnant and a litter is born maybe a timeframe as to how long the litter is allowed to stay in the home.
- Documented inability for the person to care for their animals, continued disregard for licensing and city bylaws.
- None
- When someone is fostering. Without fostering, so many animals would be dying.
- Case by case to avoid pet hoarding issues
- Not sure - maybe if someone is caring for animals temporarily for friends on vacation, or fostering rescues temporarily?
- When a person is identified as a hoarder, when they are unable to provide the animals with regular veterinary care, or they are abusing their animals.
- Breeders must have business license; or heavily fined and considered 'breeding mills'. Where there are multiple families living together and each family has pets; the numbers should be restricted differently. Where there are duplexes sharing a yard; restrict numbers and ensure home owners are aware.
- When there are puppies/kittens.
- Not sure.
- If the owner is not caring for the in a safe, clean environment, no vet care. They have been found in violation of proper care in the past, they are backyard breeders.
- grant GRANDFATHER clause to all. grace period for everyone to licence their animals, all spay/neutered. pure breed breeders with a breeding licence to operate. if not, then they must be spay/neutered. you hold up your end of the bargain with the GRANDFATHER clause and not lie 2 us.
- Limited outdoor spaces
- If the owner is a foster for a rescue organization.
- All circumstances. Limiting how many animals people own is like limiting how many cars, hats, or TVs someone has.
- People in very large households with a lot of space; e.g. acreage or property with multiple buildings and fenced space, may be able to responsibly accommodate the care of more animals.
- Size of property, owner history.
- Hard to say, case by case basis as some might have more justification than others (litters, rescues etc.)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Anyone who has had multiple dogs in the household should be grandfathered in.
- Farm, working dogs
- again it comes down to cost of looking after a pet if you can afford it fine
- Foster homes
- There should be no limit on them unless it becomes a public health issue.
- See above
- No exception as there should be no limit. If one is put in place then foster dogs/cats should be exempt from the limit and not counted.
- I don't believe there should be a limit, the restrictions should be tougher penalties and consequences for abuse and neglect. To penalize those few that do not deserve the right to have an animal. By placing a limit on a household you are punishing the many because of a few.
- Dog sitting, training or puppies in a litter prior to leaving
- If there was a limit, should be an allowance for kittens or puppies up to a certain age before limits kick in.
- If a litter has just been delivered, people need time to wean the babies and sort out where they'll go for homes
- Rescues, PROPER breeders, and grandfathering in those who already had the dogs before the bylaw.
- More than can be financially cared for. More than can be reasonably cared for ie un-kept litter boxes/ no litter boxes. Sick or injured not seen by vet.
- Only if the owner is REGISTERED breeder. Then the limit should be only 2 adults and one litter. To be a breeder, then owners need to be licensed and pay a fee.
- If you live on an acreage-like property, if you have them for a means of living - work business (e.g. approved Pet café where patrons pay to have a drink and visit with cats, or perhaps a cat breeder, or animal agility/trick trainer/entertainer business)
- Any existing pets should be grandfathered in if changing the rules and maybe if they are just fosters they should be included
- If the owners can provide adequately and prove they do take all animals to the vet.
- IF THE ANIMALS ARE OFFERED GOOD CARE. The numbers is a superficiality that encourages hiding from the City, wastes tax dollars, and stigmatizes people providing genuine sanctuary to animals. Only respond when there's a real issue - an owner can have 1 neglected/abused pet or 8 blissful ones.
- The exception should be specific to each individual. If an individual was deemed unfit to care for X-number of pets, then that should be regulated. The bad deeds of one, should not affect the deeds of the whole.
- Breeders
- Large homes (by square footage) and large lots should be able to have exceptions.
- Registered breeder
- Registered animal daycare



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Registered dog walker

- I do not believe there should be any limits on pets in a household
- if they are under control and well cared for then why should there be a limit. I know some homes where there are 10 large dogs and they are under better control than my 2
- Only for pet rescues, trainers or pet-sitters.
- Prior non compliance by owner. Inability to properly care for pets
- Breeders, dogs participating in dog related activities, responsible owners
- Responsible breeders only who use their dog me for exhibition and purpose sports only after extensive health testing and titles are their dogs bred. Not "rescues" that steal and import dogs for sale and not backyard or puppy mill breeders designer breeders selling mutts for profit.
- Fostering. If they ate cared for properly
- If person has been deemed to be abusive they should NOT be allowed any animals.
- Stay out of my business. A limit should only apply to those who are not conscientious owners.
- If they are not licensed....but how would you know? Restrictions to condos or apartments with no yard. Limited to people with a record of not abiding by the pet bylaw.
- Professional, registered and licensed breeder
- Therapy dogs.
- If there is a fostering situation, large yard, multiple care givers, healthy home.
- Temporary exceptions for dog breeders (while raising a litter) or dog sitting services.
- Rescues and breeders. Not in town city kennels or daycares should not be permitted In Residential areas
- If animals not healthy (physically or emotionally, mentally)
- just because I think there is a reasonable number of pets to have, doesn't mean I think the city should limit the number of animals in a household. The city would be overreaching otherwise. Does the city also think it limit the number of cars or children per household?
- Inability to properly care for the pets and insure that having them does not interfere with their neighbours right to live a peaceful and undisturbed life. People who to fail to clean up after their pets - ie yards filled with animal waste - should also be limited.
- Size of house and size of dogs
- When an owner has demonstrated that they are incapable of caring for the number of animals in the household within the existing by-laws.
- A visitor to the home. Pet rescue or fostering.
- No exceptions.
- emotional support animals
- Grandfather in existing pets - give people a chance to license them all prior to implementing rules, etc.
- With a permit (higher fees) and regular un-announced inspections.
- If there is a true concern for the well-being of the animals. However again this could even be one animal so number doesn't always matter.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- For fostering for a licensed rescue within the city and not for personal possession. Or temporary pet sitting
- If cats are strictly indoor cats.
- If cats are siblings; perhaps if the dogs are very small more than 2 would be acceptable.
- Any sign that pets are a problem or nuisance to neighbours or in poor health or neglected should trigger bylaw enforcement.
- This varies by household and the caregiver ability to properly care for an animal responsibly and in accordance with bylaws.
- Temporary care- if it's 6 all the time (even if they're turning over) that seems like too many! But occasionally have more, if managed properly, may be fine.
- Large house, breeder, foster home for animals, etc. Case by case basis though
- None. No exceptions.
- Well, if there are lots of people living in the household. For example, multigenerational (a grandparent with a few animals moves into their (adult) children's home and there are already 4 or 5 animals). Perhaps consider more for people fostering animals for a registered and legitimate rescue org.
- Does the person have the capacity to provide for a high quality of life for all animals under care? Love, time, money, space to run, essentials of life amply provided: food, water, shelter, waste regularly collected etc...
Is there independent evidence of that?
- One litter only.
- Daycare for dogs/cats
- Licensed Breeders or Fosters
- If it is a rescue, fosters or care facility, Legit breeders (not puppy mill)
- no exception
- Type of home, ie condo living.
- Licensed breeders, other businesses related. Again I don't think you should have a limit on number. So I can't really answer the question
- Hoarding and neglect situations should be handled differently than average pet households. That should fall under abuse and a criminal offence. Those types should have limits and be closely monitored for the animals well being. Or animals are removed and rehomed if situation is out of control
- Temporary situations such as dog sitting, fosters or breeders waiting for puppies to get bigger to sell.
- Anytime it seems reasonable. Perhaps when fostering, for example. Keep an eye on this in case there are folks running puppy mills, though.
- if it is a rescue that is able to handle and look after the dogs. sometimes it is hard to find fosters. and if you limit the amount of dogs to each house. it could make it even harder for them to get fosters.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Homes that own and foster animals, there should still be a limit but higher since some animals are short term stays. Responsible home breeders, family melding situations should have a "grandfathered in" rule.
- Breeders should have allowance.
- Properly trained/licensed breeders, rescue situations, if there is enough space and food for all animals, if it is not creating a dangerous situation, if the owner is experienced/trained and willing to have checks done on the animal's welfare
- Fostering, or breeder under the responsible breeders act.
- I don't believe there should be a limit unless people have a history of neglect or abuse.
- None
- When fostering animals or when taking in another pet due to unforeseen circumstances. If it's not a permanent situation there should be exceptions
- If it is a small space without a backyard
- I don't believe there should be, to an extent. Like stated prior, it shouldn't matter how many pets there are, as long as everyone follows bylaws and pets are healthy and well taken care of (including sprays and neuters). If that isn't being followed, NO animals should be allowed in that household.
- I think dog professionals (daycare owners, dog walkers, trainers, rescues, etc) should have a much higher limit (I think 10) because they are professionals; they know what they're doing and they are helping animals which is awesome!
- Attached vs detached housing - attached having lower limits.
Size of yard available for dogs to use.
- I don't think people should be able to own multiple dogs for breeding purposes so only spayed/neutered animals should be exception for limit
- Same as answer above. Regular vet visits maybe a requirement to ensure all cats and dogs are in good health and up-to-date with vaccines and spay and neuter
- Financial reasons
- Condos, apartments, 4 plexes, places with no yard.....
- See #5.
- Foster homes
- No limit to dogs unless it's a breeder.
Lifetime bans on animal abusers. No more of this small fine for animal torture ridiculousness.
- Condos/apartment buildings etc. If a person has not proven them to be a responsible pet owner. I think there should be an exception to allow people to have a higher number of animals if they are fostering for a rescue agency.
- In situations where people are fostering dogs and/or cats, then it should be allowable to have a number that the household can maintain safely.
- Emergency situations, temporary boarding and the occasional breeding of registered purebred animals. If the bylaw changes to restrict numbers, the owners should be able to keep the ones they have (grandfathered) at the time the law come into effect.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If earning income, boarding, grooming etc., dogs or cats not owned by household may increase numbers for income purposes only, not for love of pets.
- See above
- Fostering, litters
- Breeding and maybe lot size of property
- If the home is filthy and an unhealthy environment then I would say an exception is needed.
- Small homes
- People should be allowed to have as many as they are able to properly care for - giving proper love, affection, food, water, shelter and enrichment with health and safety concerns covered for all people and pets. .
- Neighbour complaints about excessive noise/smells, vet concerns about animal wellbeing
- Fostering, no matter how long - some animals take more time to rehab
- If they are not cared for properly or not spayed and neutered
- If a limit ends up being set, then owners who have already licensed dogs/cats above the limit should be grandfathered. If no limit is set but an owner is found to have dogs/cats in a hoarding situation or they are not adequately caring for the multiple animals in their care, they should have a limit
- Any limit should be grandfathered and animals being fostered should not be part of the limit.
- As an avid dog lover and foster for multiple rescues. Limiting the amount of dogs one can own/have is detrimental.

I also would like to add that non residents of Calgary should have zero say in this.

- Circumstances where the animals are being looked after appropriately. As in being fed, walked and loved etc. Not being neglected. Foster moms and dads should have a special amount to have in their homes as long as they are being well looked after.
- ONLY if the individual owner is abusing or neglecting animals. I live in Didsbury with a limit of 2 dogs and am selling my house to move to Calgary because of how forward thinking it is and so that I can resume registering my dogs! Didsbury is losing my business because of their backwards thinking.
- When people already own these animals, are a rescue or breeder. Don't make people choose which pets to keep and which to give up, would you do that to a family that has 6 or more kids...oh pick your favorites and the rest...see yeah. Not logical to pose on Calgarians
- If they have a good reputation for caring for them well. Fostering rescues. Running a dog sitting business from the home.
- See above
- puppies/kittens, a proven responsible breeder.
- Under application and review of city and bylaw
- If there is a hoarding situation or if the person has had animal issues before
- None
- Exception if the owner can't care for them and they are living in inhumane conditions
- A licensed breeder that has puppies or kittens.
A short stay from a pet that does not reside there



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should not be a limit. Rather, clear expectations about care, training and behaviour.
- in rural areas.
- More if approved as a reputable, licensed and trusted breeder
- none
- If there is a bylaw change, anyone who already has multiple pets should be allowed to keep them.
- Perhaps for people that are fostering (approved and licensed!) and trainers.
- I don't believe a limit on the number of pets making a difference to animal health and well-being. It would also make fostering difficult/impossible.
- Temporary pets eg. fostering, dogsitting
- Looking at houses with separate suites, each suite should be considered separately if the secondary suite is a legal registered suite with the City.
- Local pet rescues rely on fostering animals in temporary homes. If household pet limits are as low as 2-3 pets, some people will be unable to foster because they own pets and cannot take in any more. Even if fostering can be viewed as an exception - this could make the process more complicated.
- Size of home and property. Proper care and attention given to the pets. Someone at home for the pets during the day.
- If the household is licensed for home boarding.
- People who are professionals and people who have the time and resources for the pet.
- the number of people in the household who are responsible to look after the pet.
- When someone is a registered foster with an animal rescue (like me!) they can have up to a certain amount based on the square footage of their home.
- difficult to state a limit as circumstances between households vary greatly. I've stated numbers above as what is reasonable, but I'm not in favour of a limit under a bylaw
- Licensed breeder
Fostering animals until they can be adopted
- Short Term foster/rescue care. Legal breeders who will be adopting out puppies within a reasonable time eg: six-eight weeks old
- I don't think there should be a hard limit as long as all the animals have ample space, attention, and care.
- When someone is known to the law and who keeps getting fined for certain things relating to dogs, cats etc. If they have an illegal operation regarding animals as well
- Foster care
- none
- When people are fostering animals -- especially in emergency situations.
- Fostering or breeding
- Based on the size of property
- None



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If a person can provide proof of extraordinary care and training, and minimal disruption to others there should be no reason they can't have additional animals.
- Multiple confirmed complaints by bylaw. But I feel it is necessary that bylaw confirms citizen complaints as without verification, these can't be considered valid.
- Proof of responsibility. And the regular checks on them. Exceptions creat loop holes for hoarders and such.
- If the pet is cared for properly, not causing damage or harm, there shouldn't be any restrictions
- Maybe for a multi family dwelling
- Breeders of purebred animals, especially those who actively participate in events or shows with their animals to promote the responsible breeding and keeping, and using of those animals in jobs and services
- If you are a reg breeder with the Canadian Kennel club. You may have a litter or two a year and therefore will have the pups till they are a t least 12 weeks old and up to 6 months
- Permaently or temporarily? If you've got a few dogs and you have guests stay temporarily and they have some dogs, that shouldn't put you out of compliance. Exceptions could be made for people who dog-sit for a living or side-incime. Maybe for people who volutarily foster rescues as well.
- Canadian Kennel Club Registered breeders should be exempt from a dog limit
- Responsible breeder households
- The exception to dogs would be if someone had a large piece of property for the dogs and excess income to provide for them also
- Rural area or home size
- Individuals qualifying or receiving low income benefits, individuals solely in CPP, or unable to work.
- If the owner does not comply to animal safety and welfare. Some people think that they are doing good by having more rescues/pets but they are overestimating their capacity. Unless a show/champion preservation reputable breeder, everyone else should have spayed and neutered animals.
- Breeder or rescue. Or proof of responsible care. le vets , cleanliness.
- Responsible owners who have achieved Canine Good Neighbour certificate with their dog, or other CKC titles. Responsible breeders of CKC registered dogs who maintain CKC standards of ethics. Responsible breeders of registered cats. Responsible owners of cats who provide safe outdoor and indoor space.
- If responsible and ethical breeder are breeding. However animals should have access to food 2x daily and water 24/7 including requirement to vaccinations and flea/tick/worm preventions
- There shouldnt be a limit. This is something that if the person is responsible and taking care of their animals why does it matter how many they have
- Responsible breeders should be an exception to any limits. Multiple neighbour complaints about barking, odour or waste should trigger an evaluation of the exception.
- Those who are unable to properly care for themselves first, unable to provide the safety and well-being of their pet, those who are unable to keep a clean and healthy environment



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Only if the owner has a history of noncompliance to the bylaws, resulting in repeated fines or other corrective actions.
- If you want more than the limit, you should have to apply for a kennel license explaining why you want more. The application would be reviewed by a board consisting of qualified personnel ie trainers,
- When breeders are proven to be responsible, with well cared for animals, tidy properties and are breeding purebred REGISTERED dogs & cats
- If other by-laws are being observed ie, noise, picking up after pets, leash laws, fed, watered, sheltered, I don't believe there should be a limit. Responsible people should not be limited.
- Breeders will own more dogs or cats than the typical city limit as they raise a litter. They own breeding aged and retired animals.
- People who are reputable breeders
- Fostering or breeder
- If they are responsible breeder and have the resources to pay for them and not being abused
- There should be no limit period. You can be just as shitty an owner with 1 pet as you can with 5+, and just as responsible with 5+ as you can be with 1.
- There should not be a limit. If there is a limit, proof of being a responsible breeder (registration with a kennel club) should allow more dogs, or some additional screening possibly.
- In the area of zoning where there are staff to enforce zoning bylaws. Private ownership of property where the owners can enforce the numbers ie rental.. do not use public money to enforce something that is not currently a problem. Money can be better spent endorsing Real criminal activity!
- When someone has been convicted of animal abuse/neglect, they should not be allowed to have any pets. Rescues should be allowed to take in any amount of pets they can handle and/or foster out to willing families. Limiting pets leads to shelters being full, higher stray animals on the loose.
- A fostering situation, a breeder, providing they are breeding one dog or cat at a time and not cages and cages of them.
- A CKC registered breed "kennel".
- For dogs responsible and ethical breeders should have the opportunity to prove themselves in order to keep their breeding stock but the city could benefit by breeders having to complete some kind of test/home inspection to be allowed to continue breeding. It would help weed out backyard breeders.
- If the owner is not proven to be a responsible owner (RO)
The definition of the RO must be very concise.
- Hoarding....Also the basis for defining this needs to be carefully examined based on circumstances.
- breeder or rescue
- Responsible CKC registered breeders need to be able to take back animals they breed. Returned animals that don't work out. Death or illness of a pet owner. This keeps them out of the shelter which is psychologically damaging for animals. Breeder is better able to evaluate and find proper homes



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If numbers not limited no exceptions required. Calgary has always maintained numbers don't matter. I hope they continue to be a pet friendly city and not get bullied in to changing what really isn't an issue.
- I do not think there should be a restriction.
- No
- Size of house, size of dogs, capability of owner to control their animals
- Rescuing, fostering and breeding
- If the human cannot manage the health and well being of the animals in their care.
- Always until proven otherwise
- For reputable breeders. If you aren't a puppy mill you won't have a lot of breeding dogs however until puppies are sold you may have more than 12
- Breeders should be allowed to have more cats/dogs as they often have puppies/it tends for a short time. The breeder should be reputable and belong to the CKC or other to ensure animals are not part of a puppy mill.
- I do not support household limits.
- Member of Canadian kennel club, purebred dogs
- There should not be a limit. If they are looked after its fine. If a person has one and they are not looked after that is a bigger problem. If someone is found guilty of animal abuse, they should be banned from any animal ownership for the rest of their life..
- Why impose a limit if all animals are being cared for properly and not a nuisance to their neighbors.
- Registered breeders
- Foster homes
- When there are signs that the owners cannot handle it such as sight of messy lawn.
- breeders, rescue organizations working from home and foster homes.
- The person is a foster, breeder, trainer, or has the appropriate education on caring for those animals
- If an owner has previous convictions of animal cruelty or behavior issues (pet is causing harm or distress to general public). Then a limit should be imposed.
- Rentals.
- When someone has demonstrated unexceptable care of animals.
- If the owners are not physically or mentally able to care. Homes without fenced yards. People with multiple bylaw offenses or any singular case of animal abuse.
- Breeders
- None except farms, outside city limits
- Rescues and fosters.
- When the owner has proven they are able to provide vet care and responsible household management (no injuries from infighting, all animals are appropriate weight, all animals are reasonably trained, no unplanned breeding, all animals are housetrained) to all animals. Require a vet reference?
- Reputable Breeders, Doggy Daycares



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- All purebred breeders (registered dogs) know how to maintain their households and only keep what is a controllable number.
- Qualified breeders
- In home boarding or professionals.
- those who are fostering for rescues and more than one family in the home. (ie combining households
- People who show or exhibit dogs should be able to keep dogs that they are planning to show
- Responsible breeders/kennels,homes that actively work their dogs,etc
- As above, people with additional training and skill should be allowed more
- If you are a CKC breeder and take good care of your animals.
- Responsible breeder or responsible foster home
- Service Dog training, Canadian Kennel Club breeding
- Responsible breeders and groomers.
- The only circumstance I could see is for Breeders who are Registered with the City or province AND the CKC
- Not being taking care of, living conditions are horrible. Or if they are show dogs and are out with a handler, and all the dogs do not live in the house but are there for a few months.
- If the owner can honestly afford having more animals,
- Let me clarify I don't believe the city should be imposing limits!
- if your caring for an animal while their owners are away. If you foster animals for a short period. If your animal gives birth.
- If not cared for properly, do not clean up after them & mistreat should be restricted to less. Fosters & registered breeders should be allowed more than what the limit might be. Grandfather for those who currently have more than what the limit might be. Pet sitting allowmore (prof & 4 family/friend)
- If the person is short term fostering through a rescue. or is a registered breeder.
- Grandfather the current number so no one is having pets removed due to a new law; breeders (see conditions above); foster pets as they are not owned by the people fostering them (with proof of ownership by the rescue, still having a limit apply - like limit of 6 in household whether pet or foster)
- For breeders and fostering
- The city shouldn't be dictating
- No right to dictate
- There shouldnt. Be limit. Or limits based on individual households. Dogs in a house should be trained , excersized and vetted
- Responsible registered Ckc breeders with registered kennels, or training facility. Or a foster/shelter home with regular inspections.
- When a responsible breeder has a litter of puppies. This doesn't happen every month. Sometimes it might happen once a year or less
- Breeders should be able to have more dogs/cats for their program.
People with animal neglect, ect. charges should not be able to have any pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- People should be free to have as many pets as they like. Government should not be in the business of policing this. If maltreatment occurs then step in. Do we limit the amount of children people have ?
- Basic needs not being met, abuse and neglect, hoarding.
- Breeders/ accidental pregnancies fostering litters of puppies
- A responsible breeder should not be limited.
- Hoarding situations (more in cats than dogs.) Ability to properly care for multiple animals - i.e. proper food & clean water; fenced area for bathroom outside (dogs); proper number of litter boxes for cats; if caged, cages must be appr size & cages should not be main area of keeping animal. CLEAN.
- Responsible pet owners/rescues and breeders should be allowed more dogs. They should be on a case per case basis. Or if a loss of a family member that had a pet and you were the only one who could care for it without it being surrendered.
- Apartment buildings and people who have been deemed incapable of proper care of animals.
- REGISTERED breeders with CKC for dogs, TICA OR CFA for cats or accredited rescues.
- Dog competition trainers and handlers. These dogs get the best care (as I outlined above)
- when a new law is brought in and someone already has the limited number over
- Breeders
- Only when the owners are unable to manage them properly
- If someone is working to foster for a rescue, a breeder with valid membership in the CKC or UKC, someone with a litter of puppies or kittens.
- Under no exception should there be a limit.
- Of they belong to a rescue or foster foundation
- If the owners cannot afford vet bills, food, etc then they should be limited.
- Registered breeders should have the option to be reviewed for pack size based on accommodations to adequately keep and care for their pack.
- Show performance, serious sport involvement or working dog environments may deserve flexibility in numbers.
A boarding kennel also should have close supervision and regulation!!
- There is only a small amount of offenders. There are people who won't follow the rules anyway. So why add regulations to all the other people who reasonable to their pet ownership.
- Foster families who hold animals pending forever homes, fostering puppies/kittens as they are often born in numbers greater than 3. Temporary animal sitting circumstances
- That they are a registered breeder with Canadian Kennel club or nation cat club.
- Breeders that are responsible should not be limited to a number. But seriously - nobody should be limited. It is all about looking after your animal properly!
- None
- Only if one is a CKC registered breeder and would have puppies for the short amount of time required til the pups reach the age of going to their new homes.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Registered, reputable breeders. Breeders should be members in good standing of the Canadian Kennel Club, and be able to provide veterinary records/health test results for all breeding dogs in the home.
- There are many responsible dog breeders in this country — people who health test their animals before breeding, raise puppies in a careful manner and find responsible homes. This supplies the public with a source of carefully bred and raised puppies. Allow this to continue without undue hardship.
- Mental health
- If the person has a kennel license.
- Households should not be limited it is like putting a limit on how many children you can have, as long as people are caring for the animals and have the means to do so leave them alone.
- You can't safely have 50 cats and dogs in a household unless you're in a gigantic house or acreage, so it would take more time to actually discuss this to decide.
- If you are a known hoarder.
- Breeding
- There shouldn't be an exception.. What I wrote is generous. For breeders they shouldn't have an excess of dogs as they won't be properly loved and cared for if they have to many
- Small breeders -- to adequately ensure genetic mixing a breeder requires at least two males and three females, with young animals constantly being brought in/rotated out -- this should be at the breeder's discretion, and not municipally controlled.
- Complaints from neighbours or other concerned citizens.
- Foster homes and licensed and ethical breeders.
- If there are issues and they cannot be controlled. If you cannot walk all your dogs at once without incident then any number should be allowed.
- An exception would be for reasonable breeding purposes or those households who participate in dog related venues such as sledding, conformation and other dog related activities.
- I think kennel licensing should be offered, so long as conditions are met.
- Responsible breeders, dog/cat sitters watching an animal(s) for friends or family
- If their animals are not licensed, they are not providing proper medical, physical, mental care for the animals, they should be limited in the number of pets in their home.
- Off topic. There was an attack as one large dog had the other dogs head in his jaws and the dog walker had a difficult time prying it open. She was bloodied and one of her 10 dogs ran away. Kids on trampoline were told, days later, DO NOT LOOK AT THEM!! DO NOT LOOK AT THEM!! They wanted to attack.
- Rescue groups, adoption volunteers and rehoming and foster homes
- How they are looked after.
"Owner responsibility".
- Service needs. Self training when and if one washes, them it is very hard to rehome to get your next. You have such a strong bond to them working so closely.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

If you are caring for them accordly then there should be no problems.

- mouse infestation, security
- Responsible breeders and owners.
- If the animals are being mistreated due to numbers.
- Breeders who are not licensed to do so. AB has so many supposed “breeders” that are cashing in for \$\$\$. Selling sick /unsocialized dogs/cats . This should include ppl in rural areas . Having more than 3 dogs is too much IMO.
- If the person is unable to manage their basic needs. The animals need to have mental stimulation as well and food and housing.
- If that person has been convicted of an offence against animals, and as such has been restricted from owning pets. Otherwise, stay out of it and leave people alone. Free country?? Really?? I can't even believe this survey exists! Ridiculous
- When the owner of the home is unable to care for them in a healthy way.
- Breeders of CKC registered dogs could have more on a case by case basis. With veterinary inspection of the premises to ensure that the increased numbers have adequate housing and care. Basically a kennel license. This was done years ago in Winnipeg.
- Some foster situations, in the case of a litter of puppies or kittens, if there is adequate proof that the animals are well cared for (not just provided with shelter, water and food).
- A litter of pups/kittens. In the rare case more than 2 family members need a service dog
- If animals are not being cared for properly.
- I do not support limits, however responsible hobby breeders should be exempt from this rule. But again Calgary has been a shining example across North America as well written and enforced animal bylaws . I see absolutely no reason why Calgary needs to change its animal bylaws.
- Foster homes should have an exception.
- breeding facilities (only regulated ones)
- If there is adequate space; i.e. an acreage or a farm, they have the space to allow for more animals.
- If they're a breeder or rescue a dog or cat from a shelter. There are problems with rescue animals and there being so many strays that if someone can provide a loving home and proper care it shouldn't be an issue.
- Many communities have a "hobby kennel" license that allows breeder to have a higher number of adult dogs and any number of RELATED puppies under 4 months of age. This licence moves with the owner, so the community can track complaints(or lack thereof).
- Breeders are at times going to have more animals
- Canadian Kennel club member breeders need the ability to keep their breeding stock. Many donT want to be forced to place their older show/breeding dogs just because they want to continue a generation. Many of us like to keep our dogs for the entirety of their lives. It's responsible.
- Breeders/breeding.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Responsibility is up to the owner and if not taken care of them they be removed and/or surrendered. The dog's well-being and veterinary care should depend upon the owner of the animal and their veterinarian. Yearly check-ups with the vet should decide whether the animal is being well cared for.
- Licensed breeders (2 adults plus one litter maximum) or rescue foster homes (4 animals maximum over the age of 3 months with an exception for fostering moms with new litters).
- Only in the instance of a fully licensed and monitored breeder or shelter. Both those should be CLOSELY monitored considering the tragic consequences in past of numerous animals in poor living conditions and bad health. And NO chickens or farm animals in yards ... or we WILL end up like China.
- breeders, trainers, working animals, large families.
- An unreasonable square footage of inside and/or outside living/exercise area to accommodate the pets
Indoor/outdoor Hygiene issues, provisions or vet care re necessities of life.
- Breeders should automatically be exempt. Reputable breeders dogs are RARELY a problem. It's the back yard mutt producers and the "rescue" groups that often produce the most problems. Having multiple dogs from iffy or unknown backgrounds is just asking for trouble.
- Medical reasons or for therapy. Each situation is different.
- registered breeders, daycares/homes etc
- Registered breeders who are breed club members, not just registered with CKC. There are many backyard breeders and puppy mill operators in the CKC
- If the person can't properly take care of their pets or their environment.
- If you are a responsible breeder, you would most likely exceed 5 (especially if you had a litter of puppies/kittens), so that should be taken into consideration.
- When the owner is not able to humanely care for the animals and when they aren't adhering to the bylaws.
- If you are a breeder registered with the Canadian Kennel Club, your breeding animals are fully health tested, each animal is CKC registered
- Kennel name license from the CKC...proof of well maintained animals, inspections within reason to prove the animals care
- If the family is able to meet the physical/mental and space needs of more.
- Service / support animals, foster animals.
- If it gets to be out of hand like a hoarding situation
- Registered breeders (not backyard breeders) and obviously rescues
- If you are a breeder, you will occasionally have a litter, possible hold one or 2 back for a short time to evaluate.
- Puppies/kittens under 10 weeks
- taking care of them for short terms friends or agencies waiting for adoption
- When charged with abuse to animals or hoarding. Poor welfare in animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None. If animals are being neglected or behaviour is a problem, enforce other existing legislation related to noise complaints, safety or waste management.
- A licensed breeder or someone who fosters dogs &/or cats
- If animals are suffering then SPCA needs to actually enforce the law, not just oversee it.
- the amount really doesn't matter. It's how responsible a person is regarding their animals is the concern.
- When the owner is not caring for the animals properly.
- Breeders often have more dogs on their homes.
- none
- I think if they're a registered, reputable breeder who health tests and is trying to better/improve the breed that they're working with. I believe that in this case, there should be an exception, but there should still be strict bylaws in place to ensure it doesn't get out of hand (no puppy mills).
- As a responsible breeder, dog trainer/walker, occasional dog-sitter (non-professional etc. watching neighbours dogs on holidays), show dogs, able to register their animals and receiving an official exemption to the rule proving why they should be allowed to have more for any above reasons.
- If the owner has proven that they are responsible and their pets are responsible. Maybe request that at least half of the dogs in their ownership have passed CGN or equivalent tests (SPOT, CGC). I'm honestly not super familiar with cats, but I think it would be fair to request photos of animal areas.
- Known criminals animal abusers dog fighting
- Grandfathered in, if a household currently already has let's say 4 dogs if those rule gets made then they should be able to keep their animals.
- Breeder/fanciers
- Homes of CKC members that breed registered, Canadian Kennel Club breeds, for dogs and the same registering body for cats.
- Company from out of town visiting with their pets
- When reports of abuse, hoarding or negligence are there.
- Breeding, one litter of puppies temporarily allowed in a household
- Service animal
- small residence, line of work. people should not keep animals if they work out of town for extended periods.
- licensed registered ethical breeders that show etc.
Possible short term foster for animal rescue situations
- If there is more than one person who is the pet's master. If the owner has professional background with animal handling.
- Foster homes and litters of puppies as well as service animals
- If they aren't being taken care of. If dogs are barking and being a nuisance to neighbours.
- All circumstances - there really shouldn't be legislation about the 'number' of pets. It is the care received that is important. We have laws against animal neglect/cruelty. Enforce them, be it 1 pet or 100 pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If a females is pregnant and has puppies, but then you sell the puppies and go back to two dogs.
- With a specialty licence for breeders 9r rescues
- Can't take care of them and/ or provide the necessary care for life
- Yes. Responsible breeders should be able to file for an exemption, but only after meeting certain specifications.
- If someone is HOARDING pets without proper care and training to have an abundance of unlicensed pets that are not spayed or neutered or receiving proper vet care.
- None, no exceptions.
- Breeders, rescue homes and foster homes should be an exception to a limit.
- If it's a foster pet, foster homes have the training and due diligence to keep a home clean and animals under control
- When the owner can no longer provide proper care and management
- Mistreatment of animals should result in a ban on pets.
- Preservation breeders
- Registered breeders
- Working dogs, and reputable breeders of quality registered animals.
- An exception can be made for a properly certified CKC/AKC breeder or a properly certified trainer be it for therapy or obedience.
- No number restriction unless animals are not being cared for according to existing bylaws.
- Ckc registered breeders who can prove registration and obey all codes of ethics of the ckc and their parent club.
- Square footage of dogs personal space, per dog (like livestock pasture allotment)
- If animals are well looked after and fed well and get enough exercise. Don't know rules for breeders.
- Foster homes for rescued animals.
- Breeders, people in the veterinary industry and rescues should be able to apply for exceptions
- None
- If the house is big enough and the owner has resources to provide for all the animals.
- All animals should be well cared for, in good health and regularly visit the vet.
- Responsible, CKC registered, purebred, well bred, animals from fantastic local breeders. Also, when people foster animals, they could temporarily handle an extra for those periods I think.
- A notice of assessment calculations
- If they have had any complaints to by-law in the past that were proven, or many complaints by more than 2 complaintents in separate households or more than one visit from by-law
- If neglect or abuse is found at the house then yes, there should be a limit or ban for that person.
- For reputable breeders to keep the purebred bloodlines to continue
- Someone who is a breeder. But they should have a special permit with bylaw that allows them to have more than the legal limit
- Careful breeders of working, show, performance dogs.
- Where there is a connection to a rescue organisation there should be no limit.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Get out of people's faces, period.

- If fostering rescued animals
- When an animal has a litter and you are raising the young. When you are fostering animals. When you are training an animal either as a guide dog or support dog.
- I don't think limits should be set.
- Breeding
- If you live in a condo. If your pets are repeatedly causing issues.
- If the animals are not taken care of properly
- Reputable breeders, they take the time and energy that is needed to effectively own more than the limit, and generally spend a lot of money doing so as well
- Apartments, people who are elderly, or terminally ill
- CKC registered breeders should be able to apply for an exemption & be allowed to have multiple animals. This enables them to continue breeding healthy animals & take back a dog they have bred if the owner is not able to care for the animal.
- A very responsible caring owner that has been vetted by bylaw services to get the exception and regular checks from bylaw to ensure they are adhering to the rules
- If service animals are needed
- If someone can obtain a licence for breeding? Therapy dogs/ pets? Prove that they are adequately looked after.
- There should be no limits on dog/cat numbers.
If there is a limit, exceptions should include foster animals and also responsible pet owners who apply to have more than the limit.
- A reputable breeder often has more dogs than an average person.
- People that are irresponsibly breeding (no kennel club, health testing of animals, jobs or titles for animals.) People with aggressive animals (many could be too much to manage properly,) and people with outdoor cats.
- An owner who demonstrates proper animal husbandry for whatever number of animals, has a reason for higher numbers, and the facility to care for those higher numbers.
- Maybe foster care/verified registration, showing that there is 2 or more persons with the animals 16 hours a day or more a day.
- Within city limits I don't think there should be an exception, besides additional pets brought by short term visitors.
- Space, size of dog,
- If someone has been proven to overexert themselves to the detriment of an animal. First offense of sub-optimal care determined by a vet (not abuse) should limit the person to 1-2 pets. 2nd offense, none.
- Some people are breeders and will briefly have multiple puppies in the home.
- Breeders need an exception and perhaps foster homes for rescues



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- When someone chooses to foster an animal (please get foster city licenses); or when there is a service animal.
- Breeders, kennels, dog or cat professionals of any kind should be granted exemptions to the 'pet' limit.
 1. known foster households during peak rescue periods.
 2. reputable purebred dog breeders (not backyard breeders cross breeding willy nilly)
- House size
Owner's ability to care for animals
- Foster families for rescue organizations. These groups need all the help they can get to deal with the homeless animal population, especially during breeding season. They are a valuable community resource for spay/neuter/adoption.
- Short term care is needed.
- Again see answer to number 5 . Also if you live on an acreage and can still licence and provide Medical needs ie. vaccinations than the number of animals can be increased.
- I don't know that there should be exceptions.
- Very rare circumstances that I can't imagine right now.
- service dogs are the only thing I can think of.
People have not proven themselves responsible enough
- I think if you were a licensed pet sitter, or just looking after someone's pets for a short period of time, or if your pet has puppies/kittens and it's not feasible to separate them.
- Breeders, competitive sport people, rescues with fosters
- Breeders, competitive sport people, foster homes with rescues
- There should be no limit. Quality of care is what's important - not numbers.
- Mixed dwelling (condos, townhouse etc).
- This is a slippery slope and I don't agree with a limit. I have had multiple pets in the past, and have friends who have multiple pets. Whether it's one or more, they all need to receive the care they deserve. There are plenty of owners of single pets who should not have even one.
- Professional breeders, trainers, People that raise and train show dogs and competitive dogs.
- Fostering, but if someone were to have beyond the limit of animals they should be have discussions/permission from neighbors. If noise/smell becomes an issue they should respect noise bylaws and neighbors requests for changes to the situation.
- Past owner irresponsible behavior should have a zero limit. Having a pet is a privilege and not a right.
- if u decide to cap, city to grant GRANDFATHER clause to everyone, provide written guarantee that all animals licensed are guaranteed the GRANDFATHER clause for those animals.
- If you are running a dog daycare/overnight business in your home.
- Larger homes or yards, say homes over 2,300 square feet.
- breeder or foster home
- Condos, apartments and tighter congested housing units.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If there have been issues with hoarding or neighborhood complaints
- It's nobody's business how many animals a household can own as long as they have the means to take care of them and are not abusing them. There's already too many animals in shelters that can go into good homes, limiting ownership will just make the problem worse.
- When there is a litter of puppies or kittens or an animal care business.
- None.
- If the house hold is a responsible breeder or owner
- If they are backyard breeding
- ie: litters needing time at and following birth and/or housing for homeless animals under consideration.
- Pure bred breeders need exceptions
- There shouldn't be a limit unless those animals are unwell.
- When someone can reasonably care for all needs of the animals within their care. Not just food and shelter but stimulation training that villes cleanliness and that sort of stuff. As well as having enough space for them.
- breeding for a short periods until the puppies are ready to be sold ie eight weeks
- Service animals. Fostering animals while they are awaiting adoption.
- If an animal has a litter of young. you would not euthanize the extras. If spay and neuter is mandatory this would not be an issue. Many hoarding situations could be reduced if mandatory spay/neuter were in place. Individual permits for larger number could be considered. Limit breeding strictly.
- Cleaniness
- A farm or an achrage where there's lots of room
- History of Abuse
- - pet sitting
- - live rural area
- - less neighbours
- - support animals
- - well trained
- Exceptions would make the bylaw less clear, so better to avoid having exceptions.
- special service dogs / breeder licences / short term new litters to a certain age.
- No circumstances. Firm numbers are more easily managed by the City Admin. Wiggle room becomes just that and therefore not easily managed.
- Combining households / families can result in multiple pets. Keep them with family versus having to rehome or adopt out just because of a bylaw or rule on total number
- Exceptions just lead to more people bending the rules with are broken anyways. Whats going to stop someone from having 8 dogs but only registering 2?
- Healthy environment, proper care, noise issues etc.
- Some owners can handle one more responsibly.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement
June 29, 2020

- Can't think of anything.
- Fostering
- If there are more responsible people in a household to train, exercise and keep their pets content then so be it.
- For a reasonable time after a litter is born.
Professional trainers or breeders
People who take in strays to socialize them and prepare them for adoption provided an animal by law officer is persuaded that the person is both competent and genuine
Folk who live on acreages and farms
- Not sure. I suppose there could be commercial breeding operations, but I would not want to encourage puppy mills or cat equivalent.
- babies
- The larger your house the more you can have. It also depends on what your business is and/or you run it from home
- People who foster animals, crazy cat ladies, pet breeders.
- I don't see a circumstance for an exception. I suppose if dog or cat has a litter but there should be a time limit to reduce to the limit.
- None. A limit of two "traditional" pets (i.e. cats and dogs) should also apply to so-called "foster homes" for animals. I have no problem with people taking in abused or abandoned animals, provided that they understand that these are transition arrangements if they have a pet of their own already.
- A household with 5+ blind people probably needs 5+ service dogs...
- If there is more than 2 blind or otherwise handicapped people that require dog assistance to function.....
- If the number is temporary - e.g. temporary dogsitting, maybe fostering. Also, if the animals are approved therapy animals.
- Whether or not that space can handle the number of pets in the space without issue to their or owner's health.
- If cats are kept inside, then the number of cats could increase, but not if cats are allowed to roam free – then they kill birds and also make a mess in other people’s yards. I can’t see a reason to allow for more dogs, since they are usually allowed out into a yard to poop.

Licensing

Primary reason for not licensing cats

- No retail place should sell animals, this isn't china. Regulations should be placed on breeders and encouragement in adoption should be paramount. Many Calgary homes are big enough for a cat at least. Chip all pets and prosecute abusers.
- To avoid the fee. This should not be tolerated. People who do this should be fined, put on a ban list, and have their animals removed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- My cat never leaves the house, why would I spend money yeraly to licence them when they never leave the house?
- Cost? They see now benefit from having one?
- cost, or cat does not go outdoors
- Not essential, doesn't provide much benefit for indoor cats.
- Cats are indoor pets. Those who don't are probably responsible enough to know this. Also, have you ever collared a cat? Some just WON'T wear one no matter how much you try. What a waste of money licensing a cat is, when he won't even wear the dumb thing.
- Likely that they don't typically let the cat out and therefore don't see a need to licence them. OR they don't know that they do have to licence them.
- low income or they think it wont get outside.
- ignorance, or lack of responsibility, laziness, or even a lack of care for the animals they own. So many reasons not to unfortunately. Cat owners that let their cats roam may not license either so there are no repercussions for their choices.
- Cats stay at home so they might think that there is no need to do so as cat won't get lost or anything like that.
- cost
- Its impossible to enforce.
- They think it is unnecessary, are unaware of the requirement, or do not know what the cost of licensing pays for or how it benefits them
- Lazy + lack of education. Necessary.
- Pure selfishness. Feel rules don't apply to them. Fine these people
- If the cat is inside all the time you shouldn't have to license it
- Money grabber, why do we need to do this? Most animals now are being chipped so whats the point.
- Cost
- Responsible pet owners probably don't let their cats outside and don't think the City needs to know about them. Or they may not know how or know that they need to.
- Irresponsibility or financial hardship.
- Expensive and pointless. What is the city giving in return? No off leash parks to fund like you do with dogs, and the people who actually care about their cat being returned microchip already, a vet office can return the pet without city involvement.
- my cats are indoor pets and have chips in their ears which provides owner information. if they are outside, they are on a leash and under supervision
- Lack of enforcement means no consequence for not licensing.
- Cats are not allowed outside and have no reason to be licensed. This is nothing more than unnecessary cost for the pet owner. They can be chipped and tattooed, have engraved collar with name/phone # for reunification. Licensing a cat should not be mandatory.
- lazy or cheap



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Pet owners may underestimate the risk of their pets escaping, and feel that licensing is unnecessary. Cost may also be a barrier for some families.
- They assume indoor cats don't need licenses or it's a money grab
- I have an indoor cat, he is never and will never be outside.
- They feel that cats don't need to be licensed because they should be free to roam and be nuisances in our communities. and they feel like there is no resources for cats that should cost them money.
- So they're not responsible when it gets caught/trapped, entitled that they do not have to follow the rules. Nobody enforces it anyway.
- Lack of money, or just plain stupidity.
- Cost.
- If a cat is kept indoors and has few or no opportunities to escape, licensing seems redundant. The owner has already chosen to take total responsibility.
- Why would they pay a large amount of money to register their cat who will never leave their home?
- Financial, lack of education and safety (having a collar on a cat puts it at risk for choking).
- N/a
- Don't want to pay money.
- Laziness
- Because they believe cats should roam free, and if they license them they will be caught.
- They are indoor pets
- As a former owner of 2 cats that were indoor only cats, I see no reason for them to be licensed. Licensing cats that are not supposed to roam free is just a cash grab as 99% of owners don't take their cat for a walk, so there is little to no chance of them getting out of the home in the first place.
- The cat may never go outdoors, so why license? It is expensive and time consuming to license every year. It should be a one time item.
- Can't be bothered. Don't think their cats will get out. Disagree with the rule to license ?
- Cost, value added. How is it more effective than a tag with owners address?
- They believe that is their cats right to wander free and unnecessary to register them. Possibly lack of education.
- Lack of enforcement or incentive for registration
- Cats are indoor only and/or cost.
- Lazy and old school and ignorance
- My cat does not go outside, I follow the rule. I've paid to have him chipped. I pay enough taxes I get nothing out of.
- The people I know that don't license also let their cats roam. They don't get why it's important. But they feel their pets aren't a problem, even though they roam for hours a day.
- Cheap!
- cost
- Laziness and income



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If my cat stays indoors I don't think I should have to license it. I don't let them wear a collar in case they get choked so if they were to get out it is their microchip that identifies them. Having said that I license my 3 cats every year and I think it is a money grab.
- Laziness and knowing they can get away with it as Bylaw officers to not go door to door to verify that cats are licensed. These would be the same owners that let their cats run loose outside.
- They truly believe it is unnecessary as their cat never leaves their house.
- If something is not required why would one go through the bother of doing so if there is no incentive?
- Cost.
- I would think because their animal is strictly indoors and not a nuisance. So what would be the point other than a cash grab? Or cost?
- Think they won't go outside. I think it should just be for the privilege of having a companion animal and to help out with animal services budget.
- I would think people with indoor cats, especially in apartment buildings, feel no need to licence as the cats really never leave the premises. They likely see it as an unnecessary expense.
- Cost vs. benefit. Eg. if you have an indoor only cat what benefit does licensing offer? Re-unification is available to all pets microchipped and many pet adoption agencies include these with adoption fees.
- Not feeling it's important or their cats have value
- They are lazy and they likely don't think they need to because they have inside cats
- cost, don't want to take time out of their day
- Ignorance, cost, laziness, and not believing that it is in their best interest.
- 1)They are strictly indoor cats.
- 2)They do not leave the house or yard.
- 3)Owners never intend for them to be left out unattended.
- cost.
- Avoidance of fees, free-roaming animal, or irresponsible breeding
- Money, pets are already expensive as it is and sometimes dont have the cash flow to renew licenses And Feels like a money grab. If your cats stay inside. Whats the need to license then??
- People typically have no money to spend on making responsible choices and people don't like following the rules. Especially when they are easy to break and get away with.
- Cost or laziness.
- Cost and awareness
- money
- Cost
- Uneducated on bylaws. Have indoor cats and don't think they'll get out.
- Cost or they believe it isnt necessary to licence pets who are inside only like cats.
- N/a
- Costs
- I think many people don't know it's required or don't feel that it's necessary



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Laziness and cost. A cat owner may not license because the cat is indoors only.
- Money
- The cat never goes outdoors.
- The ease of which they can get away with NOT licensing their cats. Most people keep their cats indoors and those who are outdoors are rarely reunited.
- If there inside cats why should you licence it? Seems silly to me and I don't have a cat. And it doesn't seem to help with the car population or people abusing animals and etc.
- Money
- they don't think they should have to
- No knowledge about licensing laws and thinking the cat won't leave the house so they hope to save the money.
- Because they don't have to. No one is fining the owners of the cats. It is unfair to fine owners of dogs, but not cats.
- They think their cat(s) will never go missing so they don't need a license.
- don't know
- My cat doesn't go outside, so he does not need to be licensed. Microchip and tattoo should be enough if my cat gets lost, plus he has a collar.
- Their cat is an indoor cat who should never be outside.
- we believe money is the reason, however, if the owner(s) can't pay for a license how are they going to take care of the pet??!! again the pocket book is a good deterrent..we strongly suggest when an animal is licensed they MUST have a chip inserted into them..
- They don't think its necessary and don't understand what would happen if their cat ran away.
- The yearly expense.
- As a former City Pound manager, because they do not want to pay money for it. Cats are a pet manageable with very low income and people expect that to be consistent across the board.
- People seem to think they are a disposable animal and do not put the same value as dogs. I think licencing should also include a microchip. Microchips are cheap and I know many people who allow their cats out of doors and I never see a license tag on them.
- Indoor only cats are a real possibility. I licensed my indoor only cat anyway, but it felt totally ridiculous. An unnecessary financial and administrative burden.
- Cats are indoor only and the belief is if they are never outdoors the risk is negligible. People also do not feel they receive anything in return for the fee collected. This could very well be an education opportunity.
- Excess cats
- they are not allowed to roam outside even if they are licensed so whats the point. Money grab.
- I don't have cats but since I need to license my dogs I feel that any cat that is allowed outside should be required to be licensed. To me it is part of being a good pet owner.
- Cost or letting them outside and not being a responsible pet owner
- They think it's a money grab for cats, especially as they are housebound.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I license my dog but fostering dogs should not require a licence .This appears to be a gray area.
- Cost or cats are indoor pets.
- I think they feel that the cat never goes out so it doesn't need to be licensed.
- They think keeping them indoors means they firstly won't get caught, and secondly don't need to pay fees for something internal.
- Cost
- Perhaps they feel the license is too expensive or their cats are solely indoor and feel there is no need for licensing.
- CAS only enforces rules on responsible cat owners and only tickets them not the irresponsible cat owners, I do not blame people for not. I work in the industry & it is terrible hearing the stories. CAS also refuses to actually HELP cats & do not attend cat at large calls try to send to CHS
- In my opinion, people choose not to license their cats because they do not think it is important , either because they have an indoor cat who they don't feel is at risk, or they have grown up with outdoor or farm cats that had free reign to roam.
- The cats are indoor cats and never go outside.
- They know they can get away with it
- Cats should need to be licensed
- Defiance and unwillingness to take responsibility and to put out cost. The cost is reasonable. I used to have two cats and they were always licensed.
- Cats aren't allowed outside so they aren't needing city services
- If the cat is in house only and not allowed out, I don't think they should have to be licensed.
- The cat is 100% indoors. Seems ridiculous to have to pay for indoor cat licence.
- The primary reason for this choice I think with many people is they do not want to pay a fine if it is caught because they've let it run around loose. Cats should not have to wear collars with tags, instead they should be microchipped. at least that should be an option
- fees
- Not necessary
- Cost and perhaps lack of understanding this is a requirement.
- Because the cats are allowed to roam free.
- They have indoor cats.
- Cost of licensing
- That they keep the animals inside.
- I license mine
- Cheap and irresponsible!!!! Do not care about being a polite and responsible citizen nor do they truly care for the well being of their animal. If their animal should ever get lost, run away then responsible pet owners have a much better chance to get their pet back if it is licensed
- I feel like I get nothing in return. My cats are microchipped and tattooed so reunification is not a problem. They are indoor and have never gotten out in their lives. So it seems like there is little purpose or benefit.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Don't see a benefit.
- I think it would have to do with their having their cats indoors only.
- laziness, cost
- Fees
- Cost! This is just a money grab for the city. I have indoor only cats. They are not causing any harm and are not a problem for the city. If one of my cats were to get out and I needed city services then I would expect to have to pay and license my cat.
- No benefit for responsible cat owners who keep their cats at home
- No. Should license.
- Indoor cat only.
- They don't feel that the same rules should apply to cats, those people are wrong
- Waste of money for an owner. As someone who lost a cat who was licensed, the city didn't even have the decency to advise me of his pick up when they were called. He was tagged, and chipped. The homeowner who found him called me. There is absolutely zero benefit as an owner, and it's a city cash grab
- Laziness.
- I believe those who choose to forego licensing of their cats have animals that are indoor pets that never get out of doors. If by chance the pet does escape, most are chipped or tattooed. Financial constraints is likely another reason
- Cheap and not responsible
- Many people think that because they keep their cat indoors, they don't need to license. However, as a responsible pet owner I think licensing fees to help pay for other animal services are important. This could be stressed as part of the licensing. Also important if a cat accidentally gets out.
- Because they are indoor animals like fish, gerbils, snakes, etc
- Prices or a day who only lives indoors.
- My cat is totally indoor only, and has never been outside the house in 12 years. There is no reason for me to pay to license him.
- A sense of entitlement
- Cost
- They don't see cats in the same light as dogs. My cat has been licensed since I got her because I believe it is my responsibility to care for her and to help support animal services. It is a privilege, not a right, to own a pet.
- City does not use its funding for the animals
- No consequences.
- I think people don't want to license their cats because most stay indoors. So why bother to pay the money if they don't go out.
- I would guess the cost involved. Or they have outdoor cats they don't want linked back to them?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cat owners may feel, why? If a cat is kept indoors all the time, why bother? If it 'escapes' and then captured, there's still a huge fine. There's no options. Cats are supposed to be indoors and nothing else obvious is provided to responsible owners. And, a vaccinations are still expected.
- They do not care.
- Indoor cats
- Na
- Cats are treated as more disposable pets than dogs. People still let them out to roam the neighbourhood, stating it is cruel to keep them indoors. Then when their cat doesn't come home, they simply get another kitten and continue the cycle. Licencing their cat is a waste of money in their minds.
- Money, negative view of the law, laziness, carelessness, irresponsibility.
- Possibly lack of income
- Cost And laziness
- No idea dont own cats
- they do not want to give the government more money. Pets already cost money to take care of, paying a yearly fee just so the government is aware that you have an animal is not ideal for most owners
- Lazy and don't thing an indoor cat needs to be. Also the City wont do anything , the fines are so low they will take the risk... make the fines high and people wont take the chance at being caught!!!
- Money
- People think cats who stay indoors need not have a license
- Money. No reason to. Most cats, outside of feral, do no harm.
- Cost. Hassle. Not necessary.
- Cost and that they just simply forget. Why are there no reminders to license your pet OR options for multiple years to avoid the nuance? I think may people simply forget (I do!).
- All cats must be licenced, and a cat owner who does not do this is an irresponsible pet owner. If the cat has become lost and is found, and put in the custody of Calgary Humane Society, the city licence tag will see cat gets returned to it's owner, and that's a good thing.
- Cost, administration requirements (i.e. you need to be looking after things), lack of awareness
- Strictly indoor cats, how does licensing actually service those animals.
- Lack of respect for both other people and the pet itself.
- Cost and apathy
- Indoor cats...too expensive
- Some simply do not want to pay, others don't think they will ever be caught or ticketed. If you can afford an animal you can afford a license!
- Too expensive



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They're jerks taking advantage. If a license is required, they should get a license. Why require a license then ignore people who don't bother?
- Irresponsible owners. Don't care about their cat and will let it roam.
- I don't see what licensing any pet does for the safety of a pet. It is better to have a cat or dog microchipped and / or tattooed. What does the city do for cats with the license fee?
- They aren't a responsible owner. They don't care about the bylaws or losing their pet. If you can't afford a license, you shouldn't own a pet
- Owners believe since the cat is an inside cat no one will check on licensing
- Don't want to pay, don't care about the animals being returned and do not want to be held accountable for their animals behaviour and keeping it at home and trained.
- I assume they keep their cat indoors at all times, and that licensing is for the purpose of controlling animals roaming and then contacting the owner.
- Little to no punishment for infractions.
- They think they are exempt because their cat is inside most of the time or is small or non-violent or, they don't walk them however, we've had cats in our "condo" building who escaped through a window or open door! Then they end up in some city facility or a vet site or other, costing tax payers!
- I think that people think that no one will know, if they do not register an indoor cat.
- Knowing how and where to do it.
Forgetting to renew.
Believing that since it's going to be an « indoor cat » it's not necessary.
- They think that they won't get caught, for indoor cats that never leave the house and even for those who still let their cats roam freely. Need more information about the benefits of licensing.
- Cat owners think they're above the law.
- **THEY ARE SELFISH, SELF CENTERED AND IGNORANT.**
- They figure if their cat doesn't ever go outside, why should it need to be licensed? I'm inclined to agree with them - even though I don't have cats.
- They think that it is not required because they never get out of house
- They can't be bothered to pay.
- I have no idea why people wouldn't. I suppose those who keep their cats indoors don't think they need to be (but what about if kitty unexpectedly gets out?).
- I believe these individuals are predominantly the ones who allow their pet cats to roam. I believe they don't think it's necessary.
- They don't know it's mandatory or they aren't let outdoors
- They have an inside cat and don't let it outside.....or they feel they're above the law and it doesn't pertain to them. Financial issues.
- I have a licensed totally indoor cat. I believe in supporting the cities S/N programs. Other people may not feel this way. It can also be a financial burden to low income or seniors.
- Skirting the expenses, that may not see any benefit.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Maybe cost. Not knowing how to do it or that it is required. Not wanting to be traced back to the animal if it's injured or lost because of cost - sky high vet bills are beyond the ability of many to pay. Pet insurance is costly too.
- Price and no value
- Don't think they have to because they are indoors
- Their cats live indoors only
- Indoor, not wandering, not boarded, fees
- Financial barriers, no enforcement and no consequences for their cats to roam and have multiple litters.
- Cats are always kept indoors and there is no risk of them getting outside
- Cost and lack of transparency of where they go.
- Lack of responsibility for their animal, they chose to have one and should be financially stable to afford all aspects of caring for that animal.
- They stay indoors
- Cost, and desire to have an outdoor cat without facing bylaw implications
- I believe a lot of people feel like it's pointless. Plus I think they don't want to pay a fine if picked up by the city.
- They assume the cat will never leave the home or attempt to escape the home.
- Above the rules
- They think it's a money grab by the City? Don't see the benefits?
- No excuse.
- Lack of enforcement (no fault of officers/system, just logistics). Cost. Indoor animal, so less risk of being lost or picked up.
- Cost, convenience
- Some cats don't like to wear collars? Cost?
- Society seems to think cats are disposable.
- Cost & accountability.
- Money
- They feel there is no reason to license a housecat, who will spend the majority (if not all) of its life indoors
- They are socially irresponsible.
- The fine is not high enough to force people to license their cat
They believe that cats have the right to roam
- They may not know and/or cannot afford the cost
- Financial. Most cats stay indoors as well
- The cat is only an indoor cat. Don't think they'll get caught.
- Not being responsible pet owners
- No idea
- The cat is an indoor pet and therefore owners don't feel they should have to license it.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They are cheap
- Cost
- Irresponsible pet owners
- Erroneous impression that their cat could never get outside, and therefore that they can evade the law without consequence.
- Never leave the house
- Cats are indoors and not permitted to wander outside. When cats leave the house, they are kenneled.
Also, not likely to wear a collar/tag!
Waste of money to license a cat.
- too expensive.
- I have no idea.
- Cost
- Cost! It's only \$45 but that's something which some cannot do ... which is a barrier for one to apply for the free neuter/spay program
- Not seen as a pet or bothersome animal
- To not get caught or fined for letting them out unattended. People can't afford or forget to do it. Indoor cat so they don't think they need to to save a few bucks.
- All pets must be licensed. If one cannot invest in proper care including licensing they should not have pet.
- Cost.
- Cost
- Financial and what is the point? I have my cats micro chipped so why do I have to license them?
- Dont leave the house. Cost
- They think they will never escape and theirs no repercussions if the city isn't aware of the unlicensed cat
- Ignorance, lack of concern for the common good.
- Cats are considered less dangerous, less nuisance than a dog.
- Laziness and cheapness, if you can afford to have a cat, you should be able to afford a licence
- Lazy and cheap
- Cost
- The price might be too high
- The cost is prohibitive and the animal is no burden on the City administration.
- Price
- Lack of understanding regarding the importance of licencing their pet.
- The city's blatant cat racism. Dogs can poop in my yard all year long, and they're amazing!
Dangerous pit bulls are a threat to all children on the street, and the city does nothing. An owned cat goes for a walk in the neighborhood - LIKE SCIENCE MEANT IT TO DO - AND HURTS NO ONE EVER!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Probably cost?
- Likely ignorance or laziness.
- Cost and burden
- My cats are all licensed.
- The collars, cats don't typically like collars. Have you ever tried collar training a cat it's nearly impossible.
- Inside cat
- nothing, defiance
- That indoor only pets never escape.
- Anti nanny-statist activism or the money. Seriously, make it free.
- Cost
- Can't afford it or cat is a totally indoor animal
- Possibly not wishing to spend the money when their cats are indoor only.
- Lazy , anti system
- Cost only.
- Don't want to pay the fee. Are not afraid of enforcement so low incentive to do so.
- They think being an indoor cats its unnecessary. Lack cognitive insight on the dangers or value if their cat inadvertantly gets outside. Cost, lack of education and ease to license. Dont value the animals enough. Many dont value cats as much as dogs.
- Indoor cats. Don't think they would ever get out.
- Too expensive and the city wants to control what you do in Your own home (limit how many). Licensing an animal that stays inside or on your property (if you're responsible) is strictly a money grab from a city that doesn't know how to manage their responsibilities.
- It could be cost. I know it may seem low but it may have an impact if the owner has a few to register. It's cheaper for neutered animals - great but spaying and neutering is not! Make this as cheap as possible and I guarantee more owners will licence!
- The issue is not licensing a pet, it is the fact that you have to re-license them every year. That is a very transparent money grab by the government
- They think that their pets dont leave the house so why should they.
- They don't feel the need to.
- It's a cash grab.
- There is no real reason to have a registered cat. By law it is my understanding they should stay inside.
- Most folks don't see a point in licensing a cat. The majority of owners keep their cats inside and don't let them out. A cat isn't like a dog where they are going to training classes or animal salons or daycares etc
So licensing them is really unnecessary
Also the cost is too high

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Strictly indoor cat - NEVER goes outside. Cost of license. Owner just does not care, maybe considers cat just a cat ie disposable. Wow, that's harsh!
- The reason is, that it is unreasonable. Having a pet licence is not a guarantee that the owner will be responsible nor does it provide assurance that a pet will behave appropriately. It is just another piece of annoying, unnecessary, wasteful, government oversight.
- Can't afford it, or they don't let their cats out.
- Coat and the belief that cats do not have to be registered.
- many people think licensing is just for dogs, especially those that have indoor cats.
- Honestly, the people are too cheap to pay. If they can afford a cat then they can afford a license once a year. If the fee is a hardship an assistance might be helpful. I don't think people understand where the money goes or what it supports, it would be nice if the city made it common knowledge.
- Few reasons some are can't afford to pay the fees due to their tax bracket low income etc and then they have the ones who can afford it but purposely ignore it sometimes because they feel entitled some just because they may have had an issue in the past involving animal abuse
- expense. unwilling to be held responsible for pets
- Likely they are indoor only cats.
- Cheap
- They are probably going to let it out and do not want to be responsible.
- Don't care
- Am sure the owners would say that "my cat" would never be allowed outside so I shouldn't have to license it.
- I think they think that if an animal never is out why bother paying for a license.
- They are kept indoors ... but licensing is good if a cat "escapes".
- Lack of finances.
Constant rotation of pets through the home.
Over reach of by law officers creating distrust/distaste of the organization.
- Don't realize it is a requirement. Don't realize the cost it how to register.
- No excuse for this minor charge.
- 1) They feel that cats are not controllable and fly under the radar. If they are truly indoor-house cats then the need to license is not as important to some owners.
- Not sure but likely avoidance of paying.
- Indoor cats only. Should not have to license indoor cats.
- I feel that indoor cats should have a minimal amount for licensing. If the cat is microchipped and escapes one time...no fine. If it happens a second time then consider a fine. These cats that do not go outside do not spread disease or get onto roads or other peoples property.
- Cost. This should be free.
- Cost
- Costs too much. Money grab from the city.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost, and I also believe that if your cat is staying indoors you should not have to pay as much as someone is letting their cat outside off leash.
- Why bother. What are we regulating for? Money ?
- Laziness .
- Cost
- No need to license an animal who is 100% inside and has a microchip to identify the pet
- They don't want to pay licensing fees or be held responsible for what their pet does when loose.
- If the cat is indoor only, they won't license.
- Cost? Inconvenience? Forgetfulness? Seems silly to license an animal that is expected to stay indoors. Should we also license our hamsters then?
- Cost, and doesn't make sense for indoor cats.
- People believe it to be a cash grab and if their animal remains inside should not have to do it.
- There is nothing stopping them from not licensing and indoor cat. Nothing is monitoring this.
- They maybe have a cats that never goes outside. They perhaps don't understand how licensing works.
- People choose not to licence their cats because it is the direct tie to fines in cats are caught off property. The fine in many cases is enough for people to simply abandon the animal.
- They don't care. Their animals stay inside and aren't a nuisance to their neighbours.
- Cost. Feeling no need if their cat never goes outside.
- If a completely indoor cat why is it necessary. Budgies and fish aren't licensed.
- They say the cat never goes outside
- Cost or amount of effort required to license
- I just don't think the city needs to keep track of cats like they do for dogs. I would never license my cat.
- If it is solely an indoor cat, why does it need a license? Microchip, yes, license, no.
- IF their cats are indoors, they don't feel a need to licence. Perhaps also money is an issue....maybe they think because they are 'smaller' (compared to dogs on the whole) they don't need to pay..
- People don't like paper work and dealing with the government. They don't like the fee even though it's small. They don't want their irresponsible behavior to be traced back to them ie: they let their pet free roam.
- Cost. And the fact that these cats never go outside. They remain indoor cats with no reason to be licensed.
- All cats and dogs should be licensed- there is no excuse
- they think that since their cat stays indoors, they don't need a license; or they cannot afford it
- Cost, convenience
- A lot of people consider cats as disposable pets and don't want to pay for a license.
- If cats don't go outdoors....or because they know they can get away with it easier than dogs
- Dereliction of duty of owners!
- Not willing to pay, concerned about being caught, avoiding retributions.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Multiple cats, indoor-only cats, laziness.
- Their cats are indoor or don't meet the requirements for licences or are too expensive (not spayed/neutered), also they are less likely to be picked up if they do get out of the house
- Cost
- Indoor cats that never go out, but given some felines propensity for escape, I believe all should be listened.
- Knowledge. Cats have only just recently been required to be licensed the past few years and there really isn't any advertising for it like there is for dogs.
- They don't go outside and have no means of getting out
- Inconvenience and habit - there's little in the way of checks and balances to ensure the cat is licensed until something goes wrong (i.e., the cat vanishes and is picked up by bylaw control)
- They either have too many or just think they are better than dog owners!
- Cost
- Lack of consequences.
- Lazy, irresponsible, entitled, cats and dogs should follow same rules, same licensing and same standards. They are just as much a nuisance or danger to community as a loose dog
- Cost
- Cant afford it...City fees are up every year
- Being lazy? Possibly ignorant about rules or fees?
- To be honest, stupidity and a sense of entitlement. Cats should be treated the same as dogs, should be controlled and licensed. Cat owners think they are entitled to not pay registration fees and to allow their cats to roam free.
- Cost or the fact that they let their cats roam and don't want to be caught doing it
- Probably price? Contempt about rules, laziness.
- Cost
- People are cheap. They won't go out of their way to pay if they don't have to. "My cat isn't like THOSE cats, and it never leaves the house!" Yeah, right.
- Refusing to pay what is essentially a tax for owning a pet.
- I think the choice not to licence an animal stems from the lack of knowledge to what the 'license' represents, and where the funds go.
- Their cats are indoors, spayed/neutered and have permanent ID. It infuriates me that R.P.O's are paying for cat licensing. My cats have both microchips and Tattoos so if they went missing it would be those ID's that would get my cat home not their license. Especially since cats hardly wear collars
- "It's a money grab"
- Too expensive, especially since taxes in the city continue to go up and services decrease. They know monitoring and enforcement is a joke and they wont get caught so why pay.
- Unaware or uncaring.
- Cost and that they are responsible owners who do not let their animals out intentionally.
- Cost or convenience



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Being cheap/lazy. If it's a money issue those same people cannot afford to be pet owners. The only other reason I could think of is if they are 100% an indoor cat.
- Indifference.
- Likely the cost and they don't feel it is of value to do so
- Probably cost or unaware of CoC requirements
- Licensing costs money and no value is received for these fees when the cat is kept indoors.
- If they are not roaming cats, meaning live inside, they don't license cats.
- Indoor cat, unnecessary expense
- They don't go outside
- Licensing is a money grab for the city
- Apathy to the reasons cats should be licensed.
- Cost and/or an overstep of city authority.
- They are not responsible pet owners and do not want to take the time/money to do so.
- if an animal is microchipped what is the point. cats are indoor animals they are not going to get out
- Probably because they are indoor cats, or they just imagine that it won't be enforced
- You ever try to keep a collar on a cat? Seriously, do the people writing these questions have any experience with animals at all? And really, when's the last time there was a vicious cat attack on a person that required tracking down an owner? It's all about money and control for the city...
- Too many animals, not wanting to get caught having roaming cats. Unaware, forgot
- Because it's annual!!!! You make a monstrous cash grab and don't send out renewals. Make it a ONE TIME registration. You fine the hell out of us if the registration lapses. Many of us have multiple animals registered it's not unreasonable to assume they aren't all registered the same Time.
- What do they get for it?
- Lack of enforcement
- They are strictly indoor cats who will not go outside. They have a clean bill of health from the vet and are not required to be reported. Fostering for a rescue or otherwise watching them temporarily.
- Cats are indoors only or they don't care what might happen to the cat if it got out or ran away. Or they don't want to spend the money.
- If the cat is an indoor cat, it is pointless for it to be licenced.
- Expensive yearly. Family pets should only need to be purchased once for each owner.
- Perhaps the cost. Perhaps that their cats never go outside.
- Cost and laziness
- They think their cats are inside and not interacting with other animals or have the opportunity to run away. Cost may be a factor
- lack of funds, and they keep cats indoors at all times.
- They are keeping the cat indoors and see it as another way for the city to make money off of them for no good reason.
- That their cat never goes outside into the public arena



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They don't feel that it is necessary or don't want the City to know the animal lives there
- They're selfish [removed] who think they are above the rules.
- Cost and usually people don't feel like they need to license indoor cats
- Indoor cats. Forget about the renewal.
- cheap ... cat never goes outside...
- Don't think it is required as "they are kept indoors"
- Perhaps the cat is always indoor, never allowed to roam free? Perhaps a money issue as well? I think there should be different license rates for a indoor cat vs a cat that is let outdoors all the time and that may encourage owner of indoor cats to buy a license?
- if you keep your cat indoors it doesn't make economical sense to license your cat. They don't have a collar to attach a tag to so it comes across as a money grab. Especially when you pay for a \$100 microchip from your vet. Maybe get vets/Calgary to create a microchip licencing program.
- ignorance of law and cost for irresponsible pet owners
- cost
- They think they are exempt from the rules or they have not bothered to look in to what the city rules are. Ignorance? Laziness?
- Indoor cats, do not see the benefit. Also, dangers to cats (and dogs) wearing permanent collars and tags, I would not have my cat wear one. Reduce fees for microchipped animals.
- Lack of understanding of benefits, allowed to get away with not paying, cost
- They are lazy, or don't feel they should have to pay for it.
- Cost
- I think people don't want to go through the effort, especially for indoor cats. Some might find the cost unreasonable.
- Being an irresponsible pet owner - if you cannot spare a few dollars and do not have the time to get a license maybe pet ownership is not for you
- Because it's useless? You tout the reunification of lost animals is the primary benefit but, since cats don't carry their license around, how does it help? Microchipping and tattooing (which our cat is, as well as being licensed) are more useful.
- Cost, belief it isn't necessary
- Owners may feel their cat does not go outside therefore does not require a licence, or cat does not roam far and does come home so no need for a licence.
- Cost
- They are irresponsible owners and likely allow their cats to roam.
- My cats are licensed, however they are indoor only and do not wear collars or tags but are microchipped and tattooed. A tag and license will not serve to return my cats home if they get loose by accident. The cost of registering cats in many cases does not seem worth it. Esp if funds are short
- Cost
- Money and lack of care if cat goes missing cats are seen as easily replaceable animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stay inside?
- Many think that licensing does not pertain to cats, they also know its rarely enforced.
- They aren't aware of the rules. I think people new to the city tend not to even think about it. People also believe that cats should be allowed to roam
- Indoor cat.
- Dont care about their cats, consider cats dispensable
- Maybe cost or lack of knowledge? It's easy not to get a cat licensed. Especially if it's exclusively an indoor cat
- Arrogance. The only purpose for a license for a cat is to give the city admins an idea of the number of cats that are currently in the city. Beyond that, it is just a cash grab for the city.
- They are lazy or have no money
- Ignorance is probably the number one reason. Poor and irresponsible pet ownership. Thinking that cats aren't worth it.
- They're never outside, why would they need to? It feels more like a cash grab against cat owners. Might as well lisenxe exotics and rodents if you demand indoor cats.
- lack of education & considered an unnecessary expense ('my cat will eventually come back' attitude)
- Cost and not believing that cats need to be licensed.
- I assume it's because the cat remains in their home, therefore they might feel it's not a threat or concern of the public.
- Unable to afford; figure they can't get in trouble if the City doesn't know they have pets
- Lack of understanding of the need or benefits.
- Cost, laziness
- No benefit to the cost.
- the lac of proof that licencing cats provides any benefits to our animals. the feeling that this is a financial grab on owners.
- Costs for licencing costs is expensive, especially considering they if the owners follow the bylaws they are not free roaming.
- Ignorance of the requirement to license, lack of understanding around the need and purpose of licensing, or complete disregard for the responsibilities of pet ownership.
- Wish this was easier. I have 2 pets and i got them at different dates. I can not pay them at the same time. Also indoor animals so they need licenses as well ?
- Can't be bothered, cost, lack of education regarding this.
- Because cat is indoor only. This is reasonable only if the cat never tried to escape outside, otherwise it should be licensed.
- They are ignorant? There is no excuse - cat licenses are low cost.
- Unaware or laziness
- Unnecessary if the cat is living indoors 100% of the time. Cat doesn't wear its collar, and so isn't wearing its tag so if it accidently gets out, hence the licencing is of no help.
- If it's an indoor cat who cares? Not really any of your business.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost and laziness
- Either cost or ignorance.
- City doesn't take it seriously. City must actively require licensing. Adopting agencies should be required to have people license their animals and that information be given to the City by law enforcement.
- Lack of responsibly with pet ownership
- They just don't think they have to bother, it's an attitude of just not caring about it.
- They are housecats and not roaming free outside, apathy, and money.
- Laziness.
- Laziness, lack of consequences
- They are indoor cats.
- Cost
- Not knowing about licensing
- Won't spend the money even if they had it
- Probably not bothered or cannot pay the licence. Should not be a choice in the city - you have an animal you follow the rules i.e. licencing & spaying/neutering etc.
- Their cats don't go outside.
- PRICE AND JUST ANOTHER TAX
- The perception that is it is an unneeded cost or a money grab.
- Unaware that it's a requirement; I didn't know cats need to be licensed.
- They are not responsible pet owners or citizens. They proudly post about it on FB, saying they have outdoor cats. When someone points out they should be licensed so that a fine can be issued, they laugh, say they didn't know that. Why would they want to be accountable?
- Cost - as well as if the owner keeps the cat indoors, why license?
- Cat is kept indoors so see no need to license.
- They see no benefit and some people just believe that nothing applies to them.
- I am not sure, may be individual decision that differs from one person to another.
- Disrespect/ignorance of the law.
- Expensive and some feel it's not worth it.
- I think they don't believe in licensing due to cost or there pets never leave home.
- They don't think it's necessary
- I know I have friends who do not have their cats licensed as they are strictly indoor cats and don't see the point in it.
- I cannot license one of my cats as he is still licensed to my ex and in order to license him I have to physically go to the city with my ex to complete the transfer. No thanks, I don't want to spend that much time with my ex. Make the transfer process easier please.
- Money and the fact they don't want to be held responsible.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ignorance. People understand dogs should be controlled but many think that it's OK to let cats roam around just because 'they want to'. This needs to be corrected with education first but enforcement of fines can work as well.
On the other hand with an indoor cat someone may feel it's not needed
- Still a mentality that cats are different and more independent than dogs and have a right to be. The idea of cats being licensed is a lot newer than dogs. I feel bicycles should be licensed!
- Either cost or don't think they will be caught.
- "I keep my cat in the house - why should I"?? Don't want to pay.
- Laziness and not taking responsibility for their pet. If something happens to their cat, they are not responsible if there is not traceable paperwork to the owner.
- They don't want to pay and don't let their cats out of the house and don't think they will get caught having unlicensed cats
- Don't know that it's a requirement
- They are old school in thinking because it isn't expensive.
- weighing cost against service received for the cost. Most permanently indoor cats are at low risk of getting lost.
- Lack of money or they forget.
- They don't see the need or consequences.
- they do not understand why they should license their pet. and see no benefit on doing so
- Cats are "indoor cats" and/or do not see the benefit for the cost
- Many people think cats are not harmful, or see it as being ok for them to be semi-feral. Education is an important piece here.
- For me, I've never licensed by cats because they are indoor cats and the licensing requirement felt like a cash grab from the city.
- The cost and the fact that their cats may be indoors only so they think that they do not need a license. Not knowing why a license is required.
- They're [removed] people, who believe [removed] "Cats are outdoor/roaming animals", and who don't want to get in trouble for their cat constantly being outside.
- Cost
- Keeping the cat indoors at all times and having them chipped are 2 reasons for this choice.
- Their cats are indoor only.
- Lazy
- Cats are strictly indoor cats and have been spayed/neutered.
- I have no idea. Licensing makes complete sense to me
- Don't know cat people
- Expense, negligence, or potentially because their cat remains indoors and they do not think registration is necessary.
- Don't let their cats outside
- Cost and irresponsibility.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Complacency and lack of consequences
- They are strictly indoor cats
- They do not want to pay the fee, they feel it is their right to have unlicensed animal (when it should be a privilege). They consider that cats are different than dogs and do not harm, they have a lack of knowledge.
- \$\$
Outdoor cats don't linger long usually, so harder to catch or control.
- the cat is a largely indoor animal that doesn't frequently leave the house. They see little value in licensing the animal so this is an easy cost-benefit analysis
- Cost and ignorance.
- Likely cost and belief that cats should be allowed to roam free
- The cats are inside so no need to.
- I think the cost of licensing is primarily the reason why folks don't get their cats licensed. For many cat owners they tend to be housebound pets so I can see why they may not license them.
- They don't go outside and are already microchipped
- I cant understand it. I have a dog and have had others in the past and they owners are simply too lazy
- Lazy and they don't feel it is needed. Their cats always come home. I'm not allowed to let my dog roam, why should cat owners
- They may only live indoors and don't affect others.
- No enforcement
- Financial, or perhaps think because cat is indoors only that it's not necessary, not realizing that cats can sometimes sneak out and potentially get lost.
- the cost of getting the license
- they didn't have the need to walk a cat outside.
- Pricing, and the hassle that if you cannot pay the fine that you're animal will be taken away even though you are responsible and caring to the animal
- Dont see why they have to and no penalty not to
- If cats remain as indoor only cats and don't leave the property, licensing seems unnecessary. I do think all cats (and dogs) should have proper microchip identification in the event they get loose.
- Cost.
- They allow their cats to roam and if the cat is picked up there is no way to trace it. Owners are not committed to the ownership of the cat.
- Their cats do not go outside so what is the point if they are not a concern to the public. If the city finds the cat, fees are in place for finding the cat and housing it.
- Affordability.
Indoor vs outdoor cats
- Because they strictly stay indoors and are never outside nor escape to go outside.
- income levels, irresponsible in other areas of their life so this is just a transient effect



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Laziness, greed.
- I would guess it is because A) cats are indoors or B) owners don't want to be fined
- Cats are indoor only and don't impose an extra burden on the community
- It's a rip off. If a cat is strictly an indoor cat (which all cats should be) than there is no reason to license them than to seek money
- Laziness, ignorance, or a belief that their cat will never get out.
- Financial
- Ignorance based on why it is important/cost
- Financial. Sense of entitlement. Laziness.
- For those with indoor only cats, I think they feel it's an unnecessary expense. For those with roaming cats, I think they're just plain irresponsible.
- The cat never goes outside.
- They see cats as disposable and not a family member. They are lazy. If they don't follow existing bylaws of only allowing cats outside if tethered/secured on personal property, why would they pay for licensing. The cost is minimal so maybe they just do t care or think its needed.
- Cost and if the cat is strictly indoors, licence shouldn't be required.
- cheap,lazy,and dishonest with animal cotrol
- Because they don't want to be fined if the cat ever gets picked up by bylaw and are basically jerks.
- If they are indoor pets, as they should be, they should not require a license.
- They don't care. OR they have no idea that it's a bylaw. They are not responsible. If a cat is only an indoor cat (or patio/yard only), licensing is really not important, in my mind. It's the free roaming cats that are the issue. Owners are not following the bylaws.
- They never go outside and don't use any city facilities
- Mostly because they are kept indoors due to the bylaw.
- It's a waste of money / cash grab. Plus, since cats aren't allowed to leave the house, what's the point? And cats don't have to wear collars, so even if they were licensed, if they don't have their collar/tag on, they still can't be identified using that means.
- cost, inconvenience, put primarily that they do not care to be a considerate citizen
- I don't have a cat so I don't know
- I think it's possible that they may not be aware of the bylaw. Whereas it's commonly known that one must licence a dog, it's not as well known with cats.
- The city is just trying another money grab.
- Ignorance, apathy and entitlement. The licenses are affordable.
- They are indoor cats
They don't use dog parks
- Strive for them to be primarily indoors.
- No purpose besides govt keeping tabs on you and collecting more money in any way it can.
- Laziness.
- Cost !!!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- laziness
- Cost
- Time and cost factors. A collar with contact tag should suffice.
- Its a bylaw so why not follow the rules, it is the ideology like letting their pets run at large all over the neighborhoods mentality they think they can do what they want.
- Minimal consequences
- Money; lack of knowledge
- I see no point in making people license their cats if it is indoor. Outdoor cats should be more \$ as they cause a lot more problems- especially to homes w indoor cats.
- They dont care
- They never go out. Usually animals are tattooed or have a chip implant.
- I personally license my cats however I have a hard time doing it. They are both indoor cats and would have a stroke if they went outside. The front door opens and they hide until it closes again. Both have microchips if they do escape, which they won't. Why are they licensed?
- They think the cat is an indoor cat and will never get out. But when or if it does, the licensing, via tatoo and microchipping will allow for the cat to be returned to its owner. This needs to be emphazized.
- They say they are indoor cats. Too expensive
- Cost, cats don't leave house
- If the cat never leaves the house why license it. Seems like a money grab not a safety net for if by chance my cat gets out.
I'd rather out a collar on my cat (breakaway) and my info on a tag
- 100% indoors.
- Cost
- Don't see a point. Too expensive. Never leaves the house. Didn't know animal had to be licensed
- Cost. Or lack of knowledge that they need to do so. Mainly cost. It's not a lot but it's prohibitive for some.
- They don't go outside
- No idea there is no good reason not to licence
- If cats remain indoors as is the bylaw they are on private property so why should they need a licence. I'm not sure how cats cost the city money so why should a fee be collected. My cat does not wear his licence because I worry about the collar getting caught and causing injury.
- They don't go outside so people don't see the need.
- They have cats that they consider indoor animals
- Irresponsible, don't want to spend the money as they think they will get away with it.
- Cost. Laziness.
- With cats it is likely that the owner has an indoor cat and does not see the point. My indoor cat is licensed because I'm paranoid she will get out accidentally and I want every reinforcement in place to find her.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost and that the cat never leaves house.
- They think they don't have to because their cats are "indoor cats"
- They don't agree with controlling their cats.
- not sure.
- It's stupid. Why should someone license an animal that doesn't leave the house. Charge people if it gets out and picked up.
- The primary reason is that their cat doesn't go outside.
- They think that as the cat remains indoors it doesn't need a license, no fines or policing of unlicensed cats
- If the cat lives only indoors, it seems unnecessary to pay the fee
- Cost and that they don't go outside
- Trying to save money because their cat is likely an indoor cat
- They are too lazy. And don't want to have to put cat on a leash outside.
- They do not value them, often consider them as disposable/ not a member of the family. Let them outside frequently against bylaw and do not want to get caught.
- They are unaware that licenses are required or they don't care.
- They tend to have indoor cats who do not get access to the outdoors or the cats have no interest in leaving the house so they don't see the point.
- Ignorance of the benefits.
- Not wanting to pay money out
- Cost per year
- "too busy"/lazy/irresponsible
- They are all house cats and never go outside minus their luxury catio... Spoiled buggers!
- Cat licensing does not work and is a money grab. Cats have break away collar designs, so there goes the tag! Instead any cat brought to vet could be chipped. If cat is found outside, I think fining the owners for negligence is the answer. Cats shouldn't be outside to get attacked or hit by cars, etc
- Cost - cats are usually indoor animals, they probably don't feel the need to license them if their impact on public is non-existent
- Money and They probably believe if it's inside no one will know if they are licensed or not.
- That the cat doesn't leave the house
- Cost, not outdoor animals
- Indoor only and not utilizing city services. Mandatory spay and microchip would've better
- Probably people with indoor cats don't license them as it does seem silly.
- Irresponsibility
- Their cats are not outdoor
- Cats are typically indoor animals and generally are not outside.
- If the cat never gets out I don't think it's feasible or necessary
- Their cat is an indoor cat and they don't see the benefit.
- They don't think they have to because their cat stays inside



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Because they are indoor cats. Or the owners are just too lazy to do so.
- Their cat does not go outside.
They don't think it is necessary.
- Cost
- Perhaps if the animal is strictly indoors, they might not think they need them licensed
- Possibly cost or just don't care about the bylaws.
- Think it's stupid, unnecessary or too expensive, or they're just lazy & dumb.
- Cost and a belief that their animal won't escape
- the high cost for the license for low income or the homeless or they could not care less.
- Do not want to pay
- I don't know anyone who hasn't licensed their cats
- Easy to get of without paying
- Laziness, or they only keep indoors
- Indoor pet only- lazy - not aware it is required
- The lapse in responsibility that cat owners seem to treat ownership more like sponsoring a zoo animal.
- Probably that if they aren't allowed to let their cats off of their property for any reason they shouldn't need a licence. Dogs go for walks around the neighbourhoods and around the city and therefore need regulations however I'm not sure if cats need the same regulations if they don't.
- the fee & having to redo it annually.
- Can't afford to, money grab, big brother is watching --- privacy issues, freedom to own a animal without having to deal with documenting, lazy, don't see the value, should we start licensing other pets too?
- Lazy, want to save a few bucks. Not sure why cats are licensed, though. In many European countries it's just dogs.
- Their cat is indoors at all times or they don't agree with the price of the license.
- They are irresponsible, and can not afford an animal.
- don't think it's necessary - esp. for indoor animals
- My indoor cat doesn't need to be licensed
- Expensive.
- Cats are primarily kept indoors and have little impact on city resource-compared to dogs.
- They are indoor
 1. They're cheap
 2. They're irresponsible
 3. They think people won't notice
- Laziness
- No Input



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Laziness and fact they know no one follows up. We license our indoor cat. No one every checked up ever. Same with out dogs. The cost is really reasonable. Maybe a low income rate for those suffering economically right now.
- They believe that the cat is indoors-only and there is no benefit to registration.
- They think their cat doesn't go outside and therefore they should not license the cat or they believe they would not put a tag on a collar.
- because they not their cats see any value, especially for indoor cats. responsible pet owners tend to not need outside controls to continue to be responsible. those that are irresponsible pet owners probably aren't licensing. when launched, intent was education - has that been effective?
- It's an indoor cat, it has no contact with the public.
- Probably the cost is prohibitive for some owners-big red flag. A responsible pet owner will only own as many pets as they can afford.
- money they don't want to be held responsible
- Because he cats don't leave the property so they don't feel they have the need.
- Not aware that it is available.
- Indifference
- Laziness
- Cost. I also have spoken to a number of people who don't seem to understand why licensing of cats is necessary. They don't see any benefit. It seems like a money grab.
- If it's meant to be an indoor cat there is little reason to license it compared to other indoor pets like birds
- It's easy to not license your cat. Cats don't often wear collars and the majority stay inside. There isn't an off leash cat park.
- Its expensive
- Laziness and an attempt to skirt the system....it's not overly expensive so to me those are valid reasons
- No fear of punishment. Same with letting cats roam. They know what the law is but choose to ignore. Penalties should be stiffer. Dog owners could never get away with this.
- Cost. They are indoor cats and stay indoors
- I don't see the point when my cat is an inside pet and he is chipped so if lost he will be returned to me.
- People think it's a money grab. They aren't aware of the benefits.
- Effort and possibly lack of knowledge
- Cost
- No perceived benefit for license process. Feels like a cash grab.
- Irresponsibility.
- Money
- Cats should be licensed and should be the same cost as a dog. People don't because they can get away with it



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stubborn.
Entitled.
Lack social responsibility
- lazy, and cheap
- I do not see any reason for licensing a cat that is never out doors. Only cats who are allowed outdoors to roam or on leash should be licensed. Cats are an affordable pet for seniors and low income and one more bill is more than they can handle.
- Laziness. There is no excuse for having an unlicensed pet.
- I think this is due to the fact that they are not roaming freely and that are an in-house animal. If they did get out most cats do not wear the tag and are either micro chipped or tattooed so that is the method that would be the step to reuniting them with their owner.
- No idea. It seems pretty easy to do and it helps them be reunited if their cat gets out.
- Laziness, if it's an indoor cat they probably think it's not necessary - until they get out.
- Lazy ignorant owners who believe that cats should be allowed to live their lives outdoors killing birds and crapping in neighbours flowerbeds.
- Be afraid of paying a fine in case they run away from home
- Lazy, cheap and unorganized. Finances?
- That the cat is an indoor cat or that they don't harm people, so licensing isn't necessary. Someone who has lots of cats may not want the City to know how many they have.
- Indoor animals, because Calgary has said they are not allowed to roam so why should they be licensed if they don't go outside. Also the cost, and people are stupid, sometimes valuing cats less than dogs.
- Some believe that their cats are indoor cats so they don't need to be licensed if they're not out and about. It could also come down to finances, especially for some seniors.
- They never go outside anyways
- Greed and stupidity
- Probably trying to avoid the cost.
- Not enough enforcement on missing licenses.
- money concerns
- They are idiots.
- I don't have a licence for my cat, but he is an indoor cat. The only time he is outside is on a leash, in our backyard. Plus, he is neutered, so why would I licence him? He is, however, microchipped.
- Cost.
- Lazy or do not know that they need to.
- Lack of funds and equally a refusal to acknowledge that the city has a good reason to license cats.
- They know they won't get caught.
- I think the reason is that the cat is an indoor cat and does not impact anyone outside of the home.
- It's a money grab from the city.
- Owners are too lazy



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They don't want to pay the fee for an animal they feel never leaves the house.
- The annual fees involved.
- Lazy. Cheap. Scofflaws.
- Too cheap to contribute.
- If the cat is indoor all the time, why would you license it?
- N/A
- One reason might be that the cat is an indoor cat and the cost would be my guess.
- If the cat is in the house, it's furniture. Requires no resources so no licence makes sense
- Safe money, too much work
- Cost, inconvenience, having to renew every year
- Financial reasons
- I think people feel that cats are self-sufficient and don't cause problems, so they don't feel the time and money to get a license is worth it.
- Money or ease of payment.
- Stop trying to make me license my dog or cat. You guys are actually really annoying [removed].
- For some pet owners there may be a financial reason for doing this, but I think the main reason is because Calgary is a leader in requiring that cats be licensed and remain on the owners property. Some people are just not used to this idea, but it is essential we keep this place to avoid feral cats
- Cost.
- Laziness.
- Lack of the money to do so
- They are just too cheap to do it.
- I do license my cat but I live in a hi-rise so don't see the benefit of it. Feels like a cash grab! Are there any repercussions to owners who don't license their cats? Only if the cats are picked up out on the street, unlikely when you live in a hi-rise.
- Cannot understand why they would refuse. If their cat gets outside, easier to find their pet.
- A lack of understanding about why. My cat does not go outside - the only reason that the community at large knows of his existence is his active Instagram and Facebook accounts. The only reason the City of Calgary knows about him is that you get my money once a year. Does my fee even cover admin?
- Lack of awareness, selfishness (want cat services subsidized by non-cat owners).
- The cost.
- This could be a financial concern or due to the lack of understanding on why licensing their cat is important.
- Lack of knowledge that an indoor cat needs to be licensed. It is unclear what purpose is of licensing indoor cats. And what the benefit is to the owner. May seem like a cash grab to some. I think it's a lack of clear communication from the city.
- Laziness, a general "I don't care" attitude towards pet ownership, cost.
- that cats should be allowed to go outside



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost and logistics. If your cat is outdoors any type of collar comes with risks. Micro chipping is a much better choice for a lost or injured pet. If your cat is always indoors and has a microchip or tattoo? Why does it need a license?
- Laziness or belief their cats will never go outside
- Cost.
- Cost. Don't care. Indoor only and so do not think they need to.
- That they're primarily indoor animals who "won't get out" or that no one will find out if you don't register them.
- It's an unnecessary fee imposed.
- Lazy; don't want to. Plenty of the ones I have seen can afford it, but don't think it's something that they should have to do, nor do they want to pay for.
- If the cat never leaves the house should it be licenced? (this works up until the cat gets out somehow e.g. door left open, house fire, break-in, etc.)
Also the cost can be viewed as an issue. Discounted multi-year licensing could help mitigate that
- Ignorance
- Lack of understand of cat bylaw and laziness as cats aren't in public the same as dogs
- Cost and Accessibility
- The cat is an "indoor" pet and is never outside.
- Money and access to services. If the registration is too far away and inconvenient people won't go.
- They don't believe anything will happen to them due to lack of enforcement by bylaw.
- Laziness? Cost? Don't believe in regulations? If the animal is truly always kept indoors then the rules are different than for other indoor pets like birds and guinea pigs etc. License all pets sold at a pet store?
- They think their cat will never be in the public
- too expensive
- Probably only if they have indoor cats. I, personally, wouldn't see the point.
- They are indoor cats and paying \$15 a year is bonkers. A one time fee for indoor cats makes A LOT more sense.
- It may be cost for people on low or no income. Other people don't know or don't care.
- cost
- cost, forgetful
- Cost.
- Financial and not understanding why an indoor cat would need a license.
- House cats I'd say. That seems logical. Fine them if they are caught outdoors.
- If the cats are housebound they should not need to be licensed. Unfortunatley some cats escape from the home. If they become a nuisance the owner should be required to license to retrieve, be fined and/or have the cat removed
- Ignorance - they don't understand the benefit. The City has a responsibility to educate people. Adoption agencies can inform the City of new owners; vet clinics can do the same.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cat never leaves home
- laziness and disruption, arrogance. Nothing to do with welfare of animal or community.
- I have no idea. Imbecility? License your cat!
- indoor cats do not need a license
- Likely they think it is an indoor cat and no one would ever know. Also, they probably don't see the point as it never leaves the house so it just seems a waste of money.
- They are irresponsible and ignorant on the services that are funded by those fees that the rest of the taxpayers have to fund
- Cost. Think its useless.
- The cost. Same with vaccinations. And the inconvenience.
- Probably because the cats are indoor-only cats, that would not be allowed outside. However, we all know that cats do escape.
Secondarily, they probably see the ~\$18 licencing fee as expensive.
- There is no good reason but I'd guess the main reason is a simple intention to flout the bylaw. Also, possible ignorance of the bylaw and the benefits of licensing.
- No enforcement
- They don't want to be held responsible for their outdoor pets or they cannot afford the yearly fees? Or they don't know about the bylaw.
- Cheat
- its a [removed] cash grab
- Laziness, they don't believe they need to.
- Lack of understanding of why; not knowing they need to
- Because if their cat die in a run over accident in the middle of the street without their supervision, they can pretend they don't know that cat.
- No return on investment. It is expensive and a hassle.
- If a cat is kept indoors as it should be, licensing should not be necessary
- I have two cats, whose licenses have expired. They live indoors and I have no plans to renew.
- It might be ignorance of the system, I didn't license my cat until I got a dog and realized that my cat should have been licensed as well.
- it seemed a money grab by City, but I appreciate the idea of my cat being found and returned.
many cats roam and defecate in flower beds... if they have a licence maybe they owner should get a fine?
if it is not their flower bed being defecate in.
- I feel this is an example of lazy ownership, the responsibility rests with the owner to license a cat to protect the animal and help the management of feral populations which pose dangers to other animals and is inhumane.
- Stupidity. The belief that cats NEED to go outside. Lack of responsibility.
- They don't think they have to! Currently if cat gets caught & catcher doesn't know pet's address, owner gets away with it! No consequences! Pet should be taken and owner have to pay fine to get



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

pet back! Also, 311 should accept address OR ph number to notify owners (increasing amnt) of captured pet.

- cost is prohibitive.
- Indoor cats really don't require a licence. it is just a tax grab. Licences should be required for outdoor cats only. It would discourage people from allowing cats outdoors, and provide an incentive to have indoor cats.
- Don't see it as necessary for indoor cats
- They think no one else has the right to know what's going on in their household.
- They do not care about the rules and think it does not apply to them.
- They want a pet but they can't afford it
- they do not want to be responsible for their animal
- Indoor cats should not need to be licenced.
- Cost and they may be strictly indoor animals
- the cost
- Either laziness, poverty or most likely the cats are kept indoors. Indoor cats should not be licensed.
- Laziness and cost are probably the main reasons. I have heard that people who intend to let their cats roam also do not want to have them traced back to them.
- Less necessary/thought of when most cats are indoors and already identified by microchips.
- Financial reasons I assume. Also, if you have a busy family life I feel that something like this would fall fairly low on the priority list.
- They don't believe that their cats leave the house, so why should they be licensed.
- Indoor pet
- These are the same people that try to break all rules ... it was how they were raised ... fine them to death ... good luck ...
- laziness, not believing that cats should or can be confined
- cost
- cause they are indoor only. never outside = never lost. Should not have outdoor unless leashed secured same as dogs or other pets.
- It seems like a money grab. Most cats never leave the house anyway.
- They don't roam outside much
- Because the cats live indoors and are never expected to be outside, run away or get lost.
- Belief they won't get caught
- Most cat owners do not put collars on their cats because cats often resent them and pull them off. There is no point in licensing a cat in the hopes of reuniting the lost cat and owner if the license tag isn't with the cat. Microchipping is a much more reliable method of identification.
- Lack of knowledge and lack of enforcement. Limited consequences of not licensing if identified as being non-compliant.
- lazy, cost



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- A pet owner may feel that the need to license is an expense that isn't necessary if their cats stay indoors. The owner may license their cat because it is mandated but indoor cats seldom, if at all, wear their license while inside their owner's home. Hence their decision to go against the mandate.
- If a cat does not go outdoors ever why do they need a license, also could be the cost
- Cats have naturally occurring allergies to license. We must be sensitive to their condition and not force license upon them. Instead, we can slowly transition them to license over a 17 year period.
- People don't want to pay the fee for indoor cats. I think it isn't logical as when an indoor cat escapes is the time when a microchip and ID is most helpful.
- Costs, inconvenience, forgetting, or if owners are otherwise irresponsible with regards to how many animals they have, then there is no formal record of them owning these animals.
- Owner laziness.
- Ignorance. If cats are indoor only these owners don't see the need. Other owners don't care. Also few cats wear collars. Even though my cat is licensed this is not an effective identification for her. She is microchipped for that purpose.
- They have already microchipped or tattooed them - or don't care
- They don't feel they should have to pay for their indoor cat - no one knows they have it, no one knows it's not licensed.
- Unaware cat licensing is required
Lack of flexibility of payment methods on the website requiring a person to pay in person for a license (need to offer more bank payment options, or paypal, not just credit card and limited bank direct pay)
- They all should be licensed. Why not, probably cost. Then they shouldn't have animals.
- Often shame at not being able to afford, or not prioritizing it as an expense. Also a lack of understanding for the consequences of stray cats.
- In my experience, people do not license cats for one of two reasons. They either keep their cats indoors with no intention of letting them out of the house or they want to be able to let the out to roam without having to deal with fines as a result of them getting picked up (at large).
- Cost, forget, not aware they should be.
- Not go outdoors, cost, not want to be subject to regulation
- their cat does not go outside. My cat never leaves my apartment and if she did she is microchipped. Microchipping works regardless of whether or not you have a license...
- not knowing that they needed to as not every city requires cat licensing.
- cost
- Don't see the value.
- Unnecessary and a cash/tax grab by the city.
- Cost or "my cat doesn't go outside"
- I am guessing this would be because these cat owners did not think their cats would ever be outdoors and therefore would not require any services provided by licensing fees.
- Cheap



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Lack of notification.
- They are indoor cats - so they may be seen like a hamster and you wouldn't listen either that. If a cat goes outdoors then it should be licensed.
- Cost and the fact that there doesn't seem to be much reason if the cat is indoors 24/7
- cost? Not sure
- They likely don't want to pay for an animal who mainly spends their time indoors thus never thinking they will be fined. Price of License is likely the issue
- - Lack of knowledge of requirement
- - Can't afford
- - Lazy
- Laziness and/or the arrogant belief that the rules do not apply to them
- I am not aware of this. I'm ok with it being optional as it seems the main purpose is reuniting the pet with their owners in case it is lost. There are other means to guarantee this and it should be optional.
- Cats should never leave their house, so I can't imagine why they do need a license.
- Lack of knowledge.
- Cost, they don't see or understand the necessity
- Likely cost, and not considered necessary if it is an indoor cat.
- They are Solely indoor cats
- 1. If a cat is in their own house or within the confines of their private property they should not be licensed.
- Privacy. Too much information is gained by the city through data collection of pets' owners
- The cats never go outside.
- they are irresponsible. they are trying to avoid the rules and not follow them.
- I don't know.
- Cats are hard to catch and owners will not pay if they know they can get away with it! They are not responsible pet owners or law abiding. These owner just do not give a damn.
- They don't believe an animal that does not leave the property should need a license. Unfortunately animals escape and costs are high to investigate complaints. Licenses also allow the cat to be returned home easier.
- General laziness and overall petty cheapness
- Probably because a lot of cats are indoor cats so someone doesn't think it would ever get outside.
- Cost, not wanting to be controlled, having to remember to do it.
- Cost and awareness.
- Cost, annoyance, not seeing any benefit.
- Probably because they're typically inside the house. All animals, both cats and dogs should have to be licensed.
- Cats are indoors.
- They have indoor cats and don't think they will get out.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Maybe they don't know about the requirement or they are hoping their cats doesn't get impounded, at least for a few years, so they save some money.
- Money? Desire to allow them to roam?
- A cat that has never in it's life been outside the house & never will doesn't need a license. A cat found or caught outside its house must not only have a license but the owner must pay a fine for loosing the cat outside.
- They are probably indoor cats, or perhaps the fee is too expensive.
- Cost!
- Cost, dont want to fill paperwork.
- The cat is an indoors and the cost is too high
- There is really no effective way to enforce licensing the animal, so why bother.
- cost!
- They plan on the cat being an indoor only cat so want to save the cost.
- Cost and cat's are indoors
- Cost
- Some people believe that cats should roam freely without the burden of collars or license tags.
- Cost and it's inconvenient.
- Because they are always indoors.
- You get nothing for it.
- They don't think that it is important. Inconvenient.
- Not cost. Fees are reasonable except for upfront cost of neutering. That might be a deterrent for low income owners. Lack of knowledge of rules for some?
- Indoor cats perhaps. Cost of licensing or maybe they simply dont know they should.
- It feels like a money grab. You won't let cats outside. Why do I have to register something that is confined to my house?
- It's ridiculous for a fully indoor animal
- Expensive
- Cost and hassle
- Cost. You get nothing in return for doing this with a cat, they aren't allowed outside and don't benefit from any city programs.
Most cats don't wear collars, the tags are too large.
- Most people take in strays and don't want the cost.
- Not worth the cost for an indoor animal
- It requires time and costs money.
- Money grab and not necessary
- Cost or not feeling a need to
- Their cats don't leave the house so they don't see a need is what I imagine. I don't have cats, though.
- Could come down to cost of it and or just lazy and irresponsible.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They think their cat is only going to stay inside and nothing will happen to them.
- The cost is high. And cats with collars makes no sense.
- Having a cat that is strictly an indoor cat.
- Cost. The fact that a pet is an "indoor" pet. Worried about "the man" knowing too much.
- Perhaps their cats are indoor only and the owners feel that since the cats don't go out they shouldn't need a licence. Or perhaps they feel it's not the city's business to bill them. FYI I have two licenced indoor cats myself.
- Many people think House cats don't need a license however, it seems most pets that get lost are cats, same rules should apply as it does for dog owners
- They are likely neglectful of other things in life. Do not see any purpose with the license.
- Cost
- Cats stay inside so what would be the point? They aren't using any city services or land. If you just want to track why bother changing a fee
- Lazyness, inept at following rules and possibly cheap.
- Because they are indoor cats and the odds of being fined for an unlicensed cat are very small.
- House only cats
- Cats are not allowed outdoors now the rabbit and mouse population has exploded. Now other predators are moving into urban areas. Cats should only be tattooed or micro chipped .
- Uneducated and uncaring, probably look at the animal as disposable and do not spay or have the animal vaccinated. vaccinations
- This is probably because the cats are indoors and are not taken anywhere. If they follow the bylaws for keeping cats in doors then they don't need to worry about licensing and getting outside.
- Lots of people don't take cat ownership seriously. Couldn't tell you why people are jerks.
- *3) I've seen folks who license become immediate victims of law changes. Suddenly bsl or pet limits enacted, and responsible owners with license the first targets. I have many dogs of breeds targeted for bsl.
- if the cats are strictly confined to perimeters of their own yard
- Habit
- Cost..and cat never goes out
- Irresponsible pet ownership
- "Old school" perspectives that cats do not need licensing.
- Because there has not been a benefit introduced to cat owners for this license. Absolutely appears to be a cash grab with no benefit seeing as most cats are indoors always.
- It's expensive and seems unnecessary when Calgary has a leash law for cats (which in reality means they can't go outside at all). If the cat is staying inside at all times, licensing seems unnecessary. It's not like we license hamsters or birds.
- I think most people choose not to license their cats because of cost. It feels like a money grab. Pets are expensive and people don't see the benefit of a yearly fee to the city.
- Their cat doesn't run away



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost
- If the bylaws say the cats can't leave the owner's property, it seems silly to have to pay to license them. I think this is the primary reason people don't do it. Why should they, if the cat is never going to be outside?
- There is no acceptable reason. It's an animal in a city. Licenses are mandatory.
- People may assume that licensing requirements does not apply to indoor cats. Cost of licensing is probably an issue for those with a limited income.
- They don't let cats out.
- Cats are indoor cats.
- Lack of understanding of responsible pet ownership, costs, inconvenience. It should not be a choice - there need to be barriers to pet ownership so that only those truly committed to responsible pet ownership have pets. It would solve a lot of issues.
- They think that because the cat is an "indoor" cat, a license is not necessary.
- Cat stays indoors
- Unnecessary, another way to be monitored. Honestly there is also very little information unless you go looking very detailed for it.
- I don't see a point in doing it. It's just a money grab. My cats are indoor animals and have been microchipped so they can be returned to me if they get lost
- Maybe they are unaware or have limited income?
- A majority of cats are now kept indoors so it is seen as a cash grab over anything else
- Cost. While I feel our licensing fees are reasonable, I suspect the reason would be costs. Maybe a sliding scale fee structure?
- My cat does not go outdoors. He is micro chipped so if found I would think you will find me .
- Finances and assuming that because they don't go outside they shouldn't have to pay for them to be in the city
- inconvenience, cost
- Possibly the fact that having to license a cat seems to be contradictory to regulations stipulating that cats are not actually free to be outdoors!
- Cost.
- Not transparent with money raised from licensing or information on Calgary spay/neuter program. CGY has a state of the art facility that isn't being used to its full potential. CGY should no longer have the issue with unwanted/homeless cats & kittens. Look to other cities who have solved this problem
- Laziness
- Cost
- It's bizarre to those of us not from Calgary and who have indoor cats. It feels like a cash grab from the city to get money for cats that are never leaving their homes.
- cost, inconvenience, not wanting to be accountable for their roaming pet
- No clue. But if I had a cat and chose not to license it, it would be because if they're outside they are elusive and tougher to catch than a dog.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Irresponsible. They think because they have an 'indoor' cat they do t have to license it. But they let it out.
- Cost and lack of enforcement.
- They do not want to take responsibility for them or they think that their cat will never leave their house or get lost.
- cost, a lot of people have a lot of animals, lady next door had 10 cats, Stunk.
- Laziness
- I think when you register your animal and get the registration metal tag it should come with a silicone wrapper so it doesn't jingle all the time I don't keep my tags on my dog for that reason which would be better for the city if my dog always has tags on it doesn't because they jingle. 10 cent Fix
- If they are indoor cats they shouldn't need to have a license. If your pet gets out you should look for it. Licensing isn't going to help with lazy pet owners who don't search for pets when they are lost
- Lazy, cheap, think their cat is indoors only so not necessary.
- Not sure
- Their cats probably never go outside / leave their house.
- Cost
- Responsible cat owners keep their cats inside and do not allow them to roam free. Those who choose to have their cats roam free and be a nuisance should be accountable by licensing their cats. In addition, licensing tages are too large and unsafe for most cat collars.
- For indoor cats, there is no penalty/consequence for not licensing their cats. It isn't like the city keeps track of how many pets you have per household and if they are licensed. If the cat is indoors, the only way the city would find out they were unlicensed would be if they escaped.
- My friend has a cat she did not license and said 1) it's a cat and won't leave my house; and 2) car licensing is a stealth tax.
- Either the cost very reasonable rates in my opinion) or too lazy. Some think of the cat isn't going outside why license? All animals should be licensed.
- They think it's a indoor cat so it's not needed
- Cats that are strictly indoor pets should not require licensing.
- Greed, laziness, uneducated, denial that the cat will never get out, away or be stolen.
- They keep them inside
- Cats are not outdoors/don't see need for licensing, cost barrier.
- No idea
- Cats don't use as many city resources as dogs
- Irresponsible owners. They might not be able to afford it or simply ignore it. Microchipping your cat might be best if you want your cat returned if it goes wandering off. Licensing cats increases the # of cats picked up by animal control and brought to shelters. High #'s end up being euthanized
- Cats don't really leave the house
- If the cat is not leaving the home it feels unnecessary



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They don't want to pay the fee and they don't want to follow the rules. They say their cat is an indoor cat, so why licence it. But sometimes the cat gets out.
- Why should people pay for a license for a pet who is never supposed to leave your house? I did not mind licensing the cat before that ridiculous bylaw was put into effect, but I feel it is just a cash grab now.
- 1) Cat is indoors and does not impact the neighbors, public or City property.
2) Cost of license is not proportionate to the value of service received. The lifetime license fee could be as high as \$400 and the only cost to the City is entry of info in the data bank.
- Probably seems like an unnecessary expense for animals that don't leave the home.
- Annoying and they can abandon their cats anytime or sell them, or just leave their cats outside. Also so the authorities do not know if animal abuse.
- Indoor cats only. Cost. Tax grab. Does no good!
- They don't respect laws, their neighbours, nor their community; are self-important, and know they won't be penalized. KeyThe lack of enforcement (no neighbour wants to raise the issue and the City is not proactive dealing with this, so it continues, as does most of the lawless behaviour in Calgary).
- Cost, the fact that if the cat isn't aloud outside anyway, why licence it?
- No value received from licensing (ex indoor cat only)
- Cost, inconvenience, If the cat never leaves the house I could see not wanting to pay for a license but the fact remains that pets in general should probably be licensed as this keeps owners accountable in case their pet is involved with damaged property or injury to human or animal.
- Neglect to follow local bylaws.
- Indoor only cats. And cost.
- Lack of enforcement
- It's a cat. Haha. Most don't know you have to license it, I'd say
- Expense.
- Irresponsible or unaware of the requirement
- They dont believe they will get fine
- If they were 100% indoor cats I'd have no issue. But if you choose to let your cat out you risk using City of Calgary 311 (for lost pets), humane society etc. so should pay into the pet fee to support those programs. Hard to differentiate cat owners inside vs outside. So... all cats need a license
- I am a responsible cat owner and keep my cat indoors at all times. there is no impact to the neighbourhood or community, nor does my cat need to be registered for people to log complaints as with dogs. I would rather a small fee upon pick up of a found cat at the city shelter, then an annual renewal
- Because they're indoor cats and don't ever leave the home.
- Mine is licensed & has been since day one. They are an in door cat, but likes to door dart. If he escapes from our house, he is microchipped, as he doesn't wear a collar. Microchip would be better than a license. Penalties for non- licensed. No excuse. My cat is important to me.
- Don't feel cats are "worth" licensing

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- So that if the cat gets out they are not held responsible.
- be use they are strictly indoors
- cats are indoors
- think its indoor cats and haven't relations with city infrastructure
- see the dog section
- Avoid spending money, lack of responsibility
- Lack of funds.
- Their animal doesnt go outdoors
- People do not licence their cats, so if the cat roams, damages or poops on another's yard, the owner can deny ownership and responsibility.
- Unsure, maybe laziness?
- Because it's a money grab by the city
- Cost, cats live indoors, lack of understanding how licensing helps lost cats.
- Costs.
- Two primary reasons would be that the cats are indoors only, or the cats have a microchip or tattoo for identification.
- Laziness.
- They are indoor and cost
- Lazy, lack of money, don't want to have animal tracked back to them when they break the rules of at-large.
- The think they'll never leave the house so there is no reason to.
- Cat lives inside only.
- If a cat is allowed to roam outdoors it makes sense for them to be licensed. An indoor cat, under bi law not allowed outdoors, makes no sense to license. It is a money grab on the part of the City.
- They think cats are "free" and should not be controlled in the same manner as dogs. There is also a factor of cost and convenience.
- Ignorance or entitlement.
- Maybe if they are indoor and they think they will not escape.
- The cats live indoors and the City doesn't enforce it. The City needs to find a better way to enforce cat licensing and with that record pet ownership, put standards into place on how many cats a household can own thus cutting down on shelter costs and strays.
- A fine should be imposed and if not paid or the person continues to not obtain a license, remove the cat. Drivers should not drive without a license, neither should pet owners own pets without a license, for the sake of the animal and for others.
- The ridiculousness of a bylaws stating cats can be controlled to a yard.
- lack of knowledge
- Financial, laziness.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ignorance. If you own a pet, you can pay the small license fee to get it back to you IF they should ever get lost. Even if you abide by the laws and keep it inside, if your house was broken into and the door left open or animal stolen, you have a better chance to get your beloved back!
- Lack of awareness. Or forgetfulness. I forgot to renew my cat license one year after I had moved. Also rebelling against the fact that they have to do it. Thinking that the cat stays inside anyway so what's the point.
- They are cheap.
- They are cheap.
- Cost, laziness, don't care, disdain for bureaucracy, and thinking they don't need a license if they don't leave the house.
- To save money
- It is a risk to the cat to wear a collar, so most people won't have a tag on the cat for ID. Micro chips work for that.
- Laziness
- Laziness or not wanting to pay the fee. Many owners are unaware of the requirement.
- They seem to think they don't really "need" to. They think it's ridiculous and/or "intrusive". They're cheap, lazy, irresponsible, and selfish. Most of all selfish.
- They believe their animal is at no risk of getting lost or sick.
- I think for indoor cats, it should be an option on whether or not cats are licensed, and for those who allow their cats to roam, the law isn't strict enough, they get too many chances before fines, if found ever!
- Expenses, \$\$
- They don't want to pay
- Cat does not leave the house. Most cats have a tattoo that is registered to owner
- Money.
- Liability. They are quick to deny ownership as they do not want to be liable for their cats harassing or causing damage to others. They just claim they are caring for a stray, despite the cat being invited into their home.
- Unknown
- No extra cash.
- tracking purposes, as there is not shortage of missing cat posters every where you go.
- Cats shouldn't need to be licensed
- Uninformed?
- Cost (money grab) and annoyance and cats not being a issue especially if they are an indoor cat.
- Probably just being lazy and a cost thing especially if the cat is strictly indoors I do not see why it would be necessary
- May seem unnecessary if the cat never leaves the house.
- Cost, laziness/forgot/lack of time
- It is a house cat that does not leave the house
- We license our cats but have friends that don't because "they never leave the house"



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Price, inconvenience, lack of info
- The thought that they can get away with it because a cat stays inside.
- Cost
- Because licensing an indoor cat seems ridiculous when they aren't leaving the house.
- Money
- I have indoor cats and live in a condo and do not license my cats. They have no chance of getting out, therefore no reason for the expense.
Most cats are micro chipped or tattooed at the vet, so why pay to also license the cat?
- Money. And cats often do not leave the house so why bother.
- I don't use collars. My cats don't leave my yard. They are chipped.
- It's practically pointless and another way to squeeze money out of people.
- people do not feel it is a "real" law that will be enforced.
- High cost with limited benefit. Often cats do not venture outside, does not seem necessary.
- Cost. It cost money that I don't have.
- There is little consequence.
- Not necessary - indoor cat. And/or the cost.
- 1:) No accountability. How will you catch them?
- 2:) Save money.
- 3:) Lazy
- 100% indoor cats with little chance of escaping outdoors. Cats unable to wear collars due to safety concerns. The cost of licensing a cat.
- Their cats do not go outdoors
- The only reason that I could think of would be the cost. It is an extra annual fee that is not mandatory, so I could see many members of the public opting not to pay it as they don't see the value in it.
- If cats are microchipped and/or tattooed, why are people supposed to get a licence? Especially if you cannot let your cat outside. People know the risks of letting their cat outside
- Cause it's a cash grab from responsible pet owners to pay for the cost of the pets neglected by negligent pet owners. It's expensive when you consider all the taxes we pay on literally everything from property tax, income tax (30%), sales tax, provincial tax, carbon tax. Don't we pay enough to gov?
- Laziness. Think they are above the law. Responsible pet ownership
- laziness
- I think people don't license their cats because of a difference of social standard which is unfair to dog owners. Other reason is cost or the cat never leaves the house.
- The burden of paperwork
- Cats not going outside
- Perhaps their cat is always indoors and the main reason for licensing is to return them back home if lost.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think this is two spectrums far left they are entitled and dont care and will risk getting caught far right they are impoverished and cant afford it. I also think Vets should be required to report to the city unlicensed animals.
- Animals are never off owners property--ie outside
- The owners don't see the value or reason to license. The education is not out there. It appears to just be another fee to pay.
- Stupidity and lack of disrespect of the law. They think that they are above the law.
- Financial reasons or they plan for the cat to remain indoors all the time.
- What are the chances of getting caught.
- usually kept at home not seen in public
- Possibly cost. And annual renewal
- Laziness and a feeling privilege. This is something that many Calgarians feel. They think they are entitled to do they want. I've never met so many self absorbed people in my life who think rules are not for them.
- The cost.
- they're very irresponsible people
- Lazy and too easy to get away with it
- Cost in their eyes unnecessary for an animal who never leaves the house. As long as they are indoor cats and stay there.
- Indoor cats? Probably don't know, don't want to pay it, don't think they will ever be caught cause they are indoors.
- Zero return on investment. The responsible cat owner, not wanting their cat to become coyote/bobcat food, does not let the cat out so, does not license the cat. Those who let the cat out see no reason to license either.
- I didn't know you could choose not to do this. I think licensing cats that never get out just a cash grab by the city. Ours are chipped and tatoo'd if they got out. If they roam, they should be licensed (or if you love your cat, don't let them roam).
- indoor only cat, affordability, no access to computer, not sure where to license,
- not sure. maybe the fact that the fees keep going up every year!
- rebel thinking
- Cost, not responsible
- Cost. Maybe also time and not wanting to support bureaucracy.
- The cat never leaves the home.
- Price, don't see value in this
- lazy?
- Laziness? I have to admit, my cat is strictly indoors and I don't have him licensed. There doesn't seem to be a strong benefit or need to license. Even though I know the potential benefits if he should escape, it seems fairly low risk.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cat people in general simply don't understand the responsibilities that come with pet guardianship. I see this over and over again. There is not enough punishment for these people; they need to understand that the underlying cost to society of cats and dogs is equal and act accordingly.
- Old school thinking that cats should be free to roam. Cats' like dogs need to be licensed.
- Cost, can't be bothered.
- Probably a) the expense of the license and b) for people whose cats spend time outdoors, the owners hope to limit their potential liability for any harm or damage caused, since the animal cannot be identified.
- Have no idea. Maybe too expensive for some?
- Their cats don't go outdoors, so why spend money that most can't afford.
- they don't think it's necessary or understand the purpose. Also, why does it matter what I think of this? Shouldn't you ask "as a pet owner, do you license your pet? Why or why not?"
- Because they're forced to be indoor animals and the cat never leaves the house. Most owners don't even bring them to the vet.
- Cost
- Finances
- It's a cash grab by the city if the cats are indoors
- That their cat never leaves their home.
- Money. Plus people might think "why should I license a cat when it stays in my home most of the time".
- If a cat is just an indoor cat why does it need to be licensed? Licensing for cats is simply a money grab. Cats that are microchipped don't need to be licensed too why duplicate work>?
- Because it is not needed. A license is only a way of politicians to make easy money.
- Don't see the benefit. Think it's just another tax.
- When I tried to fill it out I had to gather a lot of information like microchip numbers and exact dates of birth, which I didn't have all of. If the form were simpler, I would have licensed my cats
- They don't think it's important? They many also think that it's no one's business but their own if they choose to own a pet.
- Money and laziness
- Because they either never leave the property and the price is to high or they do leave the property and the owner doesn't want to get caught doing this
- The cat is an indoor cat.
- no benefit to owners
- They don't know to do it or don't want to spend \$\$\$. I wish they would.
- it's a money grab. they aren't allowed out so why do they need to be licensed? if people are worried about reunification then they should be able to opt in to licensing - otherwise it should not be required for cats.
- I feel these people think that cats always come home and dont need a license.
- All domestic pets should be licensed



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost or forgetfulness
- Money and the belief that they don't go outside ever.
- Because the Bylaws do not have a history of cat-specific enforcement; society perceives cats are not an aggression/attack concern nor ongoing over-population concern to the public. The aggression is more of a concern for dogs; large dogs may be perceived as dangerous or aggressive.
- Cost and if the cat is an indoor pet it feels unnecessary.
- Often those owners are the ones who let their cats wander as they please day and night. I would be worried about their safety! It is easy to be that kind of owner.
- Because they are indoor only, and have other identification available such as a tattoo or microchip
- Crazy enough, but the main reason I do not license my cat is because he CANNOT WEAR A TAG. He has a condition called PICA where he eats EVERYTHING, even his own tags. I understand the importance of licensing my cat, and I will do quite happily, but please find a way with no tags.
- See it as a cash grab by The City.
- They are lazy and irresponsible. They think their cat will not get out.
- I would guess they are lazy, & also do not wish to incur the expense.
- They think it's a money grab
- Cats remain inside, licensing is not necessary. Main reason is that owners are not allowing their cats outside.
- I think people have in door cats and think it is not necessary. I also think it costs a lot to license an animal and to do this every year.
- Animals that do not leave the house
- Cost
- Not sure? Maybe money. Maybe the thought that it's a cat and they wander the neighbourhood and catch mice. The fact that they crap in other people's property is not their concern. Or maybe that it's just a cat and not a pet.
- Ignorance and cost cutting.
- That they're indoor cats probably. I imagine people don't get the purpose and the economy is down so no lone is looking to spend money unnecessarily. Hard enough to get ppl to take their cats to the vet when they should.
- Cash grab. The city shouldnt ask people to license pets that do not go outside. It's none of the city's business.
- Laziness, avoidance of city bylaws, cat is only indoors
- Kept indoors.
- They don't understand the importance
- they are indoor cats only
- I think those individuals are lazy & just can't be bothered. I'm sure they feel that because cat owners are not usually out walking their cat (such as with dogs), no body will know. Personally, I am ok with not having people license cats as long as they remain indoors. Not too many out on leashes.
- Cost, irresponsible ownership, think they won't get caught.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cat is indoor only
- The cat doesn't go outside, it's 'just' a cat are the reasons I've heard
- I believe it is because they have not been held accountable for licensing their cats! They have gotten away with it for years and years and years! It is unfair that dog owners are held accountable. It all come back to responsible pet owners
- I really think they are cheating the system and are basically lazy. They need to be shamed into compliance in my opinion.
- Too expensive and very dangerous for the animal
- Awareness of the need to lisenice cats
- Apathy, don't believe it is important
- If you're a responsible pet owner you have your pet microchipped, licensing is just a waste of time and money.
- In my experience the cats are always returned to the owner and the owner is not find. Enforcing the fines it's a huge issue with me. False calls on responsible owners with license pets is also an issue that needs to be addressed. Microchipped and altered animals should not have to be licensed
- They don't want to pay for the licence.
- Cost
- Cost &/or lazieness
- They either have a cat that's always indoors or else they think the freedom to roam is just normal for cats.
- Not concerned that their cat will run away/need a license
- Na
- Indoor cats?
- Cost, forgetful, don't want to be accountable if cat roams
- Cash grab
- It is unnecessary administration with no benefit.
- I would assume that if the cat is and indoor cat, that the owner probably thinks they won't need to license it since it doesn't go outside. or alternatively they may have the cat microchipped and feel this is adequate for identification if the cat is lost.
- Want to let them outdoors and not be held responsible for their actions
- It's not automated. Take a cc and have the option to have it automated. It be able to buy a 5 year license.
- the cat is an indoor animal
- Indoor only so don't see need to license.
- They don't feel the need to license their indoor pet. Cost.
- It's the mentality of some
it's a cat why bother
- Cost
- Cost and lack of necessity (if it is an indoor cat people do not see the point).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Because cat is a house cat..
- I believe only cats that are indoor bound should not have to have a license but only as long as they are microchipped/tattooed and wearing a collar. Cats that escape the house frequently should have a license just to ensure their safety and security in the chance they get lost or picked up.
- the thought of 'what is the point'.
- Honestly I keep forgetting to renew. A longer lasting license would be awesome!
- laziness. If my cat doesn't go outside, they don't need to be licensed. Lack of understanding of why it is important.
- Laziness. If you can't afford to license your pet, you shouldn't be able to have one.
- - They believe their cats will return home
- - Think the registration program is a City of Calgary money grab
- Lack of responsibility as a pet owner. I think they believe that if the cat is an indoor cat it's not necessary.
- They are cheap and do not want the expense.
- Likely an outdoor cat, probably not a responsible owner. Or they have too many they don't want anyone to find out. I also believe there is a stigma that people think it's a cash grab
- If the cats are indoor only, they really shouldn't need to license them because they are not taking the Animal Services programs. If they are letting their cats loose as well as not licensing them, they are irresponsible owners and their cats should be confiscated. The license is cheap!
- They tell me it is a house cat & do not allow cat to go out doors. Any cat in Calgary should be licensed.
- it takes time and money
- They believe it doesn't apply to them. Plus identifying ownership of a loose cat is difficult and most people aren't concerned about their cats being caught.
- Don't want to spend the time or money
- Money?
- Lack of responsibility and do not care
- That their cat does not exit their dwelling.
- Cost?
- Indoor and assumed that it is just a cash grab. Opposition to government oversight.
- Cost? Time?
- Cats always stay indoors and don't wear a collar. If they are lost they have ID through microchip/tattoo
- Cheapness. And they feel that cats should be allowed to roam free.
- Don't feel a need, indoor cat, money
- No one enforces any of the rules regarding cats so why should anyone that has a cat follow them?
- they plan to keep the cat indoors so they feel a license is not necessary
- They leave their cats to roam and do not want them to be tied back to the owner and fined



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They never go out side so whats the point. Its just a money grab. I can understand if they are out side more but you cant get a collar on 90% of cats in The first place. So they ar licensed so what who knows even when they are out side a chip in pets is more useful thou even its not 100%
- They feel that they are above the law and continue to let their cat(s) out and do not think the cat can be traced back to them.
- For cats that remain indoors at all times it doesn't make much sense to have to license them (although we did license our cats when we had them)
- The fee, and having to do so every year.
- not sure? lost pet recovery?
- Lack of available funds
- Primary reason is likely because the owner doesn't want to spend the money each year. Some people may need the company of an animal but lack the funds to license. Also maybe some people don't believe cats should be licensed.
- Cost
- So if the cat roams, the owners won't get fined?
- If the cat ever escapes and found. With the owners information they can be reunited.
- The cats are indoor cats or cats do not wear collars.
- too lazy to do so
- They think they don't need to because it's too expensive for a cat that probably doesn't go outside
- The current bylaw states that cats can't roam, therefore they shouldn't be outdoors, so people don't licence to avoid getting caught and there are those that can't afford it. Allow them to roam as long as they are licensed.
- some might be cost? but most I believe just don't care. they are the ones who don't spay/neuter either and have multiple cats
- Cats aren't meant to be locked up
- Indoor cats, that do not ever roam outside, should be exempt from licensing. Cats also frequently cannot safely wear collars, so proof of licensing is challenging for them.
- Some people don't believe their cats will ever get out. It can be dangerous to put collars on cats, so no where to hang a license anyways. Licences fees go towards fixing cats that are not their own. Some just don't want to pay. They dont value their cat enough.
- The cost, and for what benefit really.
- Owners that fail to licence their cats likely feel that they have no responsibility to ensure bylaws are followed as the licence fee is reasonable.
- More than likely the non licensing of cats is because they do not go outside
- Not sure
- They don't want to take responsibility for their cat. Their cat doesn't like to wear a collar with the license.
- they don't think it is important



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't see any reason to license an indoor cat. It's probably not possible to separate licensing indoor /outdoor cats but it would be nice if it could happen.
My cat is tattooed and as a chip this should be enough information to get the animal back to me if it happens to sneak out.
- they can't afford it or they just don't care and are lazy
- Not wanting to pay the fee or else thinking their cat will always be inside and they should not have to license.
- Seems silly that you have to pay the city to have a cat inside your own house. There aren't any cat parks or similar amenities obvious to cat owners, seems like you're paying for nothing. Inconvenient to pay annually
- Cost, inconvenience, irresponsible
- The owner has an indoor cat only.
- My friends with cats say that there's no benefit: they've said the City won't contact them if their cat is turned into the pound/humane society.
- Being lazy and the cost
- lack of enforcement, lack of understanding of benefits
- They don't go out.
- Why, there is no point. They don't really get anything for having a license and not perceived benefit. Also should be a one time license I am guessing - paying every year I am guessing causes people over time to really say, why? Plus less city man hours (tax payers' money) needed for one vs many.
- No reason to, bylaw doesn't appear to pay attention to roaming cats
- Education
- They are inside cats and Don't roam outside
- The animal is kept indoors only.
- If I lose my dog they're licensed and if found I can generally find them. My cat doesn't leave the house. He is terrified of doing so. I'm extremely confident that I will not lose him and if so he wouldn't go far. If he doesn't leave the house and isn't in the public then why does he need to be?
- Financial reasons
- Idiocy. Poverty.
- Money , laziness, lack of awareness, negative attitude towards the city
- Seems pointless if they are kept inside.
- A waste of time and money, they do not spay/neuter their animals, are not educated on why licensing is important, have lived in rural areas where rules are different, animal does not leave the home so does not see the point
- Cats are beyond rules. And if they are keeping them indoors, why pay for a license? However, cats can escape and those that roam free should be identifiable.
- They do not think that the cat will ever get loose from the home.
- It is too expensive.. If the cost was lower or every 5 years I bet more people would license their pets and because cats don't tend to kill each other like dogs would if in a fight.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- increase of fees every year
- I would assume cost and perceived hassle. Perhaps they don't know why licensing is important?
- don't see the need, don't want to pay the government.
- Cost, and if they are considered indoor only I think many people don't see the point.
- Inconvenience and cost
- cost and active decision not to
- The cost and the harassment to re-license yearly.
- They don't believe they should need to if the cat is "indoors". I do not agree and like that they are licensed providing funding from licensing goes to spay/neutering etc.
- They don't care
- They probably have strictly indoor cats.
- I think it is because they are indoor cats and see no need to be licensed. If you let your cat out, then I can see why they would license it.
- Can't be bothered and their feeling cats should not be controlled in any way as well as the cost of the license.
- I don't understand why you wouldn't license a cat. The fees are reasonable. My cats are both indoor cats and they are both licensed.
Maybe people with indoor cats don't think it's necessary.
- It is an expensive cost that some may feel is unnecessary for an animal that is confined inside a private property and is not let out to roam or come into contact with other animals.
- "Indoor only" and don't think it'll get out.
- Cost and an I don't care attitude.
- Lazy
- N/A. My cats are licensed. Having said that - I think people are cheap and don't want to pay.
- I assume because cats mostly stay indoors?
- Laziness, belief that their cat stays indoors so shouldn't need to be licensed
- Can't afford it?
- Do not care if licensed or not. The city does not need to know how many they have
- Lazy or irresponsible. All my pets are licensed.
- N/A
- Doesn't seem necessary or needed.
- Price/indoor only
- Probably that the cat is an indoor animal and the owner doesn't think that licensing would be of benefit.
- Cost
- Cats are indoor only cats and owners are not worried that they will become lost.
- cat does not leave house/home
- Financial



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Honestly I am not too sure, for those that have strictly indoor cats which is very good on their part probably figure they dont need it because their cat is never outside, but on the contrary if your cat were to ever escape it would be good to have them licensed so they can be returned.
- Cost and having purely indoor animals
- Not informed, lazy, or can't afford it. But if money is a consideration, should someone own a pet? Pets still need to be fed, and that costs money.
- Inconvenience/cost.
- money and no control
- They are indoor cats
- Id guess money.
- It is silly to have to license something that is never allowed to see the light of day. Is the city going to license fish, hampsters, reptiles next? Only animals allowed outside should be licensed.
- Cost, indoor only, money grab for the city
- cost and not knowing the requirement
- House only
- Cost
- Lazy
- unable to afford it, don't feel they need to license, lazy, irresponsible
- That these owners let their cats free roam Calgary
- Unknown, I don't have a cat.
- It's expensive and my cats are completely indoor animals.
- Financial reasons. They don't have the time. They don't know where to go.
- I would think they do not see the point in it and the expense
- They do not know it is a requirement of the city
- Laziness.
- Strictly indoor
- lazy
- I have no idea why they would not license. Perhaps laziness, lack of awareness, lack of consequence. The cost is so low enough that if your pet is altered I don't see cost being a factor.
- They do not see why it's necessary, seems like a money grab.
- Cats shouldn't need a licence as they can't really do any real harm.
- Cats stay indoors all the time.
- Financial barriers. It can feel like an unnecessary cost, especially if the animal is primarily indoors. Also it's annoying to have to do it every year.
- Cost
- Annual renewal
- Because the cat is indoors. Also many people probably don't even know that they should
- cost
- They don't care



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They mainly keep the cat indoors
- Their cats are indoor only cats.
- Don't know or are too lazy to bother.
- Cost
- Because they are cats. Cat owners and dog owners are completely different. It is believed that a dog is bigger and will therefore do more damage, so they are not trained or treated the same at all. Imagine if I just let my dog wander the neighborhood and come back whenever it felt like it!
- Too expensive.
- Placing a lower value on their cats than on their dogs. Ignorance about what the license fee is used for and how registration can help their cat. A belief that as long as the cat is kept indoors there's no need for a license. Cat licensing is a recent thing and it takes time to change attitudes.
- They are kept indoors only. However, I feel the point of ID on pets is for the offchance they escape. You do not plan on this happening but should be prepare in case it does.
- An annual pet license is a bogus fee that does not benefit the owner in any way. A reasonable one time licensing fee (eg. One \$50/charge or something) to enter your animal in the system should suffice.
- Not sure, I'm not as familiar with cats
- Indoor cats pose no threat and aren't an inconvenience to neighbours. Most cat owners probably feel no need to license their pet, and if they are in a lower income bracket, licensing cats is not a top priority.
- They believe that their act never leaves their property- see it as a cash grab
- Cats live indoors only and never leave the home. The yearly cost is too high.
- Price and cats not going outside.
- They can't afford it. They forget. They no longer have the cat and are too embarrassed to report it. They don't see a need for it.
- Price or they no there is no consequence
- Money. Laziness. Lack of awareness. Because their cats are "inside cats".
- They know no one will find out and penalize them.
- I don't know. I don't have cats.
- If the cat doesn't go outside then they don't think it's necessary. Otherwise, laziness.
- Expense.
- Habit and old ways. Especially if they are not out in the community. People don't see a need. With microchip that is how people have their animals returned.
- Cost?
- Lack of education/laziness/escalating costs
- Cost, having to renew every year especially if cats are indoor. Silly in my opinion. Indoor cats don't wear collars so the tags just sit in a drawer.
- No idea. Throw the book at them.
- If it is a house cat only it seems unfair that it should be licensed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If a cat never is allowed outside why does it need a licence? seems like a cash grab
- Cost.
- Did not take the regulations seriously.
- Cost
- Cost
- Cost and not likely to get caught if cats kept inside.
- Price point and if they are indoor cats only
- Indoor cats.
- Expense, disregard for health and well being
- Can't afford it or want to breed their animal
- Cats require much less commitment by nature, cats are not brought out to public places such as dog parks, cats do not tend to interact with the public
- House cats
Cats lose collars
- Cats who only stay indoors
- Unsure
- Affordability
- Money
- Belief that their cat won't get out, don't understand how it benefits them.
- They have indoor cats and don't see a reason to spend the money when their cat is unlikely to be impounded.
- They may not expect their cat to get loose if it is an indoor cat. They may not be able to afford it. They may not be aware of subsidies.
- Cats do not leave the residence to it seems unnecessary
- They assume their cat will not get out of the house / don't want to pay the fee
- Cat does not go outside.
- They see cats as disposable and not worth the effort.
- Lack of money, irresponsible, indoor cat so doesn't need one.
- Likely can't afford it or view it as unnecessary
- the cost and just being lazy. These people should understand that if they want to own a pet they should be responsible to pay for a pet license.
- Indoor cats that typically don't go outside
- expense
- Finances. I worked in low income areas of the city for 12 years. People would rather decrease their own food than their cats, let alone licence them
- Cost. Many cat owners have multi cats, a good portion of low income persons have cats as they cost the least, until the altering fees that do NOT equal out the reduction of license over the life of the cat (\$30/10yr not worth the \$4-500 spay) and unaltered license fees too high, esp for multi homes
- The cat does not go outside in public. COST



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Unknown, I do not own cats and wont sumise why others do not follow the bylaw.
- Not responsible, can't afford it. Probably should not own pets!
- Irresponsible.
- To avoid paying as well as not providing an avenue to back track ownership
- They don't go outside and don't want the cost
- cost, and if the cat is an indoor cat
- Lazy - or money. Also they may feel that if they don't take there cats out of the house it does not matter. more education is really all you can do. I believe in licensing both cats and dogs
- Willing to take the risk to save some money
- N/a
- Indoor only, cost, own unhealthy number of animals
- Expense or they are house pets only.
- Cost and responsibility
- Cost
- You aren't allowed to have cats outside of the house so why on earth would anyone pay to licence an animal they aren't allowed to have roam free
- The rule is already that they stay in the home only so people might think what's the point. People get cats because they're easy and might see licensing as an unnecessary expense that they can easily get around (due to the cat staying in the privacy of home)
- cats are indoor only animals, have microchipping or tattoos
- There are no benefits to licensing
- They think there is no need...
our cat is solely indoors however I believe all cats should be licensed for the odd time they escape.
- Indoor cat that doesn't leave the house? "Unnecessary" fee.
- They don't feel the need to take responsibility for what their cat might do when roaming free, unidentifiable
- If cats are to remain indoors, what's the need for licensing? I think many don't license due to the cost.
- The cats are indoor cats and never go outdoors.
- Money
Keep them inside
- They don't want to pay the fee.
- a pet owner who is selfish and does not think of their cats or other people.
- Avoid a money grab from the city licencing cats that are exclusively indoor animals.
- Their cats are indoor cats, or they can't afford the annual fee.
- Cost as a major factor for indoor cats not believed to ever escape or wander. To owners I have heard this often, they're pet is indoors and as such does not affect city workers, etc,. The other is that even licenses when cats are picked up it's too expensive to 'bail' them out of animal services.
- Cost



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- cost
- They are inside cats and do not go outside
- Cost
- The cost and effort - if they are indoor cats then they may not understand why it matters. If they never go out then why worry about it?
- cat stays indoor all the time?
- My cat stays inside and is afraid to go outside. My cat that does escape sometimes is licensed. My dog is licensed as well
- People are lazy and they haven't felt the repercussions of not licensing. For some they may not be able to afford it on top of pet food, perhaps.
- They do not think it is necessary. Their cat doesn't go outside lack of education on licensing/purpose.
- I feel like they just don't want to, they don't feel that it is necessary, they also often don't think it will be enforced
- Uninformed and cost.
- Cost of money or time.
- Don't have one
- Likely because their intended to indoor cats and therefore owners feel they will never be outside..
- Cost, indoor pets, not knowing the laws
- They intend to keep there cats indoors, but they should still be licensed and spayed -neutered.
- Cost - and an independent streak
- They don't know that they have to.
- Too expensive or just simply do not want to comply; viewed as an unnecessary imposition.
- Price or they don't care about their pet. To me licensing is a bit of a joke because some pets are licensed and others are not. If I don't license them then I don't have to pay if they get picked up and the city can deal with them.
- We all know it is just a cash cow, cats do not need to be licensed. Responsible people have always been responsible before licensing. Cats are not licensed in most countries. When you fine people to retrieve their unlicensed cats, some will opt to just get a new cat and you end up with a surplus
- Irresponsible ownership
- Cost of the license as they are primarily indoor cats that never leave the house.
- Since the cost is low I think it's about forgetfulness or disdain for the process- or feeling it's a cash grab. Low income options should always been available.
- The belief that an indoor cat does not need to be licensed.
- Financial.
- I believe in not being taxed for owning a cat, if you are responsible and keep your cat inside.
- I am happy to pay a small licensing fee for my cat, but I don't really know what it's for. I think if people had a better understanding of the purpose, they may be more likely to comply. Also, people may not license because they see it as an unnecessary fee.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think for most the cost, they would rather have that cost go towards care of the cat or other costs and just don't think it's necessary.
- Too lazy, want to allow their cats to roam and so don't want to get in trouble for it. Don't want to pay the cost. Don't want to immunize animal.
- Too expensive
- Because they don't let their cats outside and in the case of them sneaking out, they likely have a microchip. For those who follow the rules around not letting their cats out and do have their animals chipped, the licensing is a cash grab.
- Misinformation, finances, laziness, lack of access to the Internet to find resources such as the MeowFoundation.
- Lazy or costs .
- They don't think cats need to be or they stay inside so no point
- The cat is not allowed outside.
- Liscencing fees mainly pays for liscencing enforcement
- Combination of laziness and old attitudes about cats being free roaming and historically exempt from such regulations. Also many people with indoor-only cats probably don't see the point.
- The cat stays in the house, so why register?
- NA
- cost and laziness.
- Not wanting to pay fees or general lack of ownership/being responsible.
- They maybe ignorant of the law, or feel that their cats are indoor and do not require licensing
- I believe their primary choice would be because the cat stay in the house.
- Because they don't think the pet ownership applies to cat owners and cat owners are not policed like dog owners are.
- Their cats are indoor only.
- Indoor cats that will likely never step foot outdoors
- Cats are generally in your home and therefore there is no need to be accountable... they don't feel they will ever be caught for not licensing
- indoors only
- Probably the cost, all mine are licensed even though they are all indoor cats but I'd like to know where all the extra money is going from the cat licensing since it started.
- Because they don't understand why the public wants cats to be licenced, they can't be bothered or think they are above the rules because the cat "never leaves the house"
- Most likely because the cat in indoors mostly. Perhaps money. I'm not sure.
- They keep them indoors so don't think they need to
- lazy, don't want or think they need to, these are the same people that let their animals roam free even in terrible weather conditions so they aren't going to pay anything, most of them don't take their pet to a vet either, and they don't care if the animal returns, it just irresponsible behavior
- Too cheap



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- For some, their cat stays inside and is unlikely to get lost or be in contact with any person / animal outside their home. For others, they're either irresponsible, uneducated about the reasons for licensing, or don't have the money.
- Cat is never outdoors unless harnessed and on the owner's property, or, owners are too lazy to bother.
- Most people get their cat for free, so they're not about to spend extra money on it. It's the same reason they don't get neutered or microchipped- a sad reality.
- Little to no benefit
- I think the primary reason for alot of people is their cats are not outdoor cats. They never leave the residence they live in.
- Laziness, being too busy, or an unwillingness to pay the tiny fee for licensing.
- Cost, what benefit is there to owners licensing their cats? Cat promotions? Discounts?
- Shows lack of responsibility
- The cat is an "indoor cat" and never sees the outside. Which is the rule in Calgary. So why license something when the cat can't be outside. I do not support this view but it is the main view. what if the cat escapes - plus the fee is extremely reasonable.
- Expense. If you have an indoor cat, what's the point?
- Cost and laziness
- They are indoors, never going to get out (hahaha) They are just cats (cat don't have the same value as dogs) . Can't afford the licence
- That they assume that it will never leave the house so they shouldn't have too.
- Years ago it was mandatory to license cats, I doubt that is in forcible.
- I don't have one but I think people who dont let their cats outside shouldn't to pay the fee. I disagree, that comes as part of pet ownership
- If it's an indoor cat, then it seems less important to keep a collar and license on the animal. Many people, especially those new to the city or new to cat ownership, also don't know about the bylaw.
- All pets who go outdoors should be licensed- shouldn't be a choice. No money to pay for licensing?
- Cats are meant to be indoor pets and I feel that many cat owners feel the risk of their cat getting loose does not warrant the cost to license their cat. A license is the best way to find an owner for a lost pet.
- I think people don't understand the reason and value of licensing. I think the price is also a barrier in some cases. It makes sense to pay more to get an intact lost pet home (like a fine) but if you're responsible owner it shouldn't cost more just to license an intact pet.
- No idea
- Likely that they have an 'indoor' cat and don't plan to have the cat leave their home, so don't see the value in licensing the pet.
- I'm not understanding why a cat license has ever come out if cats are not supposed to roam free. If my cat happens to get out it's his tattoo in microchip that are going to get them back home. Cat licensing has also doubled in cost since it started



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The cats don't go outside therefore don't bother anyone
- Cost.....recurring expense
- It seems like a cash grab
- they keep them indoors
- cats are difficult to contain
- No clue!
- My cat is never outside.
Cost
- Not being responsible or think their cat will never go outside or be lost.
- Cats should not need to be licences, they pose no danger.
- Money
- Cost, and no perceived benefits.
- I don't know.
- I don't understand cat people.
- There is no reason to license domestic cats.
- Cost?
Inconvenience?
Misunderstanding?
- N/a
- most probably don't know it is a requirement, or they assume they will never get caught. why don't you advertise cat licensing more?
- Indoor only cats should not have to be licensed. Personally my cats are afraid of outside. Since they are contained indoors with no risk of getting lost or being a nuisance, they should not have to be licensed.
- Most cats are indoors and licensing doesn't return them home like microchipping, etc., does.
Cost.
- Just plain lazy
- Cost and not seeing value out of it
- Perceived high cost. The perception that they will get away with not doing so.
- For exclusively indoor animals, with a slim chance of getting out - the price is absurd. As someone who has worked for animal control, I understand the reasons behind it but for multiple, neutered/spayed indoor cats who will never use city services, it's a lot for the average owner to swallow
- I think this is foolish, I appreciate above all the chance to register my cat's microchip number so that she can be returned to us if she ever gets out of the house and gets lost.
- Money grab by the City. Remove the cost but require owners have a licence.
- Likely cost. Depending how an animal has come to be in someone's life (ie a stray, taking in an animal from someone, etc), there may be true ignorance to the responsibility of pet care and ownership.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost, and thinking it doesn't matter (ie licensing is just a tax grab)
- Laziness or cost
- They plan to keep their pet indoors at all times.
- Cost and fear of accountability
- indoor cats don't go out and if they escape, chances are the license will fall off.
- Licensing not only with owner but all rescues.
- Arrogants and being cheap, cant afford it. Or feel indoor only pet means it shouldnt apply.
- They undervalue the cat as a pet and see them easily disposable and replaceable.
- I think people who dont license thier cats have indoor cats. I dont think cats should need licenses, but I do think they should have a form of ID (tattoo, microchip)
- Ignorance of the law and apathy.
- I would guess that their cats are indoor cats.
- Having to pay money to tell someone you have a pet, and not seeing how that information is relevant to anyone other than the pet owner.
- do not have a cat. but do feed the strays in the area
- No, it should be for all pet owners. If they cannot afford it, lower the fee.
- They think their cats won't go outside, cat's are second class citizens in many homes so they don't consider them as they do dogs
- A responsible pet owner has their animal tatoood and cared for by their vet, at their own cost. I think licensing cats is an extra, unnecessary cost, as their is no benefit to the owner or cat for this. The money from this goes where?
- Cost and convenience.
- they believe as strictly indoor cats there is no need or benefit to licensing; cost of licensing
- Distain for the bylaws of the City.
- They think that because their cat is an indoor cat there is no need, however, kitties get out. I feel that people are uneducated about the risks and sometimes don't care. They feel its a waste of money perhaps.
- Likely the cost. Especially if pet never leaves household.
- Its their personal freedom.
- Cats & dogs should not require a license
- I think that the primary reason is that people don't expect their cat to be outside, and therefore it doesn't need a license.
- the cost or the desire for privacy from the city knowing "everything"
- I think people assume if their cats are indoor cats that they do not require licensing.
- Save money
- Too dangerous for the cat to wear a collar or harness so they probably think it is pointless and a waste of money to get a cat license, especially when most animals can be identified with a micro chip
- It's a money grab



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- N/A
- Cost and ignorance!
- They are unlikely to let their cat outside so they don't think they need one and don't want to pay for it.
- They are indoor and we so not avail of any services paid through licensing. You can place your own tag on cat, not necessary to license through city.
- Laziness, money, don't feel like they have to/don't need to
- Being cheap and lazy and not a responsible member of society
- That the cat is primarily an indoor cat and that they were "unaware" of the requirement to license and indoor cat
- He is micro-chipped - what's the purpose of licensing besides The City collecting money wherever it can?
- lack of responsibility and no consequences
- Cost. Also it is more dangerous for cats to wear collars, even inside the house. So having a license that isn't worn seems silly.
- I know that I would find it easier to more regularly license my pet if I had only one account for my household instead of a separate account for each pet.
- Price. If it could be clearly demonstrated that the licensing fee goes directly to the care and programs for animals, it would have greater impact
- My cats are licensed.
However, it is not practical to have cats wear their licenses with a collar.
- What are the benefits? Ignorance of laws, more education required perhaps. People don't view cats the same as dogs, not as messy or loud so they tend to be ignored but can also cause problems for neighbours.
- I can't imagine because they absolutely should be licensed. I can't say that it is cost, because the cost is the same for dogs and cats.
- Cost, lack of awareness on need & how to do it, marketing.
- many people don't let there cats outside, maybe these people feel they don't need to license their cats if the are indoor only.
- not seeing the benefit
- For multi-cat households it is a financial burden, and may consider it unnecessary, especially if all of your cats live indoors
- they are indoor cats that are never outside and shouldn't need a licence to be able to find the owner if they go missing.
- Lack of enforcement.
- because they are indoor cats
- cat does not leave the house
- Cats stay indoors.
- Money and believe there cat will never go out



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- My cat is only ever outside on a leash so therefore there is no point in her being licensed.
- No good reason - - licensing should not be a choice.
- Monetary.
- If cat doesn't go outside, why license
- Laziness and a right wing attitude that doesn't feel like they should have to do it.
- Primarily cost most likely. Can it be done online for ease?
- They think their cat is strictly an indoor cat and doesn't need a license or their cat won't tolerate wearing a collar.
- They just don't want to pay the fee or they think that since their cat isn't allowed outside it's a waste of money? Not sure
- Cost
- It doesn't leave their house, or are feral.
- Price, couldn't be bothered
- they probably think the rule does not apply to them, their cats are inside so therefore why should they be licensed.
- Convenience and Laziness
- The cat is only indoor
- Indoor cats.
- People see license as a means to return a stray cat to its home. If your cats are strictly indoor cats you don't see the need for this.
- Ignorance
- Most cats are indoor cats, and I don't think people should have to license their indoor cats, responsible pet owners should not let indoor cats out, period. It's part of the responsibility of a pet owner. For those that have outdoor cats and do not license, I think do not license because the cost
- Over stepping government
- Cats that are in the house have no need to be licensed
- They feel they are entitled to not register their pets.
- Laziness. My cats are strictly indoor yet are vaccinated, sterilized and licensed.
- Cost and the fact that they are strictly indoor cats.
- Expense and accountability
- what right does the city have to charge me for my pet that costs the city nothing. piss off
- Saving money.
- Indoor cats. Outdoor cats must be licensed or not allowed at all.
- cost
- cost
- Cost
- cost though I do as I like the program
- Likely unaware of license expiry date.
- Unaware that cats need a license.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Do not want to have to pay to license or renew license.

- cost
- Ignorance to the actual cost to the municipality for control efforts.
- ignorance. cost. laziness.
- City of Calgary charges quite a bit, with no discount to multi-cat households.
- Cause they can
- Cat owners don't want to pay out money to license their cats. Another reason could be laziness.
- Cost for indoor animals
- They own only indoor cats who never go outside.
- Not sure why cat owners should not license their cats. It should not be optional at all - it should be part of the by-law that they have to.
- We do not pay to license children. Licensing and the Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw is demeaning towards animals.
- Indoor cat that is not allowed outside. Cost
- They may not see a point if they have a 100% indoor cat and/or see it as a 'money grab' by the City. Probably could push the 'what if' that if their cat gets out they have a better chance of being returned if they are licensed
- I think people believe the cat is indoors so no one needs to know they have cats
- They don't agree with licensing, do not see it as anything necessary, don't wish the city to take money from their pocket and put it in the city's coffers to waste.
As the Calgary's mayor said at the time - a solution looking for a problem
- The idea that their cats are kept indoors and there is no point to it.
- They are unaware that they have to do so.
- Privacy
- No clue. I license my cat
- Maybe because those cats are indoor cats and don't leave the house, so they always stay within private property. I think cat owners should license their cats.
- cat is kept indoors only. cost.
- They don't think they will get caught so why pay for something that is not policed
- They think it is expensive, they say they are only indoor (but accidents can happen), they have no faith that they will get their pet back, they think they will still have a ticket if the breakaway collar is gone.
- Ignorance, cost or resentment of government. But you should ask them. I've always licensed my pets.
- I would assume the primary reason for not licensing a cat, is that it will be inside your house and never out so why pay the money.
- I licence, but for many indoor cat owners, they don't understand the benefit. I licence my cat because I like to support the many programs that support other animals like the spay program,



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

senior programs etc. I also like the comfort of knowing that if my cats escaped, they are more likely identified

- They don't go outside and are microchipped.
- Laziness
- Laziness and being irresponsible.
- price increases when we are in we have been in a bad economy for the past 12 years!
- COST , Cats rarely are off property so folks do not see how they impact the community .. also lack of knowledge what the city can provide. Plus fear of policing.. the world is to judge and people are fearful of losing their loved ones
- They keep their cats indoors (as per the bylaw) so don't think it's necessary.
- see no value in it
- Laziness. No consequences from city.
- Don't want to pay money to the City,
- Cats are house cats probably, so no need to get a license.
- people are poor or they are unemployed with limited income or they just want to spend their money on other things and/or they do not want to give any money to The City of Calgary.
- It's a cash grab. Licensing does nothing other than keep track of who owns what animals. Why there is a cost associated with it is beyond me.
- I think cats should be licensed however it should be last for longer
- They believe cats are free spirits and do not fix their cats to keep population down
- - No enforcement
- - No value
- - Go to humane society
- - Indoor Cats
- - Less licensing
- - Different resources required for cats
- Bec indoor cat, it's just a cat
- - Apartment cats
- - Education
- - Cost
- - What benefit/no service used
- They might not have enough money or don't want to give money to the government.
- - Costs too much
- - time/inconvenient
- Indoor cats only
- Do not want to pay the fee
- the cost and just being lazy. These people should understand that if they want to own a pet they should be responsible to pay for a pet license.
- Indoor cats that typically don't go outside



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- expense
- Finances. I worked in low income areas of the city for 12 years. People would rather decrease their own food than their cats, let alone licence them
- Cost. Many cat owners have multi cats, a good portion of low income persons have cats as they cost the least, until the altering fees that do NOT equal out the reduction of license over the life of the cat (\$30/10yr not worth the \$4-500 spay) and unaltered license fees too high, esp for multi homes
- The cat does not go outside in public. COST
- Unknown, I do not own cats and wont sumise why others do not follow the bylaw.
- Not responsible, can't afford it. Probably should not own pets!
- Irresponsible.
- To avoid paying as well as not providing an avenue to back track ownership
- They don't go outside and don't want the cost
- cost, and if the cat is an indoor cat
- Lazy - or money. Also they may feel that if they don't take there cats out of the house it does not matter. more education is really all you can do. I believe in licensing both cats and dogs
- Willing to take the risk to save some money
- N/a
- Indoor only, cost, own unhealthy number of animals
- Expense or they are house pets only.
- Cost and responsibility
- Cost
- You aren't allowed to have cats outside of the house so why on earth would anyone pay to licence an animal they aren't allowed to have roam free
- The rule is already that they stay in the home only so people might think what's the point. People get cats because they're easy and might see licensing as an unnecessary expense that they can easily get around (due to the cat staying in the privacy of home)
- cats are indoor only animals, have microchipping or tattoos
- There are no benefits to licensing
- They think there is no need...
our cat is solely indoors however I believe all cats should be licensed for the odd time they escape.
- Indoor cat that doesn't leave the house? "Unnecessary" fee.
- They don't feel the need to take responsibility for what their cat might do when roaming free, unidentifiable
- If cats are to remain indoors, what's the need for licensing? I think many don't license due to the cost.
- The cats are indoor cats and never go outdoors.
- Money
Keep them inside
- They don't want to pay the fee.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- a pet owner who is selfish and does not think of their cats or other people.
- Avoid a money grab from the city licencing cats that are exclusively indoor animals.
- Their cats are indoor cats, or they can't afford the annual fee.
- Cost as a major factor for indoor cats not believed to ever escape or wander. To owners I have heard this often, they're pet is indoors and as such does not affect city workers, etc,. The other is that even licenses when cats are picked up it's too expensive to 'bail' them out of animal services.
- Cost
- cost
- They are inside cats and do not go outside
- Cost
- The cost and effort - if they are indoor cats then they may not understand why it matters. If they never go out then why worry about it?
- cat stays indoor all the time?
- My cat stays inside and is afraid to go outside. My cat that does escape sometimes is licensed. My dog is licensed as well
- People are lazy and they haven't felt the repercussions of not licensing.
For some they may not be able to afford it on top of pet food, perhaps.
- They do not think it is necessary. Their cat doesn't go outside lack of education on licensing/purpose.
- I feel like they just don't want to, they don't feel that it is necessary, they also often don't think it will be enforced
- Uninformed and cost.
- Cost of money or time.
- Don't have one
- Likely because their intended to indoor cats and therefore owners feel they will never be outside..
- Cost, indoor pets, not knowing the laws
- They intend to keep there cats indoors, but they should still be licensed and spayed -neutered.
- Cost - and an independent streak
- They don't know that they have to.
- Too expensive or just simply do not want to comply; viewed as an unnecessary imposition.
- Price or they don't care about their pet. To me licensing is a bit of a joke because some pets are licensed and others are not. If I don't license them then I don't have to pay if they get picked up and the city can deal with them.
- We all know it is just a cash cow, cats do not need to be licensed. Responsible people have always been responsible before licensing. Cats are not licensed in most countries. When you fine people to retrieve their unlicensed cats, some will opt to just get a new cat and you end up with a surplus
- Irresponsible ownership
- Cost of the license as they are primarily indoor cats that never leave the house.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Since the cost is low I think it's about forgetfulness or disdain for the process- or feeling it's a cash grab. Low income options should always been available.
- The belief that an indoor cat does not need to be licensed.
- Financial.
- I believe in not being taxed for owning a cat, if you are responsible and keep your cat inside.
- I am happy to pay a small licensing fee for my cat, but I don't really know what it's for. I think if people had a better understanding of the purpose, they may be more likely to comply. Also, people may not license because they see it as an unnecessary fee.
- I think for most the cost, they would rather have that cost go towards care of the cat or other costs and just don't think it's necessary.
- Too lazy, want to allow their cats to roam and so don't want to get in trouble for it. Don't want to pay the cost. Don't want to immunize animal.
- Too expensive
- Because they don't let their cats outside and in the case of them sneaking out, they likely have a microchip. For those who follow the rules around not letting their cats out and do have their animals chipped, the licensing is a cash grab.
- Misinformation, finances, laziness, lack of access to the Internet to find resources such as the MeowFoundation.
- Lazy or costs .
- They don't think cats need to be or they stay inside so no point
- The cat is not allowed outside.
- Liscencing fees mainly pays for liscencing enforcement
- Combination of laziness and old attitudes about cats being free roaming and historically exempt from such regulations. Also many people with indoor-only cats probably don't see the point.
- The cat stays in the house, so why register?
- NA
- cost and laziness.
- Not wanting to pay fees or general lack of ownership/being responsible.
- They maybe ignorant of the law, or feel that their cats are indoor and do not require licensing
- I believe their primary choice would be because the cat stay in the house.
- Because they don't think the pet ownership applies to cat owners and cat owners are not policed like dog owners are.
- Their cats are indoor only.
- Indoor cats that will likely never step foot outdoors
- Cats are generally in your home and therefore there is no need to be accountable... they don't feel they will ever be caught for not licensing
- indoors only
- Probably the cost, all mine are licensed even though they are all indoor cats but I'd like to know where all the extra money is going from the cat licensing since it started.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Because they don't understand why the public wants cats to be licenced, they can't be bothered or think they are above the rules because the cat "never leaves the house"
- Most likely because the cat is indoors mostly. Perhaps money. I'm not sure.
- They keep them indoors so don't think they need to
- lazy, don't want or think they need to, these are the same people that let their animals roam free even in terrible weather conditions so they aren't going to pay anything, most of them don't take their pet to a vet either, and they don't care if the animal returns, it just irresponsible behavior
- Too cheap
- For some, their cat stays inside and is unlikely to get lost or be in contact with any person / animal outside their home. For others, they're either irresponsible, uneducated about the reasons for licensing, or don't have the money.
- Cat is never outdoors unless harnessed and on the owner's property, or, owners are too lazy to bother.
- Most people get their cat for free, so they're not about to spend extra money on it. It's the same reason they don't get neutered or microchipped- a sad reality.
- Little to no benefit
- I think the primary reason for a lot of people is their cats are not outdoor cats. They never leave the residence they live in.
- Laziness, being too busy, or an unwillingness to pay the tiny fee for licensing.
- Cost, what benefit is there to owners licensing their cats? Cat promotions? Discounts?
- Shows lack of responsibility
- The cat is an "indoor cat" and never sees the outside. Which is the rule in Calgary. So why license something when the cat can't be outside. I do not support this view but it is the main view. What if the cat escapes - plus the fee is extremely reasonable.
- Expense. If you have an indoor cat, what's the point?
- Cost and laziness
- They are indoors, never going to get out (hahaha) They are just cats (cats don't have the same value as dogs). Can't afford the licence
- That they assume that it will never leave the house so they shouldn't have to.
- Years ago it was mandatory to license cats, I doubt that is enforceable.
- I don't have one but I think people who don't let their cats outside shouldn't have to pay the fee. I disagree, that comes as part of pet ownership
- If it's an indoor cat, then it seems less important to keep a collar and license on the animal. Many people, especially those new to the city or new to cat ownership, also don't know about the bylaw.
- All pets who go outdoors should be licensed- shouldn't be a choice. No money to pay for licensing?
- Cats are meant to be indoor pets and I feel that many cat owners feel the risk of their cat getting loose does not warrant the cost to license their cat. A license is the best way to find an owner for a lost pet.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think people don't understand the reason and value of licensing. I think the price is also a barrier in some cases. It makes sense to pay more to get an intact lost pet home (like a fine) but if you're responsible owner it shouldn't cost more just to license an intact pet.
- No idea
- Likely that they have an 'indoor' cat and don't plan to have the cat leave their home, so don't see the value in licensing the pet.
- I'm not understanding why a cat license has ever come out if cats are not supposed to roam free. If my cat happens to get out it's his tattoo in microchip that are going to get them back home. Cat licensing has also doubled in cost since it started
- The cats don't go outside therefore don't bother anyone
- Cost.....recurring expense
- It seems like a cash grab
- they keep them indoors
- cats are difficult to contain
- No clue!
- My cat is never outside.
Cost
- Not being responsible or think their cat will never go outside or be lost.
- Cats should not need to be licences, they pose no danger.
- Money
- Cost, and no perceived benefits.
- I don't know.
- I don't understand cat people.
- There is no reason to license domestic cats.
- Cost?
Inconvenience?
Misunderstanding?
- N/a
- most probably don't know it is a requirement, or they assume they will never get caught. why don't you advertise cat licensing more?
- Indoor only cats should not have to be licensed. Personally my cats are afraid of outside. Since they are contained indoors with no risk of getting lost or being a nuisance, they should not have to be licensed.
- Most cats are indoors and licensing doesn't return them home like microchipping, etc., does.
Cost.
- Just plain lazy
- Cost and not seeing value out of it
- Perceived high cost. The perception that they will get away with not doing so.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- For exclusively indoor animals, with a slim chance of getting out - the price is absurd. As someone who has worked for animal control, I understand the reasons behind it but for multiple, neutered/spayed indoor cats who will never use city services, it's a lot for the average owner to swallow
- I think this is foolish, I appreciate above all the chance to register my cat's microchip number so that she can be returned to us if she ever gets out of the house and gets lost.
- Money grab by the City. Remove the cost but require owners have a licence.
- Likely cost. Depending how an animal has come to be in someone's life (ie a stray, taking in an animal from someone, etc), there may be true ignorance to the responsibility of pet care and ownership.
- Cost, and thinking it doesn't matter (ie licensing is just a tax grab)
- Laziness or cost
- They plan to keep their pet indoors at all times.
- Cost and fear of accountability
- indoor cats don't go out and if they escape, chances are the license will fall off.
- Licensing not only with owner but all rescues.
- Arrogants and being cheap, cant afford it. Or feel indoor only pet means it shouldnt apply.
- They undervalue the cat as a pet and see them easily disposable and replaceable.
- I think people who dont license thier cats have indoor cats. I dont think cats should need licenses, but I do think they should have a form of ID (tattoo, microchip)
- Ignorance of the law and apathy.
- I would guess that their cats are indoor cats.
- Having to pay money to tell someone you have a pet, and not seeing how that information is relevant to anyone other than the pet owner.
- do not have a cat. but do feed the strays in the area
- No, it should be for all pet owners. If they cannot afford it, lower the fee.
- They think their cats won't go outside, cat's are second class citizens in many homes so they don't consider them as they do dogs
- A responsible pet owner has their animal tatoood and cared for by their vet, at their own cost. I think licensing cats is an extra, unnecessary cost, as their is no benefit to the owner or cat for this. The money from this goes where?
- Cost and convenience.
- they believe as strictly indoor cats there is no need or benefit to licensing; cost of licensing
- Distain for the bylaws of the City.
- They think that because their cat is an indoor cat there is no need, however, kitties get out. I feel that people are uneducated about the risks and sometimes don't care. They feel its a waste of money perhaps.
- Likely the cost. Especially if pet never leaves household.
- Its their personal freedom.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Cats & dogs should not require a license

- I think that the primary reason is that people don't expect their cat to be outside, and therefore it doesn't need a license.
- the cost or the desire for privacy from the city knowing "everything"
- I think people assume if their cats are indoor cats that they do not require licensing.
- Save money
- Too dangerous for the cat to wear a collar or harness so they probably think it is pointless and a waste of money to get a cat license, especially when most animals can be identified with a micro chip
- It's a money grab
- N/A
- Cost and ignorance!
- They are unlikely to let their cat outside so they don't think they need one and don't want to pay for it.
- They are indoor and we so not avail of any services paid through licensing. You can place your own tag on cat, not necessary to license through city.
- Laziness, money, don't feel like they have to/don't need to
- Being cheap and lazy and not a responsible member of society
- That the cat is primarily an indoor cat and that they were "unaware" of the requirement to license and indoor cat
- He is micro-chipped - what's the purpose of licensing besides The City collecting money wherever it can?
- lack of responsibility and no consequences
- Cost. Also it is more dangerous for cats to wear collars, even inside the house. So having a license that isn't worn seems silly.
- I know that I would find it easier to more regularly license my pet if I had only one account for my household instead of a separate account for each pet.
- Price. If it could be clearly demonstrated that the licensing fee goes directly to the care and programs for animals, it would have greater impact
- My cats are licensed.
However, it is not practical to have cats wear their licenses with a collar.
- What are the benefits? Ignorance of laws, more education required perhaps. People don't view cats the same as dogs, not as messy or loud so they tend to be ignored but can also cause problems for neighbours.
- I can't imagine because they absolutely should be licensed. I can't say that it is cost, because the cost is the same for dogs and cats.
- Cost, lack of awareness on need & how to do it, marketing.
- many people don't let there cats outside, maybe these people feel they don't need to license their cats if the are indoor only.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- not seeing the benefit
- For multi-cat households it is a financial burden, and may consider it unnecessary, especially if all of your cats live indoors
- they are indoor cats that are never outside and shouldn't need a licence to be able to find the owner if they go missing.
- Lack of enforcement.
- because they are indoor cats
- cat does not leave the house
- Cats stay indoors.
- Money and believe there cat will never go out
- My cat is only ever outside on a leash so therefore there is no point in her being licensed.
- No good reason - - licensing should not be a choice.
- Monetary.
- If cat doesn't go outside, why license
- Laziness and a right wing attitude that doesn't feel like they should have to do it.
- Primarily cost most likely. Can it be done online for ease?
- They think their cat is strictly an indoor cat and doesn't need a license or their cat won't tolerate wearing a collar.
- They just don't want to pay the fee or they think that since their cat isn't allowed outside it's a waste of money? Not sure
- Cost
- It doesnt leave their house, or are feral.
- Price, couldnt be bothered
- they probably think the rule does not apply to them, their cats are inside so therefore why should they be licensed.
- Convenience and Laziness
- The cat is only indoor
- Indoor cats.
- People see license as a means to return a stray cat to its home. If your cats are strictly indoor cats you don't see the need for this.
- Ignorance
- Most cats are indoor cats, and I don't think people should have to license their indoor cats, responsible pet owners should not let indoor cats out, period. It's part of the responsibility of a pet owner. For those that have outdoor cats and do not license, I think do not license because the cost
- Over stepping government
- Cats that are in the house have no need to beocensy
- They feel they are entitled to not register their pets.
- Laziness. My cats are strictly indoor yet are vaccinated, sterilized and licensed.
- Cost and the fact that they are strictly indoor cats.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Expense and accountability
- what right does the city have to charge me for my pet that costs the city nothing. piss off
- Saving money.
- Indoor cats. Outdoor cats must be licensed or not allowed at all.
- cost
- cost
- Cost
- cost though I do as I like the progame
- Likely unaware of license expiry date.
Unaware that cats need a license.
Do not want to have to pay to license or renew license.
- cost
- Ignorance to the actual cost to the municipality for control efforts.
- ignorance. cost. laziness.
- City of Calgary charges quite a bit, with no discount to multi-cat households.
- Cause they can
- Cat owners don't want to pay out money to license their cats. Another reason could be laziness.
- Cost for indoor animals
- They own only indoor cats who never go outside.
- Not sure why cat owners should not license their cats. It should not be optional at all - it should be part of the by-law that they have to.
- We do not pay to license children. Licensing and the Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw is demeaning towards animals.
- Indoor cat that is not allowed outside. Cost
- They may not see a point if they have a 100% indoor cat and/or see it as a 'money grab' by the City. Probably could push the 'what if' thatbof their cat gets out they have a better chance of being returned if they are licensed
- I think people believe the cat is indoors so no one needs to know they have cats
- They don't agree with licensing, do not see it as anything necessary, don't wish the city to take money from their pocket and put it in the city's coffers to waste.
As the Calagry's mayor said at the time - a solution looking for a problem
- The idea that their cats are kept indoors and there is no point to it.
- They are unaware that they have to do so.
- Privacy
- No clue. I license my cat
- Maybe because those cats are indoor cats and don't leave the house, so they always stay within private property. I think cat owners should license their cats.
- cat is kept indoors only. cost.
- They don't think they will get caught so why pay for something that is not policed



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They think it is expensive, they say they are only indoor (but accidents can happen), they have no faith that they will get their pet back, they think they will still have a ticket if the breakaway collar is gone.
- Ignorance, cost or resentment of government. But you should ask them. I've always licensed my pets.
- I would assume the primary reason for not licensing a cat, is that it will be inside your house and never out so why pay the money.
- I licence, but for many indoor cat owners, they don't understand the benefit. I licence my cat because I like to support the many programs that support other animals like the spay program, senior programs etc. I also like the comfort of knowign that if my cats escaped, they are more likely identifie
- They don't go outside and are microchipped.
- Laziness
- Laziness and being irresponsible.
- price increases when we are in we have been in a bad economy for the past 12 years!
- COST , Cats rarely are off property so folks do not see how they impact the community .. also lack of knowledge what the city can provide. Plus fear of policing.. the world is to judge and peopel are fearfull of loosing their loved ones
- They keep their cats indoors (as per the bylaw) so don't think it's necessary.
- see no value in it
- Laziness. No consequences from city.
- Don't want to pay money to the City,
- Cats are house cats probably, so no need to get a license.
- people are poor or they are unemployed with limited income or they just want to spend their money on other things and/or they do not want to give any money to The City of Calgary.
- It's a cash grab. Licensing does nothing other than keep track of who owns what animals. Why there is a cost associated with it is beyond me.
- I think cats should be licensed however it should be last for longer
- They believe cats are free spirits and do not fix their cats to keep population down
- They stay indoors. Nobody sees them. Hoarding of cats.
- They claim their cat is an "indoor" cat so it is an unreasonable cost. They don't think about the possibility or the consequences of when their cat ends up outdoors.
- My cat is an indoor cat and never goes outside.
- They probably assume their cats will never leave the house if they are only house cats, or they may not know this is something they need to do.
- They cant afford it
- No need, they stay indoors and it's expensive
- Cost is the primary reason. Licensing of indoor cats should not occur.
- There is no apparent value to purchasing licenses for pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The cat is 100% indoor
- Because their cats do not go outside
- The primary reason would be that cats are never on the streets but often cats are on the streets. Cats should be licensed.
- Why are we doing this anyway? If a cat stays inside and never leaves who cares?
- Cost, going to registry
- Finances
- I believe people think that if the cat is indoors and not roaming, it doesn't need a license or collar.
- Apathy
- Why do we need to license? It's a city way to see how many animals and a cash grab
Not necessary when as responsible pet owners we already pay extremely high immunization costs yearly
- Waste of money/no service provided in addition to license or not aware of requirement. May be completely indoor pet and owner does not see benefit to licensing.
- Not educated that its required
They dont want to pay the yearly cost
They don't want the city to know how many animals they have
- Feel it's not necessary if their cat does not leave the house. Laziness
- most cat owners dont allow their animals out side due to the threat of wild life encounters in city of calgary, the liscence to those owners is just another money grab.
- Their cat is not an outdoor cat or The animals' previous owner did not license the cat
- Finances
Legislated annual warning before enforcement action taken
Lack of return
Indoor cat
Value of animal
Relatively new process
Ignorance of importance/value of licensing
- They don't want to spend the money.
- We suspect these are most likely to have cats roaming free and do not want the responsibility of paying fines if/when they are trapped.
- The cat may only stay in the house
- The cat is strictly an indoor pet.
- Laziness
Lack of interest to pay
- Lazy
Irresponsible
- Most likely because the cat never goes outside.
- N/A



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- finances
 - legislated annual warning before enforcement action is taken
 - lack of return
 - indoor cat
 - value of animal
 - relatively new process
- It's extra effort and cost and they don't see the value. These are often the same people who are irresponsible, don't spay/neuter, and let their cats out. People view cats as disposable and this attitude needs to change before everyone will license their cats.
- Laziness, forget to renew, keeps cat indoor only, finances (although if you can't afford this fee, can you afford to have an animal)?
- probably because of cost and it is not the City's business if a person has a cat or not. Privacy concerns. It is totally unnecessary; cats are quiet.
- Government legislation has allowed people to consider animals as disposable, causing many to be ignorant rather than uneducated. A cat is a different animal compared to a dog & more dangerous for a cat to wear a collar/license regardless of whether it's a house cat or an outdoor cat.
- Cat never leaves the home.
- expense, laziness, owners above the law, owners not responsible
- I feel like cat owners believe their cats never go outdoors so a license doesn't make sense. I would agree but still require an indoor license to be required and offered at a lower price. It would be interesting to see all the cats and dogs on a street via a map.
- Not sure
- Ignorance that cats don't need licenses.
- Indoor cat, cost of license, lack of return.
- No idea, all pets (except fish?) should be licensed, part of the license should be a declaration that they are properly vaccinated and neutered.
- They don't care if they get the cat back. They don't want the administrative hassle.
- The cats do not go outside.
- Laziness
- I think the licensing is not appropriate that would be like licensing a family member. Also the licensing fees are very high
- Irresponsible pet ownership, then financial issues.
- Finances; Legislated annual warning before enforcement action taken; Lack of return on investment (don't see/know what benefit they are getting); Indoor cat (feel they don't need to license as cat not outdoors); Value of animal; Relatively new process
- Not wanting to pay the fee. Libertarian approach to life.
- Mostly I expect they object to spending the money, being told to and not seeing any return from doing so and some perhaps do not have money.
- Laziness and a feeling they don't need to.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They are justifiably confident that no one has the courage to report them and even if they do you won't do anything about it, and even if you do, the penalties are trivial.
- I can't surely say but if it costs money then I for one might choose not to license an animal (haven't owned one yet in Calgary). Additionally if they don't let their cat(s) outdoors then they may not see the need to.
- - People don't understand what their licensing fees go towards.
- - People are cheap, a large percentage only provide their pet with it's basic needs, so they are loathe to give up their money to the city for some invisible service.
- - Lax enforcement fuels fee avoidance, especially due to the economy
- Lack of money and lack of education.

Primary reason for not licensing dogs

- What is the reason for a license for a dog?
- Same as above, to avoid fees. They should be heavily fined, banned from future pet ownership, and have their animal removed from their care.
- Cost? They see no benefit in having one?
- cost- if a pet is micro chipped then a physical license should be one-time payment and done. The chip scanner can replace the license database going forward.
- Cost
- Probably money. I've lived in many cities in this country and Calgary was the only one where I've had to renew my pets license annually.
- Likely that it slips their mind and/or that they don't want to incur the cost.
- low income or they do not walk dogs in the city they walk them in the country.
- I don't know why anyone wouldn't. Same as above I would wager.
- Not sure. Maybe they don't take their dogs to off leash areas and believe that they have them under control at all times.
- cost
- It's a cash grab.
- They think it is unnecessary, are unaware of the requirement, or do not know what the cost of licensing pays for or how it benefits them
- ignorance
- Same as above.
- Money
- Money grabber, why do we need to do this? Most animals now are being chipped so whats the point.
- Cost
- Cost? Not know how?
- Irresponsibility or financial hardship.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Yearly licence renewal is absurd. Another major problem is that dogs must have the license on them. Completely impractical for small dogs or dogs that can't wear heavy tags. Microchips are way safer for lost dogs anyways.
- perhaps the same reasons as noted above
- Lack of enforcement means no consequence for not licensing.
- No idea.
- lazy or cheap
- See previous answer.
- If the dog doesn't go to dog parks or that it's a money grab
- Maybe they forget?
- Cost, nobody really enforces it. Not as big of an issue as cats.
- Same as above.
- Cost.
- Not aware of the requirements.
- Not sure.
- Financial and lack of education.?
- N/A I license both of my dogs.
- Don't want to pay money.
- Laziness
- Money or attitude. Either they think they can't afford or, or they have the attitude that rules do not apply to them.
- Cost
- Outstanding fines is most likely the reason for this, the location of where you can buy the licence (as a lot of people don't have credit cards to pay online) is inaccessible by transit and beyond inconvenient. More portions of where and how to pay.
- It is expensive and time consuming to license every year. It should be a one time item. They may be afraid of the stigma of owning a 'violent breed'
- Unsure. All my dogs have been licensed. Perhaps if you have many dogs cost or not wanting the city to know how many you have and not be targeted by bylaw or SPCA?
- Cost, value added. How is it more effective than a tag with owners address?
- Possibly lack of education.
- Trying to follow regulations and hope that my fees go towards improving the program and animal care services
- Cost. Illegal breeding. Dog fighting rings. Stolen animal.
- Same as above. Perhaps cost?
- That their dog is always under control, well behaved and don't cause problems. Dogs are smart, so they think dogs don't need licenses. The mindset that if their dog isn't a problem dog, it doesn't need licensing.
- Cheap



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- cost
- Laziness, income and ignorance.
- We microchip our dog. Also, I honestly don't see the value the city brings to pets. We called animal services Sooo many times about off-leash dogs by our house and they never came. So why pay?!
- Stupidity.
- I don't know as every responsible owner I know licenses.
- They are being cheap and lazy, or they are keeping a dog they shouldn't own (in terms of having a vicious dog and not following the laws for owning a vicious dog).
- The penalty and risk of it being assessed of not licencing the dog is deemed to be not worth the bother and cost of licencing. Greater penalties and greater enforcement will increase licensing compliance.
- Cost.
- Cost? or a more nefarious reason is they want to remain anonymous for fighting rings or they have a vicious dog and don't want a trail?
- As above. These licenses aren't expensive. Perhaps for low income folks and seniors there could be a lower fee.
- Could be the dog or owner rarely leaves the property (older, handicapped) and see it as unnecessary.
- Cost
- Cost
- They are lazy
- Cost. fee for intact animals is too high. Responsible owners who have intact animals should not be subject to higher costs when their animals are not an issue
- Too cheap/lazy. If you can't afford to license your pet then you can't afford to have one.
- 1) Maybe it's a senior pet that never goes out
- 2) The dog has an illness and isn't going to live very much longer
- 3)New to Calgary and has come from a place that didn't have an animal bylaw
- cost
- Avoidance of steep fees for intact dogs, free-roaming animal
- Money. Cash flow for calgarians is tight. Doesnt come as a priority to license your dog. Especially if they never attend off leash parks.
- Cost is likely a factor.
- People typically have no money to spend on making responsible choices and people don't like following the rules. Especially when they are easy to break and get away with
- Cost or laziness.
- Cost and awareness
- money
- Cost



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Uneducated on bylaws. Cost for those acquiring puppies for free and can not afford vet care, let alone licenses. Don't think they'll get caught without a license.
- Cost and they think they will never get caught.
- N/a
- Costs
- Cost
- Laziness and cost.
- Money
- For people who show dogs, we are penalized because we must keep them intact to show them. Our dogs are not the ones that will be roaming the streets as we have too much time and money invested in them. For regular pet owners...laziness.
- Just the yearly cost. It can add up when you have more than one animal
- Not aware of it, lazy, plan to breed them for a puppy mill
- Money
- they don't think they should have to
- Lack of knowledge about licensing laws, ignorance, lack of means to pay for license.
- I don't know.
- Laziness...irresponsible behaviour.
- don't know
- Don't understand the point of licensing. Microchip and tattoo is enough to locate my pet if he's lost.
- You shouldn't have to renew your license each year, this is probably why people don't bother with this.
- we believe money is the reason, however, if the owner(s) can't pay for a license how are they going to take care of the pet?!! again the pocket book is a good deterrent..we strongly suggest when an animal is licensed they MUST have a chip inserted into them..
- Either they don't think it's necessary or they don't have the money to license the dog.
- The yearly expense.
- I don't know as I license my animals. Thoughts- Expense? Ignorance in thinking rules don't apply to them? Not sure
- Cost. And the fact that if their licensed dog is picked up by animal services, they are still paying hundreds of dollars in fees to redeem their dog from the city pound. If these fees were lessened then people would pay for the service.
- I think every license should include a microchip. City can set up microchip clinics. Every pet store animal should require a microchip.
Cost, uneducated and since you rarely see bylaw at any off leash park or driving down the street checking why bother buying one.
- Holes in their head.
- They are not clear on the value return for the dollars given. Could this be somehow considered a donation that is tax deductible? Again this is an opportunity for education likely.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Excess dogs
- To get reunited if lost or got loose from yard.
- For some I know that it is due to the cost as I do know of breeders who live within the city limits and it would be expensive to license all their dogs. Some people feel that their dogs are “house” dogs and only have access to the house or backyard/dog run.
- Same as above
- Laziness and price.
- \$
- Not sure.
- Lack of responsibility if the dog gets picked up. If the City doesn't know who owns the dog, they can't fine them for the dog being loose.
- Lazy and disrespectful of the bylaws.
- Cost and lack of understanding and transparency as to where fees go.
- Cost
- Cost or perhaps they feel the license is paying for people with problem animals.
- Cost. CAS is all about tracking down dog owners who don't license unlike cat owners, I believe it is not knowing they need to or cost that stops people for dogs.
- In my opinion, people choose not to license their dogs due to the cost (ie. have multiple dogs), or the fact that they cannot keep the tags on the dog successfully. People also seem to think that dogs are more easily found than cats when lost, so they won't require city services should that occur.
- Cost.
- Same as above, In my 21 years in Calgary I have yet to see any bylaw officer checking dogparks for licenses, does this even happen?
- Dogs should need to be licensed
- They don't like to be told what to do. I have known people like this. The cost. But it's a reasonable cost. I have a dog which has always been licensed.
- They think they keep dogs under control and won't need city services
- Same for dogs If they are not outside at all then they shouldn't have to be licensed.
- The current system punishes responsible pet owners who choose to keep their animals intact. Despite the propaganda that the humane society pushes, spay/neuter comes with some very serious health concerns and owners should not be punished for making decisions in the best interest of their dog.
- Probably lack of money. It's another expense for pet owners that some may not be able to afford.
- Believe it or not the main reason people don't license their dogs is they don't like to hear the license jingling around the house. Or they may license a dog but then not put the license on the collar which puts them in the same place again and not being able to be reunited with their animal
- fees
make it free to register your animal and huge fines if your animal if found not registered, is caught at large etc. to pay for the admin.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Costs, time consuming
- Cost
- Cost,
- The cost.
- Cost of licensing
- Cost.
- Laziness.
- I license Minecraft
- Same as above -CHEAP & IRRESPONSIBLE
- It's too expensive and should cost about half as much. Again, my dogs are chipped, tattooed and have a tag with my contact information, so reunification is not a big selling point for me.
- Don't see a benefit.
- I don't understand people who don't license their dogs. If it gets away from them it's chances of return are lessened. Perhaps those owners don't actually care. In that case they don't deserve a dog.
- laziness, cost
- Fees
- Unfair biased to responsible owners who have intact pets
- Everyone should license.
- Amount of dogs or costs
- Yearly cost as I am on low income
- They are lazy
- Depends on the dog. I understand no longer licensing an older dog that doesn't leave the home. Others maybe just can't afford it.
- Laziness
- I believe financial constraints may be the primary reason for not choosing to license your dog; another may be that the animal is an indoor pet (consider small dogs); or that the resident is new to the city. Again, pet is tattooed or chipped for return if needed.
- Cheap and not responsible
- Probably cost for a dog as most people take their dogs outdoors. Perhaps there could be a program for those who cannot afford it - to ensure their pets are at least licensed regardless of the owners ability to pay.
- Because they can't afford the cost of altering or licences
- Price, dogs who are identified in other way, hassle, lack of repercussions.
- The city abuses license lists to target certain types of dogs as alleged bite risks or accused biters, and abusers their power to remove these dogs from the city. The city has a trackable and admitted bias against rescue dogs and certain breeds of dogs, and people have to protect their pets.
- A sense of entitlement
- Cost



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They are cheap!
- Same as cats
- No one checks
- I think people choose not to license their dogs because of the expense. Fixed dogs are less expensive than non fixed.
- Cost of license
- No idea. Dog licensing has been around a long time. Cost?
- They do not care.
- Not too sure. Maybe money?
- Don't want to pay fee, too much effort.... People are lazy
- They either don't want to spend the money, or they simply don't care.
- Same as above.
- Financial
- Cost and laziness
- Cost is so high when you own more than 1 pet.
- they do not want to give the government more money. Pets already cost money to take care of, paying a yearly fee just so the government is aware that you have an animal is not ideal for most owners
- Lazy and don't thing an indoor dogs needs to be. Also the City wont do anything , the fines are so low they will take the risk... make the fines high and people wont take the chance at being caught!!!
- Money
- Money?
- Money.
- Cost. They think their dog will not get lost/run loose.
- They forget! Either that or they are negligent.
- Dog owners who do not licence their dogs should not own dogs in the City of Calgary. A dog on the loose and running at will in the city streets poses a danger to adults and children in all areas of Calgary.
The dogs owner tries to escape liability with no dog license, when dog attacks people & pets.
- same as cats
- Cost?
- Owners think their pet is never at large.
- Cost and apathy
- Same as the cats....too expensive and privacy. Why the difference in price to spayed or not spayed. If they are a responsible pet owner it should not matter
- Same as above.
- Too expensive
- As above.
- Irresponsible owners who don't take ownership of a pet very serious.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- My dog is microchipped, why should I have to buy a license too? I'd like to know how these fees are used by the city to enhance my dog's life. In France I didn't have to license my dog and he went almost everywhere with me, restaurants, bars, shops, etc., so he's better socialized than most dogs.
- Same thing as above.
- They are irresponsible or think their dog is so special they don't need to license it
- Same as cats!
- They may have the same reasons as cat owners if the dog is kept confined to the yard.
- Little to no punishment for infractions
- They don't care! They're dog is perfect, will never escape or hurt anyone! Obtuse. Many don't want to pay the fee.
- I am shocked by the choice. The people I have known who do not licence think that they are an exception to the rule, or that rules don't apply to them.
- Knowing how and where to do it.
Forgetting to renew
- It could be money or it could be that they think their dog will never get lost so that it doesn't matter.
- Money....many just don't have the money.
- **THEY ARE SELFISH, SELF CENTERED AND IGNORANT.**
- People who don't license their dogs are usually anti-establishment, redneck types. There may be a few people who can't afford a dog license - perhaps the City could have some sort of special waiver of fees for lower income Calgarians.
- It's the cost yearly. It should be a one time cost .
- Cost of license and too much trouble to come to animal bylaw office to acquire one
- Irresponsible.
- I think this is far less common. I would assume these are mostly dogs that are bred or owned for nefarious purposes.
- I'm not entirely sure why, perhaps they can't afford it?
- Can't afford it or don't care
- Dog never goes out of their yard. Probably mostly financial.
- Again it could be a financial burden. Or lazy.
- Cost.
- Same as above.
- Price and no value
- Money
- They don't feel they need to
- Same as above
- Financial barriers and lack of enforcement to do so.
- Cost - especially multiple pets
- Same as above.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Lack of responsibility for their animal, they chose to have one and should be financially stable to afford all aspects of caring for that animal.
- Can't afford
- Cost, laziness,
- I believe a lot of people feel like it's pointless. Plus I think they don't want to pay a fine if picked up by the city.
- They are under control and would not likely not leave their owners.
- Above the rules and don't want to get caught when incident happens
- Don't see the benefits. Risk-takers—would rather not pay yearly & take their chances on not being caught.
- There is no benefit to having a license only a penalty if caught without one on your pet
- There is no excuse.
- There is no perceived benefit, only penalty if caught
- Lack of enforcement (same as above), and cost.
- Cost, convenience, vaccine requirements (vaccine requirements need to be adjusted for the current needs, for example rabies every year shouldn't be required, as it's accepted that vaccine is good for much longer.)
- Cost?
- Their dogs are never out of their control, never causing a nuisance, and have permanent identification (microchip, tattoo). Makes no sense to pay the same amount as for a dog with no permanent ID.
- Cost & accountability
- Money
- Cost
- They are not responsible citizens.
- The fine is not high enough to force people to license they don't believe they have too
- They may not be able to afford it or not know when to or where to go
- Forgetfulness
- Paying it doesn't come with any benefit. Don't think they'll get checked/caught. As a dog owner for 20 years have never had check for dog licence by anyone anywhere.
- Same as 1
- Lack of education on how important it is for safety sake...lack of funds
- They don't like rules
- They are cheap of hiding a dangerous dog.
- Cost
- Irresponsible pet owners
- Cheap or the dog is dangerous
- ?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- too expensive
- Cost. Other people I know have simply forgotten in all the excitement of getting a dog to get the licence. Not a choice, but still a cause in some cases.
- Cost
- Cost ... and/or maybe have restricted dogs
- It's a hassle to get a licence
- Expensive
- Using the dog for illicit purposes
- Think their dog won't get out or loose so they don't need too, no money or just forget to renew the licence if previously done.
- Probably cost however if cost is a problem, don't have a pet.
- Cost - it's part of pet ownership but many people want to own a pet but now try to avoid extra costs.
- Cost
- Lazyness
- They never do anything with the dogs - rarely get walked or leave the yard so they won't spend the money on a license if they don't require one on their own property.
- Ignorance, lack of concern for the common good.
- Don't want "the man" to know they have a dog. Their dog has a low risk for ever being caught by animal control and thus no risk of fine. Microchip is more reliable and permanent form of identification to bring a lost pet home.
- Laziness and ignorance.
- As above
- Cost and possibly lack of value. Most stray dogs can now be reunited with their owners by a simple scan at any vet clinic. Microchips seem to be the norm and no longer the exception
- The price of licensing
- The cost is prohibitive; and for those owners who take excellent care of their dogs, especially multiple dogs, they are not rewarded with a discount, but penalized financially. One irritating dog can disturb an entire block for hours, but that person pays the same as the responsible owner.
- Price. There are so many costs associated with pet ownership. Vet fees in Calgary are astronomical. On top of that most people have families too that cost money. People prioritize what bills they can afford and what are necessities. Unfortunately, licensing might be the last on their list.
- Same as above.
- I'm more concerned that people all over my neighborhood barely pick up dog shit around my yard ever! I'm also very scared of pit bulls being walked by small people who could never control them. Do something useful instead of focusing on owned/spayed cats strolling around peacefully!
- Probably cost?
- Ignorance or laziness.
- Cost and burden
- I'm not sure maybe the feel it is redundant, or to expensive.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Lack of money
- nothing, defiance
- Expense?
- Anti nanny-statist activism or the money. Seriously, make it free.
Or, they (the owner) are the vicious type, and really shouldn't have a pet (or child etc.) in the first place.
- Laziness, money
- cost
- Can't afford it
- Probably money.
- Lazy and anti system
- Cost only. or if people have too many dogs then the allowed number
- Don't want to pay the fee. Are not afraid of enforcement so low incentive to do so.
- Same reasons as cats...dont value their pet enough, believe their dog is an indoor dog and doesnt need the license, lack of education, cognitive insight and or ease of licensing.
- Annual renewal is a pain
- Cost
- Too expensive and the city wants to control what you do in Your own home (limit how many).
Licensing an animal that stays inside or on your property (if you're responsible) is strictly a money grab from a city that doesn't know how to manage their responsibilities.
- I believe it is the same. Lower the spay and neuter costs do it is affordable to all and more will be licenced.
- The issue is not licensing a pet, it is the fact that you have to re-license them every year.
That is a very transparent money grab by the government
- I personally have struggled with this, I have a neighbour that has dogs that bark at all times of the day and night and bylaw has not helped in resolving the issue(we're moving because of them). I wonder whats the point of paying a pet licensing fee if I don't personally see a benefit.
- They don't feel the need to.
- Its an annoying administrative burden that should be setup to be done automatically without having to manually remember. The bad owners with bad dogs have no repercussions for not paying the fine anyhow
- Cost.
- Likely the cost is too high to maintain
Or the dog isn't leaving the house
- I thought most dog owners, compared to cat owners, licensed their dogs.
- Look at the previous answer.
- Can't afford it.
- They are cheap and stupid.
- Lack of education and poverty



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same as above
- This is pretty much same as cats affordability and the people who flaunt entitled attitudes or have problems in their past with animal abuse
- expense
- No good reason exists.
- Cheap
- They do not want to be responsible for what the dog might do in their community.
- Avoidance
- Can't imagine why they would think that. Dogs are outside all the time.
- Trying to buck the system. If you(the city) don't know they exist they can get away with not paying.
- Bad policy.
- Don't realize it is a requirement. Don't realize the cost it how to register
- No excuse for this, if you own a pet, it must have a licence.
- Irresponsible owners! Immature or arrogant!
- Convenience to pay, little to no incentives as in penalty or reporting for non licensers. Value proposition is not clear, ie benefits of licence
- Don't want to pay the fee.
Annual requirement to renew is not an easy process.
- I honestly feel like its my own business how many dogs I own. I think there should never be a cap on the number of dogs you can own...it should be about being responsible about dog ownership. One license for overall pet ownership per home.
- Cost. This should be free.
- Cost
- Money grab from the city.
- Cost, and perhaps they don't see the benefit of paying a yearly fee
- Same as above.
- Laziness and being cheap
- Cost, maybe breeding in house want to avoid being on the radar if they have multiple dogs neither spayed or neutered.
- No idea
- They don't want to pay licensing fees or be held responsible for what their pet does when loose.
- Stupidity. Possibly declared vicious? Possibly a breeding dog/puppies which will potentially go to new homes?
- Cost? Forgetfulness?
- Cost, hassle, personal dog tags and micro-chipping take care of re-unification anyway.
- They do not believe in the purpose for generating this revenue and they do not want their dog traced potentially. Public ignorance to the value of licensing and the use of the revenue. People do not associate the facilities and resources needed to oversee programs and believe money just appears.
- Price, laziness



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They might find it expensive. They are not responsible pet owners.
- People are cheap. Maybe a lower price for low income.
- Their animals stay inside and aren't a nuisance to their neighbours.
- Cost. Irresponsible owners.
- Don't want to spend the money. See no need. Small dogs may never be out of the control of owners.
- They don't feel it's necessary or don't want to spend the money. They see no return on their money.
- Cost, amount of effort, or trying to hide their ownership of the dog.
- For some people it may be financial, for others laziness or they may think it's not worthwhile.
- Cost.
- Perhaps a money thing or in defiance of the government. Also, maybe people don't realize what they money they pay goes to and what difference it will make to them personally?
- People don't like paper work and dealing with the government. They don't like the fee even though it's small. They don't want their irresponsible behavior to be traced back to them ie: they let their pet free roam.
- Cost. Or micro chipped and normally you licenses your dog in case they will get lost but micro chips have far more information and no risk of losing the tag.
- Cost
- think they can get away without getting a license, because the dog won't be outside; or they cannot afford it
- Cost, convenience
- They do not consider it worth the money to license a pet.
- The price! 2 dogs...120.00 a year...maybe a low income fee???? Please
- Dollars and costs for responsibility...IF you can not afford to care and license you should not have an animal
- Same as above
- Laziness, cheapness.
- Lack of knowledge, too expensive
- Cost
- I can't fathom - makes me think only people who are otherwise irresponsible would do this - needs to be harsher penalties for people who are cruel to or neglect animals. Backyard breeding should be BANNED.
- Have no idea, must be cost but again very shortsighted.
- Ignorance or they own a dog that they are trying to keep "quiet" for house insurance or licensing reasons.
- Confusion. Trying to find out how and where to get a license is confusing. Also fear of fines for doing so late.
- Inconvenience and habit - there's little in the way of checks and balances to ensure the dog is licensed until something goes wrong (i.e., dog cat vanishes and is picked up by bylaw control)
- No perceived benefit to the owner or animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Most people I know license their dogs.
- Cost
- Lack of consequences.
- Lazy, irresponsible, entitled and shouldn't be allowed to care for an animal if they can't follow the rules. Just like having a car. Responsibilities are to be followed and not just for your safety.
- Cost
- Same reason
- Being lazy? Possibly ignorant about rules or fees?
- Hoarding of dogs (more than bylaw allows)
Lack of funds
Vicious dog that they are trying to hide
pure negligence and lack of care
- Cost
- Price, laziness, contempt about rules
- Cost and administration
- Same thing. Being cheap, "my dog isn't like other dogs", etc.
- Refusing to pay what is essentially a tax for owning a pet.
- 'License' is thought of as a tax and that we have to pay for the privilege of owning a dog in that jurisdiction. I think if it was made public to where the funds go for the purchase of a licence, it would make paying this fee less painful.
- Their dogs are spayed/neutered and have permanent ID so if they go missing they have a ticket home. Also the cost is too high. Once again responsible owners are targeted. Same as cat licensing. Even more so for cats seeing most live indoors.
- "It's a money grab"
- Too expensive, especially since taxes in the city continue to go up and services decrease. They know monitoring and enforcement is a joke and they won't get caught so why pay.
- Unaware or uncaring.
- Cost
- Cost or convenience
- Cheap/lazy.
- Affordability.
- Not sure. I license my dog.
- Likely the cost and they don't feel it is of value to do so
- Probably cost or unaware of CoC requirements
- Irresponsible dog owner
- They are ignorant. I have had dogs and I licensed mine.
- cost, time, not easy
- Too expensive
- Licensing is a money grab for the city



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Apathy to the reasons dogs should be licensed.
- Cost and/or an overstep of city authority.
- They are not responsible pet owners and do not want to take the time/money to do so.
- if a dog is well behaved and microchipped they should not get away or if they do the microchip can locate them
- Laziness, lack of knowledge,
- Because they like fruit loops for cereal? What an idiotic question. Maybe ask the owner of an unlicensed animal.
- Too many animals. Unaware or forgot
- See above. ONE TIME REGISTRATION. stop making our animals a cash grab. Mail out renewal 3 months prior to the expiration. But for frig sakes stop making animal registration annual.
- What do they get out of it? I went (2) years without licensing my dog (when i had one) because there was almost no risk of fine.
- Lack of enforcement
- Fostering for a rescue or otherwise watching them temporarily. Do not have the money to pay for a license. Dog is always within their sight and will not be lost.
- They don't care what happens to their dog if it gets out or runs away. Or they don't want to spend the money.
- It is a money grab or too expensive. Very low costs and a one time licensing fee would encourage all dog owners to license their dogs.
- For some it is likely the cost. For others it is a belief that their dog will never stray and therefore a licence is not needed. They do not realize that the money is helping the City provide services to pet owners. This could be an area of advertising.
- Cost and laziness
- Cost (also some may think licensing is complicated - which is not true)
- lack of funds.
- Dogs should be licensed since they are going out. Primary reason is probably lack of education.
- They are never off the owners property except on a leash.
- They don't feel that it is necessary or don't want the City to know the animal lives there
- Ditto.
- Cost, and laziness
- Cost. Forget about the renewal.
- ignorant... dogs need to be licensed.
- Cost and neglect
- Not sure why they do not license their dogs, dogs are always outside even if it is only in their yard so there is always a risk of them getting out. Could also be a money issue
- They are lazy and cheap. I should do what Rocky Country does and make licencing mandatory but free.
- irresponsible pet owners



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- cost
- They think they are exempt from the rules or they have not bothered to look in to what the city rules are. Ignorance? Laziness?
- I never licensed my dog as she did not wear a collar. She was almost choked to death 3 times witching the first year of her life by other dogs getting stuck in her collar. Also don't see the benefit for a microchipped well trained dog. It's expensive. Reduce fees for microchipped animals.
- cost, lack of understanding of benefit when dogs are under control and not running away
- Same reason
- Cost
- Cost, or they dislike the idea of licensing in general
- same as above
- Expensive? Not of any use?
- Cost, belief it isn't necessary.
- See no benefit to licensing as dog is microchipped for identification. License can fall off collar or dog can escape when not wearing a collar so using it as identification is not effective. Microchip is permanent, dog license is not.
- Cost
- Possibly the fee?
- Possibly cost. I do think requiring licensing and donning city tags and ID tag on dogs makes more sense. Many people take their dogs to a dog park without collar, tags and leash. They seem unaware of what would happen if training failed and their dog took off.
- Cost
- Money, hassle.
- Can't afford it
- Cost, assuming if its on the owners property only it doesnt need to be licensed.
- They forget
- Indoor dog.
- Don't think it is important or realize the fines associated with it
- Cost, lack of knowledge, or the inconvenience to get the initial license? I honestly don't understand dog owners who don't license their dog. My dogs have always been licensed
- Arrogance. The only purpose for a license for at dog is to give the city admins an idea of the number of dogs that are currently in the city. Beyond that, it is just a cash grab for the city.
- They are lazy or have no money
- Poor and irresponsible pet ownership
- Cost. Process is burdensome and not streamlined and people are penalized if they forget to license or renew. Stop penalizing those trying to participate.
- lack of education & considered an unnecessary expense ('my dog will eventually come back' attitude)
- Cost.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They might not understand why they have to license a dog, or they feel it's unnecessary.
- As above.
- Lack of understanding of the benefits.
- Cost, laziness,
- No benefit to the cost.
- financial
- Cost.
- Primarily, irresponsible pet ownership, possibly financial limitations, or the process is seen as inconvenient. I found the online process for licensing and annual renewal to be simple and easy.
- What is gained by licensing? Most people think they will not lose their animal, and often they are tattooed, micro chipped, and have collars all to help identify them.
- Lack of education, irresponsible attitude, cost
- They're idiots? Dogs must be walked, can escape, may not respond to recall. It makes no sense to not license a dog.
- Ignorance first then cost.
- Laziness
- Cost.
- I choose not to register my dog as I feel it is completely unnecessary. I'm not paying the city so they can know I have a dog. My dog is chipped and I don't feel that her being registered will be any more help than that if she gets lost.
- Cost and laziness
- Cost
- Cost
- Same as above
- Lack of responsibility with pet ownership
- Probably trying to be cheap and save on the license.
- They think their dogs won't run away, apathy, and money.
- Laziness.
- Laziness, lack of consequences
- They are indoors, in fenced yards or on a leash with a responsible pet owner.
- Cost
- Not knowing about licensing
- Probably not bothered or cannot pay the licence. Should not be a choice in the city - you have an animal you follow the rules i.e. licensing & spaying/neutering etc.
- It's expensive.
- SAME AS CATS PRICE--PRIVACY AND JUST ANOTHER TAX
- The perception that it is an unneeded cost or a money grab.
- Possibly cost as most people know that dogs should be licensed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think people just don't know they have to. Rules should be better enforced. I've never seen a bylaw officer checking licenses anywhere
- Cost
- Cost and not remembering to renew.
- Laziness.
- I am not sure, may be individual decision that differs from one person to another.
- Disrespect/ignorance of the law.
- Expensive- where is the benefit for pet owners? Where does the money go?
- I think they don't believe in licensing due to cost or their pets never leave home.
- They don't think it's necessary
- Not wanting to be held responsible.
- Some people may not know about the rules, others probably don't want to pay the cost because 'my dog won't run away'.
- Either feel they can not afford it, or feel they do not have to or just do not want to.
- Either cost or don't think they will be caught.
- "My dog is always with me why should I?" Refuse to pay license
- Laziness and lack of responsibility. If someone genuinely cared for the wellbeing of their pet, they would license it so that if the pet ever got lost or impounded, there is irrefutable evidence that the pet belongs to them.
- They don't want to pay and think they won't get caught
- The cost
- cost, laziness?
- Irresponsible.
- They don't see the need or consequences.
- they do not understand why they should license their pets. and see no benefit on doing so
- Ignorance. Do not see benefit for the cost. "My dog is never off leash".
- cost and/or laziness
- Ignorance of the requirement, or just generally being an irresponsible person.
- The cost and not knowing why a license is required.
- They don't understand what the license is for, and they think "Oh, my dog will never go missing!"
- Cost
- Having them chipped.
- I'm not really sure. Perhaps cost is a factor?
- Lazy or they own vicious animals and partake in criminal activities
- I have no idea. Makes sense to me and if a dog does get lost at least they would be registered if wearing a tag
- Perhaps we need a higher fine for unlicensed dogs. That may be a deterrent.
As to people's reason perhaps their dog is never out of its own backyard so why would they license
- Expense, negligence, forgetting to re-register, not thinking that registration is necessary.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Don't see a need to
- Cost
- Complacency and lack of consequences
- Being irresponsible
- They do not want to pay the fee, they feel it is their right to have unlicensed animal (when it should be a privilege). They think that it is another government control measure
- \$\$
- Stupidity
Don't want to be told what to do or how to deal with their pet.
- They are lazy and irresponsible is the likely primary reason. I acknowledge the cost a barrier to some
- Cost and ignorance.
- They believe they won't get caught with an unlicensed dog and they are lazy and cheap.
- Irresponsible and don't want to spend the money.
- Cost is primarily the reason.
- Think it's a cash grab
- No idea
- Laziness
- Save money; so many dogs in Calgary that there is little chance of getting caught without a license
- Again enforcement is lacking
- Financial or ignorance. Some go through tough times and can't afford to renew right away. Perhaps they think because dog is chipped it's not needed. There are also those who simply don't care.
- same as the last question. The cost of getting the license
- cost to register does not reflect the amount of time the dog is always out, or even a chance of losing their pet outside.
- Expensive. A lot of people cannot afford to lose the extra money by have for this, but that doesn't mean they are bad or irresponsible owners.
- Don't see why they have to and no penalty not to
- The cost? Being honest in all my years of owning dogs I've never once been asked to see their license. I think the only reason people do register their animals is to avoid a fine.
- Cost
- Laziness
- Because they might think they will never get caught or that it's pointless because it doesn't do anything for them. And if they get lost a lot of people have microchips now.
- Affordability
- All dogs should be licensed as they go outdoors.
- income levels, irresponsible in other areas of their life so this is just a transient effect
- Laziness and greed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- age, circumstance- ie dog may not be getting fixed until later due to breeder contract and possibly cost.
- Service provided does not match licensing fees.
- Cant afford it or don't know
- Laziness, ignorance, or a belief that their do will never run away.
- Financial
- Ignorance based on why it is important / cost
- Financial. Sense of entitlement. Laziness.
- I believe cost is a factor. And, I think many people forget to renew.
- Cost of license
- People may see their dogs as disposable and not a family member. I think they are often people who are lazy, do t care about licensing issues, do t see it's necessary. I know people who don't license and they don't vaccinate, spay/neuter or follow on leash rules.
- The pet never leaves their property.
- if you can't look after them or afford to look after their health and welfare don't get them and then let them run wild
- Again, avoiding fines. Setting up puppy mills?
- Most animals are microchipped now, sort of makes licensing not necessary, and is an extra cost.
- They don't care. OR they have no idea that it's a bylaw.
- Cost. Waste of money
- Cost, ignorance
- It's a waste of money / cash grab. But most people license their dogs since they regularly leave the house.
- cost, inconvenience, put primarily that they do not care to be a considerate citizen
- I licence my dogs so I don't know
- Potentially cost
- As above
- Not enough money to pay for license Money grab
Pet is microchipped
- They think they won't get out? Can't afford it?
- No purpose besides govt keeping tabs on you and collecting more money in any way it can.
- Multiple dogs
- Laziness.
- Cost
- Cost
- Cost... privacy
- Time and cost factors. A collar with contact tag should suffice.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Many dog breeds, especially large ones, should not be spayed or neutered until they are older. The availability of hormones is crucial to their development and longevity. Responsible pet owners should not be financially penalized for choosing to leave their dog unaltered until they are older.
- Costs money and doesn't seem to have any immediate benefit.
- Its a bylaw so why not follow the rules, it is the ideology like letting their pets run at large all over the neighborhoods mentality they think they can do what they want.
- Minimal consequences, oversight & enforcement
- Money; lack of knowledge
- I think people either see it as a cost they can't or don't want to manage. I think since dogs are outdoors and sharing space with other dogs and children they should be licensed and fined if not. Although if cost was an issue I would hope help would be available to offset costs
- Didnt know they needed to be licensed?
- So they don't get caught if their dogs run loose.
- Irresponsible owners and possibly a cost issue.
- This would only apply to small dogs for the same or similar reasons as cats. Some people think their dogs will never get away.
- Too expensive and their dogs are under control and in their care all the time
- Cost. Pets have ID which will help with their return if they get lost.
Forgetting to renew
- In this market most likely affordability or maybe they have a ton of animals and to license them all would be insane.
I'll bet this is all about money.
- Owners are cheap and lazy.
- Cost
- Too expensive. Don't see a reason for it. Didn't know animal had to be licensed. Older animal so it never leaves the house
- Cost. Or lack of knowledge that they need to do so. Mainly cost. It's not a lot but it's prohibitive for some.
- Easy to forget to renew, not sure of the process/where to do it.
- No idea there is no good reason not to licence
- Save money, lazy?
- Don't want to pay a fee.
- Cost or unable to see benefits?
- Irresponsible and don't want yo spend the money as they think they will get away with it
- Cost. Laziness.
- Laziness, lack of care or concern for the animal. It's cheap to license them so there really isn't an excuse. They likely perceive their pet as just an animal and not a family member.
- Cost.
- Feel it's a "money grab" by the city



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Possibly they can't afford to own a pet but love having their dog. They keep it inside and don't feel they need a license.
- cost. its expensive.
- People don't realize how inexpensive it is.
- The primary reason for not licencing their dog is either cost, or thinking no one will check anyway
- Cheap
- Laziness
- Irresponsible
- Laziness
- Laziness again they shouldn't own one of they are not going to be responsible and license it.
- Irresponsibility, don't' want to pay.
- Laziness or apathy.
- Most likely cost.
- Ignorance of the benefits, not being socially responsible.
- Don't want to do another cost, or are doing illegal things with the animals.
- Cost per year
- "too busy"/lazy/irresponsible
- Pure forgetfulness
- Laziness, arrogance, stupidity, etc.. many reasons. Dogs are different than cats with licensing. They are always needing our for walks, they don't have breakaway collars, they go to dog parks, and other reasons. They should be licensed.
- Cost or feeling like it's unnecessary - that licensing them will have little to no impact on their wellbeing
- Money.
- Cost?
- Don't want to pay, feel their dogs won't become lost
- Cost
- I do licence my pets. However, I can see how some would not understand how they benefit. The avoidance of punishment is not a great deterrent. They should see some tangible benefit if they are going to part with their hard-earned money.
- Expense maybe! Maybe lower cost of licensing. I do think it's great that Calgary doesn't have a limit on the number of pets a person can have and believe this would encourage people to licence their dogs more. If you put a restriction on number people will just still get more pets but won't licence
- Irresponsibility
- Stupidity, laziness, cost
- It's an additional cost that does not seem to have an appropriate reason. Also the rocky view county doesn't charge people for a license now. There is no indication either as to where this money goes or how it is used.
- Dogs are often out with their owners. Licensing and chip or tattoo is helping to return lost pet.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not sure
- Lack of knowledge of when to renew
- Because they are too lazy to do so, don't know how to do it and just can't be bothered.
- Cost.
- Unware that licensing is mandatory or don't want to pay for fee
- Possibly cost or just don't care about the bylaws.
- Don't want to pay.
- Cost.
- S/A
- Just doesn't want to pay
- I do not know anyone who hasn't licensed their dog. My dog hates the jingle of the metal tags so I am supporting a local business that makes a little pouch to Velcro onto the collar - Annie loves it.
- Resources money,
- Laziness
- Not aware, insufficient income to do so, lazy
- Cost?
- They don't think pets should require regulations?
- the fee & having to redo it annually.
- Can't afford to, money grab, big brother is watching --- privacy issues, freedom to own a animal without having to deal with documenting, lazy, don't see the value, should we start licensing other pets too?
- Bigger issue. They don't want to comply.
- They may not agree due to living circumstances of dog. Such as the dog may be a senior who no longer has energy for walks and biggest trip is to the yard. They may also not agree with the price of the license.
- They are irresponsible, and can not afford an animal. Also perhaps they are breeding dogs fro nefarious purposes and dont want anyone to know how many animals they have.
- don't know or don't care
- Expensive.
- No reason not to license a dog.
- The price of licensing is too high
 1. They're cheap
 2. They're irresponsible
 3. They think it doesn't apply in their circumstance
- Laziness
- Lack of understanding of the licensing requirements. The fact that you have to license annually.
- Laziness and no one checks up. We liscense our dogs but no one checks ever. Dog owners usually say, why should I no one checks. Right now given the economy there should be a reduced rate for those struggling because otherwise the dog may be abandoned causing more issues.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Expense
- Who's going to check or know that I have a dog without a license? I can put a name tag or two other tags on the collar and no one will know, or they don't believe their dog will be lost or roam free.
- responsible pet owners tend to not need outside controls to continue to be responsible. those that are irresponsible pet owners probably aren't licensing.
- Probably the cost also - fines should be much larger for unlicensed pets. Plus the city is losing out on revenue from unlicensed pets.
- the same
- I'm not sure, maybe the price?
- Cost.
- Indifference
- Cost. I think people in general understand the reasoning behind dog licensing, but either can't afford it or don't bother because as long as nothing happens, there are no consequences.
- Money or lack of knowledge that it's required. Also licensing should be provincial it can be confusing for those who move around the Province
- When you license a dog who has two owners (spouse/ partner) only ONE persons name can be attached to the license. Which makes you the "owner". I was the dogs primary caregiver. I split with my ex, and he kept them because his name was on the license. They were MINE. But legally his, such a joke!
- Cost. There's no reason to not license your dog besides financial.
- Its expensive
- Same as above, laziness and an attempt to skirt the system....it's not overly expensive so to me those are valid reasons. If you can afford to buy the pet, you can afford the license fees.
- No fear of punishment and not willing to pay the fee. Sadly this is an issue that needs to be rectified. In my 10 years owning a dog I have only ever had 1 bylaw officer check to see if my dog was licensed.
- Price.
- Cost
- Same reason for dogs. They see it as a money grab and not necessary.
- Effort and possibly lack of knowledge
- Cost
- No perceived benefit for license process. Feels like a cash grab.
- Irresponsibility.
- Money
- Cost, as well as some just don't feel they should have to
- Lack social responsibility
- lazy, and cheap
- Cost
- Laziness and disrespect of their animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same answer as for cats.
- Stupidity, laziness. Money's not a reason - if you can't afford it then you can't afford to have a dog. What happens if the dog is lost and can't be returned - what a scary thing for them.
- Lazy and ignorant owners who believe that they are above the law. These are the same people to ignore leash laws and are backyard breeders.
- Be afraid of paying a fine in case they run away from home
- Finances?
- It is somewhat expensive, they may not want the City to know how many dogs they have, they may not understand the benefits of licensing.
- Money I'm guessing, laziness.
- I think they believe that the dog is never out of their direct care and control so why bother. I could also come down to finances, especially for seniors.
- cost, no perceived benefit
- Same as above
- Probably trying to save money.
- Not enough enforcement on missing licenses. No reminder systems in place for renewal.
- money concerns. Also don't see the benefit in it and what the City provides for licensing the dog. dogs may be microchipped through the vet and have id tags therefore can be returned safely if lost without the need for a license.
- They are idiots.
- don't know
- Cost without any known benefits.
- Cost.
- Lazy or do not know that they need to.
- Lack of funds.
- They know they won't get caught.
- Cost of licensing. If their dog escapes the yard and is caught by bylaw the fines are too large.
- It's a money grab from the city.
- Owners are too lazy
- They are cheap
- The annual fees involved.
- Lazy. Cheap. Scofflaws.
- Inconsiderate personalities.
- Cost.
- N/A
- Cost would be my guess.
- If the cat is in the house, it's furniture. Requires no resources so no licence makes sense.
- Not aware of requirement or cost.
- Safe money, too much work



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost, inconvenience, having to renew every year
- Financial reasons
- Time and money.
- Money or ease of payment.
- Because it's a stupid money grab
- I think the main reason people do not license their dogs it a disrespect of laws and bylaws.
- Cost.
- Laziness
- The cost of the license, and the website is nearly unusable
- Lack of the money to do so
- They are just to cheap to do it.
- Don't want to pay, don't want to co-operate.
- Cannot understand. perhaps some folks cannot afford?
- Lack of understanding about why licensing is important and lack of consequences for not licensing.
- Stupidity, selfishness.
- The cost.
- This could be finances, concern regarding breed-specific discrimination in a living situation, or just not understanding or caring about the licensing program.
- Likely irresponsible pet owners that don't respect the system.
- Laziness, a general "I don't care" attitude towards pet ownership, cost.
- don't want the city to know that they are breeding without a license, or they are puppy mill
- Cost. Again many owners now microchip their pets. It is the best option for a lost pet. I think the licensing situation is out of date, but perhaps a cheaper option for some people.
- Dog never leaves home/yard or goes off leash in public
- Disinterest.
- Cost. Don't care. Do not recognize that the city has an interest in pets and services.
- Cost.
- They can not afford it. It should be a once per lifetime of the dog not annually. Or they are irresponsible dog owners.
- Lazy; don't want to. Plenty of the ones I have seen can afford it, but don't think it's something that they should have to do, nor do they want to pay for.
- Usually cost. Sometimes laziness or inexperience.
- Ignorance
- Cost
- Cost and Accessibility. Why Licence your Dog? It does not allow you to access any more services or advantages than unlicensed.
- Unable to afford it, and those who have these animals as emotion support/service animals are just paying an extra expense that they really don't need.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost. A desire to be free from City Bureaucracy. The fact that there are better and more modern ways to facilitate re-unification without incurring the costs associated with City Animal Control.
- Money and access to services. If the registration is too far away and inconvenient people won't go.
- They don't believe anything will happen to them due to lack of enforcement by bylaw.
- Laziness? Cost? Don't believe in regulations?
- Same. Think they will always have their dog under control
- too expensive
- No idea. My family always licensed our dogs
- Don't understand people who don't license their dogs but suspect it's the annual fee.
- It may be cost for people on low or no income. Other people don't know or don't care.
- cost
- cost, forgetful
- Cost.
- Financial and a belief that licensing represents over-regulating their lives.
- There is no excuse.
- Some owners can't afford the license, others simply do not want to license.
- Ignorance - they don't understand the benefit. The City has a responsibility to educate people. Adoption agencies can inform the City of new owners; vet clinics can do the same.
- Monetary
- laziness, beligerance, arrogance. nothing to do with animal welfare or community.
- I have no idea. Imbecility? License your dog!
- the cost of the license is NOT an acceptable reason; fines should be higher
- Probably they don't see the point and are not worried about enforcement.
- Pure ignorance and a feeling of the law does not apply to them
- Cost. Think its useless
- The cost and inconvenience. Same with vaccinations.
- Probably because they think that the fee is too expensive.
- There is no good reason but I'd guess the main reason is a simple intention to flout the bylaw. Also, possible ignorance of the bylaw and the benefits of licensing.
- No enforcement lack of funds
- Same reasoning as above
- Cheating
- Laziness, they don't believe they need to.
- Lack of understanding of why it's necessary
- Probably they just don't care much about dogs but they still have one, and are not good dog owners, don't want spend money.
- No return on investment. It is expensive and a hassle.
- Some people are cheap, lazy and really shouldn't own pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I have two dogs, whose licenses have expired. I have no plans to renew. Buying an annual license does not serve the need to meet community expectations or enhance public safety.
- Not wanting to pay for something that they don't think they need.
- being ignorant and maybe the cost.
- I feel this is an example of lazy ownership, the responsibility rests with the owner to license a dog to protect the animal and help the management of feral populations which pose dangers to other animals and is inhumane.
- Stupidity.
- Lazy and cheap. NO excuse not to license your pet. Should be fines (increasing amount per event) for no license! FOLLOW THE RULES if your'e going to own a pet!
- Cost is prohibitive. I have 4 dogs, all licensed, but I find this is very pricey and 3 of my dogs are more like cats (tiny) and rarely leave the house. Why can't we have a household fee instead of a per pet fee?
- Some people just don't care to follow the laws.
- No reason not too
- Education - they don't understand their responsibility to neighbours and being a good citizen.
- Same as above.
- They want a pet they shouldn't have a pet not being treated right there being held hostage in apartments I also cannot afford to have a pet
- they do not want to be responsible for thier dog as licensing is a vey easy process
- Cost
- Costs, dogs stay in the yard only, and the appearance of a cash grab
- the cost
- Laziness, poverty, bad memory with annual renewal.
- We're tired of being "taxed" on everything the city can use to extract more money from us. Most of us feel that a yearly license is just another cash grab. There are many better ways to take care of lost animals that don't require a yearly "tax".
- Laziness and cost.
- Don't think of it.
- See above answer. It also matters that certain drugs cost more to license which is completely unreasonable.
- Cost.
- Laziness
- These are the same people that try to break all rules ... it was how they were raised ... fine them to death ... good luck ...
- no idea - but I believe it is wrong not to license them.
- cost
- cost is primary reason not done. not everyone can pay on line with a cc and not accessible for everyone t get to place to do this.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It seems like a cash cow. I don't see the purpose in it and the owners will almost never see any benefit from it. Maybe license once for life, but to always have to renew it is expensive and inconvenient.
- Cost, not sure what the value is
- It's a cost for something that seems archaic with social media, tattooing, and microchip. The tags are big and metal, and small dogs should have smaller tags. And a replacement fee is charged despite paying an annual fee.
- Belief they won't get caught
- Microchipping is a much more reliable method of identification because the microchip stays within the animal. Collars and tags can come off. Also, the jingling sound of the tag can be annoying to some people.
- Lack of knowledge and lack of enforcement. Limited consequences of not licensing if identified as being non-compliant.
- lazy, cost
- Irresponsibility and non-accountability are the primary reasons. Every dog owner needs to license their animal because every dog eventually goes outside, unlike indoor cats. Absolutely NO exceptions when it comes to dog licensing. Make owners accountable if their dog becomes a nuisance or threat.
- the cost
- It is my understanding that the City doesn't require dogs to get their license. That's strictly for humans, as dogs do not have proper anatomical positioning required for the safe operation of a motor vehicle.
- Cost and not responsible citizens. Rebels.
- Costs, inconvenience, forgetting, or if owners are otherwise irresponsible with regards to how many animals they have, then there is no formal record of them owning these animals.
- Owner laziness and willful irresponsibility. Dogs that are not licensed are not properly controlled. Sick and tired of ill-controlled dogs in this city!
- Those who do not license their dogs just can't be bothered. All responsible dog owners have their dogs licensed. Possibly the ones that don't aren't the best owners and don't want their dogs traced back to them if they should get into trouble.
- ???
- They don't feel they have to, or they just don't want to pay the fee
- Lack of flexibility of payment methods on the website requiring a person to pay in person for a license (need to offer more bank payment options, or paypal, not just credit card and limited bank direct pay)
Higher cost of license for intact animal multiple animals (multi animal discounts may help)
- Cost.
- Often shame at not being able to afford, or not prioritizing it as an expense. Also a lack of understanding for the consequences of not registering.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- For people with multi-pet homes, it can be quite costly to have to license each pet separately. Others may not if they don't utilize off leash areas and do on-leash only walks within their neighborhood.
- Cost, forget, not aware they should be.
- Cost and taking time to complete registration
- Cost
- cost
- Don't see the value.
- Cost, unaware that it's required
- Dog owners may think their dogs are always under their control and therefore not at risk or running away. Cost might also be a factor.
- Cheap
- I don't know. I make sure my dog's license is always up to date.
- Cost
- Cost and fear of being fined if they dog runs loose and is caught
- as above
- Expensive and do not wish to pay, think they will never get checked / caught / lazy owners
- - Lazy
- - Cant afford
- - Lack of knowledge
- Laziness and/or the arrogant belief that the rules do not apply to them
- I don't agree with this. My dog has a tag and an embedded chip for identification. I don't agree with neutering your pet. It affects them physically and its purposes can be achieved otherwise.
- Forgetting to renew?
- Lack of knowledge.
- Same as above
- Again cost, but there is no good reason.
- Not sure. Maybe the cost? Personally my dogs are licenced and microchipped. If they ever went missing, I want the most amount of identification on them as possible
- 1. If it's a very tiny dog and it's never off leash, no licence.
- See above.
- Perhaps they feel that their dog will never be out of their house without them and will not be at risk of running away or getting lost.
- they are irresponsible. they are trying to avoid the rules and not follow them.
- They are cheap.
- Irresponsible pet owners. Why pay if you can get away with it? Also if their dog is picked up by the city they do not want to pay a fine to get it back. Nor do they want to be made to feel guilty for the dog getting away in the first place.
- They feel that it is a money grab and they don't get value for their money.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- General laziness and overall petty cheapness
- Many people who have animals have no money to support them fully. I think if theres a way to make licensing fees based on a sliding scale of income more people would licence dogs.
- DK
- People are dicks. Said otherwise, social loafing
- Cost and awareness.
- Cost, annoyance, not seeing any benefit.
- I am aware of a household that refuses to license their dog until cats are required to be licensed as well.
- Cost.
- Irresponsibility.
- No one is checking whether dogs are licensed or not so the real reason to get a license is so the dog is returned faster should it go missing. Maybe they aren't planning on losing their dog.
- Money?
- Not sure - cost perhaps?
- ALL dogs should be licensed, due to the fact that they are out in public. There should be large fines for those who do not license. Fees are probably the main reason.
- Cost!
- The cost is too high. Often it seems like they will not call owners if the dog does end up in city care. People expect to be contacted if they license the animal and its wearing its tags
- There is really no effective way to enforce licensing the animal, so why bother.
- cost!
- Cost
- Cost
- Cost
- People who do not license their dogs feel the City Bylaw does not apply to them, or they are too cheap to pay the fee.
- Cost and it's inconvenient
- Dont see value in it.
- You get nothing for it. It is simply a tax. People doing paperwork and shoving it. Use the tax money to build dog parks and even a couple with playgrounds for dogs. Smaller fenced in areas on unused city lands in each neighbourhood within walking distance for most - think elderly, families.
- They don't think that it is important. Inconvenient.
- See above.
- They're cheap!
- Cost, process, not aware
- Cost
- Expensive
- Cost and hassle



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- People are dumb and irresponsible.
- The cost is too much in today's economy.
- Don't see value in this
- It requires time and costs money.
- They feel it's a money grab and not necessary
- Cost or not being reminded to renew. Also new pet owners should be told this is necessary as I was not and simply didn't know until I was ticketed
- Honestly it's a waste of money. My dogs have been licensed for years and I've never had to use their licenses for anything besides the city performing polls about what breeds are most popular in which areas. I'd like to see the cost of licensing lowered.
- Can't be bothered
- That their dog will not wander and nothing will happen to them.
- Cost. There is a lack of benefit to doing it overall. It's an annoying yearly hassle. It should be a one time deal. There is little to no benefit to doing it.
- Do not want to pay the hefty licensing cost.
- "Indoor" dog. Worried about "the man" knowing too much.
- Maybe they just see it as another tax and dislike taxes? Or maybe they disagree that the city has a right to charge pet licence fees.
- Cost, irresponsible
- Do not understand the purpose of doing so. Likely neglect other matters in life.
- Cost
- Cost.
- Lazyness, inept at following rules and possibly cheap
- People believe they will not get caught - no expectation of consequences or they are unaware of the laws
- Too costly
- Lazy. Tax money should go into off leash parks.
- Don't want to bother or can't afford licencing. Probably not spaying or giving vaccinations either.
- I don't know why someone would not license their dog. It makes more sense because the city is able to identify them right away with their license number and micro chip. Some owners might not want to pay to register their family member.
- I stopped in Calgary some years ago despite being proponent of licensing . 1) couldn't ever walk my dogs during your ACO hrs without several "he's friendly!" offlead disasters anyway 2) you once gave license info for the Herald to publish online which I was greatly appalled by. 3) I've seen..
- if the dogs are confined to the perimeters of their own yard
- Don't care
- Cost..most expensive fee I've ever paid
- Irresponsible pet ownership
- Money. And the fact that it is enforcement is very time consuming and costly -- eg. difficult.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cheap and irresponsible. Dogs migrate, fact. If they get free and are not exercised properly they will 'migrate' most dogs are found away from home because they are migrating and following their noses. Licensed dogs get returned to owners. Responsible owners know that they want their dogs back.
- Probably barriers in price. Also it's easy to forget to relicense.
- Same as above
- Their dogs are always under control or they don't have the funds
- Cost
- Cost, and inconvenience
- There is no acceptable reason. It's an animal in a city. Licenses are mandatory.
- Cost may be an issue for a certain percentage. Some people just don't respect the laws.
- Laziness.
- Cost
- As above.
- Cost
- Don't know. They should
- Price and convenience?
I plan on getting my dog done but I was also given false information. This is information that should almost be provided at the vet when you're getting your puppy's shots done. Or new information package including all this information
- Maybe they are unaware or have limited income?
- They view licensing as a cash grab and that it only comes in handy to save money if your dog ends up at the pound
- Cost. While I feel our licensing fees are reasonable, I suspect the reason would be costs. Maybe a sliding scale fee structure?
- They travel outside so I feel they should be licensed.
- Finances,
- No comment
- It's a money grab by the city.
- Cost.
- CGY doesn't do enough to solve the issues of unwanted pets. Nor do they support rescue shelters. Program btw CGY and rescues to spay/neuter should be in place. CGY vets should be mandated to volunteer at City s/n clinic to help end the issue of overpopulation/homelessness/unwanted animals
- Laziness
- Cost and convenience
- I would imagine it'd be financial.
- cost, inconvenience, not wanting to be accountable or regulated
- Not sure why a person would chose not to license a dog?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Perhaps cost? Don't know the rules?
- Think the laws don't apply to them. Lack of enforcement.
- They do not want to take responsibility for them.
- Laziness
- Lazy People
- Lazy, cheap, don't like government restrictions
- Not sure, lazy?
- They don't want to pay for it.
- Cost
- The purpose of licensing is unclear. Most dogs are not a nuisance or aggressive. Those that are aggressive or nuisances should have to be licensed to deter further irresponsible pet ownership.
- There is no consequence or penalty and no way of tracking if a dog is licensed unless it actually escapes and is caught by the city. Therefore, not a huge incentive to license, especially since a license isn't cheap.
- Again, maybe it's because they consider the licensing a stealth tax?
- Same as above.
- Cost or convenience
- Affordability, repetitive renewing, lack of knowledge
- Most dog owners that choose not to license their pet is simply because of the fee and denial that they will be caught and fined.
- Forgetfulness or foolishness. Not licensing your dog makes it exponentially more difficult should they run away.
- Cost barrier, not aware of need to license dogs.
- Cost
- Bad citizenship
- Irresponsible pet ownership.
- Don't understand the process
- If they don't take them out and pricing. It costs me 100 for 3 pups but I don't ever have them off leash and mostly take them out of city limits for walks
- They don't want to pay the fee and follow the rules.
- Either a lack of finances, or I have known people who just thought they were so responsible they always knew where their dog was.
- Money and disregard for the rules.
- Animal abuse.
- Indoor dog only. Cost, tax grab. No point in a licence.
- They don't respect laws, their neighbours, nor their community; are self-important, and know they won't be penalized. Key The lack of enforcement (no neighbour wants to raise the issue and the City is not proactive dealing with this, so it continues, as does most of the lawless behaviour in Calgary).
- Cost or the hassle of going down.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No value received from licensing. Feels like a tax on pet ownership.
- Cost, inconvenience. They don't see a benefit.
- Neglect to follow local bylaws.
- Maybe they don't take them out of the house often. And cost.
- Lack of enforcement
- Not aware. The city does a bad job at letting us know. I also don't think we need to waste money on letting people know or even licensing your dogs
- Expense - why wouldn't someone licence their dog otherwise. It would make it easier to find dog owners if dogs were licensed and chipped.
- Irresponsible or unaware
- I don't know. My dog escaped out of the yard years ago. It was helpful to be able to call 311 to report her missing, knowing that if found, her city of Calgary tag would help ensure I got her back quickly. That, and I assume pet licenses help pay for dog bag stations, which anyone on a dog walk uses
- Because they're indoor dogs and don't ever leave the home.
- I don't know. We have always licensed our dogs. They are also microchipped. They are both rescues, loud noises can spook them. I'd want them to be found & able to find us. I think the price is fine. If a pet owner can't afford it, they shouldn't be a pet owner. Pets are expensive.
- They don't want to be held accountable for their pet
- irresponsible dog owners
- irresponsible owner
- i don't know, just illegal behaviour
- People are lazy or they lack access to technology to do it online. Upstream wise, lack of public education on pet ownership is a big one. A lot of people don't know you can register your pets with city of Calgary, so incentive to building public awareness is lacking on city's part.
- Cost, lack of responsible ownership
- Lack of funds.
- Cost
- People choose not to license dogs if the dogs are a dangerous breed or are an attack dog (drug dealers)
Also to avoid responsibility for roaming, damage by dogs.
- Again, laziness?
- Because it's a money grab by the city.
- Same as above
- Costs and liability.
- Money or the dog has a microchip or tattoo for identification.
- Laziness.
- Cost
- Lazy, lack of money, don't want to have animal tracked back to them when they break the rules of at-large.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Assuming they have the dog under control at all times, so the need for a license isn't necessary (won't be lost).
- Cost
- I believe dogs should be licensed and microchipped.
- Cost primarily. There are also people I know of who do not license their dogs because they are small breed that are never out of the house or off the owner's property
- If you have a microchip or tattoo already in place licensing feels like an unnecessary fee
- Same as above. No excuses. A law is a law or do not own a pet.
- Laziness. It's inexpensive and easy to do
- Impose a fine and if not paid or the person does not obtain a license during a certain period of time, remove the dog.
- Cost.
- cost and the regulations that go with it
- Financial, laziness.
- Again ignorance.
- Same as above.
- They are cheap and think they will not be caught.
- They are cheap and think they will not be caught.
- Cost, laziness, don't care, disdain for bureaucracy
- To save money
- Ignorance of the bylaw or they live on their own acreage.
- Perhaps cost, lack of responsibility?
- Laziness
- Laziness or not wanting to pay the fee. I think most people are aware of the requirement for dogs.
- See cats.
- They're not responsible
- Can't afford it, owning pets come cost but just another cost people can't afford, push push to adopt yet most can't afford, some also feel I am sure, why should they license if their dog is a house/yard pet why should they!
- Expenses, \$\$
- They don't want to pay
- Forgetting to renew
- Money.
- Liability. Having a long record with multiple pet ownership, some of which may have had issues in the past on City files.
- Unknown
- No extra cash
- It adds no value to the owner and should already be included in the exorbitant property taxes
- Cost of licensing fee's and fear of bylaw taking their animal away.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Money
- Uninformed?
- Probably same as above. However, dogs most always are out and to dog parks or walking so important to be licensed
- Definitely the cost
- Cost? Lack of benefits? Not sure.
- Cost, laziness/forgot/lack of time
- May not know about the licensing or the fee may be too expensive.
- I do not know, but I am not sure why this legal. If you avail yourself of public dog parks, you should be licensed or fined.
- They are irresponsible jerks.
- Price, inconvenience, lack of info
- They think they can get away with it
- Cost
- I honestly think we shouldnt have to pay for a licence for each pet. We shouldnt have to pay to register our pet that we are paying already to take care of, love and spoil.
- Money
- I am guessing it would be the expense.
- Money and the hassle to do it yearly etc.
- I licence my dogs because they leave my yard.
- Possibly the same reason. Perhaps hiding their dog ownership from landlords.
- Lack of enforcement. People think they will never be caught or fined.
- Cost and limited benefit.
- Also cost.
- They feel it is a waste of money or costs too much.
- Great question.
- 1:)Save money
2:)Lazy
- No excuse for this, but likely cost?
- Cost
- Again, likely the cost of the annual fee, or they don't see the benefit in licensing their animal.
- Money. I think it should be discounted if you license for 2, 3 or 4 year license, or if you have a few dogs & cats.
- Same reason as above. It's a stupid fee. I'm paying so that other people can have there pets spayed at low cost while I have to pay \$700 to spay mine as a responsible pet owner. How is this fair? The responsible are penalized while the negligent get subsidies? Can't afford a pet? Don't get one.
- Laziness. Think they are above the law. Responsible pet ownership
- laziness



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It seems unnecessary to have to do it every year and becomes another added expense to pet ownership.
- Cost or the dog stays in the house.
- The burden of paperwork
- Money
- All dog owners should license their dogs. Dogs get loose more often than any other pet
- I think this is two spectrums far left they are entitled and dont care and will risk getting caught far right they are impoverished and cant afford it. I also think Vets should be required to report to the city unlicensed animals
- Little house dogs in enclosed yards.
- See answer to question 1.
- Stupidity and lack of disrespect of the law. They think that they are above the law.
- Financial or for privacy concerns over their information.
- What are the chances of getting caught.
- didn't know or think needed
- Cost and annual renewal
- Same as above Laziness!!! And entitlement that they are above this. These people are the same ones who don't pick up after their dog & have their dog/dogs off leash. I'm tired of being a responsible dog owner surrounded by people who just don't care how their actions affect others in the community
- The cost.
- they're very irresponsible people
- Lazy and too easy to get away with it
- Cost.
- Don't know. Cost is always one. Remembering to do it?
- Economics. People find a way to (maybe) afford the dog, and then the bills for food, veterinary care etc start rolling in and licensing is just not affordable.
- I don't have one but I would assume cost. Dogs should be licensed as they are outside all the time.
- affordability, no access to computer, not sure where to license,
- don't know.
- rebel thinking
- Not responsible, household finances
- I'd like to know more about them. Are they experiencing housing insecurity? Are they unable to afford it. Maybe ask them.
- They don't want to get caught when the animal does something they shouldn't. Or if the animal gets away.
- Price>value
Dog is senior/little likelihood of roaming, doesn't leave property
- lazy



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

not wanting responsibility for the dogs actions.

- I'm guessing laziness and/or cost. I think a dog escaping is higher risk than a cat, and even though I don't license my cat, I would license a dog if I had one.
- I've always licensed my dogs so I have no frame of reference from which to offer an opinion on this.
- Think they wont get lost.
- Too many dogs in one home to license. There should be a limit on the number of dogs allowed.
- I would imagine the same as for cats.
- Probably too expensive. Or maybe they have a nasty dog they don't actually want to be responsible for.
- Too expensive. The money for licencing does not do anything for the dog or the owner. It lines the pockets of City Hall. For example, Carstairs has free licensing in January every year...it's not about making money, but keeping the furry residents safe.
- as above- they don't understand the purpose or agree with it
- Cost
- Same as above, or lack of funds
- It could be the expense. Or that the dog remains at their home at all times.
- Money.
- Again I don't see why when a dog is microchipped why it needs to be licenced to it seems silly. for example you can scan for a microchip a dog tag falls off.
- Because it is not needed. A license is only a way of politicians to make easy money.
- Don't see the benefit. Think it's just another tax.
- Doesn't make sense to me. Can't help you here
- They don't understand why you need to license your dog. Or they feel that their dog is never out of their control so they shouldn't have to license their dog.
- Laziness and money
- Sometimes I think they just don't know. I got my first dog ever from a rescue and did not know I had to license him until a bylaw officer stopped by. Otherwise it may be a dog that is never let off leash or the property so they think it is unnecessary.
- No benefit to license for the owner. Just a tax cost. I can microchip, put a gps tracker on , collar tag with identification , etc with no requirement for city intervention
- no benefit to owners
- They don't know to do it or don't want to spend \$\$.
- cost is too high
- Maybe these individuals feel that they are not getting their monies worth.
- Cost
- Cost or forgetfulness
- Money and the inconvenience of payment. There is only credit card and a very limited number of banks on the interact. I would like to see Paypal or etransfer. Some of us don't have credit cards.
- Freedom of choice; sees no benefit; or unaware this is required (education).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost.
- To me it is irresponsible, I would want my dog to be found in the event it was lost. Some people don't like rules or don't want to make the extra effort when buying a pet. And they may not want to pay the fee.
- I don't know.
- Same thing as above, my CAT will eat my dogs tag (she a big husky but my cat has the power in the family). Please find a way for alternatives for people like us. I want to be responsible, but refuse to pay money for something that I will still be fined for anyways just because they don't have tags.
- have no idea.
- They are lazy and irresponsible.
- as above
- Probably the same.
- Dogs need to be licensed as they are outside. Main reason is the owner does not respect authority.
- cost
- Not sure
- Cost
- Again not sure? Maybe that it's just a dog and not a pet.
- Ignorance and cost cutting.
- Poverty or laziness.
- Cash grab. Prices should be reduced.
- Laziness, avoidance of city bylaws
- Don't want to spend the money.
- They don't understand that it is important and why
- not remembering to license the dogs
- I feel licensing dogs is an absolute MUST!
- Cost, think they won't get caught, don't understand why they have to pay.
- Cost?
- Ignorance about how important licensing is
- The majority of dog owners I know and come into contact with, license their dogs. People with cats however, laugh in your face because they "don't have to". The double standard is very offensive
- If this is happening, it has to be due to the economic conditions. This could be the same reason people abandon their animals. I would suggest a 15% reduction in fees to help.
- Too expensive
- Cost
- Apathy, don't believe it is important
- It is not the cost, because the cost is reasonable, they simply don't want to spay or neuter and is probably hiding the reason for having an animal
- Same as above.
- Cost



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost &/or laziness
- Stupidity.
- Not concerned their dog will run away/need a license
- NA
- Cost
- Same as above
- Cash grab
- It is unnecessary administration with no benefit. Use funding towards dog parks, pet infrastructure etc. And make this clear and people may licence.
- They may have their dogged microchipped and feel that is adequate for identification. Some people just don't want to pay for a license.
- Dogs are not trained or hard to control
- Pain in the butt
- The cost.
- Lack of funds, already have pet microchipped or have own identity tags.
- Cost. They don't understand what the money is used for.
- Fees associated with costs to have needles and spaying
Not educated in/ on benefits
- Cost
- Cost and lack of education/knowledge re: need of a license.
- All dogs need to be licensed.. any animal that is not house bound needs to be licensed..
- All dogs should be licensed especially those who are off leash capable.
- the thought of 'what is the point'.
- Keep forgetting, a longer lasting license would be cool
- Laziness. If you can't afford to license your pet, you shouldn't be able to have one.
- Price! The fees are high especially if your pet is not neutered. For those who are affected by the changing economy, the price to register may not be within their means. There should be a social assistance program for low income Calgarians
- Lack of responsibility as a pet owner.
- Same
- People believe it's a cash grab, and don't see where this money is being spent - specifically to benefit the dog community. It's just another tax.
- Irresponsibility. I don't believe it's an affordability issue because the licenses cost far less than dog food, collars, toys, etc. I happily license my dogs because I want them to be cared for should they ever get loose in a park and need to be picked up. Also I want to support the care of strays.
- Owner says it is strictly an indoor dog. Any dog regardless of size or living conditions, must comply & buy the annual licence.
- time and money



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They don't think they need to. They don't understand how a license will help them if the animal gets lost.
- Don't want to spend the time or money
- The cost?
Ease of licensing. Not having a credit card.
- Lack of responsibility and do not care
- That their dog does not exit their dwelling and/or behaves responsibly in public
- Cost?
- I think all animals should be licensed. I also think the public needs to know where the funds are going and how they are being used. This may increase compliance. Why are intact dogs costing more than spayed and neutered dogs? Intact dogs don't bark or poop more!
- Thinking they won't be caught. Opposition to government oversight.
- Cost?
- Cost. However, having said this, I have a dog that never (and I mean ever) leaves my side when outdoors. He is lazy and never goes for walks. He goes outside to do his business....that is it. He would never walk away from me, let alone run away. I have been very tempted not to license him.
- Money?
- Cost
- don't think it is necessary and don't think they will get fined for not having one
- Cost, low income household
- Dont want to be charged with aggressive dog or are in criminal activities Or they dont care if they lose their pet
- Unsure
- The fee, and having to do it every year
- cheap and or avoiding vicious dog label
- Lack of funds
- Primary reason may be stubbornness--or simply a red neck reaction to rules.
- Cost
- They don't walk them, or allow them out unless they are in their fenced yard with supervision?
- If the dog ever escapes and found. With the owners information they can be reunited.
- The cost for the license. It is nice that it is online, so that's the easy part.
- money and laziness.
- They don't think they'll lose their dog
- Many people don't have the extra money to afford it.
- Might be cost but I have met many who think that dogs should still roam free ?
- Disregard of the law
- I would assume cost and difficulty in licensing. Not everyone has credit cards or easy access to the licensing location.
- If their dog isn't fixed, its pricey.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- See above.
- Dog owners that fail to licence their pets seem to think that the rules don't apply to them and feel the likelihood of getting caught is low.
- I think they would be more licensing of dogs if there was, say a week every 6 months where it was free.
- Lazy and cheap
- Forget mostly. Needs to be reminded and make it easy
- They don't want to take responsibility for their dog.
- they don't think it is important
- they can't afford it or they just don't care and are lazy
- Not wanting to pay the fee. Some people may not take their dogs out often on public property so don't want to bother paying the fee.
- Money, forgetfulness
- Cost, inconvenience, irresponsible
- They probably don't want the licensing department to be aware of a high number (over 3-4)! dogs in the home
- Same as above, I'd think?
- Being lazy and cost
- COST and convenience
- lack of enforcement, lack of understanding of benefits
- old
- Why, what is the point, there is no benefit seen. Also should be a one time license I am guessing - paying every year I am guessing causes people over time to really say, why? Plus less city man hours (tax payers' money) needed for one license vs one for every year.
- Expense and no added service, essentially feels like paying for nothing
- Education
- Cost/ laziness
- The animal is kept indoors or enclosed in a secure area when outdoors
- I do license my dogs. If they get lost they have their license tag and will hopefully return to me when found.
All dogs SHOULD go outside so they should all be licensed.
- Financial reasons
- Idiocy. Poverty.
- Same as above for cats
- They don't see the value.
- Same as above
- Usually bad pet owners that do not follow any of the bylaws including issues around vicious dogs and being off-leash wherever they choose.
- I think it is because people do not want to pay the fee.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It is too expensive..
- same as above
- I would assume cost and perceived hassle. Perhaps they don't know why licensing is important?
- negligence, and no consequences.
- same as cats, but also maybe stupidity. Dogs can run away ...
- They don't want to be responsible for them.
- Inconvenience and cost
- cost and active decision not to
- Cost, time to complete process, lack of importance. I personally don't even like to put a collar on my dog, I use a collar as punishment for behaviour issues.
- The cost and the harassment to re-license yearly.
- They do not want to pay the fees
- Fee
- No idea.... I don't understand why you wouldn't.
- Money.
- Can't be bothered and the cost
- I think it is either that they have something to hide, they are cheap, or maybe they don't understand the rules
- I believe cost is probably a contributing factor, especially if there's an up charge for certain breeds. It is a recurring cost, which is difficult as well. Also they may move frequently which makes the process more of a hassle.
- Laziness? Cost? Not sure.
- Cost and an I don't care attitude.
- Lazy
- N/A My dog is licensed. Having said that - I think people are cheap and don't want to pay.
- Negligence. Because they think it's not necessary? Not sure. My dogs are all licensed.
- Laziness. Cost?
- Cost, or the animal doesn't leave the property so they think they don't need to. Not informed on the laws and benefits
- Do not care if licensed or not. The city does not need to know how many they have
- Lazy or irresponsible. All my pets are licensed.
- N/A
- Doesn't seem necessary or needed.
- Cost.
- Price
- Probably that they forgot to renew and it is unintentional or that they can't afford the license.
- Cost
- Most dogs get microchipped so if lost vets can identify their owners that way do city of Calgary animal license is not needed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- price
- Financial
- Once again I do not understand why people would not license their pets especially dogs who are more oftentimes than not the ones that like to go on their own adventures.
- Cost and again only having the animal confined to their home
- Not informed, lazy, or can't afford it. But if money is a consideration, should someone own a pet? Pets still need to be fed, and that costs money.
- Inconvenience/cost. Difference in registering an altered dog/cat requires no differences yet the cost is higher for a dog, no explanation for extra cost, suspected cash grab.
- money
- Cost. I register mine though
- Id also guess money.
- Cost. You should pay one fee, not annual.
- Cost, money grab for the city
- cost and not knowing the requirement
- Cost
Difficult to license pets
- unable to afford it, don't feel they need to license, lazy, irresponsible
- Price, irresponsible pet ownership
- Not sure why someone wouldn't license their dog. Maybe they don't see a need if it's leashed anytime it is out of the house.
- I do not have a dog, but i assume its because its expensive aswell.
- Financial reasons. They don't have the time. They don't know where to go.
- They may not see the benefits to the cost
- There is little enforcement for this, so there is little need to comply. Public education campaigns go a long way. Calgary was way more successful with compliance in previous years.
- Laziness.
- lazy
- I have no idea why they would not license. Perhaps laziness, lack of awareness, lack of consequence. The cost is so low enough that if your pet is altered I don't see cost being a factor.
- They do not see why it's necessary, seems like a money grab. For most, pets are family members, not an owned object.
- Dogs should require a licence because they can do harm and their owners should be held responsible. If they get out of the yard and are not causing harm they may not be able to find their way home. I support the at large ticket, but only to fund the animal control.
- Lack of knowledge on bylaw requirement, too expensive, no perceived value, unsure where funds go.
- Same as above, it can be a financial barrier to low income families, and it's a hassle to do it every year.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stupidity
- Anti-institutions. And also That they didn't even know it was recommended-required.
- cost
- They don't care
- They are uneducated to the benefits of licensing their animal or are involved in back yard breeding, hoarding or some other illegal activities
- Uneducated about what the fees go towards
- I really feel that it is just a forgotten thing. I got a new dog and literally forgot to get her a license, because she isn't free roaming and doesn't use city of calgary off leash parks etc. It was just a simple oversight after I bought her per insurance, did her microchip etc.
- Cost or too lazy to bother.
- Cost
- Cost. For newcomers, possibly a lack of knowledge that it is required.
- Too expensive.
- irresponsibility. Dog licensing is a well established thing and helps ensure responsible ownership.
- Cost and laziness.
- Same reason as cats, annual licenses fees are a cash grab that doesn't benefit the pet owner in any way after your animal is entered into the system.
- They don't see the value in it
- If the owners are low income, it is not a top priority for them.
- Misunderstanding of the purpose and use of a license- see it as a cash grab
- Not sure.
- Price 100% i shouldnt have to pay double what a spayed/neutered dog costs to have my dogs intact. People dont have to lisenice their children, why do i?
- Same as above.
- They are not afraid of consequence
- Money / cost. Laziness. If there is a limit on the number of dogs, they just won't get a license for some.
- Bylaw officers are not checking regularly and they chance it. Others feel their dogs never leave their property so it isn't necessary.
- I do not know. I license my dog. Maybe people are not aware or realize the benefits or negative consequences.
- Laziness. Cheap.
- Price , having to renew each year, mabey a one time licence ata small charge
- Expense.
- Same as above. They don't allow for off leash or any area where they animal can get into trouble. Identifiable with microchip.
- Cost?
- Lack of education/laziness



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stupidity and inconsideration. Throw the book at them as well.
- They are irresponsible owners.
- forgetfulness, not understanding why they need a license, hard to pay
- Cost
- Did not take the regulations seriously.
- Cost
- Cost
- Cost, no deterrent if caught.
- Price point
- All dogs should be licensed.
It pays for off leash areas, pet conservation officials.
- Expense, disregard for health and well being
- Can't afford it or want to breed their dog
- Cost?
- Price...especially for non puppy status and gender/ reproduction status. Should be the same. Many people get pets as therapy or support or on guardianship programs which means they have to allow breeding by the seller...intact animals cost significantly more to license
- Not aware of requirement to do so
- Unsure
- Affordability
- Money
- Not a responsible pet owner. Don't see how their actions affect others
- They do not want to spend the money and think they won't get caught.
- They may not expect the dog to escape. They may not be able to afford it. They may not be aware of subsidies.
- Cost
- Don't want to pay/ live somewhere they don't think their dog could escape
- Cost.
- Cost. Just not bothering to do it.
- Cost. Must have license before being neutered which costs more than if neutered. It should be the same regardless. Less active dog. Senior dogs.
- Same as above
- the cost and just being lazy. These people should understand that if they want to own a pet they should be responsible to pay for a pet license.
- Cost. Licences should be a one time fee per pet.
- expense
- Same as last answer for cats
- Likely cost.
- as above.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Laziness, inability to follow one of the most forward thinking well respected bylaws this country has.
- Not responsible, can't afford it. Probably should not own pets!
- Irresponsible.
- Fees for licensing based on the cost of sterilization. When they can not justify several hundred dollars for fixing, it is easier to hide the animal from bylaw or stay out of the system.
- Financial and not seeing the need of a pet does not go outside
- Cost. And people don't understand why they have to license there pet.
- Cost
- Lazy - or money. Also they may feel that if they don't take there dog out of the yard it does not matter. more education is really all you can do. I believe in licensing dogs
- Lack of education/awareness of the requirement
- Money, maybe dogs never go out, not sure.
- Cost
- Expense? Negligence?
- Cost
- Cost
- Cost. The cost to take care of animals go through the roof with food, vet bills etc. You charge people if their animals end up in the pound and you charge them for the privilege of owning animals? what kind of BS is that
- Don't know -- dogs are in the public sphere of every community so there shouldn't be any reasons not to license. Perhaps costs or low-income people might not be aware
- have microchipping or tattoos
- There are no benefits to licensing
- lazy...
all dogs need to be licensed.
- Unwillingness to pay the fee. Laziness. Not worried about getting fined.
- Cost and also not wanting to take responsibility if something happens with the dog, unidentifiable
- I think many don't license due to the cost.
- The dog doesn't go outside, it's older or to small for walks or off leash parks so stays on the owner property. Or maybe it's to pricey.
- Money
- They don't want to pay the fee.
- same as above.
- Likely to avoid the licence fee / sense that the fee is too high. Licencing a dog makes sense as they will spend a lot of time outside and the probability of getting lost is much higher, and when lost dogs put themselves in danger.
- Just plain irresponsible
- Lack of education and what licensing does for the owner. Lack of a benefit for them, especially if they're dog does not use city dog parks . Cost of retrieving a pet from the "pound" ends up too much.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost
- cost
- They do not want to pay for it
- cost or illegal hoarding or breeding
- Cost and effort. Or laziness.
- not being able to afford it. not knowing that this is a thing they need to do.
- can't afford it. adverse to administration & bureaucracy.
- see previous comment
- They do not think it is necessary. They do not know the purpose or care about the purpose of licensing the dogs.
- The same as with cats
- uniformed and cost
- Cost of money or time
- Their dogs are never loose.
- All of mine are licence even with the high fee
- Lack of knowledge about the rules and regulations. Not receiving or paying attention of expiring licenses.
- Cost, not knowing the laws, ignorance
- Neglect, totally wrong. Perhaps economic reason, but how can you afford to keep and look after a dog then, as it is not cheap owning a dog
Dogs should also be spayed - neutered ,
- Cost - and an independent streak
- They don't know that they have to.
- Too expensive or just simply do not want to comply; viewed as an unnecessary imposition.
- Cost pets are expensive as it is.
- Same as above, especially as you seem to increase the cost every year for an email which costs zip to send, you don't even supply collar attachments anymore and make people pay again if the dog loses it.
Suggest all animals be microchipped and you can do away with the whole licensing system.
- Lack of responsibility...trying to save money
- Cost of the license as it should be a one time rather than a yearly thing.
- I've honestly just forgotten. I think that the cost is reasonable but having to do it yearly is tedious.
- Primary reason is likely cost,
- Financial.
- Facilities, such as dog parks, are created by the city for dog owners, so a tax is more fair in that case.
- Same as cats the cost, just one expense that they don't want to worry about or can afford.
- Laziness, don't want to get caught if they let their animals roam free. Don't want to pay the cost.
Don't want to immunize animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Too expensive, what is the benefit / point of licensing?
- They may think their dogs don't leave the yards so they don't need one.
- That they don't have the proper vaccinations up-to-date to get their license. Just a theory.
- Pretty much same. People think it's not important if the animal is well trained.
- Avoiding costs
- Lazy, money, don't care enough
- Financial.
- Same as above
- Can't afford it or don't like being regulated "by the man".
- Lack of funds, they don't see the benefit to them, the dog is stolen, they forgot to renew.
- NA
- not being a responsible dog owner
- Avoid spending money, lack of ownership/being responsible, avoiding accountability for dog behavior.
- Financial or ignorance
- There is no reason that they shouldn't be licensed. It is irresponsible not to.
- They do not know the bylaws.
- Stupidity
- Financial reasons
- No idea as they are traceable of lost and the money is supposed to support other pet initiatives
- do not understand process
- Probably the cost but mine are licensed.
- It's just another tax that the city collects and the owners of their pet get nothing out of it. Your dog gets caught you still have to pay to get him out whether he/she is registered or not. I personally don't use dog parks or anything along the city off-leash areas.
- Because they aren't responsible pet owners (sorry there is simply no excuse to not license your pet) and think they don't get value for the money
- Not sure, my dogs have always been licensed.
- Lack of understanding of the benefits in terms of finding the owner if lost and not knowing where the license fees go.
- lazy, don't want or think they need to, these are the same people that let their animals roam free even in terrible weather conditions so they aren't going to pay anything, most of them don't take their pet to a vet either, and they don't care if the animal returns, it's just irresponsible behavior
- Too cheap
- They have the animal for some nefarious purpose, are irresponsible and don't care, or don't know the benefits of licensing.
- Laziness
- Tags are expensive and annoying. I paid one year and didn't bother renewing because I forgot/didn't feel like I was getting anything from it.
- Little to no benefit



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Those that do not license their dogs, either don't care if the dog gets lost, unable to pay for licence.
- Laziness, being too busy, or an unwillingness to pay the tiny fee for licensing.
- Possibly fostering for rescue,
- Shows lack of responsibility
- Stupidity and irresponsible dog owner. Costs them money of which they see no benefit. My experience is a dog owner who does not license does not care about their animal.
- Not sure, this one doesn't make sense to me
- Cost and laziness
- Can't afford, can't track "person"
- Cost.
- Not licensing, probably price.
- I have 6 and license them all, people who don't just are people who think the rules don't apply to them or possibly they think they can't afford it
- Income restrictions, or lack of awareness
- No money to pay?
- I have many dogs and I always fear that licensing them will alert bylaw and I will be hassled for my pets. They are all cared for, vaccinated and properly vetted but bylaw has not been friendly to me in the past.
- I think people don't understand the reason and value of licensing. I think the price is also a barrier in some cases. It makes sense to pay more to get an intact lost pet home (like a fine) but if you're responsible owner it shouldn't cost more just to license an intact pet.
- Cost
- It can be cost prohibitive for multiple animals. Beyond that, I think I'm the majority of cases people who are not registering dogs could be doing this to avoid raising red flags about potential 'backyard breeding' situations.
- I think part of it is cost, some completely irresponsible and there are many backyard breeders who turn their animals over so quickly to license them would draw attention but they don't want and if you complain about your backyard breeding neighbour it takes a very long time for an investigations
- Again the animal doesn't go outside.
- Cost- recurring expense
- too expensive
- cost
- Cost possibly!
- My dog is never outside.
- Cost
- Irresponsible
- They are already chipped and tattooed
- Money and rebellion
- Cost, and having a number of animals exceeding the allowed limit.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They don't want to spend the money or they don't care if they lose them.
- they want to be off the grid or don't have the \$\$ to license their dog (if they can't afford it, they can't afford a dog!)
- There is no reason to license domestic , non aggressive breeds of dogs.
- As above
- Cost, nuisance, forgot to renew
- they city doesn't advertise animal licensing requirements. they also probably don't know what the fine would be.
- Cannot afford the licensing fees
- Other, better identification such as microchips. Cost
- Just plain lazy
- Cost and not seeing a value out of it
- As above.
- Ignorance or costs most likely.
- Laziness? All owners should be required to have pet licenses.
- Money grab by the City. Remove the cost but require owners have a licence.
- Likely cost. Depending how an animal has come to be in someone's life (ie a stray, taking in an animal from someone, etc), there may be true ignorance to the responsibility of pet care and ownership.
- As with cats- perception it's just a tax grab and doesn't matter
- Laziness or cost
- They cant afford it. Or they are an irresponsible pet owner.
- Cost and fear of accountability
- can't afford it
- Irresponsible.
- same as above
- I think they take a chance thinking you'll never be seen by bylaw with your dog or that the dog never leaves their yard dot-dot. Which is a responsible dog ownership. Also some people have warrants and they're probably worried but they will get arrested
- They cant afford it?
- Apathy.
- Lack of financial resources
- Possibly cost.
- Having to pay money to tell someone you have a pet, and not seeing how that information is relevant to anyone other than the pet owner.
- The cost right now money is very tide. And we have two dogs that never leave my home or yard. We do walk them down the street. and never let them off leash
- Laziness or cannot afford it.
- They think they won't get caught



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Licensing pets made sense years ago but doesn't now because people work with their vets for pet care and identification. Why aren't city taxes allocated to manage abandoned animals? Licensing costs a lot of money to administrate and is an additional tax to pet owners.
- Cost or in some cases, neglect or hiding a number of animals, as in 'puppy-mills'.
- cost of licensing; not aware of benefits
- Ditto
- I have clients who have dogs who were not licensed prior to me walking them, this is because they think if they are on leash they do not need to be licensed, or because they are not 6-12 months old they do not need to be licensed.
- Likely the cost. Especially if pet never/rarely leaves household and/or is always under constant supervision.
- If I have a house dog that is chipped & spends all it's time indoors or in my yard that pet imposes NO cost to the city. If I take my dog for a walk, that pet still does not impart any cost to the city. I pick up after my dog so that also imparts no cost to the city. So why a license?
- Its their personal freedom.
Cats & dogs should not require a license
- I can only imagine that it's viewed as a cost-saving measure.
- the cost
- I believe it is generally laziness or a monetary issue.
- Save money
- Cost, laziness, lack of responsibility.
- It's a money grab
- It is an absolute unnecessary expense. It makes no sense at all to need a license to own an animal. Just the government trying to make money any way it can.
- See above
- Cost, forgetting
- Not sure
- Money or thinking they won't get caught
- Being cheap and lazy and not a responsible member of society
- Cost of the license is too high
- Money perhaps.
- lack of responsibility and inability of City to enforce
- Probably cost. I think knowing where the money goes would help.
- Same as above
- I don't have a dog.
- Unrealized benefits, cost, laziness... ignorance... again, more education may be required.
- Same. I can't say that it is cost, because it is the least expensive thing I do for my dog.
- Cost, lack of awareness on need & how to do it, marketing.
- unsure



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- avoiding the risk of a fine
- They may not know it is required or be burdened financially from licensing fees
- they are stay in the yard dogs that are never go outside the property and shouldn't need a licence to be able to find the owner.
- Lack of enforcement.
- cost and potentially behavioural issues
- lazy
- Purely money driven
- No good reason - - licensing should not be a choice.
- Monetary.
- I believe that many think it's a money grab.
- Increase in fees
- Laziness and as above.
- Primarily cost, also can it be done online?
- They just don't want to pay the money and aren't worried about the consdquences if they don't.
- Fees? Not sure
- Cost and time
- My dog is never unsupervised.
- It doesnt leave their house and a fenced yard
- Same as above
- inability to afford the licensing, and perhaps thinking the same....their dog is indoors therefore does not need to be licensed
- remembering without reminders. We all have lots of 'other' prioritizes in mind. Should be an auto-renew with an opt-out feature (instead of opt-in), and emailed reminders should be standard. Lots of options, could be added to property tax, could be paid via vet clinic etc.
- Cost /
- Maybe the cost?
- Laziness, forgetfulness, and yes cost even though it's not that much
- Ignorance
- Cost, and laziness
- Overstepping government. So many taxes and fees already on everything
- If the dog is microchipped it can be reunited with its owner should if get out of the yard. Having a license on a collar is dangerous for the dog when alone.
- No idea
- Laziness.
- Cost and time.
- As above
- what right does the city have to charge me for my pet that costs the city nothing. piss off also, its way too much money.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Saving money.
- They don't let their dogs out unattended ever.
- cost
- cost
- Cost
- They don't know it is a law.
- Unaware that their license needs renewal.
Do not want to pay for license.
- cost
- Ignorance to the actual cost to the municipality for control efforts.
- cost. laziness. maybe ignorance.
- City of Calgary charges quite a bit, with no discount to multi-cat households.
- Cost? Unaware of what the fee provides
- Dog owners don't want to pay out money to license their dogs. Another reason could be laziness.
- Cost of license as well as by law fines if your dog gets out
- Cost?
- No idea why someone should even be allowed to choose not to. Licensing for dogs and cats should be mandatory - if they choose not to, they should be fined if caught.
- We do not pay to license children. Licensing and the Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw is demeaning towards animals.
- Cost. Perhaps a reduced fee if you renew. Also reduced fee for multiple animals.
- I don't know. I did have a neighbor once who didn't see how paying the fee would benefit her dog or her.
- I think if a dog is unlicensed it is because the owners don't believe there is anything in licensing that is a benefit to them. It is just a money grab for the city.
- No idea
- Probably cost
- They are unaware that they are required to do so.
- Privacy
- No clue. My dogs are licensed
- Dogs are different from cats, in that some cats never leave their home. Dogs need to exercise and socialize. Perhaps dog owners who don't license their dogs, they may not be able to afford the yearly license or may not treat their dogs the best if these rules are not followed.
- irresponsibility. cost.
- They are irresponsible
- Bad owners. No reason for this. Maybe hiding an aggressive dog, or hoarding.
- See above.
- I suspect people don't license their dogs because they think they're above it, and rules shouldn't apply to them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't own a dog, but I think people assume a tag with their info will suffice. Again, highlighting the many benefits of licensing for your own dog, but others. Highlight our collective responsibilities. Also highlighting the high licence rate, that's it's normative to licence here.
- Cheap. They don't like authority or their dog doesn't like wearing a collar.
- Irresponsible owners
- same as above
- COST , lack of knowledge what the city can provide. FEAR of policing.. the world is to judge and people are fearful of losing their loved ones
- Too much money or lazy. Some folks truly have trouble affording it.
- don't see the point
- As above. Disregard and respect for bylaws.
- Don't want to pay money to the City, does not want the City to know how many animals they own
- Cost, plus no reminders.
Need online Expiry reminders!!!!
- same input as above.
- It's a cash grab. Licensing does nothing other than keep track of who owns what animals. Why there is a cost associated with it is beyond me.
- I think forgetting to re new is a big thing. Possibly paying for a few years at a time would help?
- Not sure, cost of licensing isn't too bad
- - No enforcement
 - Know they won't get caught
 - No value
 - Does re-unite dogs and owners
 - Not clear that money is being used as it should
 - No guardians & owners
 - Animal rights taking over
- -Voice not same as animal rights groups
 - Not guardian but owner
 - Not as advertised anymore
 - Why penalize if not spayed
 - Should be no diff between spayed and intact in fees
 - Dogs don't go out
 - Seniors
 - Mindset is fixed - either they do or don't
 - Education requirements for getting license
- They might not have enough money or don't want to give money to the government.
- - Cost
 - It's a house dog & never gets except for the yard
 - Had it a long time & never saw the need



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Do not want to pay the fee
Their dogs are well trained
- the cost and just being lazy. These people should understand that if they want to own a pet they should be responsible to pay for a pet license.
- Cost. Licences should be a one time fee per pet.
- expense
- Same as last answer for cats
- Likely cost.
- as above.
- Laziness, inability to follow one of the most forward thinking well respected bylaws this country has.
- Not responsible, can't afford it. Probably should not own pets!
- Irresponsible.
- Fees for licensing based on the cost of sterilization. When they can not justify several hundred dollars for fixing, it is easier to hide the animal from bylaw or stay out of the system.
- Financial and not seeing the need of a pet does not go outside
- Cost. And people don't understand why they have to license there pet.
- Cost
- Lazy - or money. Also they may feel that if they don't take there dog out of the yard it does not matter. more education is really all you can do. I believe in licensing dogs
- Lack of education/awareness of the requirement
- Money, maybe dogs never go out, not sure.
- Cost
- Expense? Negligence?
- Cost
- Cost
- Cost. The cost to take care of animals go through the roof with food, vet bills etc. You charge people if their animals end up in the pound and you charge them for the privilege of owning animals? what kind of BS is that
- Don't know -- dogs are in the public sphere of every community so there shouldn't be any reasons not to license. Perhaps costs or low-income people might not be aware
- have microchipping or tattoos
- There are no benefits to licensing
- lazy...
all dogs need to be licensed.
- Unwillingness to pay the fee. Laziness. Not worried about getting fined.
- Cost and also not wanting to take responsibility if something happens with the dog, unidentifiable
- I think many don't license due to the cost.
- The dog doesn't go outside, it's older or to small for walks or off leash parks so stays on the owner property. Or maybe it's to pricey.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Money
- They don't want to pay the fee.
- same as above.
- Likely to avoid the licence fee / sense that the fee is too high. Licencing a dog makes sense as they will spend a lot of time outside and the probability of getting lost is much higher, and when lost dogs put themselves in danger.
- Just plain irresponsible
- Lack of education and what licensing does for the owner. Lack of a benefit for them, especially if they're dog does not use city dog parks . Cost of retrieving a pet from the "pound" ends up too much.
- Cost
- cost
- They do not want to pay for it
- cost or illegal hoarding or breeding
- Cost and effort. Or laziness.
- not being able to afford it. not knowing that this is a thing they need to do.
- can't afford it. adverse to administration & bureaucracy.
- see previous comment
- They do not think it is necessary. They do not know the purpose or care about the purpose of licensing the dogs.
- The same as with cats
- uniformed and cost
- Cost of money or time
- Their dogs are never loose.
- All of mine are licence even with the high fee
- Lack of knowledge about the rules and regulations. Not receiving or paying attention of expiring licenses.
- Cost, not knowing the laws, ignorance
- Neglect, totally wrong. Perhaps economic reason, but how can you afford to keep and look after a dog then, as it is not cheap owning a dog
Dogs should also be spayed - neutered ,
- Cost - and an independent streak
- They don't know that they have to.
- Too expensive or just simply do not want to comply; viewed as an unnecessary imposition.
- Cost pets are expensive as it is.
- Same as above, especially as you seem to increase the cost every year for an email which costs zip to send, you don't even supply collar attachments anymore and make people pay again if the dog loses it.
Suggest all animals be microchipped and you can do away with the whole licensing system.
- Lack of responsibility...trying to save money



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost of the license as it should be a one time rather than a yearly thing.
- I've honestly just forgotten. I think that the cost is reasonable but having to do it yearly is tedious.
- Primary reason is likely cost,
- Financial.
- Facilities, such as dog parks, are created by the city for dog owners, so a tax is more fair in that case.
- Same as cats the cost, just one expense that they don't want to worry about or can afford.
- Laziness, don't want to get caught if they let their animals roam free. Don't want to pay the cost. Don't want to immunize animal.
- Too expensive, what is the benefit / point of licensing?
- They may think their dogs don't leave the yards so they don't need one.
- That they don't have the proper vaccinations up-to-date to get their license. Just a theory.
- Pretty much same. People think it's not important if the animal is well trained.
- Avoiding costs
- Lazy, money, don't care enough
- Financial.
- Same as above
- Can't afford it or don't like being regulated "by the man".
- Lack of funds, they don't see the benefit to them, the dog is stolen, they forgot to renew.
- NA
- not being a responsible dog owner
- Avoid spending money, lack of ownership/being responsible, avoiding accountability for dog behavior.
- Financial or ignorance
- There is no reason that they shouldn't be licensed. It is irresponsible not to.
- They do not know the bylaws.
- Stupidity
- Financial reasons
- No idea as they are traceable of lost and the money is supposed to support other pet initiatives
- do not understand process
- Probably the cost but mine are licensed.
- It's just another tax that the city collects and the owners of their pet get nothing out of it. Your dog gets caught you still have to pay to get him out whether he/she is registered or not. I personally don't use dog parks or anything along the city off-leash areas.
- Because they aren't responsible pet owners (sorry there is simply no excuse to not license your pet) and think they don't get value for the money
- Not sure, my dogs have always been licensed.
- Lack of understanding of the benefits in terms of finding the owner if lost and not knowing where the license fees go.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- lazy, don't want or think they need to, these are the same people that let their animals roam free even in terrible weather conditions so they aren't going to pay anything, most of them don't take their pet to a vet either, and they don't care if the animal returns, it just irresponsible behavior
- Too cheap
- They have the animal for some nefarious purpose, are irresponsible and don't care, or don't know the benefits of licensing.
- Laziness
- Tags are expensive and annoying. I paid one year and didn't bother renewing because I forgot/didn't feel like I was getting anything from it.
- Little to no benefit
- Those that do not license their dogs, either don't care if the dog gets lost, unable to pay for licence.
- Laziness, being too busy, or an unwillingness to pay the tiny fee for licensing.
- Possibly fostering for rescue,
- Shows lack of responsibility
- Stupidity and irresponsible dog owner. Costs them money of which they see no benefit. My experience is a dog owner who does not license does not care about their animal.
- Not sure, this one doesn't make sense to me
- Cost and laziness
- Can't afford, can't track "person"
- Cost.
- Not licensing, probably price.
- I have 6 and license them all, people who don't just are people who think the rules don't apply to them or possibly they think they can't afford it
- Income restrictions, or lack of awareness
- No money to pay?
- I have many dogs and I always fear that licensing them will alert bylaw and I will be hassled for my pets. They are all cared for, vaccinated and properly vetted but bylaw has not been friendly to me in the past.
- I think people don't understand the reason and value of licensing. I think the price is also a barrier in some cases. It makes sense to pay more to get an intact lost pet home (like a fine) but if you're responsible owner it shouldn't cost more just to license an intact pet.
- Cost
- It can be cost prohibitive for multiple animals. Beyond that, I think I'm the majority of cases people who are not registering dogs could be doing this to avoid raising red flags about potential 'backyard breeding' situations.
- I think part of it is cost, some completely irresponsible and there are many backyard breeders who turn their animals over so quickly to license them would draw attention but they don't want and if you complain about your backyard breeding neighbour it takes a very long time for an investigations
- Again the animal doesn't go outside.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost- recurring expense
- too expensive
- cost
- Cost possibly!
- My dog is never outside.
Cost
- Irresponsible
- They are already chipped and tatoood
- Money and rebellion
- Cost, and having a number of animals exceeding the allowed limit.
- They don't want to spend the money or they don't care if they lose them.
- they want to be off the grid or don't have the \$\$ to license their dog (if they can't afford it, they can't afford a dog!)
- There is no reason to license domestic , non aggressive breeds of dogs.
- As above
- Cost, nuisance, forgot to renew
- they city doesn't advertise animal licensing requirements. they also probably don't know what the fine would be.
- Cannot afford the licensing fees
- Other, better identification such as microchips. Cost
- Just plain lazy
- Cost and not seeing a value out of it
- As above.
- Ignorance or costs most likely.
- Laziness? All owners should be required to have pet licenses.
- Money grab by the City. Remove the cost but require owners have a licence.
- Likely cost. Depending how an animal has come to be in someone's life (ie a stray, taking in an animal from someone, etc), there may be true ignorance to the responsibility of pet care and ownership.
- As with cats- perception it's just a tax grab and doesn't matter
- Laziness or cost
- They cant afford it. Or they are an irresponsible pet owner.
- Cost and fear of accountability
- can't afford it
- Irresponsible.
- same as above
- I think they take a chance thinking you'll never be seen by bylaw with your dog or that the dog never leaves their yard dot-dot. Which is a responsible dog ownership. Also some people have warrants and they're probably worried but they will get arrested



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They cant afford it?
- Apathy.
- Lack of financial resources
- Possibly cost.
- Having to pay money to tell someone you have a pet, and not seeing how that information is relevant to anyone other than the pet owner.
- The cost right now money is very tide. And we have two dogs that never leave my home or yard. We do walk them down the street. and never let them off leash
- Laziness or cannot afford it.
- They think they won't get caught
- Licensing pets made sense years ago but doesn't now because people work with their vets for pet care and identification. Why aren't city taxes allocated to manage abandoned animals? Licensing costs a lot of money to administrate and is an additional tax to pet owners.
- Cost or in some cases, neglect or hiding a number of animals, as in 'puppy-mills'.
- cost of licensing; not aware of benefits
- Ditto
- I have clients who have dogs who were not licensed prior to me walking them, this is because they think if they are on leash they do not need to be licensed, or because they are not 6-12 months old they do not need to be licensed.
- Likely the cost. Especially if pet never/rarely leaves household and/or is always under constant supervision.
- If I have a house dog that is chipped & spends all it's time indoors or in my yard that pet imposes NO cost to the city. If I take my dog for a walk, that pet still does not impart any cost to the city. I pick up after my dog so that also imparts no cost to the city. So why a license?
- Its their personal freedom.
Cats & dogs should not require a license
- I can only imagine that it's viewed as a cost-saving measure.
- the cost
- I believe it is generally laziness or a monetary issue.
- Save money
- Cost, laziness, lack of responsibility.
- It's a money grab
- It is an absolute unnecessary expense. It makes no sense at all to need a license to own an animal. Just the government trying to make money any way it can.
- See above
- Cost, forgetting
- Not sure
- Money or thinking they won't get caught
- Being cheap and lazy and not a responsible member of society



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost of the license is too high
- Money perhaps.
- lack of responsibility and inability of City to enforce
- Probably cost. I think knowing where the money goes would help.
- Same as above
- I don't have a dog.
- Unrealized benefits, cost, laziness... ignorance... again, more education may be required.
- Same. I can't say that it is cost, because it is the least expensive thing I do for my dog.
- Cost, lack of awareness on need & how to do it, marketing.
- unsure
- avoiding the risk of a fine
- They may not know it is required or be burdened financially from licensing fees
- they are stay in the yard dogs that are never go outside the property and shouldn't need a licence to be able to find the owner.
- Lack of enforcement.
- cost and potentially behavioural issues
- lazy
- Purely money driven
- No good reason - - licensing should not be a choice.
- Monetary.
- I believe that many think it's a money grab.
- Increase in fees
- Laziness and as above.
- Primarily cost, also can it be done online?
- They just don't want to pay the money and aren't worried about the consequences if they don't.
- Fees? Not sure
- Cost and time
- My dog is never unsupervised.
- It doesnt leave their house and a fenced yard
- Same as above
- inability to afford the licensing, and perhaps thinking the same....their dog is indoors therefore does not need to be licensed
- remembering without reminders. We all have lots of 'other' prioritizes in mind. Should be an auto-renew with an opt-out feature (instead of opt-in), and emailed reminders should be standard. Lots of options, could be added to property tax, could be paid via vet clinic etc.
- Cost /
- Maybe the cost?
- Laziness, forgetfulness, and yes cost even though it's not that much
- Ignorance



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cost, and laziness
- Overstepping government. So many taxes and fees already on everything
- If the dog is microchipped it can be reunited with its owner should it get out of the yard. Having a license on a collar is dangerous for the dog when alone.
- No idea
- Laziness.
- Cost and time.
- As above
- what right does the city have to charge me for my pet that costs the city nothing. piss off also, its way too much money.
- Saving money.
- They don't let their dogs out unattended ever.
- cost
- cost
- Cost
- They don't know it is a law.
- Unaware that their license needs renewal.
Do not want to pay for license.
- cost
- Ignorance to the actual cost to the municipality for control efforts.
- cost. laziness. maybe ignorance.
- City of Calgary charges quite a bit, with no discount to multi-cat households.
- Cost? Unaware of what the fee provides
- Dog owners don't want to pay out money to license their dogs. Another reason could be laziness.
- Cost of license as well as by law fines if your dog gets out
- Cost?
- No idea why someone should even be allowed to choose not to. Licensing for dogs and cats should be mandatory - if they choose not to, they should be fined if caught.
- We do not pay to license children. Licensing and the Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw is demeaning towards animals.
- Cost. Perhaps a reduced fee if you renew. Also reduced fee for multiple animals.
- I don't know. I did have a neighbor once who didn't see how paying the fee would benefit her dog or her.
- I think if a dog is unlicensed it is because the owners don't believe there is anything in licensing that is a benefit to them. It is just a money grab for the city.
- No idea
- Probably cost
- They are unaware that they are required to do so.
- Privacy



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No clue. My dogs are licensed
- Dogs are different from cats, in that some cats never leave their home. Dogs need to exercise and socialize. Perhaps dog owners who don't license their dogs, they may not be able to afford the yearly license or may not treat their dogs the best if these rules are not followed.
- irresponsibility. cost.
- They are irresponsible
- Bad owners. No reason for this. Maybe hiding an aggressive dog, or hoarding.
- See above.
- I suspect people don't license their dogs because they think they're above it, and rules shouldn't apply to them.
- I don't own a dog, but I think people assume a tag with their info will suffice. Again, highlighting the many benefits of licensing for your own dog, but others. Highlight our collective responsibilities. Also highlighting the high licence rate, that's it's normative to licence here.
- Cheap. They don't like authority or their dog doesn't like wearing a collar.
- Irresponsible owners
- same as above
- COST , lack of knowledge what the city can provide. FEAR of policing.. the world is to judgy and people are fearful of loosing their loved ones
- Too much money or lazy. Some folks truly have trouble affording it.
- don't see the point
- As above. Disregard and respect for bylaws.
- Don't want to pay money to the City, does not want the City to know how many animals they own
- Cost, plus no reminders.
Need online Expiry reminders!!!!
- same input as above.
- It's a cash grab. Licensing does nothing other than keep track of who owns what animals. Why there is a cost associated with it is beyond me.
- I think forgetting to re new is a big thing. Possibly paying for a few years at a time would help?
- Not sure, cost of licensing isn't to bad
- Hiding number of animals and price of license
- It is cost prohibitive.
- My dogs are always in my house or my fenced in back yard and are never walked without supervision, on leash in all public areas and very rarely taken to off-leash parks.
- They did not know this was a requirement (I was a part of this statistic, but have since licensed my dog after learning this information).
- They cant afford it
- Too expensive and a pain if they aren't nuisance dogs. They should only have a 1 time registration fee unless you move or sell the dog, not annual fees
- Cost.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There is no apparent value to purchasing licenses for pets.
- People just don't want to pay the price to license dogs, although I think it is reasonable
- Laziness, money
- There is no reason not to license a dog.
- Cause it is yet another way government sticks thier nose into our privaye business
- Cost, going to registry
- Finances
- Not entirely sure. To me, it seems like a no-brainer for any animal - especially those going into the community - to be licensed for its own protection as much as for the protection of others.
- Apathy
Puppy mills staying under the radar
- Not necessary! Just another cost with no benefits to owners
- Waste of money/no service provided in addition to license or not aware of requirement.
- Not educated that its required
They dont want to pay the yearly cost
They don't want the city to know how many animals they have
- Laziness. A lot of animal owners do not bother with licenses or regular or health care for their animals
- perhaps they keep their dog tied up and so no threat to running at large and just a unnecessary expense to pay for no reason if animal is contained
- Lack of information on how and where to license their dogs, and having to pay a higher price.
- The facilities provided by the city are far from sufficient: no fenced off leash are within 5km from my place, not enough garbage bins. Seems the license fee ist just another money grabber without any real justification.
- Finances
Return
Exploitation (breeding etc)
- They don't want to spend the money
- They cannot afford the cost.
- They may not be able to afford a license
- Unknown.
- Laziness
Lack of interest tonpay
- Lazy
Irresponsible
- Cost
- Fees, hassle, in select cases likely from trying to get around bylaws for number of dogs allowed.
- Probably cost and maybe they don't want to reveal their breed of dog, eg. Pitbulls (I assume that the city tracks this information re how many potentially dangerous dogs there are in the city.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- finances
return
exploitation (breeding etc)
- Avoiding having to know the rules around responsible dog ownership. Avoiding any potential interaction with the city and it's administration.
- Probably extra cost and effort and they don't consider the value of doing it.
- Laziness, forget to renew, something nefarious going on (stolen animals, puppy mills), finances (although if you can't afford this fee, can you afford to have an animal)?
- Irresponsible pet owners who don't want to be caught when their dog is noisy/nuisance/vicious.
- Government legislation has allowed people to consider animals as disposable, causing many to be ignorant rather than uneducated. An older dog with health issues should not have to be licensed if they don't leave one's property for a walk.
- Not responsible.
- expense, laziness, owners above the law, owners not responsible
- Money and expenses. Lack of knowledge on where money goes too
- Same reason as the cats.
- Don't see the benefit. Seems like an extra cost. They don't expect there to be any consequences if they don't.
- I'm not sure, it has been around as long as i can remember so there is no excuse.
- Cost of license, exploitation (breeding, etc), dangerous dogs.
- Recently rt'd to Calgary; and have no interest in a license when there is no park for me or her. What do I get for my small dog now that I have mobility issues? No city parks address this need. Before I was disabled I had parks for my dog, now it seems I have to drive to Airdrie. Sucks!
- ignorance
- They don't want the administrative hassle or cost.
- Cost.
- Laziness
- I think licensing in general is not appropriate that would be like licensing a family member. Also the licensing fees are very high
- Irresponsible pet ownership. I believe these are also the people who don't bother to vaccinate, spay or neuter their pets.
- Finances; Lack of return on investment (don't see/know what benefit they are getting); Exploitation (breeding operation, etc.)
- Not wanting to pay the fee. Libertarian approach to life.
- Mostly I expect they object to paying the money and not seeing why they need to do so and no return. Some do not have the money.
- Unaware of the need or the cost.
- They are justifiably confident that no one has the courage to report them and even if they do you won't do anything about it, and even if you do, the penalties are trivial.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same as my comment for cats. Perhaps there is an issue with breeders or import/export that I am unaware of but ultimately it comes down to money (unfortunately). If I'm forced to pay to register a pet I would likely oppose. Otherwise no big deal.
- - People don't understand what their licensing fees go towards.
- - People are cheap, a large percentage only provide their pet with it's basic needs, so they are loathe to give up their money to the city for some invisible service.
- - Lax enforcement fuels fee avoidance, especially due to the economy
- Lack of money and lack of education.

What would encourage pet owners to license more consistently

- remove fines and ask owners to microchip their pets
- Create a business licence for dog/cat sales in Calgary. As part of this Business Licence make it mandatory that the business require new owners to licence pets.
- what about adding benefits to licensing like discounts with local businesses? They used to have that, but it was poorly executed.
- Automatic renewal - have owners sign up for it and then send them a yearly reminder when its being processed
- You could also link licenses to a microchip to further ease of reunification.
- Licensing is an administrative exercise. Every animal should be microchipped.
- easier to access location to make payments by cash or debit, allow online payments via Paypal
- Licensing should be a one time only fee. If the information changes, an admin fee could be addressed.
- Partnering with rescue associations to give them complementary one year license or discounted license at time of adoption if they are a Calgary resident. Providing info pamphlet for the adoption agency to send off with the adopted animal on renewing that membership, regulations going forward. Restricting access to offleash dog parks to registered animals only. Have a fine if unregistered animal is using off leash area
- Require all pet rescue/adoptions have animals registered and then transferred to new owner. Cannot take home pet until proof of license provided.
- Discounts for breeders
- Help pay for microchips
- Enforcement.
- Have it mandatory for vets to report unlicensed animals.
- Really I would think the cost may be a sticking point.
- I don't necessarily agree with pet licensing/see the value
- Not charging more for intact dogs especially if they're show dogs.
- fee reduction
- Discounts for multiple pets in a household.
- Incentive programs for responsible dog ownership. For example a reduced cost for dogs who have obtained a Canine Good Neighbour Certificate from the Canadian Kennel Club, title in obedience or



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

rally obedience. All Canadian Kennel Club performance sports and the Canine Good Neighbour Certificate are open to non-purebred dogs.

- Cats who are primarily inside only could have a way cheaper cost but still a reunification means.
- Not having higher fees for intact pets.
- lower fees for multi-year licensing
- on line licensing, e mail reminders
- A single, one time license fee when you first get the pet
- when animals are licensed they must be chipped as well...
- A one time license registration. Why am I doing this every year??? Or, why is it the same price for each year....why not \$100 to initially register, and \$5 each year after? The city is financially punitive for so many things, why also on pet ownership?
- no charges if animal is found (if it got loose)
- Multi pet discount, no charge impound fee
- Notifications (again, via an app?)
- Subsidies for low income (i.e., grooming/vet/etc)
- Discounts for microchipping
- Actually work with people not just enforce. Make affordable options for people in a tough spot. Possibly offer cat licenses for free for first year to get cats licensed in the first place. ACTUALLY Attend cats at large complaints from neighbours and track down owners
- Fees that are less for cat owners who do not ever let their cats go outdoors.
- Seniors should have reduced rates.
- The option of registering their microchip instead of having to wear tag.
- No fees like Rockyview has done.
- Reducing the cost of the license (ie: renewal is half the cost)
- Discount for multi-dog homes
- Taking the animal away from them.
- Education, it's a small price to pay to ensure your pet is returned should the unthinkable happen and they become lost.
- no licence for cats and reduced licence fees for dogs that have been through training classes.
- Promote responsible pet ownership by giving incentives
- Cheaper for inside animals
- My pets have visible identification and fully updated microchips. A city tag would not help and I would not be motivated to register them.
- Perhaps have the same fee for 2 years rather than one
- Anyone who uses a vet, can get it chipped or ear tattooed. May work with vets?
- Multi animal discounts. Early licencing discount, multi year licensing. Make it a benefit for owners to do it, so they get something out of it.
- Lower fees.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Discount for those animals left intact with CKC titles and health testing proving responsible pet ownership
- License and then a rebate back that can be used at their vet clinic. .
- Combine with micro chipping for a good price
- Year reminders! Why have the notices stopped?!
- Discounts for early payment and senior citizens
- make it easier for people with financial/ oranixzational challenges. pets are often a hug plus in quality of life for people that have emotional, mental, life challenges, Make it easier for them to comply with city expectations.
- Mandatory microchipping of the pets
- Vet care requiring pets to be licensed.
- Microchipping and or tattooing is better id method; if the dog has lost his collar or doesn't have license id on him, how do you reunite pets with their owners? Why not require people to pay for tattoo/microchip at purchase/adoption.
- After 10 (or 12) years of continued licensing without any reports or never being late with licensing fees, dogs should then get a free license until they pass. A dog always licensed and never the subject of complaint should get some "reward"
- Smaller fees. In today's economy, people are struggling. More than you realize
- Some municipalities offer a no cost registration if their dog is a 'good citizen'. Meaning they pass behaviour tests that show excellent socialization skills and recall ability. In turn the city waives the registration fees or reduces them. Another idea is reduced fees for producing yearly proof of immunization
- Multi-animal home discount.
- maintain dog parks and off leash areas. I currently pay for my dog and have nothing in my area (Coventry Hills) I would pay more if the city would give me a proper place to take my dog and was well maintained and not just a mud pit!
- Maniditory tagged or chipped
- Benefits of licensing
- Reasonable fees
- Perhaps for seniors handicapped or low income a small fee is charged to enable location of a lost pet
- Should be a cheaper rate for strictly indoor cats
- Microchip
- Similar to the neuter/spay program ... fee should reflect to the fair entry guidelines
- This seems like a cash grab. I don't believe the money goes to reunifying pets and owners
- Lifetime? As a option for each pets life....
- No fees - there is fees/tax on everything. Pets are therapy and having to pay a fee is ridiculous and can stop low income families having a loving pet..



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- License fees linked to income levels; discounts for households with multiple pets that are complaint free homes.
- One time licensing fee.
- Free or bonuses like free bus fare for a day
- Cat owners should be able to have a virtual license for their cats. My fear is a cat getting caught up on something by the collar and getting strangled to death.
- going back to the old system of every animal coming due at same time rather than all over the year if you have multiple animals
- Microchipping and just having a tag on their dog instead of a license.
- No charge on fees - but a service charge upon discovery/return. Waivable in the event that the owner is impoverished.
- EDUCATION and many outlets such as social media, through vet clinics, etc.
- Seizing of animal after x warning
- Ease to license. Ex: Done through a vet or with an adoption.
- Remove the 'how many you can have rule' - have by-law officers do random welfare checks on homes that have more than 4 animals. Offer FREE informal informational 'animal care' sessions by partnering with local vet clinics - they love to share and teach.
- Lower cost of spay and neutering.
- You should only have to licence your pet once.
- A larger one time licensing fee and then a renewal fee that is cheaper each year following.
- Late fees or extra fines aren't the answer, make a sliding scale or make licensing 5\$ or free and you'll see a drastic uptake in licensing
- There are other ways to reunite pets with owners. Licencing is not the only answer.
- If person truly can't afford it and shows that animal is major positive influence their lives than maybe waive the fees
- No more fines! Due to my personal experience years ago that I tried updated my dog's license info of my home address and I never received the mail to pay the license to my new address.
- Unlicensed pets are deemed feral animals to be captured and disposed of.
- A single licensing month per year during which time a media blitz could remind pet owners about the benefits of licensing their animals.
- Benefits, reduced costs on first offenders should the animal go missing.
- You need to alter requirements. It is also a fallacy about the reunification process. Irresponsible owners do not go searching for their pets.
- Microchipping is the BEST way to get a pet home...not a license.
- This should be free.
- Discounts for multi pet homes
- One time license
- With my now deceased cat, I had a chip inserted, and a tattoo. Both provided details for reunification. So a license, for an indoor animal seemed like a cash grab.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't think licensing is necessary.
- Breeders and rescue organizations must include licensing as part of the adoption fee and provide it. All animals are delivered neutered/spayed and licensed.
- Park patrollers checking! 3 warnings, your out! Ban from using parks if not licensed.
- Rewards/discount for people that consistently licence pets
- Proof of regular vet visits to be submitted as part of a license issued
- discount for all spayed.neutered animals, discount with completion of Canine Good Neighbour test,expanded discount programs like the "Love Your Pet" one
- Should make the fines have more weight like when you get a speeding ticket you have to pay it before you get to renew license or registration. Need to make more accountability or punishments on irresponsible owners
- Dont increase fees every year..simple as that!
- An automatic payment option would be great. Set your credit card (which should be manageable online) and away you go.
- No fee. Tatoos and chips worked just fine before licences.
- Multiple animal owner discounts
- The fee should be minimal or free for full compliancy. Those with multiple animals should be given a break. Again Permanent ID in the forms of Tattoo or Microchip are more affective for reunification as they are always on the animal unlike tags which often fall off.
- Disallowing ownership of pets for repeat offenders; enforcement.
- Automatic renewal option on property tax form or other annual mailout
- For cats: one-time lifetime licensing fee
- Lower licence fees for older rescue animals.
- You're wrong about licensing, if you license them once you'll have the information. Licensing annually is a money grab. Encourage microchips.
- it should be cheaper. if the obstacle is locating your animal and verifying it's yours then why such an expensive fee. if someone has 3 animals let's say it gets very expensive.
- How about overall lower licensing fees? Oh right, this is the City of Cowgary. They don't know how to reduce fees, just increase fees and overhead.
- Partner with some training companies to get a discount upon licensing or renewal, or just for proof of license
- ONE TIME REGISTRATION FOR ANIMALS. Scrap annual license renewal. They are family members not cars on the road.
- Low cost and one time licensing.
- Advertising about the overall benefits to the City of licensing pets regarding the monies received. Also, pets are getting stolen more often so if a dog doesn't roam, it may still be found & traced if it has a licence. All breeders/importers should sell dogs/cats WITH a City licence that can then be transferred to the new owner.
- That the money goes to help pets in need, pet-friendly city areas



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Confiscation of pets.
- Discount for having more than 1
- If you don't perceive any benefit, why license? There needs to more than reunification. Most pet owners don't think their pet will get lost, so why bother?
- Mandatory microchip is more effective. Dog licenses feel more of a cash grab for the City
- only a minimal fee for a renewal license
- Permanent forms of ID should be considered (license your dog and bring him in for free microchip). Tags are not permanent.
- Discount to owners who haven't had to use the reunification year over year.
- more education for few residents - I know 2 people who didn't know licensing pets was required until I told them
- Reduce cost dramatically.
- What is gained ? My pets already are chipped and tattooed
- There's honestly nothing that would make me register my dog, unless it was free.
- Multi animal household license discounts
- Discounts for housecats
- Do not release the animal until they pay the fine and ensure the animal is cared for following all the rules.
- multi pet discounts
- Multi year licensing discount rate.
- Easier transfer process if the pet previously was licensed by someone else.
- Education. If someone doesn't pay in the first place fees and fines won't work on them.
- Do not reunify if not liscensed. large large fines
- Lower cost for indoor-only cats/higher cost for outdoor cats. Or free licensing/registration but then pay the fee to be reunited when the pet is lost/found.
- If the animal is microchipped or tattooed, reunification shouldn't be a problem
- Greatly reduced fee, in any fee at all, for chipped animals.
- Discounts for multiple pet owners
- Lower licensing fees and larger incentives for spayed and neutered animals
- one time fee to get the tag, to re-unite their pet with their owner in an event where the pet gets lost. not yearly.
- More affordable and less threats to people who choose not to.
- I have 2 dogs, I would prefer to licence them on the same date but it isn't an option
- Investigate if Veterinarians, pet food stores, other dog services would offer discounts to pet owners with city registered pets in exchange for advertising on a web page on the City of Calgary site.
- I think if an animal is microchipped, they should not have to be licensed
- Free
- One time fee.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Free vet check ups paid for by licence fee. No one wants the city grabbing more money. My cats are chipped what's a licence fee going to do for me?
- No need to at all— responsible owners ensure their dogs are chipped and/or tattooed and/or contained and/or trained. As such the city need not get involved. If city picks up lost dog owner can contact city and find it that way— NOT the other way around. You're also assuming a lost dog will always have a collar or id of some sort. This is purely a money grab.
- Ease of obtaining licences; online program helps. More advertising or email program?
- Eliminate the fee (like Rocky View County)
- Discounts for pet supplies and services.
- Register with no fees
- Yearly decreasing discounts until a base rate is met that is super affordable. Multi pet discounts. Partner with the VCA! They are buying up clinics left right and center. Anyone who licensing their cat or dog or whatever gets a discounted service at the VCAs around the city.
- Cheaper licensing fee's. Living in the USA for years the fee was between \$10-\$20 depending what state we lived in. Many of the states do multi year or one time only fees and you just have to update when the pet passes.
- Discounts are nice too but access to highly desirable off leash areas. Or lie a register your dog and bring to a brewery event.
- Some real value for the cost. As a responsible pet owner, I am paying for the irresponsible ones.
- Increased public awareness about the benefits to them & the animals at ABS.
- A low income option.
- Multi animal discounts
- No cat licenses. That's a money grab with too few actual benefits
- When a pet has a microchip, and has been fixed, the license should be free.
- Include the licenses on microchips so that if they get lost without a collar then reuniting is still possible
- Discount on vet bills or pet supplies or a small tax write off. Or access to free or inexpensive training.
- License required at time of purchase. Done deal. Fines for those caught.
- please consider auto renew? AMA and Service Alberta are trial for auto renew and I have signed up for Jan 2021. Leave my license plate and credit card on file. A few weeks before the transaction email goes out
- A one time licensing fee, why are you milking money out of us?
- How about microchips instead of licensing?
- Decrease in price may encourage for people to license their pet.
- Free for low income, easy to do online or with an app
- Education. Show the public how a licensed dog was returned to the owner sooner because of the licensing



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- microchipping is known to be more effective (tags fall off, collars fall off) - offer a discounted microchip program along with licensing
- start taking animals away from those that don't want to follow the rules
- Require that all pet sales include all relevant licenses.
- One time licensing fee
- Indoor licensing for cats. Offer it at a better rate. Think of it like insurance: if you drive your car around everywhere, your insurance will reflect this. If you have it parked with fire and theft insurance, it's a HELL of a lot cheaper. If the City offered multi-year, CHEAP indoor cat licensing , I can promise you'll have way more folks doing it. On the sole fact that the cat MIGHT get out and need to be returned. Not a lot of people can afford a 'what if' preemptive action that is too costly. Example) having multiple indoor cats.
- Fixed pricing. Why is a neutered dog cheaper than a non neutered dog?
- Exceptions for small, indoor only pets especially for seniors and those on AISH
- If an animal is found unlicensed repeated, the option to seize and re-home the animal should be an option.
- Education from a more human perspective on why it's important. Include stats about the number of animals unable to be reunited, or that are lost and never found each year
- Stray animals are put down after 3 days of capture.
- Make them aware of stress on animal
- No charge if not financially able to pay.
- Why bother with an unlicensed pet. It's the owners responsibility.
- Auto-renew option
- Immediate seizure of unlicensed pets.
- discounts for owners who renew licenses every year.
- Permanent Licensing. Often pets are tattooed or other identification but it is not unified with the city licencing system. So why have it.
- Instead of lisenicing, microchipped or tattooed animals are much more beneficial. Considering not all animals wear their liscense. Vets and pounds scan the animal and its much more effective.
- Make it affordable. 10 or less.
- Cheaper license fees
- a one time fee to register pets vs annual licence fees
- Impound/destroy unlicensed animals.
- Perhaps work with vets to make licensing a requirement of getting an appointment.
- More information on the benefits
- household pet ownership membership fee. It is too expensive and many people just avoid paying altogether. With 4 licensed pets, I have considered not paying (It is getting expensive and I am compliant and always have been.), but I am a law abiding person, so I do pay.
- Education of public. Focus on reunification rather than punitive reminders.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- ALL RESPONSIBLE pet owners would do ANYTHING to find there lost pet, absolutely ANYTHING. Checking in with the local shelter is usually the very first thing every RESPONSIBLE owner does. If your pet is rescued by the shelter simply charge an appropriate fee that pays the cost of this service ...ie \$300 etc.. If the person is NOT a RESPONSIBLE pet owner then they won't care about checking with the local shelter, and therefore probably should not be reunited with any animal anyways...
- Very low fees and free renewal. Don't fine or impose late fees. A tag on the animal is all that's needed, not continual renewals.
- Licensing should be a one-time cost per animal, and it should include microchipping the animal
- online renewal, renewal notices
- Public ostracizing. Occasional stoning.
- License required at the time of adoption & microchip
- refunds for licenses if pet passes away, multi-animal discounts, no difference in fees for intact animals
- If you need to see a vet, you should have to provide liscence first.
- Licensing based on how many pets are in your household with a discount based on numbers and by their size, age and activity level.
- More reminders.
- No fees!!
- Reduced fee for microchipped pets
- Require registration to receive veterinary care
- If reunification is truly a priority, perhaps integrate the licensing with chipping, or discount the license if the animal is chipped.
- Not being penalized when their dog/cat is found on the first offence - mistakes do and can happen.
- Walk in licensing with little to no information gathered of owners.
- First year free & better education on re-unification and fines based on ability to pay.
- Annual reminders by text or email - like you do with garbage pickup.
- Fines dont encourage people to register pets. Convenience does, keep that in mind.
- free licensing for pet owners with low incomes, and seniors
- Licences once. Have it indicated on your driver's license. When you move and update your drivers licences you get a reminder to update your pet licences.
- Multi pet discount
- Give the responsible dog owner who never loses his pet something for the tax. Give it more value. Most vets put chips in the ears or similar. They have identification.
- Option for donation to central pot for low income pet owners to enable them to licence/neuter at reduced fee.
- 1 license for every animal in the house. Pay 1 fee per house not animal.
- Vet discounts could be offered for yearly vaccinations for licensed animals or other incentive programs could be offered (chew toys could be given out at the time of licensing).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stop charging for it.
- Threats and punishing fines are not the way to increase compliance. Provide more SERVICES for licenses. Take lost and found reports at minimum for crying out loud. I once lost my friends very shy newly adopted dog... 311 just wanted info to fine me/owner. They refused to contact me if people called in sightings. This was a dog ACOs were never going to be able to catch. I felt like they would rather let the dog run in traffic and catch her themselves so they could do fines.... than help the dog live, by helping me and people she will approach, find her. It was very dissapointing because cities were I did animal control maintaining up tomdate lost/found repts was CRUCIAL to reunifications. In Calgary you let randoms on Facebook do this which is quaint, but kind of embarrassing.
- dog tatoos and gps chips
- People know how hard it is to manage fees. Maybe have "spot checks" where people take their dogs frequently? Not often but a couple of times a year.
- System to control how people purchase pets - shouldn't be off of kijiji - this is the earliest point of intervention
- Providing information when you first get your puppy either from the person selling or a vet, this information is not readily available. Leaving it with a health care professional would encourage others to take it more seriously
- One time licensing. Most people have their pets microchipped, but city pounds refuse to contact the info on the chip unless the animal is also licensed. If its not licensed they charge 4-5 times as much to retrieve it.
- Big discount for lifetime license
- replacing licensing with a subsidized program to Chip the animal
- Only charge for the tag, it's a money grab.
- Dogs might live for 10-15 years. Issue a 'lifetime dog license' to a dog owner. If owner moves, licensees address has to be updated within 30 days.
- You need to be transparent in fees collected, what they are used for, how many pets are s/n in your state of the art facility, more engagement from the City to end overpopulation. Do not feel you are doing enough to end issues of overpopulation therefore don't feel licensing is something people with indoor only cats wants to contribute to.
- It's really not that hard to license a pet. You fill out a form and every year it just auto bills a card.
- One time licensing
- Responsible pet owners have their animals tattooed or micro chipped when Spayed or Neutered. Vets maintain accurate documentation of this, thus are a excellent method of reunification.
- Lower cost
- I don't believe that the goal of licensing is reunification.. I think it's a cash grab
- Free to license for life.
- \$10,000 fines for non-compliance; public shaming in the news (print the names and addresses of offenders like they do with drunk drivers).
- Discount on vet fees



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Re-unification isn't enough of an insention, other benefits should be explored.
- Pets are microchipped are vet. Just use that.
- I do not beleive indoor only pets should require licensing. Microchipping is the best way to identify my tabby cat from all the other tabby cats etc. and this is becoming more and more the standard
- discounts for regularly licensing your pets! There are currently no appropriate incentives to reward those of us that follow the licensing rules. Its cheaper to not license your dog because tickets for unlicensed dogs are rarely given, people get out many warnings
- discounts for those who continuously license their dogs
- Whatever you do, it needs to be STRENGTH BASED, negative punishment will only result in poorer results. Provide easier access.
- This service should be free! Do parents have to pay to license their kids?
- Immediate pet removal, no pet sales without proof of licensing
- Lower price
- Program needs better monitoring
- reminder notices
- Making it a required condition of sale. Make the seller just as responsible as the buyer. Or get vets involved somehow.
- No fee licensing
- Reminders
- Cats and dogs can be tattooed to help with loss and reducing the yearly fee far to much for indoor cats. I can see it for outdoor cats and dogs.
- Animal siezure / ban if they are caught repeatedly skipping licensing. Not licensing is irresponsible & shows they should not have animals.
- One time license (for life of pet)
- Its rediculousti have to pay to register and own a pet.
- Indoor cats not requiring licensing. People tattoo and microchip their pets, so why license them in addition to this?
- Be cheaper.
- Include training in fee if licencing is necessary. How to manage an animal effectively similar to a vehicle licence.
- I have known animals that have been picked up by animal services and are licesenced but owners are not contacted. More trust would help.
- For me, if the cost of licensing was cheaper if your animal has permanent ID and is fixed.
- Maybe vetrenarians must be able to see a license before providing services. Same for pet supply stores. Do not sell pet items to people who can not show a license for their pet.
- Owners should also be encouraged to tattoo and microchip as well as licensing. Perhaps offering a discount for pets who also have this permanent form of ID.
- Discount for paying for numerous years and for numerous animals.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Multi pet discount in addition to early licensing discount. Or just don't charge one. And fine the people who are negligent.
- Provided services paid for by licensing fees
- Education on the benefits of licensing.
- Free for first time pet owners.
- pet owners have other ways to re-unite with dogs through microchip and tags, so lack of necessity
- Much lower costs for licensing
- If officers can confirm the existence of an animal at a residence the home owner should be sent the license and bill via registered mail and be forced to prove the contrary vs licensing being forced to try and gain licensing compliance.
- There needs to be a refund option with the multi year licensing such that if the animal passes I unexpectedly, they would be prorated back their fees.
- Overall lower fees.
- very high fines for not doing it, with better bylaw enforcement and more patrols.
- As I said, if people aren't licensing their pets it's most likely because they are irresponsible owners hoping to limit their liability. Fines are probably the only way to encourage that population, though I can't imagine enforcement would be feasible.
- perhaps some help for seniors who may not be computer literate
- Free during a short period of time (like Carstairs...free in January, but have a small fee the rest of the year)
- this is getting into incentivizing/deincentivizing behaviour. Absolutely not fines or fees: many people likely are low income, fines will only burden them further making them less likely to license. Notifications in the mail, an option to tag it onto property tax if they are home-owners, something like that would probably work better. Make it easier for people.
- Lifetime license for animals. Also maybe don't give cats and dogs up for adoption after a week. It should be a fine paid by owner after a certain time. Not a countdown to the city breaking up a family.
- A discount would be attractive, but those who don't believe the license are a real need but a way of politicians to make easy money won't fall for that.
- Describing what the fee is for to people better
- All pets are chipped and tattooed the city license is obsolete. If you want owners to license their pets give a larger discount, like the city used to, for pets that are spayed or neutered. The current discount is a joke..
- it's too expensive - for the price of the license we get very little. zero benefit if you have a cat. a bit more if you have a dog but the dog parks aren't maintained and there aren't enough - so again - not much benefit.
- Incentive programs, like winning a prize for a free yearly basic checkup if pet is licensed.
- More options than just tags (perhaps include a licensing number, that we can include on our own collars (I get mine made, has my pet's name, my cell phone number, and could also include licensing



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

number if this option was available) - perhaps could offer a cheaper option for those your are only giving licenses numbers and no tags.

- Let owners be responsible to pay for and tatoo their animal to help them be found.
- Free and available online for licensing. One time per pet.
- Could discounts be applied as licensed animal ages, with bonus for owner not having any infractions or instances of at-large animals?
- A no charge license for seniors
- Free lisencing
- Forced microchipping and not having to pay a license fee
- One time licensing - flat fee. Literally no reason to renew each year. This creates an administrative burden and cost,
- Not sure what you mean by scalable fees, but how about a discount for each year the dog is licensed. Lets reward people that do the right thing.
- Educate yourself and others
- Go back to lifetime licensing on cats at least. The fees are insane now... I definitely thought twice about actually paying this year.
- More knowledge on why licensing is benefitting the pet community in general
- Taking into consideration why the animal was picked up vs fining everyone regardless of the reason. Sometimes pets get loose from perfectly responsible owners who have licensed their pets, and I don't think they should be fined. However, if it's a repeat "offender" and/or circumstances that were very easily preventable, then a fine would be warranted.
- Give licensing for free if they bring their pet in for vaccination, or vice versa
- Lower cost.
- Basic license fee for all animals spayed or neutered
- Discounted microchipping for license holders (since the reunification argument is being used)
- More reasonable license fees. Seriously.
- Impoundment of the animal
- Give lower incomes a break...
- Discounts based on income or as mentioned above short periods of time the year where it is free
- Why isnt tattooing and micro chips enough!? Can't the micro ship information be sent to the city or registered with the city when the pet is adopted? Are 3 forms of identification really necessary for animals?
- Late fees will make people less likely to comply
- better understanding of the benefits of licensing pets (helps in the re-unification process), and what the fees go towards
- One time only fee - ie make it count (not sure what it is now, but let's say 10 per year, make it 50 for life. Also no license, no reunification just euthanasia - they will license pretty quickly if that if the only option.
- Lifetime licensing



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Reduced rate options for those that have adopted from shelter or having multiple pets
- I'm sure that is not the only reason why you want people to licence their pets i.e. reunite them! What other reasons can you provide for people to licence their animals???? You want the money and know how many animals people have so you can control them.
- e/mailed reminders?
- Perhaps discounts for multi-dog families that have not had impound experiences in the past
- Lower costs significantly and have the ability to update information such as address and contact info on an online portal or app.
- Mandatory licensing. You cannot purchase or adopt a cat or dog without licensing.
- other benefits added that benefit the dog or owner. Responsible pet owners don't fear losing their dog.
- Cheaper options
- Discounted fees for low income households.
- Using fee's is bad practice.
- discount for licensing several animals
- Discounts for licensing more than 1 pet for the same household.
- Maybe vet offices can aid in this administration by offering licensing forms at the time of yearly vaccines. Vets should be compensated for this administration time though.
- My cats are both microchipped incase they get lost. Yearly licencing is really annoying. Mutiple pets also make it expensive.
- Doesn't micro chipping animals help with this? Maybe you need to advertise licencing as a way to help with re-unification, rather than just an obligation.
- Able to easily change who owns animal at any time (ie: via website or app)
- Don't remove the animal or owners details from the system for 25 years and develop a proper database. If a pet owner does not renew annually, don't just invalidate their information. One time fee at registration and never bill again until the next animal.
- Free lisencing with owners info attached so they dont go to the city pound.
- Change to the permanent microchip instead and make it mandatory before the animal leaves the adoption site.
- License by way of microchip instead of tag and give a continuous price Break to seniors and puppies or kittens that are licensed before 1 year old.
- I've always thought that licensing your pet (specifically dog) should have a relationship with Calgary trainers and/or vet clinics. Once you license, you get a rebate or a promotion of sorts to use towards a training session with whatever trainers agree to be involved etc. Same goes with spay/neuter. Almost an incentive but also promotes responsible pet ownership.
- One time licence for each pet
- Discounts for multi-pet households anand low income subsidized licensing.
- Family plan for multiples. Geared to income
- massive fee reduction for a microchipped or tattooed animal registered with city



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Auto-Renew, lower fees, reminders.
- Same fees for intact and non intact animals
- Reminders!
- Free for low-income and rescues
- That's BS. You put pets up on your website. The second a pet goes missing, they look there. How about you make the pound more accessible? How about you don't treat the people who's animals escape not like criminals? Fee for an animal being on the loose? Give me a break. You nickel and dime calgarians and wonder why they don't trust you
- My dog was caught And he was registered and I never received anything they found him I found him on there web site under the adoption ready page So why bother giving the city more money and receive nothing. When the pet is registered and he was about to be sold from them.
- if someone does not want to license they just wont. they don't see a value in registering their pet. I think they feel pets are disposable. For those who have never licensed, run a 'Free licensing blitz' once a year. everyone like free stuff. Provide a reminder notice/email/call/text
- Really, how about showing statistics and a public report about how many pets are brought in to pet services and how many found their owners . Clearly show how a liscence is helping the process. Make it an advertising campaign. I guarantee 90 percent of calgary believe a liscence is a cash grab and dies nothing to help reunite owners.
- Licensed for 10+ years & no complaints = Free life license
- - Give perks to breeders, adopters, pet perks
 - 1st license year free through rescue/breeders
 - adopt - partnership, more pro-active enforcement
 - Pay as you go license fares, micro-chip
- It would lower admin charges
- Less expensive license price
- I don't agree with the licensing system when microchipping is so prolific. I think it's an unnecessary step and a lot of extra paperwork when a microchip does the same job.
- Ability to take pets to daycare facilities.
- Licensing is a rip off for responsible pet owners. Another abuse of people of this city and their pets. The city abuses both owners and pets, if they are microchipped there is ZERO need to license
- Licensing of indoor cats should not occur. Offer a coupon for free pet food (dog or cat).
- There would have to be some kind of value for pet owners. It there is value, it would need to be known as right now I am not aware of any. I was told that if an animal is lost it is returned to the owner. My neighbor has discovered that this is not the case. Rather, more fines are levied.
- Chip/ tattoo . One time tag and license
- Online registration, Education on the purpose and help of doing so
- One stop shop - immunization, chipped, Spayneuter
- Smaller license tags with built in tracker (similar to existing v accident tags. Automatic text reminders.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- An option to license more than one pet on a single license (eg. A cat and a dog in the same household)
- A pet registration should be a one time fee.
- More info about why it's a good thing.
- Offer one time license fee & low cost microchipping to those whose pets are already altered.
- For those of us with small dogs, abled bodied or not, the city offers us nothing. We need safe small dog parks that include everyone. I'd pay for that but as it stands, no park, I can't walk, my dog isn't likely to get out so what am I paying for? what's in it for my dog?
- Triple license fees to discourage ownership in the first place the back up with heavy fines
- To provide the option for one time registration with one time reasonable fee.
- Free license. Or provide information about what the city does with the fees that is beneficial to pet owners.
- Link up with vets to ensure that vaccinations are tied to licensing. In addition, work so that licensing can be accomplished through vets.
- Fines that are substantial & a reasonable expectation that they might be caught. Same same DUI practice.
- Free! Pets are expensive as it is.

Benefits that owners expect to get from licensing

- Fines won't help anyone who's already in debt. Chipping pets is cheap and lasts a lifetime, there's no need for multi yr license. For a chip record it could be \$25 a yr to hold your details on database for linking pets with home.
- Easily locating lost animals. Increased support from bylaw services in finding lost animals.
- Security that the animal can be returned safely if lost or stolen
- expedited return
- reunification with their pet after loss
- Not sure but there aren't any currently, other than because we have to so we don't get fined if they escape. The microchip makes city licensing redundant.
- Honestly?
None, if they're responsible owners. They should be chipped or tattooed already. What other benefit is there? Personally I think it's not the best way to have pets.
- The previous 'discount' program was a nice touch. Access to city-owned dog parks is also another nice touch. And finally, the ability to be quickly reunited with a lost pet is pretty important.
- any type of discounted offer or grooming coupons, food coupons, discounted vet exam
- re-unification being the main one. Accurate statistics for another.
- An educational sheet of rules and guidelines of responsible pet ownership, and maybe a discount in any of the pet shops on some items.
- Easy reunification, no costs to use The City's animal services



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Reuniting without penalty if the licence is paid in good standing. Sometimes dogs just get out from a failure to properly close the gate, which can be the fault of someone like meter reader/beyond owner control.
- Shows responsibility. Too bad cyclists don't have a license so we can report the owner.
- Not getting fined. Not sure what licensing fees are used for but maybe adding poop bag dispensers at dog parks will help to encourage people to actually pick up after their dogs
- Coupons for shots or food
- nothing
- Discount on subsequent licensing
- Other than not having to deal with Animal Control?
- Assistance for lost pets.
- Subsidized vet check ups would be nice. It is very expensive to own any pet as it is and vet fees are astronomical. Pets, however, are proven to be beneficial to one's emotional health and well being which could reduce cost of mental health requirements if pets were more affordable to own.
- re-unification of lost pets
- My pets are licensed but it doesn't help return them to me. I see no benefit. I'm just being compliant and avoiding the fees if they do escape.
- Easy identification of lost/found pets. using resources like dog parks.
- Finding lost pets
- A program to re-connect pets, not getting charged with no licensing (fines could be higher).
- Ability to reconnect with your pet. The money should also go towards animal control.
- Not being issued a fine if their pet is found to be unlicensed!
- Ease of return if the animal is lost.
- Easier process with reuniting lost dogs and owners.
- Education at dog parks and in neighborhood sand schools. Microchipping.
- Tax rebates with City of CALGARY
- Lower vet costs. ;P
- The benefit of getting their pet back should be enough
- Phone call when pet is found. Reduced fee for having pet at large if it is licensed.
- I think a discount on training (dogs) would be a good incentive to do both!
For both cats and dogs, discounted vaccines.
- The licencing fee should cover the \$40 'cab ride' that is charged when a lost dog is returned, especially for first time 'offenders'. The 'My Pet' discount card is a waste of time and resources and is not any sort of 'incentive'.
- Re-unification. Why else would a pet be licensed?
- I would expect my pet to be returned to me immediately instead of impounded and vaccinated. Vet clinics are not given owner Info when a dog is brought in.
- Discount for services. Or it should directly pay in to off leash park maintenance.
- Reduction on fees for training classes



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- System for returning lost pets; access to discounted programs for pet training or educational sessions; access to using offleash parks
- None, it's a civic duty.
- Being reunited in case of lost dog or cat escaping the house without a huge cost. Confidence that paying for licensing waives or discounts impound fees - a first impound is free maybe.
- My pet finds their way home
- The above, help with finding lost pets
- pet to be picked up and cared for until the owner arrives for pickup. First offence to be waived.
- Nothing, a tag that says "licensed" is enough.
- Actual help from bylaw officers
- All the services of 311 if their dog goes missing.
- Safe return of pet if lost.
- Discounts at pet stores, bring back something similar to the I Heart My Pet.
- The privilege to keep a pet within city limits - anything else is a bonus.
- I am not sure about the re-unification reason as the majority of responsible owners I would think either have a tattoo or a microchip so not sure of any benefits.
- The ability to be reunited if the pet gets out.
- peace of mind on reunification and services from The City.
- None, I believe it's a part of responsible pet ownership.
- What benefits do pet owners currently get for licensing their pets?
- I miss the 'I heart my pet' program. Business discounts were nice but I understand the expense in management. Would be nice to see something replace that program.
- animal included in registry so it can be returned if lost
- Pet re-unification. Rehoming and caring for ownerless animals.
- I am not sure if it is already included by a reminder of what being a responsible pet owner looks like. Maybe a map of off leash areas in Calgary.
- re-unification (period)
- Safe return if lost, discounts on Canine Good Neighbour certification and training. Allow delay of spaying until 1 year of age for large breed dogs (health benefits)
- Discounts to pet stores? Or coupons towards food?
- Security in knowing that their pet will be safely returned.
- Reduced veterinary bills/vaccinations? Free neuter/spaying services? Once the animal is in the system from the free service the animal can be tracked and if the owner decides to stop paying they can be fined and it should go to collections if not paid. People need to be held responsible.
- Easier reunification. An expectation that if the city finds your pet, and you've kept your records up to date, they will contact you.
- That they won't receive a fine from the City.
- animals returned within 24 hours without fines
- Easy reunification



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Besides what is already included. Free microchip for those who cannot afford one.
- Care of animal in case it's lost and PROMPT contact if animal is located.
- I feel what is currently in place is sufficient
- Tips and advise about pets.
- I do too think there are benefits. Its a money grab from the city.
- There really is no benefit other than the potential ease of re-unification which microchips can handle
- Discounts at pet stores
- Well, I suppose the right to have a pet. After that re-unification is a big one. Space to take their pets like the dog parks. Not sure beyond that as I don't have a pet myself.
- The right to keep a pet in the city.
- only reunification.
- No fee for picking up a lost pet from bylaw if they are properly licensed.
- Education events & materials, safe on and off leash areas
- Don't really see any benefit, more of a hassle and expense than anything. Pet has other forms of identification already.
- responsibility for their pets and reunification...
- Being able to be reunited with their pet.
- At the current rates, free spay/neuter. Why not have it be a requirement...first registration is more \$ and includes spay/neuter. Then \$5 each year after.
- Lost pet services. Off leash dog park education and enforcement of bylaws. Special spay/neuter clinics that are low cost. Animal/human protection
- Option for Animal Services to bring that animal home directly before bringing it to the city pound. Along with current benefits of Animal services that already exist.
- Microchip if they do not alr day have one, discount if they do and stop charging those of us with intacted dogs a greater licensing fee. We have a lot of science for not spaying and neutering early or if at all.
I'd love to see your stats for intacted dogs running at large who also are licensed
- Bulletproof re-unification.
- [personal information removed] I know first hand that the registered animals list was never shared with teams removing animals from homes or during reunification. Please explain how YYC is any different.
- no charge at pound if dog gets loose and is caught
- If your pet is lost it would assist in tracking down the owners but from experience collars can get lost. Access to basic pet information and care (housetraining, grooming, nails) also where to go to get further information like the Calgary Humane Society, private facilities.
- Faster Reunions when lost
- License approved parks.
- Best for locating pet owners.Reduces dog thefts and fighting rings.
- Possibly more responsible owners.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The biggest benefit has always been that if my dog got out, and was picked up by Animal Services, I would be notified that he was okay.
- Well serviced and available off leash areas, reunification services and safe facilities for lost and stray animals with spay and neutering. You hope if your animal ever ended up there there'd be room and they'd be taken care of.
- Free neutering (reduce unwanted animals!), free chipping and re-unification
- I know people who have lost their licensed animals and the city did pick them up but didn't phone the owner. I believe if this happens, the owner should be contacted. Perhaps there could be training courses for people and their pets as well.
- I do not expect any real benefits just another tax we have to pay but it would be GREAT if:
TAKE stray rabbits IN
ATTEND CAT AT LARGE CALLS
TRAP FERAL AND AT LARGE CATS
HANDLE the feral populations of rabbits and cats
- Reunification services as currently supplied; maybe e-mail health alerts to owners for species-specific information (dog or cat pandemics, groupings of poisoning incidents to be aware of in a park, food recalls).
- Funds being put into pet owner education.
Funds put into developing additional off leash parks.
- Why should they get a benefit? The benefit is the use of dog parks that all taxpayers pay for
- Means of identifying pet (tattoo or chip number) on file with city to assist in speedy reunions of lost pets
- To be able to find the pet if separated. As a theft deterrant. Safety of the pet first and foremost. To provide faster vet aid if need be if dire decisions have to be made.
- Proactive reunification - city run lost/found pages like on Facebook
- In Coquitlam when we lived there a license provided an opportunity for a free" reunification. If your pet was picked up they would try to return it to you immediately. If that wasn't possible they would hold the animal for 24 hours to allow time to pick it up. After that costs started.
- For a dog, for sure of it gets lost.
- The only benefit people believe they're going to get is that if there animal is lost it will be found and returned to them.
- "I believe that they should not be licensed but rather registered.
benefit is a lost animal can be brought home.
if an animal is seen running at large, being vicious etc the description of the dog can be crossed with the registry to track down the owner and fine them of the misbehavior.
- Access to reduced vet costs.
More off-leash services and city products
- Cleaner off leash parks. Reunification with lost pets.
- Discounted training in basic obedience



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Discounts on the license itself.
- Reunification
Identification
- For their pet to be returned if lost.
- The comfort that if their pet should get lost or away from their owner that they have a GREAT chance or reunited with their pet at a much faster and safer way if licensed. That bylaw would save lots of time and money on at NEED cases as your pet would already be in system and save resources
- Other than reunification, I think there should be some “freebies” (ie: a get out of jail free card once a year).
- Upkeep of dog parks. Bylaw officers that are current with science based education regarding pets.
- identification so they can be returned home
- By-law enforcement
- There are currently no benefits for indoor only cats it's just a cash grab for the city. For dogs, help with re-unification with a lost pet, training and advice
- Reduced fees for responsible pet ownership
- Easier to locate. Notice to police and fire.
- Multi animal discount
- Getting their pet back when it is lost.
- Maybe a break on all the stupid fees charged if a dog does get out?
- Stricter penalties, deals made with pet stores for discounts, discounts at vets since a license represents responsible ownership.
- Return of pet without consequence of fine unless repeat offences are recorded. Notification of any issue that may affect said pet/family in the city such as disease or possibly wild animal sightings (maybe through a registration process?)
- Pet reunited when they lose control of their pet
- Ability to re-unite but also the understanding that licensing can help with other services such as enforcing the bylaws for everyone's protection.
- Same as now
- The only benefit is the ability to have a pet, the community should benefit by some \$ going to animal shelters, etc which might include returning lost pets to owners
- City run animal programs
- Discounts or coupons for services
- I think a licensed pet owner should be able to expect not to have to pay a fee if their pet gets out for a first time. Perhaps a warning. Habitual offenders could be fined.
- I believe owners of licensed pets should be exempt from certain fines like Animal at large if their dog gets out... within reason of course.
- Yes, recovery if lost. Also stats on pet populations. Forward looking programs.
- If they are lost, there is a good chance you will be able to be reunited with them.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think the benefit of being reunited with your pet should be good enough!
- Team up with a few trainers in town to see if they will offer discounts for licenced dogs. See www.albertaforcefreealliance.com for a list of educated and science based trainers
- Access to low-cost spay and neuter and vaccination programs.
- The knowledge that their pet will be reunited more easily.
- Better services, to reunite families with pets, pick up lost pets at no cost, to shelter lost pets at no cost as licence fees should go towards this
- Maybe work with a pet store or something that if people licence they get a 10% discount at select stores.
- discounts on yearly registration, input to a new and/or re modelling of dog parks. Possible partnerships with pet stores/organizations for a small discount in services, food, animal care, etc
- It helps if and when a pet is lost and needs to be sheltered when found until reunited
- Safe return of lost pets.
- Discounts at pet stores?
- Dog parks kept clean. Ability to reunite pets. Monitor pet stores for compliance on sale of pets.
- To be contacted when lost.
- That they are being a responsible pet owner and they accept liability for any harm their animal inflicts on innocent people and other people's pets. Also the pet will be returned to owner should it become lost if it is licenced with a licence tag on it's collar as required by pet bylaw.
- re unification if lost
- Safety in probable return of animal if it is at large.
- I don't care. Extra benefits just seemed like a waste of money and administration effort when I don't think they provide any incentive at all.
- Large fines.
- Ability to recover pet if lost.
- Free impound and no penalty if their dog or cat gets out. Perhaps a one time exemption.
- I think pets should be allowed in more public spaces. Also many landlords charge a pet fee for rental accommodation that is non refundable, that should be illegal. I am happy to pay an extra deposit, but it should be refundable since my pets have never caused damage to an apartment.
- Reuniting lost pets with owners.
- I would like a licensed dog to be held longer and a greater effort to re-unification. It is a very short time at the moment, I believe just a few days, and then adopted.
- Ability to locate if picked up by City.
- Quick id and reunion of lost pets.
- A chip should be required for all pets thus ensuring speedy return HOWEVER, all cost associated with the keeping and return of said pet should be billed back to the owner ALL costs!
- Help with getting reunited with pets.
- Coupons from companies on food, toys, training services, etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- that they will be reunited if they are lost
- Re unification if pet is lost.
- For dog owners who use off-leash areas, why doesn't the City provide poop bags at the parks? Other cities in Canada do this. Dog owners should have access to off-leash areas that are well-maintained (i.e. parking lots), with garbage bins and benches.
- Support and incentives to programs and discounts to stores that provide services
- Speedy return of lost and found pets
- If their pet gets out or away from them, it is probably the easiest way to get them home again. Having to renew annually (I decided against selecting the "multi-year licensing option" for this reason) is better for keeping contact info up to date.
- If their pet goes missing, reuniting them with the pet. Keeping the pet safe until the pet is picked up. Discounts/incentives at Canadian pet stores.
- If they're ever lost instant notification from city if pet is found or has been seen
- No fine if their pet get loose and bylaw brings back.
- The hope of a safe and quick return home if lost. I have had a licensed dog for 45 years and never needed this service. I do hope that my license fees help pay for other services at Calgary Animal services. It is wonderful that it is a no kill sanctuary.
- Reunification feels like the only advantage. It is an excellent reason but there should be more beyond The free ride home.
- Getting their pet back if lost.
- Discounts for following rules
- Option for health clinics
- Reuniting them if they ever become lost
- Discounts on programs (training), decreased vet costs, stores, any pet related business, access to parks, events, track/return if lost.
- Calls if their pet is found and not big penalties if a pet accidentally gets loose. Maybe discounts for pet training classes, a list of off leash parks, and better reinforcement on picking up poo and disposing properly.
- Fast repatriation when pet is lost.
- Percentage of fees go towards maintenance of dog parks (more lights, surveillance, sanding in winter, watering areas in the summer).
- Some kind of discounts especially as the animal gets older, multi pet discount
- Reduction in fees for consecutive licensing
- There should be a little incentive to licensing your pets. A pet card with different companies in the city to shop at discounted prices.
- well maintained off-leash areas in the neighborhood where the owners live. I've paid for over 20 years and still don't have anywhere close to take my dog! So I just goto the nearest park and let my dog off-leash. Not fair for a responsible pet owner who picks up after him. Wish I could write more.
- Animal services dealing with the issues not home owners



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Re-unification & the care given to their animals while in the City's care.
- No benefit. If our pet is lost, we can find it.
- That if their pet is lost it will have a higher chance of being reunited.
- Discounted future licensing
- Find lost pets
- A discount for multi year
- Support for questions about animal behavior, health, etc.
- Contact with the owners when pet is lost is most important
- Cheaper vetting
- Well taken care of off leash parks
- Free pass if dog found off leash but is completely under control.
- If lost they are reunited with owners
- Most responsible pet owners micro chip/tattoo their pets now so tag is not the only way to identify a lost pet. Access to chip scanners
- Discounts, coupons, education/training options
- More accessibility for the dog
- It should free
- Being a responsible pet owner
- The ability to own a pet. This is not a human right, it's a privilege that can be revoked.
- Provide more secured/fenced off-leash parks to take my dog free of/monitored for wildlife.
- Vet discounts
- building and maintenance of dog parks. Cheap spay neuter programs. Euth services at no charge.
- Support to the community for helping to re-home lost or unwanted pets. Can be done directly or indirectly through 3rd party funding. Pet ownership leads to the inevitable problem of unwanted pets. I expect this to be, at least in part, addressed through funding/support.
- Pet reunification but good pet owners would microchip anyway making registration redundant
- Avoid fines, safe/quick animal returns
- A tax write off
- Some sort of online training resource access
- Peace of mind if they get out and bylaw picks them up. Other than that nothing really. I have licenced my dog every year and haven't seen any benefits for doing so.
- Perhaps discounts at pet stores upon showing license or provide code.
- Reunification, benefits and credits to pet related activities, direct correlation to our for dog parks (as an example)
- It would be helpful if the benefits of licensing were known, I don't think they are known (ex: reunification).
- I don't know if any. I only do it to avoid a fine. But I resent it.
- If lost can be identified
- The Comfort of knowing their pet will be returned to them wearing identification



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No benefits necessary. It is a requirement and should be treated that way.
- Reunification and bylaw officer presence
- To encourage licensing maybe free microchipping
- Than they would be able to locate their animals faster
- There are zero benefits to licensing cats or dogs.
Pets are microchipped, which is a very reliable way to find lost pets.
- More time pursuant to the by-law for notification if a pet is found (48 hours is inadequate to presume receipt of mail) and more time to recover the animal 3 weeks is more reasonable if the owner is on holiday and a pet is lost. More by-law enforcement presence in off leash parks.
- Discount at veterinary clinics. Free spay and neuter.
- I think the ability to locate their animal more easily and knowledge that they are a part of a vaccinated, tracked population of pets with responsible owners is enough.
- Less cat racism. More protection from dangerous pit bulls
- Reduced fees via animal services, prolly a high five.
- They won't get a ticket from a bylaw officer
- Mainly reunification
- Pets returned when lost.
- A discount on some veterinary fees would be awesome.
- discounts for multiple pets, early renewal discounts, discounted training classes, more free spay and neuter spaces within the city
- Dog services
- If licensing is paid for, some kind of insurance against liability, and free returns of found lost pets. If licensing is not paid for, return with fee (Waivable in the event that the owner is impoverished).
- Dog tags
- longer holds at CAS. Reduced fee when animal is caught. most cat owners who license and chip their cats keep their cats indoors (i could be wrong about this) but I have 4 cats all indoors, or supervised on harness in an enclosed yard, chipped and licensed.
- Hopefully getting them back if they get out. Otherwise not much
- I don't think there need be any benefit. Licensing your pet is part of responsible pet ownership.
- Discount at local vets, pet store etc.
- Choose the size of the tag. My chihuahua can't wear the provided tag as it is for big dogs and he's 5 pounds.
- Reunion with their pet if it is lost. The ability to have a pet in the city limits.
- Longer reuniting process. Its heartbreaking to learn that only after a few short days a pet can be rehomed. Not enough time for pet people to actively search for their missing pets especially if they were away over a long weekend, hospitalized or have a lack to social media (elders)or dont drive.
- Reunited at lower cost.
- Re-unification is the main reason I license.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Being contacted if their animal is found in a caring, non-judgmental way with a fair investigation BEFORE fining is involved. Perhaps even bringing the animal home and helping figure out how it escaped.
- Micro chipping is the only way for owners to be reunited with lost pets. Tattooing doesn't work as per my personal experience with the SPCA. give discounts for microchipped pets as micro chipping is \$\$\$!
- You offer me zero benefits in licensing my pets
- More of the fees collected put into animal-centred education. Easier access to spay/neuter or even low-cost maintenance vet care.
- Not sure. Insurance maybe?
- Free training classes
- With microchip technology I don't think there is much of a benefit to licensing an animal with the city.
- I honestly don't know of any benefits from licensing
- Re-unification of lost pet. Perhaps notification of communicable disease.
- It should be free and non-mandatory.
- Additional benefits like discounts at participating pet stores would be nice.
- Figure out a time ya to make it more appealing. People in poverty will not bother if the only perceived reason to register is to avoid a fine if the dog is impounded. Have community pop up license events in impoverished communities with low levels of licensing. Make it fun. Help them understand.
- Neutering and such free and mandatory unless they are licensed breeders for any animal
- reunification if lost or reported missing/stolen. maintained recreational areas for animals
- Pets are returns if found. Security and comfort that other animals that they come in normal contact with are not a danger.
- Return of lost pets, and control over numbers of animals in one residence
- Pets returned if they are lost - huge benefit! Perhaps a discount on certain pet items? Knowledge that they have contributed to making the community safer for animals and for people.
- Not being fined, not having their pets captured and impounded and, if found having their pets returned to them - if they love their pets and really want them returned.
- Return of pet should it be lost then found by city impound. Lower cost for return of lost pet on first offense/ incident as sometimes pets are Houdini and can find an escape route not predictable or may be a fence jumper. Cats sometime escape and are hard to catch.
- I do believe there should be a once a year 'oops' clause. Let's face it, animals by nature are unpredictable and even the most responsible pet owner can have a pet get out.
- Reunification with their lost pet.
- I don't expect anything for my license fee. I feel it makes the city aware of how many pets there are at a resident in order to better control and have knowledge of a situation.
- Re-unification. Quick identification of a pet that has caused harm or is a nuisance and can then be reported, should the owner decide to decline responsibility



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Easy recovery/return of pet.
- Exactly...what are the benefits? I don't know that there are any. Reunification if lost with a fine? That is a benefit sort of.
- No benefit
- Use the money to have more garbage bins around neighbor hoods and bags to pick up dog waste. Other cities have these set up but not Calgary.
- I don't believe there should be any further benefit than reunification, however if you have a pet that is at low risk of becoming separated from its owner then paying the yearly fee is much too high
- No benefits. Because not required.
- Recovery
- The primary benefit is to reunite the pet with the owner should the pet get lost.
- You get your pet back if it roams free.
- I think the benefit belongs to the city, not the pet owner.
- No to have to pay the city to keep a pet. That's ridiculous.
- A public system that helps them find and reunite with their animal if it is lost.
- -discount at recognized veterinarian's
- I would like to see all the money go to providing low-cost spay/neuter and education about pet ownership.
- That licences are not just a tie to hand out fines.
- Safe return on their pet should it wander away.
- Pet can be identified and returned to owner.
- Using parks, free poop bags
- I don't believe that there should be benefits, aside from the ability to reunite animal with owner. I believe it should be mandatory, like a driver's license to drive. I also don't think there should be scalable fees, as animals are expensive and people should have good financial standing to own one
- The main benefit would be re-unification. This is why i license my dog.
- A return of a pet without cost. There shouldn't be a fine for dogs to be reunited unless the dog is a repeat offender.
- More off leash parks, especially in the deep south. Poop bags provided at the parks. More bylaw presence at the actual parks. In the last 10 years I've ever only seen one bylaw truck at a park, and they only sat in their vehicle and didn't come into the park. Officer presence is important!!!
- Better pet reunification. Better enforcement of irresponsible pet owners.
- Free bandana color code for aggressive dogs.
- Easier to be reunited
- compliance with city bylaw; know that if you pet happens to get away from you - that they can be identified and returned to you.
- The ability to have a pet returned if it should wander or get lost.
- Not having to pay to pick them up if they do get out
- No benefits, just a compliance with the law



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Assurance that if your pet is lost, it will be returned to you.
- Decreased fee if dog is lost and caught by bylaw services and then picked up to return home, multipet discounts
- Free tags every few years.
Training class suggestions.
Listing of animal friendly areas; parks, off leash, stores.
- expanded discount programs like the "Love Your Pet" one
- Catch and return, identification and notification if deceased
- If impounded, they are scanned right away for chips and owner is called multiple times to come retrieve. Must be proof of trying to contact x times prior to it being put up for adoption.
- Findability
- I'm unaware of any benefits right now. I'm not sure what I'd expect from the city. To be honest, other than demographics I'm not entirely sure why the city licenses them in the first place.
- Access to free or discounted services.
- If lost they are easier to track.
- A kickback program, perhaps? Discounts and partnerships with local stores for those who can provide proof their pet is licensed?
- Tax break on property taxes. Pet ownership can be a deterrent for property crime and has health benefits. I would suggest a flat break as opposed to per pet option to discourage irresponsible pet ownership.
- There shouldn't need to be. Don't get benefits for licensing ourselves. You want to own something you get a license, car, trailer, etc. Just because one decides to get an animal shouldn't mean the city gives treats to owners where this that taxes pay for when this is not a responsibility of the city
- Easy recovery if the pet is lost.
- We get NONE
- I believe pet owners should face fines or not be allowed to have pets if they refuse to license.
- for owners who license their pets every year, a "loyalty discount" or multi-pet/multi-year discount.
Offer some incentive for those who do register, and increase penalties for those who dont
- Faster reunion and no fines if your pet is caught and picked up.
- Discounts on microchipping. Reduced cost for spay/neutering.
- Beyond the ease of reunification, I don't know what else I would expect from it.
- Lighter wallet.
- Knowledge of where these fees go and how they are utilized.
Quick return of lost animals to owners
- The only benefit I see is that the city has a spay/neuter clinic that operates 7 days a week to address low income and feral cat populations.
- Contact if lost and off leash areas
- Discounts on veterinary visits



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- License fees should be \$5. I see fees continuing to go up year after year and we get nothing more for it. Then taxes go up, then services are decreased, then the city wastes money on expensive, unnecessary projects. Licensing is a money grab and only a hindrance for responsible pet owners.
- Facilities (i.e. dog parks) and return of lost pets.
- a DNA test when getting the pet licensed might be a creative option to provide incentive to get a pet licensed. IE. breakdown of breeds in a mutt (50% shepherd, 10% golden, 25% heeler, etc)
- A better chance at retrieving their pet if they are lost.
- Return of the pet if they go missing. City had a good discount program for a long time with local pet businesses for licensing your pet, and I'm not sure why this ended, it was a fantastic, successful program.
- Prompt re-unification, discounts/ incentives for holding a license
- Pet-owner reunification, some form of medical history database to assess health of pet from previous owners
- The city already provides lovely dog parks and trash bins for dog waste collection.
- Some lower cost euthanasia services for older ailing pets.
- Perhaps a way to tie licensing to the microchip so if a pet is lost it is significantly easier to reunite
- You don't get any. My dogs don't roam and have other ways to be ID'd and reunited with me that are more secure than a dog tag.
- Absolutely none
- The benefits that are presently in place.
- I can see none.
- discounts and rewards maybe after a few years of not having to use it. more input on off leash parks
- That if they are ever lost that they can be reunited with their owners. To assist in paying for bylaw enforcement
- None aside from possibly easier to find the owners of lost animals. Nothing more. It's forced on us to begin with, so it's difficult to see any benefit at all really.
- Assistance with finding lost animals.
- I don't see any benefit except possibly getting your pet back. But if it's not registered they won't give you your pet back til you fork over hundreds of dollars. Many of us can't afford that and had to leave our pets because We couldn't afford to bail it out. Shameful.
- Pet owners shouldn't get anything extra for licensing. That money should be used to provide proper bylaw and areas for the pets exercise.
The benefits should go to NON pet owners, which is keeping non off leash parks clear of off leash animals and other bylaw enforcement.
- Discounts for training courses or pet stores/food would incentivize. Demonstrated record of licensing pets on time annually results in discount for licensing. Higher chances of re-unification.
- Knowing if they're lost that vets can track them.
- Mostly reunification
- Could you look at a getting a discount at pet businesses if you have a city licence?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If their animal is lost and seized, the owner should be contacted to pickup the pet.
- Maybe discounts on training classes, maintained off leash areas
- having the animal returned to them in cases where they get loose or if in car accident with owners and get away.
- Cat owners should be allowed to let their cats roam free provided they aren't causing issues. Any issues should be resolved without the city trying to make money and should be dealt in a calm, cool manner between neighbors. Uneducated people who cause issues for no reason should be fed to the cat.
- Abundance of dog-waste bins, emptied before over-flowing. Safe apprehension and return of lost pets. Safe, off-leash areas, away from roads and bikepaths and well-lit
- Nothing other than it helps reunite them if it's lost
- Being allowed to keep their pets.
- Coupon codes to local pet stores
- City needs to know how many dogs/cats are in a residence. And it gets the pet back to the owner.
- Can't think of any
- The biggest benefit is they can find the owners if the animal is ever lost and found by someone other than the owner
- With the widespread use of microchips and other identification options traditional licencing should go the way of the dodo.
- no fine the first time the animal is picked up by bylaw
- None. It is a requirement of being a responsible pet owner.
- Unsure. Permanent identification is more effective in returning pets to owners. Perhaps reducing fees for microchipped pets
- If the pet becomes lost the city will look after the dog if brought to the city. Additional facilities for people to engage with their pets (off leash facilities: indoor and outdoor, places animals can go if they have reactivity issues)
- Proof that pet is their pet, in cases of lost or stolen pets
- Getting their pet back
- Help with reunification, seeing some of what animal services does in the city
- Not sure there are many. It's seen as a control issue by many and they don't want to be controlled. Shouldn't you be asking about the benefits of licensing to the general public -- control issues such as numbers owned, general care?
- Funds should not be marketed as simply a way to reunite lost pets. Funds should be allocated to maintaining pet spaces, enforcement of bylaws. I have owned many dogs and never has one been reunited with me due to its city tag when lost.
- Not being fined.
- Careful effort to care for and reunite lost animals. Provide plentiful outdoor areas (off leash parks, walking areas), access to highest quality health care for strays and shelter animals, and also to animals of families who would otherwise be unable to pay for vet care: especially preventative care



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Help in returning pet
- Quick contact if lost pet is found by bylaw services staff, pet returned in same condition as found (no non emergency procedures are done)
- A benefit is a funny way to look at it. I get the “benefit” of my pet being returned and being fined. It seems the license is more to know where to send the ticket to.
- Ongoing education could be available to all owners. A brush up on the bylaw would be a valuable thing to pet owners.
- easier to have pet returned if it is lost
- Honestly the annual license is so affordable that other benefits besides reuniting me with my pet aren't necessary in my opinion.
- Nothing,.
- Active search in finding their pet if lost
- Reunification is the number one reason, and using licensing fees for animal services
- Better communication to owners if pet is lost and subsequently found by city officials. Awareness of pets in the home in an emergency. You're all linked, share the information
- Accountability and access to knowledge.
- Tax break for registering their pet.
- Education on responsible pet ownership and resources for where to go if they need help, eg. change in circumstances and they can't afford vet care/pet sitting
- Reunification, reduced cost of an animal is found and returned.
- Free pet recovery when recovered or delivered to the city
- Re-unification when pets are lost.
- along with the reunification, the offer for education classes, ie, healthy pet, obedience, spay and neutering, public manners,
- If a licenced animal is found the owners should be contacted by the city and they should not have to keep checking to see if the animal has been picked up. Many people do not realize that the onus is on the owners and checking can be delayed or not done at all.
- Re-unification should a pet escape and become lost.
Funds collected from licensing could go towards spay and neuter programs and possibly towards responsible owner incentives.
- Unsure ... this is a great idea to explore
- reunification, support for impounded animals,
- Able to get pet back if it is lost.
- Re-unification and reminder to be responsible.
- At least a voucher or something to a locally owned pet store
- Easy reunification process in the case of a lost pet
- If lost, they can be reunited with family and owners don't get as 200\$+ fine



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The city should partner with pet related businesses to offer incentives, such as discounts, to owners who register. Registered pet owners should also be able to add animals to their household for a reduced rate (multi-pet discount).
- Better reunification
- Reunification if pets get lost
- As a licensed dog owner, I don't expect anything. My dog has a chip implant and if the city finds him I would expect him returned.
- Indoor offleash dog park for cold weather.
- Reunification if the pet gets out
Access to off-leash dog parks
Not sure about the cats
- None, its the duty of the person living in the city of calgary!!
- Help finding lost pets and a recovery period window
- LOWER FEES AND NOT HAVING TO PAY TO GET YOUR ANIMAL BACK IF PICKED UP BY THE POUND
- Off leash areas for dogs
- You already provide them. There is really nothing else you can promise.
- To continue helping them finding their pets if they are lost.
- Satisfaction that their dogs are accounted for, obeying civic duty.
- I'm not even sure what they do get
- The benefits of reuniting with there pets should they be lost and retrieved by the city.
- Coupons for food
- A microchip included
- Easy reunification if they are lost and then found by someone. Maybe add some discounts to microchips, vet care, etc.
- If lost and found the owner should be notified right away where the animal is, no delays.
- Information on responsible pet ownership, quick calls to retrieve found pets, lower fine for animal at large, possibly fun events
- Reunifying. Responsibility. Identify dog challenges without owners. Bylaw coordination
- Security in the fact that their pets are able to be traced back to them in the event that they are ever separated.
- The cost paid for the license should be put back in to bylaw to be able to increase patrols in problem areas and respond to calls
- Coming home when they are lost without penalty unless they have multiple offenses.
- re-unification
programs for people who have aggressive/biting dogs to prevent bites/euthanization
- Discounts on rates for the next year.
- reunification
dog parks



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- discounts are pet stores/grooming places. Play days, free basic training lessons, on-line training manual, vet perks.
- Safe keeping and return from animal services.
- I think what is provided is good. Licensing should just be an expectation if you would like to have a pet.
If the budget were to ever exist, subsidized emergency vet care would be great.
- If the cat is lost , the City should be able to look up the information to find the owner.
- Access to private dog parks! Discounts on training/pet supplies.
- It's a money grab.
- Safe care and return of their pet.
- Ease of pet retrieval when separated. Perhaps some kind of discounts or incentives would be beneficial in improving licensing rates.
- Knowing that if their pet is lost and wearing a license tag, the correct owner can be found
- If my dog should ever escape, I would expect my dog to be humanely treated until I was able to get him back to me. If I locate a loose dog, I expect the same care be taken of that until until owner is notified
- Not sure, other than potentially a reduced rate for early registration. Might be worth increasing awareness of the benefits of registration. Maybe a yearly registered pet fair or something. Show proof of registration and get an ice cream.
- Being able to be reunited if your pet accidentally gets out/ free from its leash and is caught by the city or another person and brought it
- Reunification, discounts at vets would be beneficial.
- Reunification, maybe a tax discount.
- -pets which are adopted should have less of a fee than pets which are purchased (to encourage adoption and discourage breeders)
- If I have to pay to keep my pets safe I want bylaw out doing their job and monitoring people not following the bylaws. le offleash dogs where they should be leashed
- a one time discount at a store with supplies for pets
- If my pet is lost, I hope that by licensing them, I will get them back when found.
- free return of pets that are lost and found. Though repeated escapes may need to result in a fine
- Discounts. Included accessories such as tracking devices
- Know that if the pet is lost they can be tracked back to the owner or the vet clinic they go too
- Programs in all areas for the community to provide a better quality of life for all cats and dogs.
- Discounts for pet food and supplies that the government can work with pet stores?!
- Tracking of pet if lost; reduced fee if pay early
- Discounted bylaw fees if your animal does escape and is picked up
- If a pet is lost they can be returned to their owner. Bylaw officers actually enforcing the rules.
- Actual enforcement. [personal information removed] animal control is non-existent



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Help locating and being reunited with pet. However, tags can fall off and with pets no longer being tattooed, an animal can look like a stray to the general public. We need education for ALL, because it happens a lot that someone's pet gets lost, doesn't have visible ID, and is kept but the finder!!
- re-unite pet with owner in an event they get lost. that can be updated by the owner as a fee. similar to how when babies get registered in a hospital when they were born. one-time, not every year.
- No cost to relocate and find
Reunification
Less threats or hrsrd time getting your animal back (unless evidence used that showed abusive or neglect action)
- Reunited with owner
Money used for offleash park maintenance
- Dog parks, garbage containers for waste disposal along pathways.
- Events and or benefits on training or information opportunities. (It has become very expensive to have an animal and if the licensing could be sponsored or linked with events, information, discounts or benefits that help out pet owners, that would be helpful and would motivate people.
- Discounted City if Calgary venues
- Free microchipping at participating vets.
- Being allowed to have a pet.
- Access to areas such as dog parks, or indoor facilities
- Poop bag stations and waste bins in highly frequented areas
- I liked the discount cards.
- Reuniting if lost.
- Education programs, better bylaw enforcement for offenders.
- No recovery fee if picked up when lost.
- I've never benefited from licensing my animals because they've never gotten lost. But, accidents do happen and it's reassuring to know that if my cat or dogs manage to get out one day that they'll be more likely to find their way back to me.
- Quick return if found.
- Ensuring if separated from owners, every effort would be made to reunite pets via phone calls, email, etc.
- Discounts through vet clinics, at pet stores, etc.
- protection and name and number on their tags in case one day the go strolling and you don't realize they've got away on you if your busy then people can see where they live and belong and hopefully give you a call to come and get them
- I like the relationship now, thanks!
- Discounts on veterinary care and food costs maybe.
- If the animal ever is lost, the animal can be traced back to the owner. But of course that means current information must be submitted. Multi-year licensing option may not have current contact info updated.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Pet owners already pay tax. Don't need to charge pet owners twice
- More clarity on reuniting lost pets with owners
- Literally the only "benefit" of licensing a pet is that they can be reunited IF they are wearing their tag. A license fee should include a microchip as well or a discounted cost to neuter/spay them.
- to signal to other owners that the animal is cared for properly
- Reunification by the city. Not just them being listed on the website but an actual effort to find the owner. Maintenance of public spaces and facilities for dog owners. Enforcement of responsible ownership bylaws
- It helps with the up keep and care of the pets housed at animal services
- Return if lost
- Free or subsidiary vet checks
- They already do. Off leash parks. Waste despicable in the parks. Reunification. The spat and neutering of strays.
- Reunification. That's it. Otherwise it puts a target on your back if a neighbor complains of a dog, and you get a letter advising you to stop the behaviour. It's stressful. And may not even be your dog.
- Incentives? Sure, lets approach it this way. Reduction on cost of recall training. Free/reduced microchipping. Etc.
- Pet owners could get discount or a rebate for vet or pet store. Very cheap licensing fees based on a persons income and if the pet is fixed.
- For it not to be used as a guide to fines
- 24hr access to veterinarian nurse via the phones
- Where is the money going that we pay for the licensing fee?
- Like.. anything! For someone with a dog with an amazing recall and already microchipped and tagged.. I am having difficulty seeing any benefit for it
- To identify dogs that are lost and have the tag to identify them, to care for those that are found roaming, etc. ,
- Lost & found
- Something obvious - otherwise it can feel like another tax
- Maybe coupons to places or discounts (similar to AMA)?
- Finding their dog safely
- Returned to them.
- Safe return of their animals.
- Money put toward reunification, maintenance of and creation of new off leash parks, access to pet owner education, and discounts for pet supplies and services.
- Identifying their pets if lost.
- Discounted services for vets
- Cheaper jail rates for escaped animals



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Expectation of prompt notification if pet goes missing. [personal information removed] Also educate as to where the funds go SPECIFICALLY. If folks know the true bang for their buck, they'll be more compliant, IMO
- Discounts at pet stores, a licenseID
- Get a booklet with information about proper dog behaviour and info and things to do in Calgary with your pets. Maybe the city can work with different pet services and shops to have some sort of discounts with them if their pet is licensed. Or get a coupon book when you get your license renewal.
- The city actually doing due diligence to check microchips when Pets land in shelter or are hit by cars. Discounts on spay and neuter (or free!!!!)
- Discounts or benefits, positive reinforcement
- Maintenance of off leash areas. Bylaw officers paroling off leash areas for safety and to ensure owners are picking up after pets.
- Easier if pet is lost.
- Mostly it's a means for identification if the animal runs off
- Quick identification and reunification if lost.
- Reassurance that the likelihood of being reunified with the pet is a bit higher.
- Free tags, maybe a discount on training books or classes and poop bags. And a free bag of treats to boot.
- None. I believe it's reasonable to expect this and is common practice by most modern cities.
- Assistance if their pet is lost.
- if anything every happened, vicious or lost, i would expect owners who have registered pets have points in their favor for demonstrating responsible pet ownership by having pets licensed.
- I have seen no benefits in all the years I have owned dogs.
- Pet owners should receive discounts on other licences, such as licencing their vehicle discount, city gym discount, or city child services discount, equal to the licencing fee paid
- Use of city run off leash parks, early re-unification with lost pets
- It would be good to have the city about to scan microchips that many animals have now. Perhaps that could be included in the licence?
- Finding your dog if it goes missing
- discount on training sessions run at Calgary humane society
- None they are making the choice to own a pet. Why should you get something if you want it?
- Assistance with getting an animal home quickly if lost, would be nice for the city to negotiate a veterinary care discount with VCA and independent clinics for people who responsibly license their animals
- Re-unification is enough.
- Knowing that their animal can be returned. Also, if they are fully licensed, owners shouldn't have high fees when they come to pick up their animals. I believe many get left behind at the shelter because of the fees associated with picking up lost pet.
- No shelter fees if pet I should found and reunited.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Microchip registration in Calgary or Money put into services that benefit animals - parks, training
- Easy reunification and identification
- Lost dogs returned. Cats, not much since it doesn't work. But any pet who escapes should have owners fined for being irresponsible. Too many people need a wake up. Increase fines each time a pet is caught too.
- Free programs for fixing, and or being microchipped.
- Education on pet management.
- Reunification of lost pets, maintenance of dog parks (garbage removal)
- Search and rescue service if needed
- The city should notify families if pets are found dead on the road etc. As I understand it, this doesn't happen - even if tagged and collared. This is a real fail if it's a licensed animal.
- I don't really think it benefits pet owners. Most pets have micro chips, tags and tattoos these days and that is what reunites them more than the licence
- None other than lack of fines and eventual prosecution
- There should be no benefit, it's a requirement of responsible pet ownership
- Free poop bags in parks. No charge for tags that have gone missing.
- Proper scanning and reading of chips tags tattoos and reasonably quick contact of owner. Do not automatically find someone who has lost their dog listen to their stories have a heart
- On top of reunification, as above discounts, tax write off, access to inexpensive training.
- If their pet is lost it can be identified and traced back to them. If an incident ever occurs with another dog they can hold the owner tied to that licence responsible. Being able to report bad behaviour to the city related to a tag number.
- Off leash park maintenance.
- A microchip for their pet to aid in reunification with the initial license purchase
- To be reunited with their pets if lost.
That their pets will be vaccinated at a regular bases.
- Free training classes
Know ing that the fees help stray animals and it does not all go to the government
- Peace of mind
- Not sure how the logistics would work, but discounts on expenses that are pet related would be awesome (pet training, food, etc.)
- If the animal control is close to the home of the animal at large they should attempt reunification without a fine.
- Ability to have their pet returned if lost and collected by animal services.
- More than just a tag
- reunification as soon as possible, should a lost pet ever be reported/turned in to the city
- What are the benefits? It seems like a money grab.
- Don't really know.
- No fines if animal gets lost. Unless it is a recurring issue.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- What was mentioned earlier. Being reunited with your pet. That should be enough.
- animal is protected if found stray and returned
- Incentives (like one free vet checkup). They shouldn't expect it but that would really help license the pets.
- On and off leash areas for dogs, reduced pet insurance for licensed pets.
- My dog is chipped
- Quick, easily traceable owner for expedited reunion with family.
- That if found animal control will contact them and not put their dog or cat up for adoption. That is why we license ours. But every other year there are stories of how animal control fails to follow up and an animal is destroyed or adopted out.
- Making it easier to locate the animal if it is lost, centrally-tracked documentation of the animal's ownership
- Knowing that it is a tax that helps to offset the cost of places like off leash parks and bylaw, city animal pick up etc.
- none whatsoever - i don't believe the value is to the pet owner. the value is in how those funds are used to educate and protect animals who are in the care of irresponsible pet owners. sad to see i (heart) my pet go away, that was the one direct benefit to me.
- Reunification is the primary one.
- the reunification is most important to us.
- Identification, pre- or post- mortem.
- None, other than the safety of their own pet.
- Perhaps a discount on neutering and spaying with veterinary services.
- No fines and reunification with their animal
- The discount program was great. Access to off-leash areas; dog daycare/kennels in Calgary can only accept licensed dogs
- Any, would be nice. Work with pet stores, get discounts for licensed pets. It's not rocket science.
- A call if it runs away and is found
- The reunification aspect mentioned. Also, that funds will be put towards bylaw enforcement of dangerous animal reports, etc. Possibly monitory of on-leach/off-leash areas for those who break the rules.
- re-unification is the biggest one, but also understanding what the fees are used for.
- I think licensing should be optional - where the benefit of getting it is better re-unification.
- Free poop bags
- I don't really see any benefit
- Perhaps people should get waivers for vet offices, maybe for reduced vaccination fees or something. I think people should also be made more aware of what programs their fees are paying for.
- Assurance that should their pet be lost they will be returned to them swiftly.
- Reunification and some form of digital notification when pet has been found.
- Money goes into programs like TNR



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Notification if their pet is impounded
- Animal sheltering for a safe place in case your pet is at large.
- the ability to re-unite
- I do not see any benefits,
- I believe the benefit of re-unification is sufficient.
- Availability of support for behavioral issues and reunification, as well as support during disputes between neighbours regarding pets living in close proximity (barking, messes, etc)
- Multi-pet discounts
Upgraded off leash pet areas
- If the pet is found that it is humanely taken care of until I am located; effort to find the owner.
- The current licensing program is just fine.
- Discounts on vaccines and discounts on pet fees when renting a house
- Rehoming and you won't euthanize my cat !
- Re-unification of lost pets with owners is excellent. Safe and proper caretaking of animals who end up being "in the pound". Don't know if license fees help support off-leash park areas, but that's great, too.
- Actively trying to reunite the animals with their families.
- The biggest benefit is re-unification if your pet gets lost.
- fast return of pet, and enforcement from bylaw at off leash parks and elsewhere
- No other than what is in place
- Increased animal bylaw services.
- I don't think there is any benefit. Make microchipping through the vet mandatory.
- The right to own a pet. This is prepaying the city services and bylaw officers needed to take care of the problems with pets.
- Quick reunification if the pet is found.
- Lost pets can be reunited with owners. Populations of pets can be monitored to provide information for potential outbreaks of disease.
- Dog parks, bins to dispose of waste. Ability to track if it is lost.
- If you try to impose late fees or fines the result will just be citizens refusing to show up to license their dogs and it will only become an issue for them if their dogs are captured while on the loose.
- The rewards card was nice, but not many stores accepted it. Bringing back the card and getting business on board with providing discounts would go a long way
- Their pet could be returned if lost.
- You're basically crowdfunding animal bylaw services so the city should do EVERYTHING in their power to reconnect lost pets to their families.
- knowing that if they animal was lost that they would get them back
- Personally the knowledge that my pet can be found in the shelter is enough.
- Not having their animals put down after 3 days of capture.
- Any benefits should be for everyone, not just the owners of the pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Pet recovery, and maybe some discounts at affiliated stores/services in the city.
- I have yet to experience any benefits. I just pay some money for a tag that falls off in the forest two weeks after being attached to the collar.
- More dog parks, poop bags provided at parks
- More support for off leash areas. Cyclists seem to get a lot more support than dog owners.
- None.
I also have to license a car.
- If pets are impounded they should be contacted. Pet owners who don't cause complaints (that are considered reasonable) should get discounted fees. Off leash areas should be better maintained and not open to nuisances like bicycles. More places for pets to swim - some are not able to go in the river.
- The security that a quick unification will happen and that they won't be possibly be given fines for loss of the dog
- I have four pets, all licensed, and I do not feel I get any benefits.
- Re-unification if pet gets lost.
- Hahahaha exactly, if you have to ask...
Waste of our money.
- Reunification is the biggest one. I wonder if there is some way to offer other incentives such as when a pet owner gets a multiyear license for their pet, they get a coupon for discount on vaccinations: the vet community would obviously have to be on board with this.
- Know that their pet will be safe if found. Access to city animal programs. Access to parks.
- I have never once seen a benefit to licensing.
- Maintain a safer environment for pets within the city. (ie: control the coyote population)
- They should benefit from avoiding fines.
- Haven't seen any benefit from licensing my cat. Only benefit I would imagine would be if someone's dog ran off, or their cat left their garden and was picked up, to be reunited with owner.
- The ability to find their owners if lost.
- I liked it when I got a discount at local pet stores. Honestly, I count on reunification with my pet should he escape and get lost because he is chipped, tattooed and has a collar - not because I pay the city my cat tax.
- Reunification is the primary benefit, as well as control in community.
- Any benefit for the owner.
- Support for re-unification with lost pets, discounts or free courses (online or in-person) regarding responsible pet ownership and caring for the pet needs. Dog owners should be required to complete a course to understand why dogs must be on-leash when walking on sidewalks/in communities.
- Money collected from licensing should be spent on community education programs, maintenance and restoration of dog parks, and new technology tools like wildlife sighting apps. This should all be very transparent to the public.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The licensing system seems like a cash grab from the city, as there is currently zero benefit to the owner for licensing their pet. Perhaps there could be benefits offered to responsible owners such as discounts on vet care, daycare services, training & courses.
- Perhaps a discount for spay neuter for people who don't qualify as low income. I think more education on where the license money goes and perhaps a discount for multi pet families
- None beyond what is current
- Perhaps some form of an incentive. Is it possible to do a group plan for registered animals for (otherwise quite expensive) pet insurance?
- Subsidy on vaccines.
- -Forgiven/reduced fees if your pet does get out. (ie. first time free, second time reduced, third time full price). Accidents happen and if someone has proven they're ""responsible"" by registering their pet, some lenience should be given.
- -Free training booklet ?
- Safe, fenced, maintained dog parks. Slacker bylaws regarding where dogs can and can not go. Re-unification when dog is lost
- The satisfaction that their pet will be returned if they get loose somehow.
- The proactive return of their pet by bylaw services: Rather than having to call around searching for their animal, they are contacted/ informed that their animal has been found, is available for pickup at whatever location; and delivery back to their owners if they can't pick it up themselves.
- Keeping track of all the animals in the city, if they do get lost, they can be found easily by their license tag.
- Ease of reunification and discount on licence for up to date vaccinations
- None I would rather not have to license my Dog or Cat.
- Discounts at every pet store on pet products and food.
- That city intervention in pet disputes is supported in a timely manner and enforceable manner.
- There should be no benefit, there should be automatically fines and and extra fees for not doing so. Secondly these rules need to be enforced by bylaw and the city.
- Reuniting when pet list. Money for park garbage removal.
- their pet not getting executed for getting free
- Lowered annual fees or discounted rates for those that license their pets every year
- I think we already have a lot of benefits from pet licensing.
- discount at local vets.
- To be able to be reunited with their pet if it gets lost (why chipping is a REALLY good idea... Have regular chipping clinics run by the City, at very nominal cost, for people to bring their animals. HUGE cost savings for Animal Control if an animal is lost! And much better for the animal.)
- I believe that licensing helps the city to have a good pet management system, e.g. dog parks, animal services department and to return pets to owners.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If the licensed dog or cat is found and calls the city, it would be wonderful to be able to return the dog or cat to their owner rather than stress the animal further by impounding. Accidents happen. We could have a check box indicating our contact information could be shared to the finder.
- Free ID tattoo and a City maintained "up to date" registry so the pets can be quickly reunited with their owners thus minimizing the trauma of losing a pet
- Tags, help finding when lost
- Not having their pet impounded. Licensing is about the benefit to others to identify the animal, not about benefit to the pet owner.
- Very few. Sure, if they're lost the license could be used to re-unite dog and owner but most dogs wear a tag with owner contact info on it (which is a one-time fee to buy for \$10). Also, a lot of dogs now are micro-chipped which is way more reliable to re-unite them as it can't be lost with a collar
- Animal control
- Getting returned to their owners
- The safe return of their pet. Identification of their pet.
- by-law pick-up should be 24/7 OR 311 should be able to contact the owner on record! I found a stray dog & called 311, but it was "after hours" and bylaw wouldn't come. my only option was to leave it outside or drop it off at a clinic. luckily, i had a car to take it to a clinic.
- An expectation of possible reunification with lost pets (this is already in place); knowledge that licensing fee goes to care for animals in custody awaiting reunification or adoption, and towards spay/neuter.
- Reduced rates
- If they're animals are trapped by the City they should get a significant discount on the reclaiming fee. Most people who have licensed their animals do not have outdoor pets, they likely just escaped from the home and the owners are probably worried sick and likely cannot afford the crazy fees.
- A tag with owner identification and contact info.
- Reunification, and care until reunification occurs, guarantee that the pet will not be euthanized or adopted out until all reasonable efforts have been undertaken to facilitate reunification.
- Easy to find them if they get lost. The city keep control about how many pets people have.
- Discounts at retail pet stores.
- Enforcement,
- We've always microchipped our pets, so I don't usually consider the license as a reunification tool. If you could link it with the vet somehow. Maybe a small discount on annual vet checkups? Allow renewal at annual checkups? Renewals are easy to forget.
- the lost and found and returned is enough for me!
- Possible reduction on any fines that might be incurred. A cost for a licensed versus unlicensed animal.
- Assistance if dog gets out accidentally. No fine for first time. I have had a dog as a pet for 40 years and never had a problem or had one picked up so I would be upset if i was fined or charged for an accidental escape



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Quick return of pet. Easy and fast way to find them/discover if they've been captured. Right now it's a zillion Facebook pages of people searching for or reporting lost animals. Should be one place to call/look for lost pets.
- lower licensing fees, and multi-pet discounts. This would encourage people to be more honest when they have an animal or many.
- animal returned without cost
- Discounts on impound fees if animal escapes.
- Retrieval if lost
- City bylaws and follow-ups
- I view the licensing as a money grab or the city , with no benefit to the owner
- There should not be a fee for bailing the dog/cat out of the city animal services.
- Reunification. Easier to track problem animals. I do believe proof of vaccination with annual renewal then further benefit to public would be to know that all animals are vaccinated.
- Don't believe in licensing.
See above.
- Pet retrieval.
- Discount options for other pet-related facilities or programs.
- Reunification in case of lost.
- One free drive home for licensed pet that gets out due to unforeseen circumstances
- Return of their pet when lost ... no vicious animals to threaten their pet ...
- I believe that the funds should support enforcement and maintenance of dog parks.
- re-unification between the owner and their pet if the pet is lost.
- bylaw action and monitoring of off leash areas for licences pets, aggressive pets, dog walkers with too many dogs.
- I really don't know of any. It's already harsh that people receive fines and charges for retrieving a lost dog. It's also ridiculous that the animal can be put down if you can't pay the fines.
- Better maintenance of off leash areas, cleanup, bags for poop
- Different sizes of tags, maybe switch to plastic? Lower fee and charge for recovery instead?
- If a lost pet is found, the owner should be notified promptly. The animal should be treated humanely and respectfully while in custody of the City.
- A reliable method of re-unifying the animal with the owner. A license tag, alone, is insufficient in the year 2020.
- Potential for reuniting pet and owner if separated.
- Security knowing that if their pet had a license around their neck that they may be lucky enough to have their 'lost' pet returned to them rather than checking shelters. Not always the case as the collar and license can be easily removed by individuals that decide to keep the animal for themselves.
- Complimentary head-shot photo shoot (for the pet), city-paid obedience training, free weekend pass to the wave pool, a chance to ride the ride-on lawnmower along the Crowchild Trail median during the summer, scuba-internship at a golf course in collecting the golf balls from the water hazard.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Helpful pet return. More awesome off-parks.
- Something more than an ID tag would be nice.
- Owners should be severely fined for complaints against unlicensed pets (particularly dogs). Unlicensed pets are uncontrolled pets and a nuisance.
- I would like to see some portion of my license go towards animal welfare for those that can't afford the sometimes high costs. Anything to encourage more people to neuter their pets is welcome, especially cats.
- Unsure.
- Knowing that if their pet is lost it will be returned to them.
- I license my pets because it is required, not because I gain any benefit from it
- Accountability.
- Re-connection if lost, quality care at public facilities.
- Obviously being quickly reunited with your pet should they go missing and if they are licensed then no fees or fines if the animal is picked up within a 24 hour period once per calendar year.
- Biggest benefit is re-unification. Establishes that it is your pet.
- Animal services including notification if found at large
- as a cat owner it give me the reassurance that if he is lost there is a higher chance of return.
- safe return of their pet when found.
- Re-unification with their pets. Also providing fees to help other animals not owned.
- Reunion if fluffy escapes
- I do it because it's the law, and because i care about my dog.
- Are there any? I thought the purpose was to make the city money to pay for services
- Discounts for multi pet households would be nice
- - Quick reunification if pet is lost
- - Notification and response of there is an emergency situation in their area
- - Not getting charged with an offence
- They should be allowed to keep licensed animals and those who are not licensed should be apprehended and, if necessary euthanized. A registration should be required for veterinary care. Registration is a good measure of owner responsibility
- I don't think this is necessary at all.
- Easier to find a lost dog.
- Reunification. Discount on spaying/neutering and chipping to encourage responsible pet ownership.
- A feeling of confidence that if their pet does go stray, they have a good chance of getting it back.
- Apart from reunification, I do not see any benefit to the owner. If a pet is chipped and can be traced, I do not understand why licensing is needed. The owner can be found and held responsible for any issues.
- Well if it's the law no benefits , I know that in some states in the U.S. vets are required to report an animal that does not have a license.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Being notified if their dog becomes lost and knowing the dog will be safely kept until they can reunite.
- the knowledge that the pet can be reunited with them if something happens. knowledge that they are helping support the city's animal department, sense of responsibility.
- I license my dog because I believe in responsible ownership more importantly if I lose her it's a way to get her back home.
- re-unification of lost pets. Information on proper care and immunization.
- Great animal control and fast return of licensed dogs. You could look at higher impound fees for those that choose not to license animals.
- The safe keeping and return of any lost pet recovered by the city of Calgary
- It should help pay for animal shelters.
- Discounts? Show your tag get 10% at city run places?
- Access to off leash parks. (Which we do) help with finding uniting lost animals
- I feel responsible pet owners should do this, however, perhaps giving out 2 free passes to a city pool or skating may help encourage people to licence.
- A safe return of their pets if lost.
- Reunification is a big benefit for me.
- Multi-animal discount after a few years. We have four dogs that are all licensed but have never had to use animal services in the past 7 years. Maintaining a license for older dogs should be cheaper. Especially if same pet is being maintained.
- I hope they get one free ride home before the fines start. I license because it is identification for my pet.
- Good question.
- Dog walking aids like waste disposals. Ability to reunite with owner. Animal granted a stay of execution.
- If lost, they can be returned.
- A phone call if found lost and 24 hours of care at no additional cost. I honestly don't understand what they do provide for my yearly payment for 2 cats who have never been and hopefully never will be lost. It's just more money the city/government get from me.
- Free spay/neuter or reduced fee at the pound or discounts for certain licences.
- A better chance of reunification.
- If their dog or cat is lost, they can be found and reunited with their owner easier.
- Use the money to fence more areas for off leash dogs. Small areas and more of them on unused city land. People should be able to walk to dog parks not use cars. This should be in city planning. Not just regional dog parks. It's a privilege to have a pet in a major cosmopolitan city. more respect pl
- Reunification.
Knowing other animals have not been nuscence animals in the past.
- Finding lost pets, access to other services

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The possibility of having the pet returned should it go missing.
- Lost animals can be returned.
- Discount at pet retail store. (sponsored by local retailers)
Training or grooming discount
- 1 free warning.
- Finding your dog if it's lost.
- Fenced in dog parks close to citizens to walk to. Water access for drinking. Park benches to watch the dogs interact with each other, teach children about dog breeds, involve the neighbours more in dog activities. Regional dog parks are segregating. Many people like to enjoy dogs, let us watch.
- Finding their pet if lost.
- Tags
Reunification when lost if possible.
- Dog poop bags at the park!
- Promote the reunification factor, discounts are local stores. Nothing crazy people should license their dogs.
- Do not pick up dogs. Improved services in the city. Access to plus 15s in the winter.
Dog parks need fences, benches, Shade, path clearing and interesting features for the dogs to explore. Allow dogs to be in more businesses and public spaces.
- Cheaper vet bills.
- I would rather licensing cost be lower and lower the amount of services offered. I have never had to use services associated with licensing my pets
- Dog parks.
Should have access to lower cost spay and neuter.
Fast returns.
Free microchips.
No impound fees
- There is no benefit
- Animal registry, taking care of other animals not under care
- Pets should be reunited with their owners. The City should make it optional for owners to disclose medical needs of their pets during licensing and ensure medical needs are met while in care and awaiting to be reunited (at the cost of the owner).
- I don't know if there is much of a benefit to licensing.
- Easier to find a lost pet
- A multi pet discount would be nice, as would discounts for early licensing. Perhaps lower fees for those of us who never cause problems. All pets should wear personal ID tags to get home if lost.
That's more useful than a license.
- Sense of peace that if their dog went missing there is a higher chance of being found.
- Safe return of my furry family member.
- Only having to do it once.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- City run programs at a discounted price like training or indoor play areas that can be used by licensed dogs, especially during rainy days and cold snaps.
- Speedier reunification, less fines/a warning if a pet is caught roaming. More and better communication if a pet is found.
- Free return of their pet should it become lost and caught by city or by shelter.
- Quick return if by chance your pet is lost and picked up by bylaw
- Quick pet reunification. Recognized as responsible pet owners.
- Tags with your phone number or address so there is a first option to return the pet directly to the owner of you find it. Or city could let you know where they live if someone calls.
- The benefit of finding their pet if lost and knowing they are accountable for their pet
- If I license my dog I expect a hassle free experience and don't believe I should be fined upon the return of my dog. Unless of course the dog has caused damage or something like that1
- Free poop bags at off leash parks
- Notification if their pet escapes and is picked up or turned in to animal control.
- They should expect the city to be able to quickly identify their pet and bring them back home immediately
- Reunification is cheaper and just as likely with a petstore tag and a microchip. U don't do enough to reunite. 311 seems more about getting info for fines for stray pet owners than reunification. You don't take lost/found reports, FB volunteer groups do better at reunification. As do other cities [personal information removed]
- free ride home. free impound for 2 days or till owner is notified
- Means of getting pet back should it get away, care of off leash areas for dog owners
- Accountability to those who don't license...reasonable effort to reunite lost pets..chip option for pet management
- The ability to have a pet in the city. Use of dogparks and parks.
- The opportunity to keep pets in our homes in the city, tracking so that the pets can be returned if the pet escapes, information and maybe training on best care practices
- Reunion with lost pets. Use of off leash parks,
- Easy reunification, although that's not true with cats who have snap off collars (there is literally no benefit to cat owners is what I'm getting at) - microchips work better.
- I am honestly not sure what benefit people could get. Microchipping a pet is a great way to be able to identify a lost pet and works across borders.
- I don't think there are any besides the city having control
- Re-unification is the main thing for me.
- I didn't know there was any benefit other than identifying the animal and the city making money
- Benefits?? It's their choice to own a pet much like it is their choice of what car they drive. There are fees. NO benefits. The benefit is the love of a pet. End of story
- Help finding pet if lost.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- IDK - My cats are licensed, but they are also microchipped. They are indoor cats and do not wear a collar. If they go missing, a license will not reunite them with me, their microchip will. I do not get any benefits from the licensing program.
- Not getting fined or their pet seized, knowing they are not contributing to overcrowded animal shelters. Having a pet is a privilege and responsibility - licensing should be accepted as a basic mandatory requirement to owning cats and dogs.
- I think there should be grades of licensing depending on the level of training for a dog. Dogs with higher levels of training should be allowed more freedoms than dogs who have not had training.
- Find their pet if lost. But I have never had that benefit me, the microchip is what reunited us.
- No fine.
- I don't think there is a benefit. It's just a money grab for the city. I only licence my dogs so I don't get a fine when I'm walking them or at a dog park. Again, they're microchipped and they have my phone # on their collars so they will be Reunited with me if they get away.
- The peace of mind knowing that if they get lost, you have a better chance of finding them
- I personally think if we must license our pets we should be eligible for tax deductions as they are dependants.
- Perhaps discounts provided by partner companies? Training, vet, supplies?
- Discounts on spay and neuter
- Financing programs at local rescue organizations
- None. It should just be a licensing, fee for tag and done. My dog is tattooed and microchipped. In the event he got away from me the city wouldn't be the first method to locate me.
- No ideas here. Do not own a dog. Never will.
- If people saw Calgary as a leader in how they are tackling issues of unwanted pets, homelessness, overpopulation, how CGY uses their state the art facility, how they help rescues, people would happily participate in pet licensing. Need to see CGY taking ownership of the problem & eradicating it.
- None. It's the law license your pet.
- Aid in reunification. Vaccination discount.
- I should be able to provide a current picture of my pet with licensing if the point is to reunite lost pets.
- discounted micro-chipping program
information package on location and etiquette at off-leash parks, cremation services, re homing options etc
- Dog training advice!
- Safe return if lost. Fees should go to monitoring and maintenance of parks. Public education on animal behaviour and how to report issues and adhere to rules.
- Off leash parks.
- Dogs must be licensed to visit the off leash dog parks. If an unlicensed pet is picked up wandering around somewhere then the owners must pay to have it licensed before it is returned.
Coupons for pet food or accessories, or free admission to a pet event like a pet expo.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Free micro-chip or Reduced rate, and Fixing their animals.
- Reunification, discount on fees,
- Reunification of lost dogs; dealing with stray dogs.
- Contact upon finding of pet.
- Accountability to those who own aggressive and nuisance animals.
- Lower licensing prices in the years to follow. Perhaps a partnership could be made with vet clinics, pet stores or grooming that if owners can produce proof of current license, they receive discounts?
- Reunification with animal, off-leash park amenities.
- Rebate or lower rate for spay / neuter.
- Discount on renewals; free entrance to city leisure facility
- Be sure that their pet will not be rehomed or euthanized if picked up when roaming (within a timeline). That their pet will be kept safe provided for until the owners can be contacted to retrieve their pet.
- A discount on food or vet bills would be nice. My cats are licensed, chipped and tattooed . I love them and want them to be found if they ever ran out and got lost.
- You shouldn't have to pay to get them out of the pound the first time.
- Support if dogs/pets are lost.
- The current ones
- Proves your dog is properly vaccinated
If your dog gets lost they have a better chance of being returned to you
License fees are cheaper than the fines
Its the law in many cities
Sometimes, it is a money grab and we don't know what the money is used for
- More garbage disposal in the city.
- Discount for multi pet home
- The peace of mind knowing that if their animal is lost, they will get it back. Maybe you could offer a free leash with a licence or free poo bags.
- Quick return of lost pets.
- The only benefit should be the return of their pet should it escape from custody. The licence should be a onetime lifetime of the pet licence. Owner's should pay extra if the pet is apprehended and returned to the owner.
- I don't think this makes sense.. don't charge the huge fees in the first place and then offer to give a little back...
- Nothing much licensing of cats and dogs should be law and no one should be allowed to own them unless they have a license and license can be transferred easily. Licensing will help city and authorities identify animal abuse and the population of certain animal.
- Nothing if the license is free.
- The privilege of having a pet within city limits where their neighbours have to put up with the barking, excitement, and running at you on the pathways when you are out walking (and yes, I love animals).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cats - should be aloud to roam. And at a certain age of the pet it should be free - why am I paying for a year If my elderly dog isn't going to last for a year??
- Refund on municipal tax, discount on vet services, discount on spay and neutering,
- Brownie points? Let's be honest, this is mostly a cash grab for the city.
- Possibly reunite with lost pets.
- The ability to reunite with your pet in the event of an escape seems like a pretty good benefit.
- They are allowed to have a pet.
- A while ago, coupons or something similiar were offered when license renewed. Some bonus such as that would work?
- It's a money grab. There are no benefits now and we certainly can't afford to spend money on bribing people to be good pet owners
- Reunification in the event of lost or abandoned dogs. Bylaw officers who police poor pet owners - especially those who do not pick up dog waste. All dogs should be chipped to trace owners.
- Free unification if lost then found.
- What there getting
- Maybe a discount towards a dog obedience class? Partner with a training Center and offer a 10% discount for people who license their puppy or dog within 30 days of adopting/ buying the dog. Might help reduce the number of vicious dogs or bad dog owners too.
- If a pet is lost reunification is easier
- licensing dogs should allow for the poop bag supply at parks
- Lost pet recovery, supporting shelters
- Lost pets can be reunited with their owners.
- That my pet will be found if lost. Should be connected with microchip - multi year is ok for a young dog, but not senior.
- Reunification,
- The knowledge that if their animal is lost or gets away then the city has a way of reuniting owners to their pets
- a discount after continuously licensing a pet for several years ie once your pet is 8 yrs old if you have consistently licensed them you receive free licenses for the rest of the pet's life
- free license once the pet reaches a certain age
- discount on the rabbit vaccination
- Information and education brochure on pet-ownership should come with their licensing letters. Or do it through email subscriptions
- Discount perks for local pet stores.
Free training classes.
Discount on timely or proactive licensing.
Discount or multiple pet licensing
- Retrieving lost pets.
- Discounts on vet care, water facilities at the dog parks and multi pet discounts



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Identification tags so that pets can be returned if they escape.
 - Nothing. Most of us have other ways of tracking our pets
 - Easier reuniting lost pets. Sometimes a pet gets spooked- sirens, hot air balloons hit by a vehicle, escapes from yard if children or maintenance people don't latch a gate.
 - Return to owner and financial support of the free Spay Neuter Clinic with cat licensing
 - Maintenance of offleash parks, lower fines to get your pet back if lost. You're doing the right thing by licensing, so fine non-licensors more and decrease cost of recovering lost pet from city pound.
 - Discounts to places the city owns
 - Licensing should fund bylaw enforcement.
 - Finding your pet if lost. Off leash dog parks are a great area to redistribute monies from dog licences.
- Cat licensing only makes sense if the cat bi law is changed to allow them outdoors.
- Maybe a pass on fines for a pet found at large the first time the animal is picked up if it's licensed.
 - Animals returned to owner.
 - If they escape you will get them back
 - The City could offer a spray/neuter program with licensing. I realize there is such a program with Fair Entry, but what about everyone else? The incentive does not need to be large, maybe 10%.
 - The right to own a pet
 - better chance of return of pet
 - The costs involved in my responses to the questions in the other topics of this survey.
 - Discounts on pet food. All pets eat...if you could get a fraction of the license fee back...you would purchase a license!
 - Is there any benefits? Other than getting a call when the animals are found?
 - The main benefit is higher potential for reunification and fees going to fund all the services we enjoy in such a pet friendly city.
 - Free return of the animal to the owner, way lower costs should the animal need to stay at the facility.
 - Easier unification when the animal is lost, proof of ownership for someone who finds the Animal instead of the finder assuming it's finders-keepers
 - Funding of bylaw enforcement. Identifying owners of lost dogs/cats.
 - Maybe some sort of rewards program, where they can get an occasional discount on food/supplies? Basically, it's kind of like insurance. If your animal is licensed and gets lost, you might have better luck getting it back.
 - an identification tag as well as papers to travel with.
 - Discounts...more than 1 pet
 - Free check up for the pet(s) or discounts
 - City of calgary need to properly check tags/tattoo/ microchips or animals that are impounded and contacted owner's of animals with identification



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Traceable to the owner. I'm not even sure what else a license does cover. Except that it seems that dog licensing subsidizes cats that are out roaming about not following the rules.
- Discount on vaccinations. Discount on pet insurance. Access to more venues. Allow for dog friendly events around the city
- Renew before due date discount.
- No fines, easier return of escaped animals.
- Off leash parks with more bins and biodegrade bags, access to most public and private buildings, better facilities and resources directed to pet owners
- Discount on pet insurance programs. Maybe even coupons for pet supplies once a year?
- Referral to vet services, as well as insurance companies that aren't gouging customers for services that aren't covered under plans, stream line the types of insurances and what is offered in clear structured manor.
- More off leash dog parks
- Reunion
- Lower yearly fee don't see it necessary to charge this much.
- Perhaps a discount on pet food or vet services
- Maybe training discounts or discounts on other important services, particularly veterinary, like shots.
- Maintenance and development of public pet-friendly areas (off leash dog parks).
- Ease of mind knowing if the pet gets lost that it should be no issue returning it to the right owner.
- Great dog parks!
- I am fine with what the license provides now. I don't think late fees or fines is the way to go. With that said I'm always late because January is a tough time. So I tend not to get to it until the end of January. I think multi year options and early discounts would make me do it in dec
- Nothing really...
- If people choose not to microchip or tattoo, then licensing is the next option to retrieving their pet, if lost.
- Pet friendly city event discounts (like lilac festival coupons) or perhaps a discount to spade/neuter dog. Free bags at off leash parks
- If done my way, incentive increases drastically for licencing pets so even less pets go missing. The human animal relations could be come consistently positive with training every few years and animal neglect and abuse would reduce!
- Better enforcement and resources for animal welfare complaints in the community, more off leash dog parks, animal welfare advocacy from Calgary to the province.
- Help with lost pets.
Help getting microchips.
- Should I expect to get a benefit for licensing my car? I believe the licensing system has gone wrong. It should be to make the pet owners accountable and responsible. Imagine how people would drive if you took the plates off all the cars? A bigger more visable way to identify a pet is required.
- Discounts / access to dog training classes would help increase responsible pet ownership.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Reassurance
- If their lost pet is located, they should be contacted immediately and not have to pay to retrieve their pet (that should be covered by their annual licensing fee, as most owners do not lose their pets).
- Certain percentage off.
- Anything other than just handing over \$80 a year to receive nothing in return. Literally taking food off my table just because others don't take proper responsibility or care for their pets. I get no benefits out of that money spent. It does not benefit my animals in any way. My pets never run away.
- Easier to find your pet if they get lost, responsible pet ownership
- Maybe get some coupons or something for after as a thank you or to encourage people to license.
- Monthly payment options.
- return of their pet if lost
- Places to take their animals for recreational purposes
- The city's attention when the animal becomes lost
- Discounted rates on vaccines for licensed pets. Responsible pet ownership rarely gets acknowledged.
- Contact from the City to pick up their pet if found.
- Fees to go towards re-unification of owners and lost pets, as well as enforcement of bylaws.
- More respect from others in the community.
- Re-unification should be enough of a benefit.
- Lost pets returned.
- Maybe a discount on vaccinations. Not all owners vaccinate their pets regularly and they don't have their proper tags on the collar either when walking.
- A future discount, or a donation made in their name to a dog/cat charity, an update on how that licensing money was spent, the positives behind that money- it's important to feel it's not just wasted on other city areas and overpaid city staff.
- accountability
- Contacted / re-united if lost
Perhaps work with major vets for perks to licensed dogs.
- Benefit is if you do lose your pet that they will be easier to locate the owners to get them back.
- The reunited piece is a big one. Might be nice if we had special access to parks or some other perks like coupons or access to events. Just something to sweeten the pot and reward those of us who responsible may license our pets.
- As far as I know we don't receive any benefits. If it was \$5 a year and that paid to call the family to come get their animal, that I would understand.
- a central data base to reunite their pet.
- a discount for renewing every year.
- if lost can be found
- Pets returned to their homes as first option before shelter.
- A system that is supportive of reunification, not punitive with fines and fees.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- You will get it back if it gets away.
- Perks- dog bags, discounts on kennels, private dog park access.
- What is in place is fine.
- maybe informing citizens of the cost of the services provided through licensing revenue would increase the sense that we are ethically bound. Just answering these questions makes me feel bad for not licensing. I'll probably go do it now ;-)
- An educated City of Calgary workforce as it relates to pet interaction.
- find them if they get lost.
- Responsibility to others in the community.
- Reunification when a pet is lost
- Reunification if the pet gets lost and found
- Should their pet "escape" the yard and caught by Bylaw, there should be no fees to get the pet back.
- first, I would like to know if there is a correlation between people who have complaints against them /their pets and the rates of licensing. Maybe they should get discounts on classes/courses for dog behaviour?
- Free "first pick up " if they are found
- Just the reunification benefit.
- No fee or payment.
- A responsive animal services division. That other animals that do end up separated are cared for.
- Consider discounted vaccination, discounted vet visits
- I think that licensing needs to be a little more about education. It shouldn't just be paying \$ and getting a tag. I think that people should have to take a test so they understand the by-laws and rules they need to follow when owning a pet.
- I think it should help pay for off leash park matinance and maybe even go towards a indoor off leash run by the city. Where pets have to prove their license to get in. Also to cover costs of getting lost pets back to their owners. I think adding bags to parks would be great as well
- I am not aware of benefits. I utilize several pet identification services if he is ever lost.
- How about if your pet accidentally escaped or got lost, the city would return it to you without a fine? That would be a tangible benefit of having a city license.
- A monetary benefit like a vet discount (or a fine at the vet without proof of ownership)
You must be licensed to enter dog parks.
- something..anything..right now we get no benefit for a cat. at least have decent dog parks if you're going to charge.
- I have three pets that I license and I do not expect any benefits.
- Reunification and knowing everyone has an obligation to the city and the community
- Trackable if the pet is lost. I would also like the city to have a list of certified behaviourists that they can recommend.
- Being reunited with the pet if lost.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If a pet is accidentally lost a license can help an agency find the owner. That should be incentive enough.
- Low fees for licensing.
- It would be nice as a responsible pet owner, to know that those who are NOT responsible are actually fined. I have never met a person who has been fined, so not sure why there is even rules if there is no one around to actually give out fines.
- The features currently in place - ie possibility of re-unification, possibility that a stray animal will be cared for by the City.
- I'd like to link my dogs microchip number to his license in case he's without his collar for some reason
- Dog parks.
- I license my dog annually and do not believe I get anything from it. It is a tax that allows the city to operate animal services.
- Help with reuniting you with a lost pet. Upkeep of local dog parks. It would be great to have fenced small dog parks
- More bylaw patrols at off leash park
- Help in re-uniting the owner and pet if the pet is lost.
- Potential re-unification
- I don't really see the benefit when people's animals are microchipped.
- Contribution to the overall health and welfare of the city's pet population; opportunity for potential reunification, support for the humane society. I pay for my licenses because of these things, it's not just for the benefit of my pets alone.
- Reuniting pet and owner
- Possibility of reunification with pet. Great dog parks! Like Southland Dog Park!!! (BTW...need waaay more places to park there...or no ticketing for side of toad parking!!!!!!!)
- Exclusive access to dog parks (monitor entrances for unlicensed dogs)
- Reuniting pets and owners
- Perhaps fencing some suburban off leash areas. In my neighbourhood the off leash area is adjacent to a four lane road on one side and the main exit/entrance to the neighbourhood on the other.
- Pet owners who are honest and license their dogs, as well as spay and neuter them, should receive a discount or coupon for grooming or dog food of their choice. Maybe everyone would be on board, both cat and dogs owners
- Free ride home if picked up at large by animal control, once per year, per animal. I don't use the discount card thing, it's not easy to use. Some other form of reward or discount.
- Actually nothing if your pet has a chip it would be helpful other than that it's a cash grab
- If the pet is lost, then the city should know who they belong to quickly.
- Reunification if lost, part of being a member of a responsible society
- To be allowed to let their cat roam free



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't think responsible owners who continue to license animals should have to continue to pay for those that are irresponsible and not licensing. Giving a free license doesn't solve the problem
- My being fined for bylaw picking up a lost dog that has a current licence.
- Shouldn't have massive fees for retrieving lost animals
- No more than we already get
- Reunification information release (allow City to release phone number to veterinary offices if pets dropped off), license renewal reminder, information on pet ownership in the city
- Pound
- Off leash dog areas
- There are no benefits
- More Pet friendly spaces. More advocacy for pets in public places including apartments condos etc. Educational material about the benefits of pet ownership.
- Waived fees associated with lost pets
- If pet gets lost they can be quickly connected with family
- Help to get the pet home if it's ever lost.
- One time forgiveness fee at shelter if pet accidentally gets out and lost. 24 hour grace period in shelter without penalty and 48 hour reduced penalty.
- Decreased reunification cost!
- The ability to share information on your pet quickly and effectively
- Reunification and bylaw enforcement
- Returning the pet if found, or at min a phone call from bylaw if the animal is picked up. Clean off leash parks and more dog friendly areas.
- Responsible thing to do.. and if pet is lost then you can find owner.. but all pets should be chipped.. maybe discount on license if pet is chipped.
- When pet owners license their pets they should receive a break down of where the money is used within the city programs.
- Maybe like a discount card for certain pet stores or services would be cool
- None. They should do it because they are supposed to.
- - A tag that isn't heavy considering some dogs are small
- - Reuniting with pet if returned
- Reunited with a lost pet. Notification if the pet has been found dead. That the fees are helping to provide useful services towards pet ownership.
- Perhaps a credit on account for good standing owners. Or more widespread knowledge on where those monies go.
- Most importantly, reunification. Secondly, knowing their pets are in good, caring, safe hands while with Animal Services. Also, knowing that they're helping to support the ongoing care, treatment, rehabilitation, and rehoming of stray, abandoned, and abused animals.
- Education courses on what responsible pet ownership means. Animals are living creatures, they are not disposable material objects.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- reunification possibility is the big one
- Definitely be able to identify owners to ensure lost pets are returned. Perhaps some kind of training/information opportunities.
- Assistance in finding pet if lost.
- A nice tag with name/phone number. Some type of perks or something back. Like a gift certificate to petsmart?
- Finding the owners(s)
- Access to exclusive off leash areas
- Community discounts
- Contacted when dog is lost, perhaps information sessions to be a better dog owner and training opportunities
- Don't know what we get now so that needs to be public.
- Funds should be used to run animal services, but animal services should be no-kill. Funds should not be used for any other city services.
- Access to behavior classes, community support if your pet goes missing, discounts/credentials with pet stores/services (kennels, dog-walking, etc)
- Reunion when lost.
- Reuniting. Problem solving by by-law.
- There is a possibility that pet owners could benefit from licensing pets?
- lost pet tracking, to be reunited with their pet should it be found
- education on where they can and cannot take their pet
- Promotions or discounts to city events/areas with proof of license
- Better quality tags and free replacement after 5 yrs as dogs just wears to unreadable unless covered.
- Return of animal if lost
- Not sure, all my pets are Microchipped. Maybe a goodie bag of pet friendly things?
- besides reunification if lost? can't think of anymore. Maybe much higher fines for those caught not licensing.
- Returning lost cats to owners
- Main benefit for me would be that if my licensed pet were lost/found it could be returned to me.
- Information about bylaws and off leash dog parks/areas.
- None, and I'm a pet owner.
- Could there be some discount with vets on spay and neutering?
Could there be some discount with yearly vets visits?
- safe pet returned to owners if pet gets lost, etc.
- I assume they get called if lost pet is found, not sure what other benefit, discount on vaccines would be good.
- reconnecting owners with lost pets
- lower fines if they do get out / escape and don't have multiple "on the loose" records.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Reunification or rescue when needed
- Obviously, reunification with lost pet although, given that this can be done via microchipping registration, there should be other benefits, perhaps a personalized cost tag for dogs, pet health insurance... pet store discount? Just thoughts...
- Re-unification.
Their animals are not killed by Animal Services.
- With databases and ear tags officets could issue a notice that fido or kitty is out before they get to the pound and a big fat expense. Fines don't seem to ensure compliance.
- As above, reuniting with a lost pet.
- If your pet is registered with the City of Calgary you have a profound likelihood of having your pet returned to you I am not a fan of nor do I endorse exotic animals as pets sugar gliders monkeys I do not feel that they should be allowed
- Re uniting if lost and respect
- There is no benefit to me as a pet owner to license my pet so it is not a priority
- Free admission to things like the Pet Expo. Coupons for pet supplies.
- re-unification.
- Attempts a reunification if the pet is found
not getting fined for having an unlicensed pet
- Perhaps partner up with pet stores for a discount with proof of license.
- Lost pets returned. Free poop bags at dog parks even though some people abuse the system.
- Increases the likelihood of finding a lost pet
- I think owners should be contacted when their pet is brought in to the pound or humane society.
- maintaining off-leash parks, enforcing rules/regulations...
- Finding their pet. Control of dogs and number of dogs
- Just re-unification. It is us taxpayers without pets who subsidize the dog parks, etc. It is not the dog and cat owners they don't contribute I am guessing but a drop in a bucket.
- Waste bins on paths (ie Nose Hill where there are only two, both of which are essentially on the same path).
Being contacted if the city picks up your pet.
Input on changes and spending on parks
- Reliable way to ensure return
- Maybe a discount ?? Or if the pet gets out we don't get charged an impound fee
- Found pets should returned to their owners if they have been lost. A fee should be in place if the pet needs to be boarded until the owners are contacted
- I believe it shouldn't be as expensive as it is to have my dog registered. If they do get lost and found you have to pay fines/ retrieve the dog anyways. The OPTION of multi year would be nice for convenience.
- Financial incentive at local vets for yearly vaccinations and neutering / spaying of animals.
- Information on healthy pet ownership. Contact from the City when a lost pet has been located.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Peace of mind their animal will be reunited to them. A strong animal bylaw team who provide support to the city when there are concerns or animals at large
- It pays for animal/dog related services and park space. Primarily, identify the dog if lost.
- Coupons or discounts on food products/pet supplies (may encourage more licensing), fast reunification with owners, high communication with other cities/provinces for cats/dogs reunification
- Perhaps a discount on their property tax - the cost of licensing one animal. If multi-animal home, still only one as we can't expect the city to pick up the cost of every animal.
- Maybe some fun promotions like on the spot gifts or treats when a bylaw officer spots a licensed animal at a park?
- Can you please make smaller tags for small dogs? Our license tags are too big and heavy for our 6lb dogs so they can't wear them.
- I don't see any benefit in it.. unless my pet is lost but most cases go to the vet instead of impound and the amount to ask to get them out is ridiculous !! sometimes pets get out as an accident and people should not be penalized for that.
- a lot more than the above excuse.
- Reunion of lost pets to owners is huge. Finding programs for low income owners to have their animal spayed or neutered is huge. It's important that unsterilized animals are more expensive to register to encourage sterilization.
- A very good re-unification process. (Even if the pet is found and has died)
- The benefit of licencing their pet is that in the event the animal gets out and about they can be reunited with their owners. Other benefits of ownership is that they are contributing to the cost of capture, removal and clean up of others.
- Fund pet reunification and adoption services. Bylaw enforcement
- A discount for vet services/daycare/grooming.
- None, licensing is not practical. All my dogs have chips implanted to assist in reunification.
- In the instance of cats, the expectation would be to provide funding for spay/neuter tattoo animals. Responsible owners that do this usually have no problem with re-unification. But without having the animal fixed they do not get tattoo's or microchipping. Vets are far to expensive
- If your dog is not picked up by city you should get a discount
- Unsure....
 - Lists of pet resources?
 - Vet clinics
 - Holistic vet clinics
 - Emergency vet clinics
 - Pet friendly stores
 - Pet friendly patios
 - Pet friendly events
- Not much except that if the animal is lost, the city can return it to it's owner. If you have a name tag and a telephone # on your dog, that would serve the same purpose.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Assistance with reunification
- There used to be a discount card that you got with participating pet stores. That was nice.
- It should be a reduced one time fee with online access to update contact information and addresses.
- Help in reuniting pet if lost.
- Quick reuniting if lost
- Prompt reunification if lost. No cost in retrieval of a lost pet.
- licensing my pet should ensure that they are returned to me if ever lost
- Most importantly the ability to reunite with my pet should they become lost. I use city dog parks frequently and don't mind paying licensing fees to the city as some funds may go back in to maintaining this
- We have many great social media groups that help reunite pets with owners. So other perks or advantages would help people register, like discounts on vet trips
- Nothing but the piece of mind if pet lost you will be reunited
- Helps reunite pets with owners. Even better if that money stays in animal control to help officers help animals.
- Discounts throughout the city
- Maybe a discount on yearly vaccinations could be offered? For new / early licencees could get discounts or gifts from pet stores to help gain all the supplies they need to start out.
- None aside from re-unification
- Lenience/no fines if picked up at large by city. Escape artists exist.
- Trust that they're animals will be returned quickly and taken well care of when in care of the city.
- I have yet to experience any benefits of licensing my pet. And if he became lost he is also microchipped.
- discount at local stores
- Animal bylaw services
- The free return of the animal if found at large
- The assurance that if your pet is lost it will find it's way back to you using licensing to get in touch.
- From my understanding the only benefit is the return to home if lost. More benefits would be ideal, convenience organization of documentation for example i.e. allergy's, behaviour, vet visits/up to date shots etc etc.
- in some city, the city put at disposition poop bags for pet owners.
cats should be able to go out if they are licensed and wear their tag
- Lower costs
- Im quite happy to get my dog back. Ive had two dogs returned to me multiple times over the last decade thanks to their licenses.
I havent given it much more thought.
- Pets returned to them.
- They receive nothing now. And I don't see that changing. The city collects the money and really nothing is done for the pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Impound fees should be reduced, they should not make it as difficult as they do to reclaim

- Confidence in being reunited with pet
- free new license tag each renewal, and documentation mailed. I think it would be a good idea to provide a discount or reward to owners every year they renew their pet(s) licence.
- Discounts at vet clinics and pet stores
- Ease of re-unification when lost. Discounts in Calgary pet stores.
- A frequently updated website of lost pets with their licence # would be helpful for people and give them incentive to register their pet. If you lose your pet, there is no website where multiple vet clinics and facilities could update the whereabouts of the animal.
- To be reunited if the pet is lost
- Highlight what they are paying for. More than just if their pet is lost, as many rely on microchips alone and think that is sufficient
- The benefit of having their pet returned to them should they have tags.
- Any benefit would be nice, there really isn't any benefit at all right now. Maybe partnering with some vets for a discounted vet bill...
- Reunification is the big one. Perhaps an idea would be if a stray is picked up and they are licensed, they do not have to pay a penalty to get their animal back. I lived in BC and there were officers walking around parks ticketing unlicensed dogs. That is both a revenue earner but also incentive.
- I really don't see why there needs to be a fee associated with licensing your pets, if they are already regularly seen by vets and are microchipped.
- knowing that if their animal is lost... that they can be located.
- No benefit per se, but a better feeling that the money is being used to support animal-related (or other social) causes.
- Fast, easy identification of animals if their pet goes missing.
- I think pet owners are unaware of the benefits they already get.
- A warning if their pet is running at large, not an immediate fine
- Free tattoos or microchips. The tags are easily lost.
- Cheaper vet visits
- Finding their lost pet
- If I could get a multi year license for my dog it would prevent me from forgetting to license her. And a promo/ad reminding people that pets in the city need licenses.
- That if city finds their animal it will be returned to them.
Otherwise nothing.
- Access to parks
- How are the monies applied, currently? Could we not put small posts along pathways in neighborhoods full of doggy bags, for example? Could we apply some of the funds to assist lower income families to attend dog training classes? Could we apply funds to supply lower income families with pet food?
- I am not sure what benefit licensing provides; it seems like a pet tax.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Making it easier to trace the owners if they stray is the direct benefit. The more indirect benefit is funding animal services to ensure that stray and abandoned animals are cared for and to provide low-cost spay and neuter clinics to avoid pet overpopulation.
- Animal services (shelter and programs currently existing), but I also expect to deal with reasonable bylaw officers. There really has been some power tripping on their behalf lately. Common sense used to reign but since Bill Bruce left the city's animal services are falling back into the dark ages.
- Pet owners should have the benefit of knowing that if they've registered their animal [one time] that it is saved in a database that can be accessed at any time in the event of a pet and owner being separated.
- Not sure...?
- Multi pet discount. Benefits to licensed animals.
- I believe it's an outdated money grab. The license should have my info not the city's.
- That their pet would be returned back to them should it become lost (provided the owner keeps their information up to date).
- Discount of multiple year licensing
- Re-unification with owner and pet.
It provides a way to contact owners with info, such as outbreaks, immunizations, etc.
- Neighbourhood parks and paths should have poop bags available in dispensers along with trash bins. Annual updates on numbers and breeds of licensed pets in YYC neighborhoods, discounts at pet stores & vets and more available off leash parks in outer communities.
- I believe they should get a benefit such as pay for licensing for 3 years and the 4th year is free. Or, something like that.
- Basically what I said above. Plus knowing your pet has another form of ID etc.
- Discounts at city-approved Vets of licensed, incentives regarding pet supplies, perhaps a way to combine licensing and microchipping services.
- Maybe subsidized vet care or incentive. I know it's unlikely but I think it would have to be a big return.
- More pet friendly spaces in the city. Fenced in off leash parks.
- I think that re-unification and identification in case of issues should be enough of an expectation of licensing. Perhaps if there were discounts for pet related services/stores (similar to the AMA membership model) that could be interesting
- Discounts on vet visits or some sort of insurance for vet emergencies
- It's simply a tax. I've always licensed my dogs, but there's no benefit to it. My dogs are micro-chipped, so if I ever lost one (which has never happen in over 30 years of ownership), I'd go to the pound, pay my fine and get it back.
- Dog parks. I see no advantage for cats. Reunification with owner if lost I guess.
- knowing that if a pet gets out for any reason and is fixed microchip and licensed the owner will be contacted and given lenience for first time occurrence.
- A quicker rehoming of their pet.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Reunite when pet gets lost.
- A quick return of the pet when lost
- Get contacted if their pet is found, perhaps know funds are used to help other pets.
- Off leash parks, list and found.
- Immediate contact from shelters if pets ever turn up there, free or discounted training/obedience classes
- More free training
- I would expect the city to protect the animals licensed with them, as opposed to threats of removal or death, if the animal is found outside of the home by accident. I also expect the city to use the proper information on the license to reunite the proper owner with the animal.
- No license...no off leash dog parks
- Reuniting with lost pets. To be honest, I don't expect any benefits from \$30 per year as I'm confident the money is well used for animal services
- If they happen to get out, you can get your pet back
- FREE reunification.
- That the city's main goal is for re-unification. For those who aren't re-unified, that the city develop relationships and work with local rescues to transfer pets to appropriate rescues who may be able to give them more dedicated attention.
- Courtesy call if animal is picked up by animal services rather than going straight to the pound?
- Free ride home or discount on impound fees of animal is impounded
- - dog recognition if they ever get lost
- promotes responsible pet ownership
- Safe return home
- Incentives at vet offices. Lower ticket fees from bylaw officers
- Giving their pet a chance to be found/ re-united if lost should be enough. Maybe be able to claim cost in income tax.
- Finding lost animals.
- Discounts for: food, training, percentage off if continue to license every five (?) years, grooming, kennelling, etc. Owning a pet is expensive. Good discounts would definitely encourage pet owners!
- If your pet is missing more time is allotted to claim your pet before adopted out
reward points/ system, coupons, for specific stores, automatic notification to social media to main locations for lost pets that automatically links your licence to owners contact linking pet to owners
- The animal being brought back to the owner. I should be able to type into your website, the number allocated and get a phone number or email to contact the person rather than having them dropped at the shelter. BYlaw picks up an animal CALL THE OWNER! You do this for profit.
- I am sick of people using the Tuscani playing field as the "go to" place to walk dogs, dogs relieving themselves exactly where children play their sports, play in playground, people using grass for sitting, etc. Totally against Dog Bylaws. No one will address. Probably same across city.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No fines when picking up your animal or Immediate return to your home even when the pet has no tag on. More option to tell a person who found a pet where it lives. Many owners dont keep a collar on at home for whatever reason and having the pet wear the tag seems outdated. A chip should suffice.
- quick return of the animal. assistance in finding their animal. educational info session with helpful take home information possibly breed specific - how to be a good neighbor - expectations of caring for the pet - support if they have an animal displaying behavior issues.
- reunification, special access to events (host pet days at certain places/fairs), discounts on pet foods & products during the first months the person has the pet, real acknowledgement from City when someone calls to say their pet has died and won't be renewing license
- I had to look up what my payed license does. Currently it is to ensure if separated the animal can be returned to owner; covers costs associated. Honestly, the fee for one seems fair. But, I could see how if you had a couple animals it adds up. Maybe a group discount option scale/owner if more pets?
- I don't think a benefit further to knowing that if your dog is lost, your chances of being reunited are raised exponentially by having the animal registered with the city. I think we also get a discount card currently with the registration, but I've never personally used it.
- Dedicated dog parks that aren't just dusty hills with tall grass. This is addition to Fire Response awareness of pets in your registered address would be a good idea. The city should be able to use the licensing information to let Fire response know there are pet occupants as well.
- I think that the pet needs to be kept safe if they are picked up by your Officers.As well, pet owners should expect proper discretion with Officers. Eg, if someone's had 15 years of no fines, paid licenses, and the dog rain out the front door from lightning scare there should be discretion not fine
- I feel that owners should have peace of mind knowing that should their dog/cat be found that they will be returned without worry of fines (1st & 2nd offence), they should be able to get discounts with city businesses such as dogwalkers, trainers, pet stores, But this should benefit everyone involved
- Access to off-leash areas should be controlled via your MyPet app (or card) and you should have to scan in. 1 card per pet.
If your pet is not registered then you don't get access! That way the city also knows which owner and dog is in each park at any given time (if a problem is reported)
- Support for pet owners, as mentioned, if the dog is lost. Also assist with advice and guidance for responsible pet ownership, that means provide assistance and encouragement for animals to get proper training and socialization, and also help low income families as well.
- I think incentivizing vs. punishing is more appropriate. Also., offering free licensing for low income people. I like the idea that my licence \$ supports programs like spay/neuter programs, etc. Calgarians licence because it's normative, so explaining the benefits, and that everyone does it!
- Transparency of where fees go
 - won't walk in off-leash
 - no benefit/improvements in off-leash parks
 - knowing dog would be returned is a benefit



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- * off-leash - rent a private field to run dogs
- - Multiyears, discounts on multi-year
 - Discounts
 - Life license
 - Grandfathered after 10 years
 - If you license for 10 years -> free license for the rest of your life
 - 311 - without licensing, there would be no dept. call to complain
 - offleash = too dangerous
 - pets returned
 - enforcement, no control owners
 - free drive-home for first offence
- If something happens you can get your animal back
- - If pet gets lost easily found
- The animal being brought back to the owner. I should be able to type into your website, the number allocated and get a phone number or email to contact the person rather than having them dropped at the shelter. BYlaw picks up an animal CALL THE OWNER! You do this for profit.
- I am sick of people using the Tuscan playing field as the "go to" place to walk dogs, dogs relieving themselves exactly where children play their sports, play in playground, people using grass for sitting, etc. Totally against Dog Bylaws. No one will address. Probably same across city.
- No fines when picking up your animal or Immediate return to your home even when the pet has no tag on. More option to tell a person who found a pet where it lives. Many owners dont keep a collar on at home for whatever reason and having the pet wear the tag seems outdated. A chip should suffice.
- quick return of the animal. assistance in finding their animal. educational info session with helpful take home information possibly breed specific - how to be a good neighbor - expectations of caring for the pet - support if they have an animal displaying behavior issues.
- reunification, special access to events (host pet days at certain places/fairs), discounts on pet foods & products during the first months the person has the pet, real acknowledgement from City when someone calls to say their pet has died and won't be renewing license
- I had to look up what my payed license does. Currently it is to ensure if separated the animal can be returned to owner; covers costs associated. Honestly, the fee for one seems fair. But, I could see how if you had a couple animals it adds up. Maybe a group discount option scale/owner if more pets?
- I don't think a benefit further to knowing that if your dog is lost, your chances of being reunited are raised exponentially by having the animal registered with the city. I think we also get a discount card currently with the registration, but I've never personally used it.
- Dedicated dog parks that aren't just dusty hills with tall grass. This is addition to Fire Response awareness of pets in your registered address would be a good idea. The city should be able to use the licensing information to let Fire response know there are pet occupants as well.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think that the pet needs to be kept safe if they are picked up by your Officers. As well, pet owners should expect proper discretion with Officers. Eg, if someone's had 15 years of no fines, paid licenses, and the dog ran out the front door from lightning scare there should be discretion not fine
- I feel that owners should have peace of mind knowing that should their dog/cat be found that they will be returned without worry of fines (1st & 2nd offence), they should be able to get discounts with city businesses such as dogwalkers, trainers, pet stores, But this should benefit everyone involved
- Access to off-leash areas should be controlled via your MyPet app (or card) and you should have to scan in. 1 card per pet.
If your pet is not registered then you don't get access! That way the city also knows which owner and dog is in each park at any given time (if a problem is reported)
- Support for pet owners, as mentioned, if the dog is lost. Also assist with advice and guidance for responsible pet ownership, that means provide assistance and encouragement for animals to get proper training and socialization, and also help low income families as well.
- I think incentivizing vs. punishing is more appropriate. Also., offering free licensing for low income people. I like the idea that my licence \$ supports programs like spay/neuter programs, etc. Calgarians licence because it's normative, so explaining the benefits, and that everyone does it!
- If they are lost and found then the owner should be called before impounding the animal
- Of course the main reason to have them licensed is for the city's lost & found services, but having some sort of incentive to get it done, rather than pushing the fact you will get fined if caught without a license. Maybe something like "a free 1-hour behavior training class" thru the city.
- A certificate or maybe a free leash or something.
- To have their pets returned
- Support for pet owners. Today if someone complains about a pet, immediately the pet owner is treated like a criminal.
- Do you informed if your cat or dog has been picked up by the humane Society or the Calgary animal services division. No fee if your dog or cat is picked up
- I think it is the dogs and cats that benefit most from licensing.
- Nothing. If an animal has a tattoo or chip those do not fall off like a tag can or be removed if the dog is stolen
- Being able to unite with a lost pet is enough of a benefit for me. Also, not having a penalty if the animal gets out and is captured by the city. Sometimes animals get out. Maybe first offence should be free (not sure if there is a fine now, but I think there is).
- Lost pet gets returned to owner
- Discount on immunization
- Ability to add name/personal contact to tag, no fee for reunification of pet is lost/picked up (maybe once or twice in the life of the pet. Discount for early/on-time renewal.
- Reunited if lost
- free no fine stay at impound if a licensed animal is picked up. had a licensed dog got out and picked up. checked pound right away and were told they weren't there but when we checked back 3



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

days later he was there and we had to pay for 3 days stay regardless, they said he was picked up after hours

- Animal tags to have on their collars, ease in finding a lost pet, the ability to be the only person (the owner) who has the ability to sell or remove a pet from the home (not the owner's father or sibling)
- There are many other services offering identification for lost pet at much lower cost (medal with phone number and owner database)
- Re-unification of a lost pet. Tracking of potential future disease outbreaks. Statistics are valuable to the city for policy decisions.
- To be unified with their pet ASAP and be rest assured that their animal will not be harmed
- Locating lost pets!
 - - increased rate of return of lost pets
- Peace of mind
 - Knowing they'll be returned if lost
- Special pricing at pet stores or vets would be motivating if it could be worked out. Definitely help in finding lost pets, such as lost pet posters that can be easily customized.
- They are easily reunited with their animal that has been lost; proof of ownership
- The city needs a more aggressive approach to spay & neutering cats to reduce their overpopulation, rather than send bylaw officers to pick up strays who would then be doomed.
- Help for a lost pet.
- that their pet is returned to them, however in the case of cats some people just open the door and let them go when they get tired of them.
- Discounts at certain stores or products as an incentive
- Pet recovery and access to improved dog parks that are created from the licensing costs. A pet license should be both the pet's and owner's ticket to fun dog parks that are well maintained and programmed. What would be amazing is an indoor dog park operated by the city for when temperatures plunge
- Reunification if separated. Is there any way to do GPS tracking? Maybe there is a discount through local pet stores to incentivize people?
- Proof of ownership, assurance of return.
- Services and community for us and our dogs. Calgary has most of it but has completely missed the boat on safe parks for everyone. Nothing here if you aren't able bodied and can't walk far. Nothing here if you want safe fully fenced areas for small dogs to play/run.
- as they are now.
- Return of their pet.
- Prompt reunification.
- No penalty for first one or two captures/recoveries
- In my opinion there are no benefits at all.
- Additional information regarding low-income spay/neuter and vaccination programs.
- Proof of ownership; assurance of return if stray and picked up by City (for dogs only) and found



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stray animal roundup and reunification with owners.
- The ability to re-unite with their pet, otherwise, I am not sure. There is the ability to dispose of litter and fecal matter.
- Use the licensing fees to help with the funding of human society -- let them know this, and even perhaps rescue organisations. In addition, try working with businesses like Starbucks, Tims, independent pet stores to give a coupon for purchases.
- Uniquely the privilege of owning a pet. What benefits should I get from licensing my car? None, except that I may use my car.
- Maybe a subsidized / free health check up for their pet.
- The benefit of re-unification if they are accidentally separated from their pets. Assistance at home in the case of a fire. The inability for a thief to license a stolen animal, and therefore creating a deterrent.
- - Reunification Support
- - Municipal Support for Stray & Unwanted Rescue Services For Licensed Species
- - Plebiscites & townhalls for licensees to vote on how those fees are being collected and utilized.
- - Small Business Grants for ethical, animal-oriented businesses to increase pet care and wellbeing
- The ability to get your pet back if its lost seems like the biggest benefit.

What other pets should be licensed, why?

- In the UK, many keep Rabbits. Apart from that, no wild animals need to be kept as pets
- Any urban livestock if that becomes a thing. As well as birds, rabbits, anything bigger than a fish and that could get lost.
- Birds, they can literally fly out a window and into the world at large.
- I believe that it should be up to the owner if they want to license their pet. If an animal is outdoors on a regular basis, it would be valuable.
- Personally, I don't think cats should be licensed. Where the heck are you planning to put them?! Don't do it. This is a TERRIBLE idea.
- Any urban livestock should require similar licensing.
- Bunnys! people are letting them loose and it would be nice to fine the people who think its okay to let domesticated bunnies out.
- Any that access public spaces. Most others only impact the personal property of the owners.
- all pets
- Any pet that leaves the owners property
- no thoughts
- Any pet that does or can leave the home.
- Anything that has the potential to be dangerous or multiply quickly. Also exotic animals.
- All Reptiles (because irresponsible ownership leads to them being abandoned in apartment building and multi-family housing).
- I genuinely believe you need to do away with the licensing scheme as it is and do it based on animal microchips instead, so no other animals need to be included.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think any pet that is going to be exposed to the public (outside of it's owners private property) should require a license.
- any animal that is kept as a pet
- I would assume it helps the animals get back to me quicker but in my experience, This is not true.
- none, most other animals are indoors only and aren't anyone else's business.
- All pets that go outside, or potentially go outside so if there is an issue, there is a record of an animal in a household.
- Any pet that goes outside should be licensed, in case it strays. A pet that stays 100% inside, such as a guinea pig or a lizard, should not require a license.
- Pot belly pigs should be considered pets and licensed.
- Large birds potentially. Reptiles and rodents, since if they escape they can become significant invasive species.
- Pigs, chickens and any emotional pet.
- Any type of support animal
- Pot belly pigs, birds, fancy rats.
- Any pets that are treated in the same way as a cat or dog. So, for example, if they take their pet for a walk it should be licensed.
- I think If they're exotic-domesticated, they should also be licensed. And if a person has a support animal such as a pony, pig of monkey, these should also be licensed.
- Only dogs should be licensed. Licencing animals like gerbils and hamsters and snakes is nothing but a cash grab as these animals do not access any public areas. Charging proper fines to by-law violaters should be your revenue stream, escalating fines for frequent violators based on owner not pet
- Service animals. This allows them to be identified and returned if lost.
- Less red tape - 1 lifetime fee for a pet
- Any pet that has the potential to leave their home (escaped or walked) should require licences.
- Focus on dogs and cats being registered and strengthening this program, then maybe in the future consider expanding to other animals that may go out and interact with public (e.g. rabbits, birds, ferrets) depending on the numbers
- All pets that can be let outside a dwelling, not limited to but including birds of all types, and rabbits. Especially rabbits holy crap so many of those are set free without a tattoo or a chip and then they ruin the ecosystem.
- There seems to be a large amount of abandoned pet rabbits - any pet should be licensed. Reptiles/snakes etc should also be licensed. Birds too. Responsible pet owners will be ok with this.
- Any animals that go outside
- Exotics like snakes, reptiles, spiders. Anything that if it escapes, could potentially cause harm.
- Any that can be out in public
- I don't think our system sees waste or damage re-enter the environment like that of cats and dogs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If cats need to be licensed so should every other house pet. There really isn't a difference if the cat owner is responsible and keeps their cat inside.
- Any animal that may be walked outside.
- All animals, to track any issues that may arise. Excluding smaller pets that would never be released in the wild like fish, hamsters, and reptiles. Including rabbits though.
- All pets should be licensed. All pets need to be visually identifiable as having been licensed while on public property.
- Not really any come to mind.
- With urban agriculture becoming more common, I do wonder if those animals should be licensed.
- Neither - listed above.
- I have no thought on this
- I think dogs yes. I think Cats is a little much, I think if a cat is an escape artist or an outdoor cat yes but in Veterinary medicine it is made very clear to owners that the best thing you can do for your cat is keep them inside. So to even add on another animal would be looked at as a cash grab!!
- maybe birds. if they fly away from home.
- Large reptiles, such as boas, tegus, iguanas, and pythons. Should go by weight not length of animal. It discourages irresponsible owners from getting animals they cannot handle.
- Any that could run away..
- Chickens, livestock, snakes, larger birds...
- Any other pets that can survive outside the home for long periods without human intervention. E.g. rabbits.
- Ferrets as they can escape and are quite ferocious. Rats as they are controlled in Alberta. Poisonous snakes, in case they escape.
- Any other large animals
- Potentially rabbits. We have a lot of domestic rabbits dumped in our neighbourhood and it would give you an idea of who has done this.
- And animal that leaves the door of the owners residence should have a license.
- I
- If it is an animal that could/will be outside your home then it should be licensed because there is a change it will interact with the public. For example... fish in an aquarium - no; pot bellied pigs - yes
- Ferrets, snakes and other large reptiles
- Both
- Any pet that will be unsupervised outside/in a yard by it's owner at any time.
- small companion animals - no unless breeding for sale
chickens - only if more than 4-5 per household
larger animals - yes
- Any animal that leaves the property, unless they are microchipped/tattooed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't think that a city should have the right to say you must license your pet. It's as simple as if you didn't license your pet you don't have to options to get the city to help you find them. That's a risk that should be a choice not a demand.
- any animal used as a pet within the confines of city living should be licensed and chipped..it wouldn't hurt for acreage or large land owners on the edge of city limits to do the same...
- Any pets that go outside should be 100%. And licencing should be on condition of education about that specific animal's needs to be healthy. Might be 10 hours for some, like livestock. Might be 10 minutes for a hamster. Two hours for cats, three for dogs.
- Pigs, if pets should be licensed.
- Only vicious animals on a case-by-case basis. AKA, if an owner had a vicious python snake.
- I sound like a broke record but every animal should have a microchip including birds.
- no, if pets are not allowed to leave the residence then why should they be licenced?
- Well you could say any animal only to ensure it is receiving the proper care and treatment. Also to prevent hoarding issues.
- Rabbits because they're often released
- I had a dog licence and the court issued Warrants for my arrest.I have spent seven days in jail because they said I didn't have a dog licence.I will win in court but is this really you what you want to put people in jail for bylaw issues?I have never had a issue in my life but this is what out world
- Any animal that is outdoors, and can potentially escape from his/her pen/cage, should be licensed. If you have pigeons, they should be licensed with a leg band.
- Horses, birds and domestic pot belly pigs. All of these would create records to encourage responsibility, adequate care, follow up if needed, reunification, and succession planning since these animals have long life spans
- All pets, for the same reasons - reunification, reduce strays and unwanted breeding. Also provides valuable data to policy makers.
- I think almost any "pet" should be licensed since there is a licensing schema. If people want an animal, livestock, domestic pets or otherwise, it should be all of them.
- NONE, you need to actual deal with the cat licenses before you more to other animals. Animal services does need to deal with the feral rabbit population in this city before it becomes a major problem like Canmore had.
- Any animal larger than a large dog should be licensed, for the health and safety of the animal and those around it. So a miniature horse, goat, pot-bellied pig, wallaby, deer, or any other legal pet in Canada that would be as big as a large dog or have potential to cause physical harm.
- None, the other pets are kept indoors and do not cost the city anything to clean up after them, which does not happen either
- Any that may reasonably leave house, intentionally or not.
- Cats/dogs are allowed (by those who don't abide by the rules) to roam free as they know the way back home. Other pets do not/so are for the most part always cont'd in cages. I think to lic other pets



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

would be a greedy money grab by the city. Or perhaps a good way to allow other types of pet to exist

- I think only outdoor animals should be licensed. All indoor pets should be exempt. Cats generally have a microchip when getting fixed, this tracks them if they are lost for some reason, therefore the licensing of indoor cats seems more as an extra cost that is really not necessary.
- For the life of me I can't imagine licensing a bird or fish LOL. But in the case of an urban farm animal that I think the city has a right to ask for a specific permit in order to have those animals in the backyard
- I believe any pet that may leave an owners private residence, by any means - going for a walk, riding in a car, escaping the residence etc should be licensed.
- Dogs only
- Every urban pet should be licensed so taxpayers aren't footing the bill for enforcement.
- Dogs and cats are all
- I don't believe that other pets should be licensed. Indoor cats shouldn't need to be licenced either.
- Any other animal, besides dog and cat, that is consider an emotional support animal.
- Only one's that may encounter people.
- Birds(ie-pigeons,etc) that are allowed to fly freely at times of day. Bees & all livestock in urban setting as all have opportunities to escape, get lost , hurt public if there is NOT responsible human ownership and ACCOUNTABILITY must be present
- I really only think licenses are needed for animals who are inclined to be off of the property.
- Cats and dogs are the most likely to be found on the street so that is the primary concern in my opinion.
- Any animal that is kept as a domestic pet should be licensed. Ie rabbit, hamster,parrot, etc.
- Nope.
- Cats shouldn't be. Most dogs should be. Livestock if we're ever allowed should be of some kind
- All pets that can cause harm to people or destroy property
- If dogs and cats are required to be licensed, then other pets should be as well - rabbits, chinchillas, snakes, reptiles, birds - all others. If the reasoning is that dogs and cats need to be registered for return, then the same reason applies to other pets
- Even it is possible animal control may be involved
- Any pet that is outside or could get lost.
- Rabbits they are inside and outtside animals like cats and dogs. They can escape as well.
- All pets where owners might have an expectation of public monitoring /return if lost should be licensed
- All animals should be licensed as city provided services may be needed in case of emergencies
- I believe any pet that is able to get out of the home should be licensed.
- I don't think that any other animals need be licensed
- Urban farm animals, bee hives. If pigeons, leg tags. Statistical info for policy and future plans. How many dogs, cats, bees, chickens can a city have? The number shouldn't determined by random.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Cannot think of any other pet that needs to be.
- Livestock should be for sure if able to have within city limits
- All animals need to be licensed
- Pet pigs.
- Large snakes
- All should be licences
- dogs and cats should be licensed if they are not micro-chipped, this way in case one goes missing there is a way to return the animal to its owner. Not all dogs and cats where their license tag all the time, so most people see buying a license for their dog as not beneficial
- I think all pets should be licensed ... if you do one group do them all
- Anything outdoors that may be a nuance to neighbors (smell, noise) or attract predators. Chickens should be licensed.
- Any pet that can run at large should be licenced to show who it's owner is and what the owner's city address is should the animal create a problem or become lost.
- not sure about that
- None, dogs and cats only.
- I think chickens should be allowed in Calgary and they should be licensed.
- No others as some of it is just another tax
- Yes they should. If I am charged for my pets, all owners should pay for theirs
- Snakes.
- I would rather animals be tattooed/microchipped. Pet licenses are a money grab for the city with little benefit to the owner.
- Any service animal
- I think chickens/urban agriculture should at least be registered/licensed to comply with the number permitted to be owned.
- Rabbits. I've seen domestic rabbit loose and feel they should be treated same.
- Exotic/ venomous reptiles.
- Any pet that you allow in the urban centre with this new bylaw review should have to be licensed!!!!!!!
- Reptiles
- Anything that goes outside, ever.
- No other pets should be licensed
- Yes, all animals (other than gerbils, guinea pigs, rabbits) should be licensed
- ANY AND ALL ANIMALS SHOILD BE LICENSED.
- None really, since they aren't usually seen outside of the house.
- I'm not sure other pets go missing as often, and I see that as the biggest benefit.
- Parrots may benefit from licencing, for the reuniting aspects.
- I think it's fair to require licensing of any "domestic" animal over a certain size/weight but I'm unsure as to what that number should be.
- No other pets need to be licensed. Fees are killing us already.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Really? Now it's a cash grab. Let's remember my neutered, chipped, never ever been outside in his life cat, but I still buy a license each year.
 - None. No other pets needs to licensed. That would be over regulating.
 - Any sort of exotic animal, if that is still allowed.
 - Any animal that could possibly escape a household and get lost should be licenced
 - Therapy animals
 - Any exotic pet should be licenced which hopefully helps by law know if there is a poisonous snake for example in area. Farm animals are not pets and should not be in urban neighbourhoods.
 - Large snakes or reptiles
 - Cats and dogs are more likely to become "at large" so I can't think of other animals that would need to be licensed.
 - No, this is a cash grab and not enforceable
 - Live stock that could be within city limits
 - I only believe cats and dogs should be licensed
 - any animal should be licensed or tagged to help the city find the animal if lost or got out of a cage. fees should be a one-time thing.
 - A pet is a pet so should apply to all pets who leave the home owners land area ..
 - Any animal that would be taken out in a public setting or could be dangerous.
 - Any animal that could leave the house/enclosure.
 - None. Voluntary licensing could be an option, with very low fee.
 - All mamals
 - Possibly rabbits. There seems to be a large number of one-time domestic rabbits roaming streets and parking lots
 - Any animal living within city limits
 - Can't think of a reason someone would need a license for a bird or a guinea pig
 - Rabbits. It may help with people dumping them.
 - For the purposes of reuniting, any animal that is outdoors should be licensed
 - Licensing really is a waste
 - Any pet that could potentially escape should be licensed.
 - None
- What benefits are there besides a cash grab?
- All of them! [personal information removed] that experience gave me the raw insight into the importance of being able to locate and estimate numbers of animals living in our communities. I see that having tremendous value in planning and emergency management, big or small.
 - Depends if any other animal becomes as popular.
 - All animals should be licensed
 - Reptiles should be licensed
 - Anything that can escape and get loose. I have seen household rabbits running around the city from people letting them free etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- All pets must be licensed regardless what type they are. Even bees ..owner should license the colony as a whole.
- When and if they spend time outdoors, or if there is some opportunity for them to disrupt those around them (neighbours, etc) there needs to be a way to manage and control them somehow.
- Rabbits as there are many in our city and it is hard to know if they are pets or not.
- None of them should!
- Any that could interact with the public
- So called comfort animals but mostly all animals kept as pets should be licensed
- No as dog and cats are mostly the one needed to be licensed
- No pet should need a license!!
- It is absurd that the by-law permits emotional support livestock in the City; but is trying to justify limiting the # of dogs and cats. It is also inappropriate to use the term "handicapped" . The correct term is person with a disability
- I believe that birds should be licenced.
- Probably the agricultural ones, ie chickens and bees. Not individually, but obtain and maintain a license to have these things.
- If urban farms like chickens or goats come thru they should be. Also there should be a max on how many pets one home can own.
- None really.
- any animal that could interact with neighbours and the community, ferrets, pigeons, etc
- I don't think any other pet should be licensed.
- Licensing only really makes sense at the municipal level for pets expected to escape (and survive escape), or be a menace to the public. Probably should extend licensing, on a universal fee structure to any larger mammal (eg, rabbit/cat size plus - like pigs etc.). MAYBE birds, not sure about them
- Any exotic animal or reptile that could be a danger if it got out
- Any reptile over 10lbs
- If pigeons are allowed as pets they should also be licensed due to the high risk of loss.
- Domesticated rabbits....although most that are now feral where intentionally dumped. Some people quite literally don't care about the animals they are entrusted with. So I'm not sure it's licensing domesticated rabbits well help reduce the feral population.
- Yes. In case of emergency to evacuate pets like in the fort McMurray wildfire. Many animals were left behind and they didn't know how many until they went house to house. It will help to have all animals accounted for
- Larger reptiles, snakes
- Free deworming or free pest control in pets
- I don't agree with licensing because it's really just a 'we hope your animal gets out so we can fine you but we won't let you know we found him/her and then the fees will be hirer'. I think exotic animals like snakes or reptiles should be. It's in humane to have them period.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- As long as the fee is reasonable (poor people benefit from having pets too) but I don't think mice or gerbils and the like will be licenced as their lives are so short. Death by their owners means no humane death dealt. Euthanizing is also big \$\$\$ at vets. Lower those costs too!
- not really... other pets dont cause the same issues as free roaming cats and dogs.
- Any pet that can run away and an owner would want it return should have it licensed like bunnies, rats, lizards.
- It's ridiculous already, why make it worse
- Any animal that has the possibility of escaping.
- I don't think other pets should be licensed
I struggle to think cats should be licensed
- If urban livestock / bees / pigeons are allowed, they should also be licensed. How else do you know how many are in a neighbourhood & if challenges (too many, communicable disease) crops up, how do you track / get in touch with people?
- It is very obvious that these questions are geared toward licencing along with more rules being imposed on people being the only option the city is willing to look at. This is just sad; you should be ashamed of yourselves for thinking we are to stupid to see this.
- Any animal that is not contained in a small enclosure (tank, bird/rodent cage,etc.) should be licensed.
- If urban livestock are permitted, a reason able licensing fee would be a good idea to cover the administrative costs of such livestock and to help enforcement identify irresponsible owners.
- All pets should be licensed
- emotional support animals, they are also pets
- Spiders scorpions snakes lizards and fish exotic animals that can produce a bit more dangerous of issues such as misidentification of a type of spider and end up with a venomous animal that has not been defanged
- any animal that is allowed to be legally kept, traded or sold should be licensed. exotic animals can pose a hazard to others and are hard to rehome if given up
- All pets should be licensed and requires to have an identity chip.
- Any pet that has the ability to roam free.
- Any animal that could impact the surrounding community in any way should be licensed. Bylaw services are not free and all animal owners who may require their time should help cover the cost.
- Probably should be any pets/livestock so that the City knows what is happening in backyards.
- Chicken, rabbit, pigeon, rodent, reptile, bugs ownership annual ownership license ; so that the city can safeguard against over population, abuse or over crowding. Some people raise them for food consumption and regulating allows for health safety and environment inspections funding.
- Licensing quite honestly is a money grab off responsible owners. Irresponsible owners rarely license their pets yet they are 98% of the issue. While I do agree that licensing is required. Responsible owners should be rewarded by lower fees. This does not include mandatory spay and neuter.
- Any pet that could get free & lost should be licensed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think dogs and cats only.
- No others need to be licensed. Seems like too much oversight for a very minimal issue. The city doesn't need to know what pet each and every house might have. Too much intrusion.
- Any animal kept or except used outdoors such as an emotional support animal
- Any pet that may leave the confines of a dwelling.
- There should not be any other kinds of pets. Your bylaw officers have enough problems just dealing with dogs and cats. Don't make the problem bigger
- Remove licensing for cats. Instead make tattoo or chip technology the requisite.
- I don't think pets need to be licensed.
- RABBITS!!!! I am an animal lover and detest rabbit ownership because of the problem created by lousy animal stewardship. Look at Canmore.
- Any pets leaving a house must be licensed
- Any animal that leaves their yard at any time should be licensed.
- All pets need some sort of licence.
- If you decide to encourage urban "farms", owners and animals should be licensed. Fees should include covering the costs of cleanup should the city have to step in. Notice should be given to the neighbourhood prior to allowing setup so that they can protest.
- Any pet that goes outside should be licensed.
- Oh, I meant to say, no in tact male dogs allowed at off leash parks. It causes all sorts of issues and dog fights.
- I believe birds should be licensed, even if it's a one-time thing, because they are one of the pets that can travel far distances quickly, so are at higher risk of getting lost.
- I think the idea of licensing pets other than dogs is a huge waste of administration time and money for the city. Seriously, this city can't afford to keep bloating its budget on needless bylaws. What are you going to do - come into my house and see if my iguana has a license????!
- No. I don't think indoor cats should even be licensed.
- I don't really think other pets need to be licenced..
- Not sure of others.
- Emotional support animals, Any animal that may be outdoors.
- None besides cats and dogs
- cannot think of any typical pets
- If the pet is able to get outside, or could be lost outside, I think they should have to be licensed.
- Any animal that may wander out of its owner's control.
- Only animals that leave the house...
- ALL should be licensed so that owner is responsible for ANY required treatment
- That's great but who really enforces this law? I have Stray Cats in my yard all the time.
- All pets that are capable of mobility, i.e escaping their surroundings.
- Parrots and other exotic birds since they have a habit of escaping and are highly intelligent.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None. I think that dogs should be licensed since they are out and about more often, but cats should be indoors and as a result, not have to be licensed.
- any emotional support animal - they should also have to be certified by a veterinarian and undergo temperament testing if the owner is expecting to take them out in public everywhere. It's not a lot to ask that they can at least pass the Canadian Kennel Club's Good Neighbour test.
- Bunnies, with identity chips given than some consider releasing them okay.
- Other pets typically do not leave the house so do not see a reason for this. You aren't going to mandate a lizard wear a collar and tag... If pigs became allowed I would require this but I doubt that is in scope.
- Bunnies.
- If cats and dogs, it would make sense for other animals too. Though I can admit given the life expectancy of animals like mice or fish it would be a big inconvenience.
- All pets from dogs to pigs & chickens and whatever else in between should be licensed.
- Yes, licensing provides information on the pet population.
- Any pet that is to be on public property or have potential to escape off private property and onto public areas
- Pets that reside exclusively in the home should not need to be licensed.
- No..its a money grab
- Any domestic animal that leaves the home regularly should be licensed. To enable reunification and to hold owners accountable for the actions of their pets. Small animals (rodents, reptiles, fish, etc.) shouldn't need a license unless classified as "exotic"
- All animals who are considered pets and could end up way from their owners. Rabbits, birds, dogs, cats, etc
- Any domestic animals that regularly go off their own property should be licensed.
- Any that get outside for any reason. Maybe dangerous pets like reptiles or spiders.
- I think only animals that go outside need to be licensed.
- Anything that goes outside. Rabbits, man. On that note: how much headache would it save if animals could be licensed at the point of sale? Go to Petland, buy a rabbit (or dog or cat or whatever else can survive outside on its own), and the license is done at the till. Boom.
- I don't think that cats or dogs should be licensed either.
- I think of Licensing as a form of tax levied by the jurisdiction in which we reside. I think trying to extract money from owners to own other pets is ridiculous.. and another 'cash cow' idea for the jurisdiction to extract money from responsible owners!
- I don't think other pets should be licensed. I do feel you should have a license however to raise animals in the city. For example breeders should have to pay for a special license.
- Birds, as they do have the ability to escape
- Dogs should be licensed once and then forever in the system. Why have it annual? Its just a city money grab.
- Any animal reasonably capable of leaving their owner's residence.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Strictly in terms of dealing with a lost pet, any pet that you want to retrieve easily should it run off.
- Any animal that leaves your property and enters the community. Also, any dangerous reptiles (snakes, spiders, etc.) that could pose a serious hazard to the community if they leave your property.
- None. Dogs and cats can be a nuisance to neighbours. Other household pets should not be licensed.
- Rabbits. I see posts about domestic rabbits being found (whether abandoned or lost) in all areas of the city and it would be great to be able to find the owners more easily
- It would be ineffective to try to license other indoor pets.
- Rabbits aren't licensed?
- Emotional support animals. Livestock living in the city.
- Absolutely not
- Animals that leave their habitat and enter the public domain should be licensed due to risk of being lost, stolen, etc.
- Currently, pets are defined as property in Canada. When someone gets divorced they don't decide custody of an animal, they decide ownership as one does over the silverware or the car. I don't register my spoons with the city and as such see no reason to register my rabbit.
- No no no. Just stop. Stop. No other animals should be licensed.
- Anything that goes outside.
- All - to promote responsible pet ownership.
- Any pet needs to be licence
- There should be a licence for any agricultural animals. Not individual licences but a licence to keep bees, chickens or pigeons and the number allowed for that individual property.
- Pigeons and potentially other animals that may be outside for periods of time.
- Any pets that are taken outside of the house should be licensed - ferrets, rabbits, pigs - so they can be returned to the owners if something happens.
- Possibly some livestock provided the fees are reasonable.
- Should you need a license for a guinea pig? A dozen of them? Some "teacup" dogs probably weight less than a rabbit. Rodents can do a lot of damage, left to their own devices. Why license the dog and not the rabbit? Look what happened in Victoria with the rabbits escaping. Tough question.
- Dogs, cats as they are most likely to get out.
- Bees. LOL each bee needs a little teeny weeny license. LOL dogs, cats, and exotic pets ...does Calgary even allow exotic pets? Hope not. Poor things.
- Any animal that is allowed outside should be licensed
- how about 'emotional support pets', livestock and homing pigeons
- none at this point
- Any that are being kept as a domestic pet or emotional support animal. Doesn't matter if it's a goat, a pig or anything else. If it has the potential to escape the pen/house and could cause harm to another person, animal or property it should be microchipped and licensed.
- No!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- dogs, cats, livestock (pending further regulations), should not be extended to small animals such as rabbits, snakes, hedgehogs, birds
- Any pet that could interact outdoors with the public. Or escape. Including parrots, ferrets rabbits etc. It may increase the burden of these animals in shelters and also hold owners accountable for their pet.
- Potentially anything that could get out in the public - maybe exotic birds and rabbits
- Any pet that would leave the confine of your personal property on a regular basis
- All pets that could possible escape. If the main benefit is reunification, why not license snakes, turtles or budgies? Don't their owners want them back?
- Birds - any pet that can get loose
- See response in #5. I do not see a benefit of City Licensing of animals as bylaws are not enforced actively other than this one.
- Any dangerous or venomous reptiles/snakes/frogs etc .
- Racing pigeons. Our neighbour has over 40 that are allowed to fly over the neighbourhood multiple times daily, and they sit on nearby houses and leave droppings everywhere.
- Chickens, bees, any other animals that would use city resources.
- None, no other pets should be off of private property.
- No, other types of pets are cage/aquarium types and the chance of them getting loose is extremely low. Also very hard to enforce that bylaw.
- Any pet that could escape the owners property should be licensed
- Pot bellied pigs. Ferrets.
- Exotic animals including snakes or big lizards, pot belly pigs, goats and other livestock
- Anything other than cats and dogs. This would provide control over those who want to keep livestock and other strange animals in the city
- All pets that can "escape" the home should be so that they can be returned
- If you're going to enforce indoor cat licensing, you might as well licence all of them. I suspect the amount of actual outdoor cats to cats total is drastically different. The more rules, the less people will be honest and participate.
- Cats should have to be licensed
- Any pet that is taken off the owners property.
- There needs to be a license for exotic pets to help ensure proper awareness for care.
- Any animal that has the potential to leave the home, and be introduced to the public.
- Maybe support animals.
- Anything that could be outside the home.
- All pets should be licensed so that emergency departments know about them.
- owners of multiple pets ie, owners of 3 or more animals need to have a more tracking and education.
- I believe licensing should be extended to exotic pet ownership as a means of improving the pets' living conditions , owners' education, and the realities around the illegal pet trade.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Pigs if there are pet pigs in calgary that are a pet and not livestock.
- Any animals used for comfort/ptsd/etc. should be licensed. But there does need to be a limit on what types of animals can be used this way.
- Any pet should be licensed (even at a minimal cost to ensure registration) to ensure proper care of them. There are too many people breeding pets to make money and they are not being well taken care of. A neighbor had a turtle that was abused/not taken care of and I know it suffered a horrible life
- I think animals that go outside should be licensed. So if you walk your iguana, yes, license it.
- No, no licensing at all.
- Chickens should be allowed and the city should license those owners.
- Any pet which could be outside should be licensed. Birds hamsters etc should be exempted
- If urban livestock is allowed, owner must have an up to date license for keeping it
- Other pets? No I don't think they should be licensed.
- Exotics, particularly those with complex care needs like Sugar Gliders.
- If dogs and cats need to be then any pet that could walk or fly out the front door should be.
- Ferrets - if they escape they can bite
- Exotic pets - snakes, spiders, etc. Also pose a danger if they escape
- Only animals that are outside and in public.
- None. I don't think there are others that would go outside.
- NO--JUST NAOTHER TAX AND PRIVACY
- Cats, Dogs or any animal that is permitted outside for an extended amount of time. As an example, a oet pig but not a pet spider or reptile. The pig can survive nicely outside, the reptile or spider cannot.
- For sure any that pose a safety risk; possibly large snakes like pythons.
- Perhaps all pets should at least be registered. This will help us better plan emergency evacuation requirements by understanding what types of animals may need to be evacuated.
- Not needed.
- Any exotic animal.
- Any type of pets that can escape and get lost and only the type that would be retrievable.
- Any animal that is kept as a pet by a large number of people and could reasonably escape and wander. For instance, many people keep lizards or fish but they aren't getting loose and wandering the neighbourhood. The main purpose of a license should be reunification if they get out.
- Support animals should be licensed as well, even a nominal fee, any large exotic pets like snakes or otherwise.
- any pet that the owner lets out of the house, or that could be a danger to the public
- Anything in the yard or in public. With the slightest chance of having ability to get out. Includes emotional support animals.
- Any animal that has the potential to roam free. Primarily cats and dogs, but under some circumstances, birds or pigs and other domestic animals that could escape their household.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dangerous pets such as venomous snakes because they should be monitored for public safety.
- if you have statistics on other pets that could benefit from re-unification. Otherwise no
- I think all pets should be licensed. or perhaps called it pet registration list. it helps not only reunite pets with owners but also in case of fire or emergencies, emergency services should have access to this data to make sure everyone including pets are safe.
- Bunnies have become a problem
- any rare, threatened, or endangered species.
- Urban bees, livestock, and pigeons should probably all be licensed too.
- Maybe birds? They can often escape while their cages are being cleaned, and can be hard to link with their owners, even after they're caught. Also maybe ferrets?
- I don't
- If they are likely to be outdoors and interacting with other people and could possibly cause a danger to them.
- Dogs, cats,
- No - others pets do not need to be licensed
- Any pet that has four legs and the potential to escape or be let out of your house, should probably be licensed.
- Rabbits - To discourage release of domesticated rabbits. They should be licensed at the point of sale in pet stores, that would eliminate a much larger issue later on.
- Discounts for vaccinated animals.
Livestock like rabbits, chickens, pigs etc. to control numbers)
Reptiles, rare mammals and birds (to control numbers, illegal trade)
- Any pets which may end up outside on a regular basis (pigs). If a pet remains indoors, it should not be a problem. licensing a fish or a hamster would be silly
- Any animal that is outside at all and any animal considered dangerous, like poisonous snakes.
- Any pet that spends time outside and is likely or able to survive in our climate
- Any pet that is brought out into the public should be licensed. That way there is accountability as well as the ability to re-unite lost pets. Pets such as small frogs, fish, lizards, would never leave the house to begin with so it wouldn't make sense to have to license those.
- All pets that go outside should be licensed if they are permitted to be in the city
- I believe only dogs should. Licensing helps with the stray dog population which Calgary has a very low rate.
- I don't think other pets should be licensed.
- Any pet that is outside the home (people in my neighborhood walk their rabbit so should be licensed.
- By household rather than by animal: chickens and bees. Ensure adequate education and provision of safety (for the animals as well as people).
- Any pets that are outside and can interact with other people/animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Emotional support pets should be licensed, regardless of species, as they are out and about and at risk of separation from owner. Urban livestock, if approved, as they're just as risk of loss as cats and dogs. Repeat-offending birds who escape home should also require a license.
- any animal that goes out more often that has the biggest risk of getting lost such as dogs and cats.
- Snakes for the same reason. Reunification
- Pigeons - to add funds to cleaning buildings.
- Therapy animals that are not cats or dogs.
- I think that rabbits should be, just today I saw a rabbit that was not a jack rabbit in someone's yard. This is incredibly irresponsible ownership or someone lost their rabbit and can't find it.
- I don't see the point in anything else.
Other than emotional support animals
- All pets should be licensed. This will give the city an accurate depiction of how many animals are under the care of an individual. There's a difference between owning 1 dog, and owning 1 dog and 18 birds.
- Exotic animals to ensure proper care
- None, as they incur little cost to the community.
I do believe exotic pets need to be regulated for animal welfare reasons (especially large parrots) and there need to be guidelines for welfare and husbandry (e.g. birds and reptiles).
- Exotic pets as they are often abused and/or neglected.
- Pets that could be deemed "dangerous" to others.
- Domestic rabbits should require a license. Like cats, people purchase without understanding the care they require then neglect and release them. They die from predation, starvation and vehicular death and breed causing nuisance populations that destroy property and require municipal intervention.
- I suppose any pet that is allowed out, or that is likely to "escape" should be licensed for the same reasons dogs and cats require a license.
- All pets, what ever their specie, must be registered and licensed
- If livestock is permitted, they should be licensed.
- ALL animals should require a license, paid or not.
- None. Licensing is a waste of time, money and resources
- Rabbits & ferrets as they easily escape/are abandoned frequently
- rabbits because of the likelihood that they are released and they breed in the wild.....e.g. canmore
- Bees, just kidding, none
- All of them except rodents and snakes
- i believe cats and dogs should be licensed. However if people are allowed to keep Livestock then licenses should apply. If only to register. Small animals, reptiles, fish and birds who don't go outside should not be applicable.
- None

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

My extra noteIf the animal is microchipped you shouldn't have to buy a license as this is also a way to reunite pet with owner

- Maybe any that spend time outside? Or have the ability to escape?
- None. Ever.
- Exotic pets should have a rigorous licencing program to ensure that they are taken care of responsibly, for their welfare as well as humans.
- Yes they should be licensed because you can keep track of them and it should responsibility.
- Yes
- Exotic pets only
- Potentially
- With the range of emotional support animals coming into focus, any animal bearing that label should be. If there is another species that routinely causes issue for the city, they should be considered. Rodents, birds, reptiles, amphibians etc likely need not be.
- None that are house bound
- Dogs and cats
- If you license one then license them all.
- Rabbits and birds, they both have a chance of getting out and being licensed would aid owner reunification.
- If agricultural animals are allowed, or if they are support animals that frequently go outside, they should be licensed.
- Animals like ferrets , indoor cats , indoor anything should not be licensed.
- Until Calgary allows livestock as pets, I can't think of any others to be licensed.
- Yes. If dog and cat owners have to license then so should owners of any type on animal.
- It's good for data collection but if I am told my guinea pigs need a licence, I'll call it a cash grab because the city literally offers no service to them. I can't even feed them grass from my lawn because of pesticide drift from city spray programs.
- Reptiles birds and other unusual Or rare animals used pets like pot belly pigs. To monitor and stop trafficking of rare snd endangered species and to generate revenue for the city.
- Not at this time.
- Skunks, parrots, rabbits.
- venomous animals like snakes frogs, reptiles. because it would be nice to know if there's anything scary around if needed.
- If an animal is outside. Otherwise, why does the city care?
- I believe rabbits should be licensed
- Any that could go outside and potentially escape. Rabbits, pot belly pigs, birds.
- Urban livestock (if the city decides to allow it).
- No not necessary
- Anything that could get out of an owner's yards and cause damage to another's property or ha an individual.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Rabbits. Calgary has an enormous problem with people dumping rabbits and creating feral communities, This may help dissuade irresponsible people from getting them.
- Any animal that has a chance of running at large (even if only by accident) should be licensed. As in, also license ferrets, rabbits, emotional support animals, working dogs, etc.
- Domesticated rabbits possibly as they have a chance of escaping if they have outdoor time.
- Rabbits. Would make people more responsible for these pets instead of getting just for Easter. Any reptiles and such. Make more responsible when poisonous or dangerous reptiles are brought into the city, and less to be released.
- Since cats are a money grab, why not enforce it all? Goldfish, guinea pigs, snake, hamsters..... if you ever need to capture a lose goldfish and send it home, you'll find the owner. Oh wait, they don't wear collars just like a cat who can get their breakaway collars off easily!
- Any pets that spend time in public areas
- Any pet that has the ability of escaping from the home or yard.
- Any pet that leaves your house, some birds?
- Dangerous pets
- If you have to license indoor only cats than theoretically you should have to license all animals
- none - the other types are indoor animals (small animals). It would be an obvious money grab to try to license animals who reside solely in the home - what benefit is provided to the pet owner? Cat lisencc is a stretch as it is. Dogs have a high interaction with society at large and can get out/lost
- I think indoor animals shouldn't need to be licensed. It sort of seems like a cash cow
- None that occur to me.
- Birds, because they can escape and go very far distances.
- Cats probably. But if the law in Calgary is to keep your cat on your property then it should never be off the property mine stay in the house always.
- I think most pets/reptiles should be registered somehow. What if they escape. Or special permits to have certain animals should be considered as a method of registration.
- Not sure it would be necessary.
- Any large animal cats , dogs ,pigs etc. Anything that could be dangerous to others if it got out like snakes/spiders. Anything that can be problematic if released because it is not a local species i.e. special fish that could become an invasive species in our local lakes and rivers, like carp.
- Exotic animals, like iguanas, large parrots.
- I think pet licenses are a scan to make money.
- Pigs, snakes,
- Any animal kept as a pet that is a predator must be licensed and The City can impose conditions to minimize risk to humans.
- Ones that could be in the public
- Anything large enough to walk on a leash that is not kept in an enclosure.
- If farm type animals become allowed they should have to be licenced. Other animals that stay in houses shouldn't need licenses unless they are exotic.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- dogs, cats, possibly rabbits. any animal that can be chipped and/or tattooed, and could potentially escape from the home, especially if they could cause environmental or property damage (e.g. cats killing small wildlife).
- I don't think pets should have to be licensed. I think responsible pet ownership can be encouraged with better laws that can protect animals from cruelty and ensure they are treated respectfully and humanely.
- Reptiles.
- I don't think any others should be licensed because to my knowledge we don't have issues with overpopulation or strays like we do with cats and dogs.
- Beehives, and the keepers should have to show they've passed a course.
- No pets other than dogs.
- All pets with access to the outdoors should be licensed to help city reunite pets and families.
- All pets should be licensed. Especially reptiles like snakes. Urban livestock most definitely given the disease risks.
- I think all pets should have to be registered or all households will have to register and carry a license ie beekeeping or for you hen or emotional pet
- all pets that meet the same criteria for your reasons justifying dog and cat licensing - those aren't clear. for example, a leashed ferret or lizard on a walk seems more appropriate for licensing than an indoor cat.
- Any pet that has an impact on the public or neighbors.
- Honeybees should be licensed
- Any pet that goes outdoors.
- I can't think of any that wouldn't be super difficult to enforce (like rabbits for example).
- That's fine.
- Rabbits, ferrets, rats (sadly there's a trade for them in Calgary), pigeons — because they stray and cause problems
- Dogs and cats as these are the most popular pets.
- Any animal who is regularly brought out of the home other than vet visits should be licensed
- All pets that may reasonably cause problems if escaped. Pet hamster or fish are examples of pets who would not need license; all multiple unit animals such as bees, pigeons, livestock need different mechanism but with quantity controls
- Small-Large Mammals kept as domesticated house pets: pigs, capybaras, foxes. Anything that is generally wild, has a life expectancy of over five years and is being kept as a pet.
- None. What's the point? Do a registration instead
- If the pet can leave the home, it should be licensed.
- any animal that would be within city limits and spend some of its time outdoors (possibly escaping and needing to be tracked to an owner). This also allows the city to get an accurate count of animals and types within the city.
- I think licensing should be optional.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None. I can't think of any enforcement issues with other animals
 - I don't think other pets need to be licensed. It would be incredibly challenging to enforce
 - Reptiles particularly snakes. And Birds. I believe licensing introduces accountability and this may encourage more responsible purchasing of animals
 - Any pet that can be out doors. Dogs, Cat, Chicken, Pig, etc.
 - All pets that could leave the property on their own should be licensed.
 - All animals should be licensed in an urban area.
 - Not sure. Like licensing a hamster would be pretty ridiculous
 - Backyard chickens?
 - If indoor cats must be licensed all pets must be licensed
 - All large mammals.
 - House rabbits, any emotional support animals, small house pets (all rodents or weasels), large birds, all exotics and large snakes. There should be a determination between pet and food animals.
 - no opinion
 - Spiders, snakes, birds of any kind, lizards, rats, guinea pigs. Because it will be easier to retrieve them back to their owner. And some of those pets might be dangerous if they get loose.
 - All pets if there is an expectation of rehoming. Or a huge rehoming fee should apply when you find someone's pet
 - If we have livestock in the city, these animals should be licensed, too.
 - Any animal that goes outside should be licensed.
 - I think that any exotic or poisonous pets should also need to be licensed. For the exotics, it's to protect species. For the poisonous pets, it's to protect people.
 - If you can't stick a collar on them, licensing is silly.
 - All pets should be licensed for their protect and for added income for the city
 - Anything venomous because of their potential for harm if loose.
 - Rabbits -easy to escape and people take them outside.
- Livestock - so their numbers can be tracked and any issues links back to a particular animal or owner
- Basically any animal that people take outside of their house, or one that has a reasonable likely of escaping or being set free.
- Anything that could pose a risk or danger from disease to venomous snakes.
 - Any that can get away & cause damage to public/private property. Anything that is dangerous to other people/pets/wildlife.
 - I don't know if snakes require a license but I can see a need to license those snake species who might cause injury to citizens if they were to escape their owners.
 - Absolutely not.
 - Anything that could escape your house.
 - Any animal that is taken outside and is around the public in general.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Urban Agriculture animals should also be licensed, as they administration of those animals by the city (inspections or handling complaints) will be a burden on the city. So the city should ask for a fee for potentially handling that.
- Snakes. I want someone other than a snake owner to be aware of the existence of a snake in a residence.
- All pets should be licensed. This would help in re-unification between owner and pet. It would also make the city aware of all pets and if a pet is deemed vicious & licensed then the surrounding area residents should be notified of a vicious animal in their area.
- Anything that costs enforcement or monitoring should have a small fee BUT consider equity (ability to pay) and the huge social and individual benefit for some of owning a companion in whatever shape it comes
- All pets that enter/live in a backyard or can be a noise/smell problem for the neighbors. Pets that can be dangerous when escaped or let free.
- Anything that can cause an impact on the surrounding community should be licensed. Anything contained in an aquarium or cage that isn't dangerous, no, but most other things, yes.
- I do not think any other pet needs to be licensed because the other form of pets do not typically go outside of the enclosures or spaces the only reasonable thing would be if you had pigeons or livestock
- I think licensing is more about controlling nuisance animals so I can't think of any other animals in Calgary that would present the same issue.
- No other pets.
- None should have to be
- Domestic rabbits, because too many of them end up becoming feral. Large pythons and boas, and venomous snakes that have not had their venom glands removed. Any pet that is taken out on a leash (pot belly pigs, ferrets) and this increases the change they will get lost.
- Any that could potentially survive and multiply in the wild
- Pretty hard to license a turtle so only those creatures that could be a threat to public safety. Although some cannot hold a tag, at least the city would know where there are dangerous creatures.
- I'm not sure of the purpose of licensing any pet as I don't buy your reunification reason.
- I believe that all pets should be microchipped for identification, but animals such as hamsters, gerbils, parrots, turtles should not require licensing unless they live outside.
- Birds. Pet birds are often found and it is difficult to find the owner.
- Any animal that may be in a public place should be licensed. But it should be very clear what the licensing fees are being used for by the city.
- Exotic pets (reptiles, rodents, etc) should also be required to be licensed because they can carry diseases, and are more subject to trafficking and unnecessary breeding.
- The goal is to have animals safe and looked after. I understand the premise of the license fee - but I would rather see more effort in reducing populations and controlling back yard breeders than say, licensing a chicken or a rabbit.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't think other pets need to be licensed. Unless there would be an advantage like group pet insurance.
- Any dangerous animal or an animal if let loose would harm the environment or alter the normal balance.
- I don't think others should be licensed but perhaps registered. [personal information removed] I think this is useful information to know (ie. in a fire) - that in this house there is a dog and cat and two guinea pigs, for example.
- Birds and reptiles and rodents I don't think need to be, but perhaps BUNNIES. Those guys get let go and nobody knows where they're from; people just abandon them with no consequences. Chip and neuter/spay those bunnies before they're even sold!
- Urban Livestock
- Snakes, birds because snakes aren't everyone's favorite and if they are in a private property and something happens, if responders need to go there, they shouldn't be surprised if a snake is loose. Birds are loud and keeping a limit to them will detour the noise level as well as the mess they make.
- All, may help with illegal pets
- Why Licence pets at all? We could get rid of a lot of cost to the taxpayer by eliminating this governmental cost.
- No other pets should be licensed. Leave people alone.
- Any pet that can interact with a negative impact to anyone, such a relative , neighbour, first responders etc. (a goldfish can't harm but a ferret may bite)
- I can't license my honeybees but they are insured
- Maybe rabbits so that people will realise that they have value to and stop dumping them.
- bunnies. birds. chickens. Because they can 'escape' a property.
- Any pet that will be out in public.
- There should be some sort of system for livestock animals, and I favour a permit that stipulates how many animals the permit covers, but I have a hard time imagining having to license a gerbil or a parakeet or a lizard or fish.
- If the animals are housebound and/or properly housed they should not need to be licensed. Unfortunatley if they escape from the home and become a nuisance perhaps the owner should be required to license to retrieve their pet, be fined and/or have the animal removed
- No, just those two
- All pets that are not constrained to indoors (ie, fish/reptiles/hamsters/etc.). It's about the benefit of identifying the animal and associating the owner of the animal.
- cats & dogs are enough
- Dangerous or exotic pets.
- Cats and dogs, no exceptions
- Birds. Birds get out and caught.
- Any pet that is allowed outside the home must be licensed, so that the animal can be identified and returned. Also, any livestock animals should be licensed, for the same reasons.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Happy returns to owner.
- Dogs and cats are most visible and popular, and likely to cause problems when irresponsible owners flout bylaws so licensing is clearly valid, but a case might be made for licensing of rabbits, rodents, etc. that frequently also end up at shelters & require care and rehoming.
- Birds should be licensed, I see posts about escaped birds all the time! It would be nice to be able to make sure the owners are able to get their bird back if it's lost.
- Emotional support and service animals. Service animals have specific requirements to meet and should be identified as such.
- yes. The city need to know how many animals and people live in the city, helps with planning.
- Should be the owners decision. The only reason to licence is for rescuing lost pets. More pets would be licenced if the cost was less expensive.
- No other pets need to be licensed
- None. Licensing a pet is ridiculous. Why don't you have people license children?
- I think it would be hard to get people to renew smaller or more indoor-only pets.
- All pet should be licensed. Yes, ALL, including goldfish - no exception. Among other things, this will bring in needed revenue to the city,
- NONE ... that seems a money grab for sure.
- Cats, dogs, and approved livestock (if this changes), snakes, ferrets, bunnies are anything that can escape and create an anchor population or foreign species.
- Any domesticated animal that goes outside regularly should have a license (ex. ferret, skunk, pig, etc.)
- any that have the potential to escape. Once again, why not offer a pet membership for households instead of licensing fee per animal, and register anything that is not human under one membership?
- Nope. Totally unenforceable.
- Exotic pets - to encourage responsible ownership and ethical/legal purchasing
- None others
- Large snakes chickens rats
- Any animal that if escapes from the house can cause damage-
- Any large urban livestock if eventually allowed by City. For the same reasons that dogs and cats are licensed.
- No. Licensing is a cash grab that is simply not necessary
- Anything that could be reasonably outdoors and potentially get lost. I can't think of anything, unless we can have chickens and goats.
- Ideally all pets even if for documenting only to avoid potential hoarding situations.
- Any animals that are left alone outside, even on their own property (i.e. backyard).
- If they are caged ... no ... if they spend time outside ... yes ...
- I don't think any others should be licensed/
- any that could escape and people would want them back, or could be an invasive species if left to multiply



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- any urban farming animals should be registered to be able to monitor for humane housing and meeting regulations for housing.
- Maybe dogs, but low fees and free renewal. Also low fees if an animal is retrieved from the pound. Punishment deters people from wanting to use the system. No other animals should be licenced.
- Only animals which could reasonably be expected to wander off the owner's property need to be licensed. (However, I also believe that with certain other animals (e.g., urban agriculture) it's reasonable to require the owner to be certified in some way.
- If the licensing program remains similar to what it is now, the bylaw should not be mandatory for any pet (cat, dog, or other), as it does not provide the service it is intended to provide.
- Any pet that has the ability to regularly spend time or be lodged outdoors (i.e. rabbits). Another consideration could be for long life-span animals (i.e. parrots).
- Unless the licensing was tattooing it would be difficult to have other pets wear a physical license. Just like the rationale on why indoor cat owners do not feel the need to license their own pets as they do not wear a collar and license inside the owner's residence and do not go outside.
- hamsters, rabbits, bees (each one, 5cents), budgies, lizards, aquarium fish, snakes, reptiles, turtles, giraffes (for obvious reasons), tape-worms, hatchimals, disobedient children, crayfish, ungulates (look it up), horses and/or zebras, pigs (separte fee for its sty). Why? Duh, increased revenues!
- All pets that have the ability to get outdoors.
- Dogs and cats are the most likely animals to require licensing. Most other animals are strictly indoors. Birds can have bands in case they are lost, but these are not easily exchangeable or removable to license.
- Certain reptiles come with specific care needs and potential to become a pest (for example, loose snakes) and should be licensed.
- People with exotic pets, boa for example should be required to license them. It is important that the city be aware of were these animals are and have some sense of if they are a risk to the public.
- All animals that either go outside or are potentially a danger to others even if kept indoors
- I believe large birds/parrots/reptiles should be licensed.
- I do not feel licensing of less common pets should be required
- Agriculture pets. But they don't belong in the city.
- All mammals, all reptiles, all birds, but probably not fish or insects, unless there are concerns about invasive species.
- Personally, I think reptiles that are larger and can potentially escape and injure someone should have to be licensed, such as larger pythons, boas, monitors, etc. Also, large birds such as parrots and macaws.
- No for reptiles but yes for other pets
- Any pet that will be outside, such as rabbits, ferrets etc. as this allows a higher chance of return.
- nope. As those pets are primarily kept indoors and not taken out side to free walk.
- Ferrets and bunnies
- Rabbits, because they could be in danger of being lost or separated from their owner.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Giant ass snakes.
- rabbits should be licenced but not wear a tag more of a microchip, too many pet rabbits let go and then become feral. unknown if someones pet got out or if its feral
- - Larger livestock
- - Exotic animals (large snakes, etc)
- Exotics, any snake over 4 feet, anything that could impact the local ecosystem if it escaped
- No pet should have to be licensed. It should be optional.
- Any emotional support animal.
- Any pet that spends time out doors.
- Ferrets and pet bunnies
- Please see above. I suspect that licensing is done out of habit because it's always been done that way but what does it accomplish and can it be done a better way?
What does a license allow you, or the pet, to do? It should be seen as simple registration.
- Again if this animal does not leave the property and is being responsibly looked after why license. I know of a few people who have small dogs who get well exercised in their own yard.
- Exotic animals could be licensed. These are trafficked I've heard.
- all properly accredited support animals should be licensed as part of the proof of accreditation. any animal that would be let outside into a yard or that could escape, anything that could be dangerous or pose a threat so 1st responders could be aware before entry in emergencies or if the pet escape
- I can't think of any other animals.
- No, I don't believe we have excessive complaints about any other animals.
- Any animal that is taken out of a home for walks or fresh air should be licensed
- Any pet that has the potential to roam or get lost
- Snakes often escape and are found elsewhere.
- Pigs, if they're out for a walk and treated like a pet, perhaps a licence? Though... I don't even know if people are allowed pigs in Calgary?!
- Cannot think of any others.
- Emotional support animals.
- Only exotic animals that may carry disease.
- I don't think other individual animals need licensing but I would hope backyard chickens would get a group permit, mostly so the conditions they are kept in could be monitored.
- If certain others become legal and are kept outside the house they should be licensed. For example - chickens or a true beehive set up.
- The only pets that should HAVE to be licensed are those that consistently leave the home and or property. Service/support/wiring animals or any species. Dogs, cats(that go out without a leash more then once per week), birds that are capable or flying away and bunny's as they're a big wild problem
- Bunnies! Too many in the city.
- if a animal can be free to roam outside of their home it should be licensed.
- All pets but small things like fish, turtles and hamsters. Snakes should be or ferrets,etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- All animals kept as pets or domestic livestock within the city
- Rabbits because they're is a huge overpopulation. The spca took in more than 400 last year
- Only animals that may be a nuisance if they escape. Dogs, cats, large exotic animals.
- Birds
Exotic animals
Rabbits
- None! Just dogs and cats.
- -birds
-any animal that can run away from a dwelling
- Maybe chickens to avoid cruelty?
- I think that's fair to just be cats and dogs
- Exotic animals or large reptiles. Livestock and horses or birds probably not.
- 1 fee per house. Not per animal.
- Rabbits
Pigeon keepers
Exotic species- snakes, lizards etc. To eliminate possibility of illegal species
- If the city allows livestock I think the owner should have a license.
I also believe that dog walkers who walk more than 2 dogs should be required to be licensed
- All pets should be licensed. All pets can get lost and need to be reunited. Being a responsible owner extends to all pets.
- I think backyard livestock should be licensed and exotic pets simply to keep track of what kinds of less popular pets are in the city
- Pigs
- None. I think licensing is a cash grab that has little impact. It should be a one time fee.
- If the true intent of a licensing program is to re-unite pets with their owners, any pet that has a means of 'escaping' from their homes should have to be licensed.
- All pets should. If a rabbit got loose, it still needs to be returned.
- Chickens and any pets that spend a lot of their time outdoors and could get loose.
- None that I can think of other than cats and dogs
- Not at this time as those mentioned are the primary pets which roam in our city limits.
- No. Only pets that go out in public
- Inthink outdoor pets should be licenced or pets at risk of escape. So if its at risk of getting out it should be licenced.
- Any animals that pose a threat to a person or child should it get loose should be registered, but maybe not licensed.
- NO this is a cash grab
- Any support livestock. Encourages responsible care of animal and ensures return if lost.
- If you're going to make it mandatory for dogs and cats, then there should be rules that require you to license other pets such as birds, horses, reptiles etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No I do not believe in licensing beyond cats and dogs as other misc pets hardly cause the city reason to need to step in to mediate concern\$ (ie strays, aggression/attacks), so you have no reason to license misc pets, except greed.
- Flighted birds, rabbits, ferrets, exotic swine, livestock if allowed - tag size and mechanisms options need to be available
- All pets who may be outdoors should be licensed...it helps the city to keep trac6of the urban animals
- All pets that can leave a private property with the petowner and interact with others; or any pets above a certain weight that create manure issues.
- I think all pets should be licensed. Perhaps not individually licensed though -- eg. maybe a bee hive or a chicken pen, instead of individual. Or maybe the city could have a new license system for multiple pets (eg. over 6) where we are licensed differently.
- Dogs should be licensed. Cats should be licensed voluntarily if the owners allow them outside and are concerned with their return if they go missing.
- No need for any other pet to be licensed as most others would not leave the home
- I don't think that licensing any pet is really a necessity, other than for ID purposes. But even that is outdated, because most pets are microchipped now, and quite a number of pets that get away from their owners have no collar to identify them with anyway.
- All pets that would ever interact with the public either by walking or by escape should be licensed. Fish don't wander far in the yard. Those don't need a license.
- Any pet that goes outside.
- Urban livestock, emotional support animals.
- Backyard bees, chickens, pigeons, etc., any breeder, any other pets that require some level of monitoring due to issues in the community or significant drain on city resources.
- If it leaves the home it should be licensed
- If someone loses a lizard, no one is going to be checking an ID on every lizard they see. Takes it into just a money making level, if the animal isn't or can't leave the house. No.. tag all 21 fish I own? But large reptiles like snakes that reach a certain size should be
- None. You're just trying to tax pet owners.
- Birds maybe? We have done across birds in occasion that are clearly lost and have no way of finding their owners
- I dont believe an animal should have to be licensed. I could understand a 1 time registration fee to prove you own said animal but i also believe that any animal not being taken outdoors should not require licensing.
- Any that go off the property or out of the house. If there is a chance they could be lost, licensing would greatly improve chances of reunification.
- Any livestock, and exotic pets
- I think if the pet is strictly indoors there should be no need for a license, including indoor cats. Any animals that have contact with the public should be licensed.
- None, I'm not convinced that licensing is the best approach.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Licensing is not the issue. Pet cats, dogs, bunnies etc. should all be spay/neutered & microchipped. Licensing a pet does not make an owner responsible. Many pets remain intact contributing to overpopulation. CGY needs to revamp the entire process. Look to other cities to see how they have solved issue
- Depends on the animal.
- Birds. Anything that can live longer than 5 years.
- Any pet that can be both reasonably lost outside and reunited with their family should be licensed.
- Any pet that leaves the home and yard of the person.
- Any pet should be licensed. Even if only for rescue purposes in emergency.
- Any and all pets should be licensed so the city has an understanding of how many animals are really in the city.
- Any animal that spends time outside of the house, such as in a back yard, should be licensed in case they escape. For animals unable to wear a collar, a microchip or tattoo should be applied.
- This would be a cash grab.
- I think bee keepers and if we get backyard chickens they should pay a yearly licensing fee. This would make it so people who are serious get them.
Maybe certain reptiles.
- No other.
- None, animals which are maintained within parameters of ones personal property should not be deemed to be licensed.
- None. There are no other pets that are potentially brought into public places or get lost frequently enough
- Pigeons? If they're racing? And any animal that goes into public as a service animal or emotional support animal.
- Any the size of a rabbit or larger. Maybe by weight? Rabbits chickens, birds. Mostly all pets should be licensed.
- No. What other pet species wear collars to help find who they belong too which was your previous reason for the license. Also animal services doesn't take in any other species.
- Birds, or any animal that may be taken for walks or escape. Indoor only pets should be exempt
- Rabbits, birds, and any other pet that is a large escape risk.
- Cats and dogs are all.
- Pigeons. They poo everywhere.
- I think pot bellied pigs should be licensed
No other animals. Recently, read a story of a miniature horse on an airplane as a support service animal. That is ridiculous.
- any animal that goes out into the public space
- Perhaps rabbits, people release them and it can create a lot of problems for communities



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- All pets should be licenced. If people are going to keep pigs, or chickens - any type of animal that could escape a yard/house - they should have to licence it. It is not fair that only dogs and cats face that rule. Even if it is an emotional pet - it should be licenced.
- Not sure? I believe there are laws already about owning potentially dangerous animals.
- The argument for licensing is weak at best, and therefore I see no reason to expand the program.
- Any animal that is big and can not be picked by an eagle should be licensed. Especially animals that may cause harm to other animals, humans and property.
- None! What is the point?
Cash grab, big brother watching?
- Maybe ever animal in city limits should be licensed.
- None. That is just a money grab.
- Rabbits, as unneutered pets create a pest population if escaped.
- Emotional support pets that are outside the home.
- Any pet that can go AWOL from owner should be tagged and licensed.
- ALL animals/pets should require licensing. Includes birds, reptiles, amphibians, barnyard animals. For the same reason cats and dogs - in the event the escape, they can be relocated with owners. Not to mention, some of these animals can be more unpredictable then a cat or dog.
- Poisonous, venomous, large, small. All pets should be licensed.
- If you require one pet, you must require all pets.
- Bird keeping or excessive numbers of pets should always be controlled in urban areas such as the City of Calgary. Animals can be a nuisance to some people, birds are not always appreciated as they can be noisy and dirty.
- Exotic pets like pythons and birds. All pets really. But I don't believe any other than dogs and cats should require payment. Free registration for all exotic animal types might help understand city pet numbers, and help return randomly found pets to their owners.
- only dogs need be licensed or irresponsible cat owners who let their cats live outdoors. Tagging the feral cats with the cropped ear would also be a better practice, than licensing indoor cats.
- No, that's reasonable
- pot belly pigs
- in the future, then will be good work bylaw for dogs and cats
- any venomous or foreign exotics because of public safety.
- Domestic game,
Exotic Birds, exotic animals, big snakes, monitors, big lizards
- Pot-bellied pigs should be legal, but only with a license.
- For agricultural animals (bees, chickens, dives and rabbits) a single all encompassing agricultural licence to ensure people are capable and responsible to keep them. Also, if there are frivolous complaints from neighbours, the owner can prove permissions.
- Urban livestock if things like chickens were allowed. Maybe rabbits because they can become feral and spread if they escape.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- NONE. This is getting ridiculous. I'm sure that 'Rainbow the fish' would benefit greatly....
- Cats.
- None. The added cost of license administration for other pets would be enormous vs the benefit and the statistically much lower number of other pet species such as snakes, birds, hamsters. Also predict an almost zero compliance rate by owners of these species
- Emotional Support Animals and Birds.
- Yes; all emotional support animals (excluding fish) and any animals that may get outside ie: birds, chickens, pigeons, snakes over a designated weight/length.
- Livestock if made legal.
- All animals outside or allowed to roam should be registered or licensed.
- Just dogs and cats. Perhaps rabbits but I don't think people would Comply
- All animals should be licensed. For example, if you want the fire dept. to remove your lizard in a fire, that's a public service. If a person keeps an any animal in their possession it should be recorded (licensed).
- All pets should be licensed - how do you track them otherwise?
- If dogs and cats are to be licensed, so should ANY pet that is potentially harmful - snakes, spiders, reptiles. If bees and chickens require PID numbers in outlying counties, At minimum, the same should be held within city.
- None, no need.
- Bunnies and reptiles. So many people have been releasing unwanted domestic bunnies or they are getting out of backyard hutches. Reptiles have been stolen or escaped during summer months.
- Any animal that has the ability to escape the home should be licensed.
- Any animal that has the ability to escape the home should be licensed. [DUPLICATE]
- Livestock for obvious reasons
- Rabbits should be registered in some way for a very low cost, with extreme penalties for people who randomly breed and abandon them. Having feral rabbits is not good for the life of the rabbits or the wildlife around them. Pet stores should be banned from selling them.
- If it has the potential to be out in public or in public spaces, it should be licensed
- Any other mammal.
- ALL of them. And people should have to have some kind of background checks.
- /
- Any emotional pet, it would put a stop to those who use that as an excuse to have the pet, without the responsibility as a pet owner (no matter the type)
- Rodents- infestation possibility
- Rabbits- infestations
- Birds to assist in reunification
- Any pets in a home should be licensed for tracking purposes if nothing else.
- I think that owning an animal that is not regularly going outdoors is does not require licensing.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Any animal that is let out of the house. If you want to take your ferret for a walk, go for it, but gotta license it. Also any exotic or high maintenance pets.
- Cats and dogs, and special animals emuus etc should be licenced as if they are lost they can be returned.
- Any pets that have a possibility of getting loose requiring assistance. Birds, snakes, reptiles, could be considered.
- Stop ! REALLY ?????!!!
- Maybe animals that live a long time and are often surrendered like parrots.
- Any pets that would be outside of a private home or pose a danger/threat to others.
- Any pet that may be out in public or has a chance of getting out and lost in public. This way if there are issues with the pet the rightful owner is responsible and if the pet is lost it can be returned to their owner.
- I think pet goats should be licensed
- None. What you going to start requiring licenses for fish
- Birds would be a good one to license, simply for ease of returning a lost parrot home.
- Indoor cats shouldn't be licenced. It's the same as any indoor animal. Cats have tattoos and microchips.
- Snakes and other exotic animals
- None and neither should cats
- Just dogs and cats should be licensed.
- Livestock should be registered with the city (so their whereabouts and numbers are known and so care can be monitored). Not necessarily individually licensed.
- Anything that would leave the home should be licensed. Maybe ferrets, cats, bunnies
- Anything that goes outside often. I think if you have a pet you take anywhere outside of your home (and yard), other than to the vet, should be licenced.
- Any pet that is able to be taken out in public. The license needs to be easily availibe for non-pet owners to identify the owner so that by-laws can be contacted and the owner reported if not following the by-laws or dangerous activities encountered. Presently it's a free for all for owners.
- Other pets are usually caged pets. Perhaps rabbits as Calgary really struggles with an overpopulation of wild domestic rabbits. So something to help with this.
- Any pets that go outside
- I don't think that exotic pets or farm animals should be licensed as they general do not wear anything in which a license could be attached to, and are not generally lost. All service animals should be licensed in order to be able to quickly be reunited to their owners.
- I think your license system is robbing my back as is. Please don't introduce anymore licenses. This is stupid.
- Only if they go at large and out of the house / off the property
- anything that could possible become "at large"



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Birds and rabbits. Health reasons. Plus we don't want to have the bunny problem that Canmore had years back.
- No I don't think other pets need to be licensed because it's not common for them to leave the house.
- Dogs and Cats can cause lawn damage, property damage, and inter species damage. Licensing should be used to offset the damages. Also it helps people identify your animal if lost.
- No licences should be required
- All and any sort of pet that can escape from the house should be licensed. If the pet is let loose or accidentally leaves th house, it should be the responsibility of the pet owner to have the pet returned.
- Pigs and goats
- Any pets that have a reasonable potential of getting separated from their owners, such as rabbits. Animals that would not reasonable be separated, such as fish, should not require registration.
- Rabbits as we are now in a crisis situation in some areas with the number of domesticated rabbits that have been released.
- Any pet that can travel and any exotic pet. Especially pets that could become invasive.
- Any animal that goes onto public lands or non stereo typical pet animals eg: pigs, chickens
- livestock or any special or dangerous animals should go through checks and evaluations to ensure safety of everyone
- All the categories asked about in this survey should have some sort of license, in the hope it will encourage responsible owners ship. On another note., cyclists too should have to be licensed in this city esp for all the lanes they now have, they have more rights than walkers :(
- all pets as the issue of stress animals is being abused ie stress chickens come on people this is bs
- Anything dangerous or venomous in case emergency services needs to attend the residence they should know of its existence. No charge for those licenses.
- Rodents do not have a long enough lifespan to license. Shouldn't give anyone who would want to give them a good life a reason not to have any
- I think that's good.
- Rabbits. To prevent when rabbits get loose and then start reproducing quickly (like around Repsol sports centre for example!). If urban agriculture is allowed for them to be licensed.
- None. The next questions dealing with dog walking you forgot to leave room for comments. In a nutshell - common sense should prevail, but it is woefully missing so, forget legislating it. Walking 12 chihuahuas on leash is not the same as 12 male Dobermans. COMMON SENSE! And you cannot legislate CS!
- I think the city should leave pet owners alone and stop doing the cash grab wherever they can.
- Any animal that resides in Calgary, that has the possibility of free roaming should be licensed for its own safety
- Nothing. What, you going to make a kid license his goldfish?
Hedgehogs used to require a special permit from the province. We finally realized that was idiotic red tape and bureaucracy.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If you have a pet in the city it should be covered by the same bylaw no matter what the pet is.
- Birds for obvious reasons (roaming)
- Anything that can have the ability to roam free
- Rabbits. It's obvious from seeing the feral domestic rabbits around the City that people do not take responsibility for these pets, and they really should be held accountable for letting them go free, or not housing the appropriately so they don't escape.
- I don't think there's a sufficient population of other animals to warrant licensing. If there are a lot of escaping bunnies for instance, then perhaps they should fall under the same licensing requirements as dogs and cats.
- Good question, I'm not sure.
- Chickens, bees
- Any pet that poses a threat to other people or property
- Snakes, alligators or any kind of animal that might be harmful.
- I think licencing is not about the pets, it's just another way for the City to grab more money from its citizens. It doesn't do anything for pets of any kind or their owners.
- ok, let's not start licensing hamsters and guinea pigs. We had hamsters, and I have zero ideas what that would have done to benefit us or the hamsters.
- None of them. Everything else stays in the house. Stop trying to profit off of pets. Imagine licensing a hamster they last like a year.
- If dogs and cats must be licensed, it should be all animals that go outside. For example ferrets.
- I don't think other pets should be licensed as they are mostly in home pets.
- Any pet should be free from the license as an obligation. It should be a choice as a service. If it has no consent, it should be a crime against the population.
- No, I do not believe other pets (birds, rabbits, rodents, turtles, fish) should be licensed.
- Any animal not a small rodent (hamster, mouse, etc), not fish, or with dangerous potential such as snakes or venomous creatures. Anything with potential harm or with reasonable potential to be found and returned should be licensed
- I think that maybe if people had to get a license before they got a pet that might reduce the number of people who abandon their pet because they don't understand how much effort it is.
I think that any exotic pet should be licensed to reduce the trade in illegal wildlife (snakes, birds, spiders)
- Rabbits due to the high number of abandonment in the population
- I think pets that never leave the property or home. Like pets normally in cages should maybe be registered with the city but not licensed. Rabbits may be a good one to look at though since many roam free in houses and therefore could still escape and alter the natural population of rabbits.
- License reptiles, birds and any livestock. There is no difference between a bird or cat or reptile if they are indoor animals. All face a risk of escaping their "home" and need to be reunited.
- The city has more important things to do then go around soliciting ideas on what other pets should be licensed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- License long living pets.
- why license anything but dogs. it's only dog owners who get even the smallest benefit from this program. cat owners get zero benefit. what benefit can you possibly provide for any other kind of pet. You're delusional if you think you're providing any service.
- Can't think of another animal that should be licensed.
- All domestics pets
- Dogs, and roaming/barn cats.
- It would depend on the pet I guess. If they can wander and interfere with other people or pets then yes.
- Any pet that is taken outside for exercise.
- Any pets that go outside should be licensed - and I can only think of a few instances where this is applicable, such as rabbits, birds or rodents. Why should only cat / dog owners have to pay for licensing?
- any animal which may interact with people, property; that go outside or can be heard outside. Whose quarters can be seen outside (e.g. pens).
- I think only animals who are permitted outside should require a license.
- Any animal that might be outdoors should be licensed
- Dogs, cats, and exotic dangerous pets if released.
- Can't think of any.
- Any animal that is rare or endangered
- They shouldn't be
- Reptiles, rabbits, birds. It is about the welfare of these animals and contributing to the health and welfare of all of our pets. It doesn't have to be a steep fee, but we should all be contributing.
- Pigs pot bellie
- ?? Not sure
- Any animals that may be in public
- Anything that is likely to be exposed to the public
- No, with the exception of exotics such as snakes, iguana etc. Bylaw simply don't have time to track down unlicensed rabbits
- Like what?? Pot bellied pigs?? Birds? Dog owners are held to different standards that cat owners. Let's get that sorted out before licensing ferrets!
- Pigs and chickens as the transmission of disease between animal and human is well documented
- I only think pets that are outside at any time should be licensed.
- Exotic animals should all be microchipped and licensed the number of reptiles that are escaping or being let go is on the rise
- Any pet that has the potential to escape to the great outdoors so that it can be reunited quickly with its owner.
- Any pets that are the same size as household cats or dogs, or imported exotic pets. Anything that's costing the city a lot of money.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Are you kidding? Maybe fish?
- Yes, specifically for those in apartments but would need to apply it to everyone
- I believe all support animals should be licensed, regardless of species.
- Any pet that can safely wear a collar and goes outside would potentially benefit from licensing. Any animal who has special care requirements or whose presence and care may impact health and safety of others should have specific requirements attached to licensing.
- No need, unless wild or exotic, to ensure pet is properly cared for.
- Exotic pet owners
 - So they are educated on the care required for the pet
 - Reducing the rehoming to inexperienced people who have no idea what is required
- Pets that are allowed into public spaces should be licensed. Mainly to ensure accountability of actions.
- Anything that can become lose and be found by a member of the public.
- All pets should be licensed or chipped if in the city and outside.. cats, dogs, emotional support.. etc..
- All dogs should be licensed with the exception of recently adopted dogs. There should be a 6 month grace period. As for cats they should only have to be licensed if they go outside regularly.
- Think this should apply to 'all' pets. However pets that stay in the house solely make it optional. For example fish - not 'necessary' to have a licence as it stays put in the house but for a snake though it stays in the house it would be beneficial as it holds accountability.
- anything that could get out or is dangerous
- Pets that really don't ever leave the home for any reason (birds, reptiles, fish) don't need to be licensed. If there are going to be issues around poor ownership and hoarding animals, those people won't be licensing pets anyway. I can't see how it would help with those issues.
- Reptiles, as they often go missing and pose a threat to others (snakes, lizards)
- Any pet that can get outside should be licensed whether it be a tag or a registry.
- Any that are taken or kept outdoors regularly, such as outdoor rabbits, leashed ferrets, etc, as all can escape and need to be picked up. Also anything exotic, especially if kept outdoors. Ex. outdoor parrot aviaries, wild cat and dog species, etc.
- If you want to have back yard chickens, your flock should be licensed.
- any pet that goes outside should be licensed
- Perhaps anything over a certain weight threshold
- Any that have the ability to escape outside.
- Any animal that is permitted to leave the inside of the home.
- Rabbits
- Bunnies and ferrets
- I think cats and dogs only is fine
- Exotic pets, especially those not endemic to Canada
- Bunnies, snakes, reptiles, - if they escape they can disturb the eco-system

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think Calgary should consider exotic animals in their bylaws, I don't know the current rules, but I don't think wild animals or exotics have a place in our homes (large snakes, etc)
- I think you should need a license to keep farm animals on your property
Pet pigs
- Any urban livestock should have to be licensed. Any animal that would escape.
- any pet that could potentially be outside of the home should be licensed
- Any animal that is domesticated and going outside free roaming or engaging in public activities should be licensed
- Rabbits as my neighbour breeds them and every year lets 10 or so go in winter on a cold night . If you by a rabbit registered so you just can't let it go free to succumb to the elements when it's served its purpose
- Rabbits, as they can easily be released and multiply fast.
- pet pigs - although are they even allowed? Snakes of certain kind/size as they could escape.
- Only potentially dangerous pets should be licensed
- I believe it is sufficient at this time to ensure that all dogs and all cats that are allowed to roam are all licensed.
- None, not even sure why these pets should be licensed.
- I would think large reptiles like snakes. This would be a safety issue for bylaw officers, police and fire departments.
- cats, same reason as for dogs.
- I think a ONE time minimal fee could be considered fair for rabbits, since there are many stray rabbits around, but it must be affordable and not a yearly financial job in the pocket of the owner. But how would you know when you found the rabbit, they don't wear a collar anyhow....
- no other pets should be licensed . cats and dogs are more likely to be out with owners/ in yards. I would think most other pets depend on enclosures of some sort, rabbits, snakes, birds etc. it would be just be another tax grab
- Why would you license a bird or a ferret or a hamster except as money grab?
- Any animal/pet who spends time outside should be licensed.
- No other licences
- Alligators, cougars, sharks, pythons.
- Any pets that are taken out in public spaces other than dogs and cats should also be subject to licensing. Licensing should also ensure that pets are vaccinated.
- I feel that licensing reptiles or insects ridiculous including snakes. I am a strong proponent of not owning exotic pets I feel that should be completely illegal
- If animals are out in public then yes but not sure which animals. Pigs? I'd leave it as it is right now
- Licensing dogs and cats is a silly requirement with no benefit
- Any pets that could get loose outside of the home in case they do.
- only the ones which leave the house
- Any animal that frequently leaves the house



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Any pet that is taken out in public.
- No. Pointless cash grab
- Any that go outside and could be lost
- I think any animal that is let outside (either on-leash or off) should be licensed.
- All
- Any reptile or exotic animal (not sure why we even allow invasive species into our country). I would NOT allow any such animals to be sold or kept period. However since we do, they should have to be licensed and the license must be bought at time of animal purchase (stores, breeders, citizen sales)
- All pets that leaves their residence should be treated equitably
- Dangerous or poisonous pets including all snakes and spiders
- Maybe any exotic pets .. seen pet birds at the dogs parks
- Any animal that is kept outdoors should be licensed.
- If the pet leaves the house and has a chance of running away or escaping I believe it should be licensed so there is a chance of a reunion with the owner. Make license something that doesn't leave the house or can't wear the identifying tag.
- Any animal that has the potential to harm a human, i.e. venomous insects, reptiles capable of inflicting bites or carrying diseases that can infect other animals or humans.
- Only those who have a form of physical ID such as bird band or tattoo for rabbits - this should be optional as most other animals are not going outside.
- Any large or outdoor animals.
- Any other pet that goes outside the house should be licensed, chipped and tattooed (those smaller than a hand may not need this, or aquatic animals)
- Bee's and chickens, a reasonable rate, just so that the city is aware that they are living in the city boundries.
- None.. what does the license do? You charge so much to recover a pet.
- other pets? wow! don't forget since 2008 our economy has been in the dump and has not come back up and yet here you are trying to get more \$ from people! I haven't had a raise since 2008 because of Economy! Stop taxing us and try to get more \$ from our empty pockets.
- Any animal likely to incur veterinary costs could benefit from registration to allow access to funding for low-income pet owners
- I'm not likely to encounter a pet in public other than a dog. I assume there are regulations around the keeping of 'exotic' animals like alligators and snakes and such.
- Not so much licensed but we should not allow livestock, chickens, ect. I can also see license for exotic pets, reptiles, snakes, or anything that is potential dangerous if it escapes.
- Any pet that can get out and about should be licensed in such a manner that they can be identified and reunited with their owners. This would serve not only the purpose of reuniting but also the owner could be identified and held accountable for any damage the animal may have incurred.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I would think licencing should be based on surrender/nuisance rates. If bunnies or other pets are likely to end up being surrendered or causing public nuisance then licensing could be required to offset those costs.
- No, drop licence requirements, new technology like chips and online dog find websites help owners reunite.
- no others, cats and dogs are fine
- Any urban farming animals or service animals that fall outside of cats and dogs.
- I think anything that can get out or anything that has longevity. For example, bearded dragons, snakes.
Also, exotic animals, simply because if people think they have to lisenca it may cut down on smuggling
- I think larger animals such as horses, donkeys goats and cattle as they could potentially cause more damage and harm than a cat or dog
- Any pet that would reasonably be expected to go out in public (ie emotional support animals of the “non traditional” variety)
- Dogs and cats. Nothing else in my opinion.
- I think any pet that’s leaving your home property should be licensed
- I dont think other pets would need to be as its mostly dogs and cats using city of calgary animal services resources
- Allow chickens/livestock and register the lot. Registering each chicken doesn't make sense, but the entire coup
- Any livestock if that passes
- Unless it's an outdoor animal, then no. My reptiles don't need city tags.
- None. Just dogs and cats.
- Possibly birds or rabbits. I have found lost birds and lost rabbits and the only way I was able to get them back home was through Facebook.
- I have yet to see benefit in licensing so don’t believe additional pets need to Ben licensed
- All animals that occupy outside spaces should be licensed , including agricultural if found at large they would create an issue.
- To what benefit (besides adding extra income to the city) would licensing a snake prove?
- birds as they can easily escape
- License dogs. Indoor cats shouldn't be licensed since they dont go outside
- I dont think any other animals should be. Rabbits matbe, but that would be so hard to deal with with so many wild rabbits.
- Make this easy for people, and cost effective.
- All animals should require a license if cats and dogs do.
(Rabbits etc)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think all pets living within the city limits should be licensed but the cost should be appropriate. It's unlikely a gerbil would require much city resources if it gets loose. But, a python could require a response.
- Anything that is outside a cage or may escape
- if they do not leave the house hold i don't feel other pets need to be licensed (bunnies, reptiles, etc) HOWEVER i feel they should be registered at least to have a record of them
- Rabbits bc lots of people release them outside when no longer wanted
- May not be a license but animal welfare practices should be adhered to for all pets (exotics, etc.)
- Rabbits. They breed rapidly, and alot of people buy them, get bored and just let them go. Ive seen mutiple pet rabbits living in nose hill park.
- No others.
- Any animal that had access to public space.
- I don't think a small animal license is practical or enforceable. Any animal that leaves the residence regularly should be licensed.
- I don't think licensing should ever be implemented. Microchiping on the other hand, that makes much more sense. If a dog gets out of the house without their collar on (and therefore tags), how is licensing going to help?!
- I don't think cats should be licensed.
- Only dogs, and indoor/outdoor cats.
- I think that if people have an animal for the purpose of it being a pet, licensing is a good idea. Primarily for lost animal situations.
- Any animal that might need to be brought to the vet
- any animal that lives outside or spends more than 50% of their time outside, or has a chance of escaping. For example: a chicken, lamb, sheep, horse, etc.
- Any animal that wanders or has access to parks
- No matter what make of vehicle I have, I must license and insure it. Why are only cats and dogs required to be licensed in the city? I think all animals residing with humans should be licensed - on a fair scale. The city should be aware of, and benefit from, all animals residing in the city. No?
- I am not sure that the value of the license is worth the cost. When I lived rurally, we were reunited with our pets several times, and it was because of tattoos and microchips, licensing was not the reason we got our pets back.
- Every pet should be licensed. No pet should be billed annually when no service is being provided. An annually recurring cost model is more like a money making business, and less like support for the owner.
- Any animals utilizing outdoor space off the human's property
- Children. Far more risks. Essentially a pet anyway.
- Birds and bunnies because of the mentality of some whom believe that these animals could survive out in the wild if set free. This way if they are found the City could fine the owner for neglect.
- None unless they are taken into public spaces



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think all pets should be licensed to ensure proper care of them.
- I think pets that can leave the house should be registered such as dog, cats, pigs, etc. I think birds and smaller mammals should be accounted for somehow but maybe not with a licensing fee. Unfortunately it will be hard to have people follow through with that.
- All pets licenced except fish
- None. I feel this would simply cause more people not to license their pets.
- I don't think there is a need to license all pets. It will be seen as a money grab from the city. If you implement a volunteer registry at least people may do it.
- I have no opinion on this.
- Any animal that could be interacting with the greater community should require a license.
- Yes. If I have to licence my indoor cat, why doesn't my neighbour have to licence his hamster, snake, rat, bird, etc. All animals can run away/get lost. If your excuse for the licensing is to reunite pets with owners then that should be ALL pets.
- Goldfish. They're a menace.
But seriously, licensing has no benefits to the animal's owners. The primary intent is generate revenue and identify animals that cause damage or contravene bylaws, which in turn generates revenue.
- Pigs. These could pose health risk with animal to human diseases.
- Snakes! people are breeding these and they get out! there should be regulation on snake ownership.
- Dogs and cats are enough
- For pets other than dogs and cats, if there are concerns for public safety, it should be licensed.
- Any pet that could get lost outside.
- Bunnies, goats, sheep, chickens.
- No they do get lost usually
- Any kind of wild animal hybrids
- Any domestic animals which are not 100% confined to indoor space. However I still believe it would be beneficial to license them in case of accidental escape
- Probably not. Urban ag if it comes to pass.
- None. Any other pet is unlikely to go missing and be "at large" and there is no need for licensing of pocket pets or birds. That would very much be seen as a money grab and I can't imagine that it would be anything but exactly that.
- I think cats and dogs are enough.
- Bunnies. We have a large feral bunny population and this would help determine feral from stray or lost
- Exotic birds
- Rabbits should be licensed as they can easily get outside.
- Other small indoor pets shouldn't have to be licensed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Any animal brought in from another country, should be quarantined/neutered or spayed/vaccinated/and most definitely licensed! Training, is also a must as you do not know the situation from which it came! This applies to ALL animals whether they have four legs or fly!
- I don't see why pets need to be licensed. Responsible owners all have their own tracking chips. I would much rather use my personal tracking solution than my dog be picked up by the city and fined. There is absolutely no benefit (just penalty) in licensing through the city.
- Rabbits. There seems to be an issue with owners setting them free and it might help control the problem? People might think twice about getting one if they had to license it? Also, any animal being used as an emotional support animal to help keep track/cut down on people fraudulently using the term.
- I think if you have larger pets like a pig or pony definitely. Not sure whether it's worthwhile for gerbil/guineapigs/ferrets,etc. I would think that it would be better to do group pricing if you have more than X, then it costs. Definitely not for tiny aquarium stuff unless it's large exotics
- Rabbits/snakes/reptiles/ferrets. Too many animals get abandoned or dumped. If pet Shops and breeders had to provide on-the-spot licensing, legitimate purchases, that would add to the value of the animal and provide you with info, how many of these animals exist. F&W collaborative on exotics CITES check
- I think the whole business is entirely pointless. I do not support city involvement in pet licensing at all. The city is really only needed when there is a vicious animal or something of that nature. People are intelligent enough to be able to sort the rest.
- If the owner of any other pet, who so chooses, could get their pet licensed just in case that pet might become lost. For example, I had a cockatiel and wish she could have been licensed so anyone who found her could have a means to return her. Someone might want to license their pet rabbit?
- I am not sure how prevalent it is in Calgary for people to own wild animals like monkeys and wild cats, but those animals definitely need to be either licensed or not allowed as pets. Large animals that may come in contact with other animals and people too, so pet pigs for example.
- Pigs - enough to require license
 - Any animal that might be out and about
- - Pigeons or permit
 - pet rabbits
 - pot-bellied pigs
 - any animal that can get loose
 - licensing tag requirement should be changed -> no tag required to be worn
 - wording changed so tag doesn't have to be worn
- At the moment, no
- No fines for licensing
 - Easily reunited with lost pets
- Rabbits/Bunnies - easy to mistake wild/tame pets that are more likely to get lost



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't see why pets need to be licensed. Responsible owners all have their own tracking chips. I would much rather use my personal tracking solution than my dog be picked up by the city and fined. There is absolutely no benefit (just penalty) in licensing through the city.
- Rabbits. There seems to be an issue with owners setting them free and it might help control the problem? People might think twice about getting one if they had to license it? Also, any animal being used as an emotional support animal to help keep track/cut down on people fraudulently using the term.
- I think if you have larger pets like a pig or pony definitely. Not sure whether it's worthwhile for gerbil/guineapigs/ferrets,etc. I would think that it would be better to do group pricing if you have more than X, then it costs. Definitely not for tiny aquarium stuff unless it's large exotics
- Rabbits/snakes/reptiles/ferrets.Too many animals get abandoned or dumped.If pet Shops and breeders had to provide on-the-spot licensing, legitimate purchases, that would add to the value of the animal and provide you with info, how many of these animals exist.F&W collaborative on exotics CITES check
- I think the whole business is entirely pointless. I do not support city involvement in pet licensing at all. The city is really only needed when there is a vicious animal or something of that nature. People are intelligent enough to be able to sort the rest.
- If the owner of any other pet, who so chooses, could get their pet licensed just in case that pet might become lost. For example, I had a cockatiel and wish she could have been licensed so anyone who found her could have have a means to return her. Someone might want to license their pet rabbit?
- I am not sure how prevalent it is in Calgary for people to own wild animals like monkeys and wild cats, but those animals definitely need to be either licensed or not allowed as pets. Large animals that may come in contact with other animals and people too, so pet pigs for example.
- Yes they all should be at least registered to stop hoarding of animals or illegal sales of them.
- I think all pets should be microchipped but should not require licensing.
- Rabbits/bunnies, so people don't just release them into the wild when they can no longer look after them and they rapidly reproduce and become pests in the neighborhoods.
- I think reptiles, amphibians and arachnids dont need a license but maybe owners should have a bill of sale like a car or a registration from the pet store in case they go missing
- I don't think they need to be licensed
- None. I don't think it's worth the money that the administration costs the City.
- I don't think any other pets should need to be licensed
- If the city decides to have livestock in the city, all should be licensed.
- Non
- Birds come to mind as they are often escape artists, released freely and often found free. However, this would have to be cheaply done and easily done online without limit to birds/species per person.
- Any exotic types of animals. Licensing would cut down on the illegal traffic of exotic animals. Some animals bring risks of disease. Knowing where these animals are would help with health and safety concerns.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- All pets, especially rabbits and small mammals
- Bunnies, ferrets, large reptiles, birds. I rescued a bird at a park once (a cockatiel), and I know of several people who have reported their budgies escaped.
- Rabbits. All owned rabbits required to be sterilized. There are far too many feral rabbits roaming around. The city won't accept strays and the Humane Society shouldn't have to be responsible for strays within city limits. Same rules should apply as those for cats and dogs.
- Rabbits, they escape often and/or released when unwanted, may deter this poor behaviour.
- All reptiles, ferrets, and birds as well. Proper identification and responsibility to owner if pet escapes or becomes an issue
- Bunny rabbits should be licensed because they can grow sizable and are similar to cats.
- All species. Rabbits as a priority due to overflowing community and shelters. Potentially dangerous species (large snakes). Perhaps permits instead of licenses.
- I think dogs/cats is sufficient, the majority of the population owns one or the other. Licensing other pets sounds like a cash grab.
- Any livestock, if that was legalized.
- No other animals
- Emotional support animals other than cats and dogs.
- Any pet that could potentially get out or be taken out of the home or yard.
- If the agriculture/livestock bylaws are put into place, any quadruped should be licensed (horses, cows, sheep, goats).
- all species/ rabbits as a priority due to overflowing community and shelters. potentially dangerous species, eg large snakes. perhaps permits instead of licenses
- Any pet that can get out of the house and get lost, like rabbits and ferrets, or a pet that can be dangerous, such as certain snakes.
- Bunnies but really any species that has the chance of getting out
- No others. The following pets should not be licensed - birds, turtles, minks, hedgehogs, chickens, weasel, etc
- Why should house cats/dogs have to have licenses while birds, rabbits, etc. do not? If licensing is to reunite lost animals with their owners, then microchipping is a better option.
- Although I do not in any way support bee keeping or urban livestock. There must be criteria for them to meet and they must be licensed and there must be a way to monitor them.
- I think both cats and dog need a licence.
- Potentially dangerous snakes, rabbits due to overflowing populations.
- Which require the services of animal bylaw or services? Which require use of taxpayer money? I have no idea. If it costs the city, it should cost the owners of those pets...but then they must receive some benefit. Otherwise no, why license something that's probably only indoors and gets no benefit?
- Birds, disease



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Nothing else needs to be licensed. Just another way for the city to make money and grow the administration.
- All pets should be licenced.
- If dogs and cats need to be licensed then all pets should be licensed.
- No benefits to licensing at all for any pets
- Dogs, cats, rabbits, parrots, ferrets or any other animals commonly found and an animal rescues or shelter should be licensed and microchipped.
- All species - Rabbits priority due to overflowing community and shelters and lack of knowledge between what domestic and feral rabbit are; Potentially dangerous species (large snakes) - maybe permits instead of licenses for some species.
- Chickens and ducks - not individually, but as a permitted number per house.
- Pet pigs, chickens, rabbits, horses, raccoons, really any pet like this. Exotic wildlife. Perhaps certain snakes? Why? So the City understands what none pet owners have to put up with, what services might need to be provided, also to know what neighbors might be having to put up with.
- Almost all household pets (rabbits, snakes, etc) should be licensed and chipped so that if they are lost or dumped, they can be reunited with owners. If a pet is dumped, easier to identify and fine offenders.
- Birds that fly.
- All. To provide negative incentives to irresponsible ownership. Pay your salaries for what that's worth. Disease control, inhibit illegal animal trade, protect exotic species, promote compatible community relations, my tranquility.
- All pets should be licensed.
- I don't know what the list of eligible/legal pets includes but perhaps uncommon animals that are not native to the region should be registered in case they escape (intentionally or unintentionally) and cause problems in nature.
- Until there is a framework to provide municipal support to owners of Fish, Reptiles, Birds, and Small Mammals like Hamsters, there should not be a license. If the city funded an exotic rescue shelter for these animals with a licensing fee, owners in those communities may be receptive to that idea.
- Any wild animals that are being kept as pets although I realize this is probably illegal so the owners are not likely to do this. Licensing of urban livestock might help control what is going on out there.

What are your expectations for dog-walking businesses?

- While I generally think that restricting where they can have dogs is a good thing, I would be hesitant to put in too specific of regulations, but could see merit in rules like "not on a bike path"
- Be trained to handle multiple dogs and animal CPR for emergencies when walking dogs in a pack ALOT can go wrong!
- Be insured and first aid certified.
- Have inspection visits to ensure health and safety standards. Treat dog daycares the same as you would child care facilities.
- Be able to control the dogs they have with them



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That they are actually in control of the dogs with them and that they are picking up after their dogs.
- They should have the same rules as pet owners unless they can provide ID and have total control over the dogs at all times. No off leash unless following basic pet owners rules. I think only 2 dogs in off leash.
- Specific regulations about liability for dogs under their care, should those dogs attack a person or animal.
- All dogs microchipped
- Increased responsibility for care and control and interactions with other dogs especially with more than one dog.
- PICK UP AFTER THE DOGS!! too many dogs per walker means lots of 'presents' left behind for the rest of us to deal with while walking our dogs.
- They need to be under control. I don't care how many as long as they have full control
- Fines for those who do not have appropriate control/oversight of multiple dogs
- By walking the dogs the dog walker can not negatively impact any other Calgarian, failure to do so being a bylaw offense that is subject to fine
- They should be bonded and insured.
- Must clean up dog feces and actually enforce it please. No one cares about your signs in the parks. There is poop everywhere. Alllll over this city.
- Fined for not picking up poop. Some dog walkers release their packs on nosehill and are not able to watch multiple dogs and where they are pooping.
- Permit must be available if requested and their should be an on line list available to be consulted but I don't know that requiring it to be carried is necessary. Not opposed to it though.;t know it is necessary
- again, animals must be chipped...
- That the person is educated and licenced via education to care for multiple dogs at a time.
- Safe transportation rules. First aid training and carrying water. Pls note for limits, they need to be reasonable. If they can control the pack, that's important consideration.
- They should pick up after the dogs which I often see not happening, they often do not even have bags with them
- That they can control the dog(s) they are walking. Its not abut how many dogs, more on behaviour and control.
- Ensure all dogs have received their vaccinations
- Ensure that the person can safely manage the number and/or size of dogs they are walking
- Provide SAFE travel (vehicle(s)) for these animals as I sometimes see multiple dogs jacked like sardines into a small vehicle and if in accident is VERY UNSAFE fir these animals
- Must have current pet first aid.
- The dogs in packs walked by businesses should be treated the same as pet owners. As a dog-walking business owner, the people in my business work hard to train the dogs we take on as clients to ensure they have good recall and appropriate behaviour in the dog parks. We ensure our clients



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

provide city tags and we clean up after all the dogs in our care plus picking up extra to help maintain the cleanliness of the our beautiful parks..

- Have liability insurance
- Have to pick up all dogs poop.
- I want to add that dog walkers should also have an education based on science and a good understanding of behaviour
- Insurance
- allways on leash and have poop bags
- It is up to you the owner to find a trust worthy person. They should have mandatory insurance to walk dogs
- Ensure dogs are tatoored/microchipped.
- Required to read a list of the rules and bylaws and sign a document stating read and adhere to them.
- Ensure dogs are licensed but it is unsafe to wear the tags. Dogs get playing and they could get caught up in the tags.
- Ensure dog-walkers always pick up after the dogs
- Have adequate waste bags & not allowing dog to defacate on sidewalks
- Be responsible for picking up after their dogs perhaps an extra person doing the patrol
- As long as the walker can control the dogs they walk there should be no limit either on walks or off leash. I dont think they need to be licence or need a permit.
- Treat my pet like their own, keep them safe, love and care for them like we do. It's my responsibility to ensure the person I choose meets the requirements I need for my pet. Dog walkers should require a police check plus checks for (Canada wide) animal cruelty.
- Limits on how many and how they have the animals in a vehicle
- Ensuring any aggressive dogs are properly supervised and restrained
- Mandate all dogs always under control
- Have control of the animals at all times. This includes being able to call the animal and have it return to them when in an off leash situation.
- Keep logs of their dog identification and photos with owners contact on hand at all times while that fog is in their possession should the dog go missing or requires veterinary care.
- All the dogs must have their shots to ensure their health and the health of the dogs they're in contact with. Also walking small and large together in a clump could be dangerous. People want their animals to enjoy the walk - walking in a clump around someone without time to sniff, pee or BE A DOG is not a fun walk. Walking while distracted by their phone (not paying attention) is so wrong. Taking over the sidewalk is also unfair to other users. I cannot believe people think they're doing a good thing for their dog by hiring a glorified post that moves. If you can't look after and enjoy your dog — give it away!
- None of the above. This is not and never has been a problem.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I do not believe they should be allowed to let dogs go in off-leash areas. There is no way that they can be in control of multiple animals, or there to pick up their feces, when they have more than two animals. These dogs often just run wild in the park and cause problems while the walker is engaged elsewhere. They should always be with the walker, on leash.
- License requirement that they have police clearances and hold insurance!
- It is not the cities job to police a business in such a manner.
- Why?
- LIMIT THE NUMBER OF DOGS WALKED AT 1 TIME TO 4 or less. You cannot adequately monitor more dogs than that, and if there is a conflict with multiple dogs, you risk greater injury to the dogs or yourself...
- I was hoping for this question. Dog walkers have too many dogs and cannot manage them. I see this everyday when I take my dog to offleash areas and walk on lead in the down town core. These people need everything I checked and MUST be restricted to the animals they manage. These dogs run in packs at the parks and there is no way 1 human can manage 8 canines I'd say 4 is tough. They also cannot manage the clean up as they cannot see everything the animals are doing.
- Limited amount of dogs per handler, 6 per handler at most. I created a Dog Management program for parks in Vancouver and i'm also a dog owner. Makes me furious to see what goes on here with other dog walkers! Often they don't pick up as they have too many dogs and can't watch them all.
- They should be insured against pet losses. We have heard of dogs dying or getting lost by neglectful or distracted dog walkers.
- background checks/bonded if coming into your home
- If they break rules regarding walking a dog Off leash in a non-off leash area that they face severe penalties including losing their licenses
- The dog walker should be ensuring the animals are licensed. this does not need to be written in a bylaw. get over yourselves and stop being control freaks.
- Not permitted to walk known vicious dogs
- Dog walkers should DEFINITELY be restricted in the # of dogs they are walking, especially off leash. At Edworthy Park there are sometimes a dozen walkers each with a dozen dogs. It is chaos! However, walking small dogs is not the same as big dogs so perhaps the restriction SB by weight. Definitely no one should walk more than 4 big dogs at one time, on or off leash. Small dog max. SB 6 dogs.
- They need to be insured should a dog in their care cause harm to another dog/person or property
- Be required to take a dog walking course - there is one offered by DogBiz that has been presented in Calgary.
- Have liability insurance.
- Be in control of the dogs they have regardless of the number. Some form of training knowledge.
- No history of (conviction for) animal cruelty or other obviously related offenses. Insurance.
- Exceptions for things like a neighbourhood kid taking someone's dog for a walk everyday after school.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- KNOW where the off leash areas are in natural spaces. Don't walk 6 dogs on a footpath on a slope where there is NO escape for oncoming humans. I see this regularly in Bowmont Park.
- Criminal background checks, any issues with previous infractions regarding animals
- Whether on or off leash, no person or business should walk more dogs than they can control. Stiffer fines should apply to a business owner as they should be held to a higher level of education/training.
- Make the limit the weight of the dogs cannot exceed half of what the Walker weight is.
- Picking up after all dogs in their charge.
- PLEASE LIMIT THE # OF DOGS! I've seen many dog walkers with so many dogs on leashes they were NOT having a good time - the little ones were being trampled by larger ones.
- Safely transport dogs to and from off leash locations
- THAT THEY CARRY INSURANCE INCASE AN ANIMAL IS HURT IN THIER CARE
- qualification should be set by The City (minimum expectations - e.g., trained by an existing qualified person, probation period, referral has accountability
- Should not be allowed to walk dogs off leash at all
- I don't care about any of the above as long as the dogs are under control. It may be less likely with more dogs or less training, but not necessarily.
- Clean up after all dogs in their care!
- Pass police checks as well as be required to keep a GPS tracker on them during walks.
- This is an area that needs enforcement of all the same rules individual dog walkers have. No single person can walk 10 10 dogs and watch them
- Require all dogs to be fully vaccinated and - if off-leash - that the walker is still in control of ALL dogs at ALL times.
- All restrained properly in vehicles, not just loose in a van with multiple other loose dogs
- If they are a full out business and are charging as much as some of them charge, they better be qualified and provide some sort of enrichment that is regulated. They should also be at least mildly educated.
- This may fall under training but they should hold a pet first aid/cpr certification just like a child care provider
- Don't tell me to leash my one dog when we get close to your "pack of multiple dogs- I've seen as many as 18 dogs with one dog walker at Nose Hill Park. Also do t ask me to go another direction.
- Be insured as a business
- Ensure they can actually control all the dogs they are walking.
- Allow businesses to run as they will and stop trying to have a hand in everything. Govt doesn't know the first thing about responsible dog ownership or training and those of us that do aren't being done any favours by your stifling regulations.
- Must let the people know if they are having any other dogs.
- Qualifications and education are key
- That they are capable of controlling all animals under their care
- Have the necessary means to pick up after all of the dogs



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Know the dogs personalities and ensure reactive dogs are kept on leash and close to the dog walker
- Dogs should be up to date with vaccinations.
- Rabies tag also owner's ph# available.
- No leaving dogs alone
- full responsibility of pets behavior should be on the walker. if pets misbehave or hurt someone, the pet should be returned to owner and business should be responsible for any damages/injuries.
- Have adequate control over the animals.
- Just a clarification about limiting numbers. I'd like to know what the limit might be? My dogs used to go on group pack walks with a licensed trainer and I had no problem with her having 6-8 dogs
- Rules for waste disposal, water Usage and chemical use regarding dog washing.
- All dogs on leash
- Be able to control the amount of dogs being walked on-leash or off.
- Ensure all waste are picked up
- 2 things. 1) mandatory pet first aid course. 2) Must carry businesses or dog walker insurance. This is a business and should be treated as such. Even if it's a one person Craigslist operation.
- Limit of dogs should vary based on the size and type of dog they are walking ie 4 huskies don't equal 4 yorkies
- re: wearing tags, isn't that a reqt of all dogs? rules should be the same. anyone walking multiple dogs (business or personal) needs to be mindful of others who occupy the same space on sidewalks, in parks. and they should have control of all dogs.
- Restrictions around how dogs/how many dogs are transported in vehicle. Have insurance to cover dog clients as well as dogs they may encounter.
- Safe transportation should be provided
- The issue of trained/qualified is a key difference between individual dog walkers and businesses. Dog walking businesses need a process to train and assess competence as an on-going basis; individuals just need to demonstrate competence infrequently
- Criminal record check to get a permit that allows you to walk strangers dogs. What if you have three-five dogs yourself? Well they'll all be licensed to YOU, so no need for a permit.
- must clean up after the dogs
- Must be in absolute control of all of the dogs. I don't believe this can be done if there are multiple dogs and they are off-leash.
- Some newer parks have 2 dog maximums per person, but dog walkers do not adhere to this. The fenced park in Killarney/glengarry often has single walkers with over 6 dogs with them. I don't think it's wrong to have 6 dogs with you, but in small fenced parks this means that they monopolize the space and it becomes like a private park just for them
- As with any dog handler - owner or not - well behaved dogs are not a problem while problem handlers should be dealt with
- My expectations is that it's my duty to get the dog walker and not the city. Stay out of it.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Limit to 6 dogs (3 per hand) and absolutely have all the appropriate (inc. liability) business insurances.
- They should not be allowed to walk pitbulls in groups of dogs. To hard to manage potentially dangerous dogs in groups.
- I don't like the idea of limits (see above selections) but it's okay if the limit is not overly restrictive. I think a dog walker can reasonably walk up to 6 dogs on or off leash.
- I have seen an overweight man, driving a small 2 door compact car with 10 dogs in it. I counted because he got out with them. I shouldn't have to specify the dangers all around for this.
- Didn't know there was a problem with Dog walking businesses. Why don't you just leave them alone?
- Hygiene rules should also be expected and liability if it bites. Who is responsible?
- ensure that the dogs they walk have up-to-date vaccinations
- Any business requires a licence. Any person walking dog(s) must be in control, courteous and responsible
- no off-leash walking
- lose business license when they use school grounds, playgrounds, athletic parks, wild areas such as weasel head wild area.
- All dogs are vaccinated
- Insurance to cover incidents involving animals in their care.
- Pick up poop!!
- Must have pet first aid. Two at a time off leash per person, maximum 4 on leash at a time per person (dependent on size - 4 small dogs are different than 4 large dogs).
- pick up after the pets regardless of area the dogs are being walked (on or off leash), and if there is an incident with another pet, show identification and be responsible for injury by the owner or themselves.
- Waste collection
- clean up after them.
- Be licensed as a business depending on revenue.
- Really none of the above, any of those will kill the business and it's a valuable service that benefits the dogs as well.
- Wear recognizable identifier that they are part of a business performing a service.
- criminal background check , to be certain no animal cruelty charges
- dog-walking business must have ratio of dog walkers to employed-poop-picker-uppers of not more than 7.
- A mandatory training course on dog behavior.
- Dogs **MUST** be leashed in public areas. Sick and tired of loose dogs approaching me and my children in parks and at public events. HUGE outdoor nuisance!
- Make sure they are able to pick up after dogs in their care and have control at all times.
- Ensure all dogs have uptodate vaccinations.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Be able to recall the dogs as that seems to be an issue where ai walk, no recall no control and those dogs should not be off a leash.
- be able to control the dogs easily so restrictions not only on number walked at once but size and strength of dogs to be walked at once
- Clean up after the dogs!!!!
- Have an appropriate amount of poop bags and be heavily fined without as that proves no intention of picking up.
- I resent have to step off the curb to let them by on the sidewalk. That is not a respectful of your neighbours. Senior or not I should not have to take the risk of falling on ice or whatever to accommodate a pack of dogs. Same goes for on trails. I do not enjoy meeting a pack of dogs going either way on city park trails.
- Pass a background check.
- They should not have right of way on pathways, sidewalks, etc. They are bothersome to others trying to enjoy a simple walk.
- They must pick up the poop of every dog they are responsible for at the off leash parks.
- Proven knowledge of dog behaviour and positive training methods.
- Cleaning up properly after dogs
- All dogs need to be under control to make to safe for others passing by and those with dogs.
- Pick up feces of dogs. Not happening at Southland off leash park.
- I think people walking two or three dogs should be exempt. Often we walk our neighbours' dog with our own and that should not require a license 'cause we are doing a favour. Anytime that money is involved though, a paid service, it is a business transaction and should be properly licensed.
- Pay for conducting business in parks. Like rent that every other business owner has to pay
- I think that this depends on the dog walker and the dogs, they should be able to have control over the animals at all times.
- They take on the responsibility of the animal in their control and should carry insurance for liability of said animal.
- They should also be a certain age and have a background check for any previous abuse with animals or people, just like babysitting.
- Dnsuring agressive dogs are kept on a short leash with indentifiable markings
- I know training was mentioned above, but I want to stress this!!!! Also maybe equipment regulations? Ie. no choke, prong, slip or limited slip collars.
- the maximum number of animals could be related to the combined weight of the animals, thus more closely reflecting the individual's ability to control them.
- It is not the responsibility of dog walkers to licence the dogs - they should not be accountable for what is outside of their control.
- Full Shots and vet check documentation
- Common sense and respect.
- Business should not be responsible for the dog being licensed with the city (ie cannot be ticketed)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Strict limits on the numbers of dogs (not exceeding four) that should be permitted to be walked at any given time - especially in off leash parks where the dogs are running loose and intimidating to other dogs, especially nervous dogs.
- Provide all employees handling dogs with clear expectations (or opportunities) for basic an education on behaviour and handling skills from a certified professional. Too many incidents and costs could be entirely avoided if we regulated the pet care industry
- no extendi leashes
- limit place for walking (as example, not in the Sue dog park)
- All animals must be under control (i.e., leash or command) at all times when off owner's property.
- Dog walkers should be required to take training for handling aggressive animals as well as multiple animals. They should also be required to pay a user fee to help pay for the mess they leave in the offleash parks and the fact they are earning income at taxpayer expense.
- Respect other people and children's space in public areas
- No multiple dog walks/runs in public off-leash parks. The limit should match the limit of dogs allowed to be owned within the city bylaws.
- Make sure that they keep all the dogs within sight and availability to pick up their poop.
- Pet first aid course
- For safety reasons, should not be allowed on leash and off leash at the same time.
- I think that individuals are employing a dog walker and they should be aware of their credentials.
- Have control of dogs, follow rules, monitor dogs
- To clean up after each dog no matter where they are
- Larger fines then citizens if they fail to pooperscoop
- Just be on leash if the area requires it. I don't think the city should be involved in peoples' income- this is to be handled privincially and federally with taxes.
- I have no expectations
- Easily accessible training courses for youth needing extra income
- An easily seen license or permit. Not one you have to ask for or follow them back to their vehicle.
- Have let first aid and dog walking training, understand dog communication, and be expected to double leash dogs to prevent escaping.
- Limit the number of animals if the can't control them.
- They are able to control the situation, no matter the number of dogs.
- Clean up after the animals
- Not accepting clients who dont have licenses
- Higher fines for not picking up poop.
- Abide by the rules.
- Criminal check might be nice
- Max three at a time. Not sure this is enforceable, how could it be.
- You guys can't handle other kinds of business licensing that already exists.
- keep dogs off private property.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The only point is that it is the owner's responsibility to choose the best professional and the government doesn't need to participate on this.
- pick up excrement.
- Be physically able to control strong dogs. If the dog does not have a licence, revoke the business licence.
- To have all dogs under their control when off leash. Not to walk a dog with poor recall off leash.
- Pick up after their charges and be respectful of everyone else in the park.
- Leave them alone. Why does the city have to get involved.
- Everything at the business owner's discretion
- Maximum 2 dogs at a time. I often see dogwalkers with 3 or more and I can't pass them with my dog, it's too much.
- Quit hogging the sidewalk
- I believe if a company has trained their employees properly and are respectful to the parks and others who enjoy that park then they should be allowed to walk as many dogs as they feel comfortable with. This number would vary based on the years of experience the walker had.
- Restrictions on specific times of day dog walkers can walk multiple dogs in specific areas (such as past a c-train station at peak times)
- City should not be involved in this.
- Responsible for composition and behavior of pack
- Ensure they carry basic health information on each of the animals in their care and control
- It only makes sense that a full-on dog-walking business pay for licensing, certified training, etc.
- Limit on total weight ratio of dogs to humans. A 300lb person can easily walk 10 Chihuahuas but a 120lb person cannot walk 2 Bernese Mountain Dogs
- limits will really depend on the capacity of the person. Some dog walkers can handle more dogs than others.
- Should have regulations for safe transportation of dogs
- At this time I think all that should be required of those walking multiple dogs is that the animals are under complete control. Perhaps if this becomes more common my expectations will change.
- We are daily users of the off leash dog park. It is frustrating to see people who have no control over a large number of dogs that they are walking. We watch as they unload their vehicles and leave dogs unattended and the dogs are running around unsupervised. The feces that is being left all over is unbelievable. I strongly believe that there needs to be restrictions on dog walkers and the dog walkers businesses. I also believe that dogs in off leash areas should be spayed and neutered. There are a lot of issues with dogs that are not fixed.
- They know how to control the dogs from sniffing/jumping on people
- be responsible and fined for not picking up after the multi dog pack
- The ones around here seem to be doing just fine, Working like navvies and the owners are happy leave them alone ffs.
- Make sure the dogs are exercised and safe



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They need to pick up after all the dogs.
- No off lease dog walking should be allowed, except if they are in a designated secured off-leash park.
- Dog vaccination information available
- Carry evidence (doggy-bags) that they intend to clean up after the animals - at least then they can act like they are going to clean up any mess.
- Make sure that you don't leave the dogs in the car when it is hot or too cold. Some dogs have died.
- Pick up dog waste and dispose of properly
- Be able to control their dogs
- I would say no more than four off leash dogs. I have seen too many "dog walkers" at the parks with more than they can realistically keep their eyes on? Not picking up poops. Their dogs would attack others and they would keep walking away not noticing.
- With the exception being rescues and their volunteers . They should have separate regulations to licensure etc
- I don't think a dog-walking business should allow the dogs in their care to be off-leash in a public space
- criminal background check
- Be insured
- All dogs must be vaccinated and up to date on rabies, and must be in control.
- Pick up all defecation
- Proper control of dogs (recall, not allowing nuisance behaviour, etc)
- Be kept in a database with the City.
- Dog walkers on Nose Hill cannot possibly clean up after 10 dogs running loose in off-leash areas. There is poop everywhere up there! Dogs run into mucky areas or weedy scrub areas, and walkers / owners do NOT follow into those areas. Multiple dogs = multiple problems.
- I think a dog walking business can walk however many dogs they are able to in a safe way that does not infringe on the safety and wellbeing of the dogs being walked or the dogs around them.
- I think off leash dog walkers should be regulated way more. Not only because of the need to have all dogs under control, but also to pick their poop. It drives me insane when a dog walker comes to the park, let's 8 dogs off leash, they all run ogg excitedly, then they all go shit in different areas.
- I think most professional dog walkers are quite knowledgeable about dogs and dog behaviour. Most of them are more than capable of walking multiple dogs. It is offer. The average pet owner that can't control their pet that thinks if they can walk one how can they walk 8
- Pick up after the dogs, have them under control.
- Less dogs would make it easier to watch dogs and pick up watse. Too many times I've seen distracted dog walkers not see and pick up dog waste. It adds up when they have 7+ dogs with them.
- Insured. Bonded.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Must clean up all the feces of dogs they are walking. This is a problem when they take them to unfenced, hidden from view off leash areas. Have seen this in my neighbourhood
- have the damn dogs *under control* on leash or off
- Pick up after themselves
- Criminal background check. Dogs are part of our family, this is the equivalent of child care. Also, they are likely given access to a person's home when they are away at work.
- Must be fully responsible for the actions of the dog or anything that happens to the dog or caused by the dog while under their care. Must be fully incontrol of all dogs at all times.
- not allowed to walk multiple dogs in areas where public have an expectation of walking in peace, ex. public parks and gardens
- Ensure dog has chip or tag with owner name and number as backup
- Off leash only in off leash areas
- I believe dog walkers should be able to walk as many dogs as they see they are fit to handle. It should not be on the dog-walkers responsibility to have the dog license
- Rather than training, I think they should have to complete an online test to prove they understand the bylaws and rules. In fact, this should be done for anyone applying for a license.
- bags to clean up messes, rules "not allow dogs to run on citizens grass/yard"
- police check since they may enter a person's home
- Ensure all dogs are microchipped/ can be ID'd
- Be able to show effective control over all dogs in their care and control.
- Liability insurance
- The limit on number of dogs being walked is totally dependant on the walker. It is not about number of dogs but about ability to control the dogs.
- Be in control of their dogs. Already too much regulations in this world.
- Have certified first aid training for animals
- Amount of dogs off leash should be reasonable - walker can keep an eye on all of them at all times. Recall is vital but often lacking
- Must have and demonstrate use of litter bags
- Severe license consequences and stiffer by law fines for those companies and individuals that do not clean up after the dogs. There are so many that are walking dogs and leaving their poop everywhere or walking so many that they're not seeing the dogs poop. I saw this all the time in the bowmount off-leash area. They get angry at you when you pointed out to them. As well there are many that are walking so many dogs, it's dangerous. There's no way they can control that many dogs. An incident can happen with a child or another dog very quickly and that group of dogs is a pack. We are lucky that nothing bad has happened yet. Or that I know of. A dog walker as an individual should not be walking more then three dogs. Span of control is already limited. Please don't let an individual dog or a child or person get hurt. Please don't let them be responsible. Fine both the dog walker and The Business



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ensure dogs are properly dewormed and vaccinated or vaccine titers were performed and the dog is healthy in that sense
- Why would the city make additional rules for this specialty small business but not others? This is really going too far.
- Dogs should be required to be chipped, not licensed. That's a one time cost. The dog could have a tag that says it's chipped, for easy identification.
- vaccinated for all required shots
- Have every dog under control at all times, and if off leash a reliable recall for every dog.
- Steep fines for non compliance.
- When off leash, be able to demonstrate they have control of all the animals.
- Be insured as a business. Carry WCB for its employees.
- Pick up after their dogs. Identify the dogs in their care. Restrict the dog walkers from multiple animals at night.
- Have a background in behaviour, there needs to be more regulation in animal care professionals
- Higher fines if an incident should occur.
- spending tax money enforcing this??? All dog owners that utilize a dog walker must have their dog get an accredited canine good citizen course that can receive an enrollment discount when liscenced. Promote responsible ownership... do not discourage. We want the dog walked! The people that do this are highly likely responsible owners, encourage them not discourage them!
- Absolutely a limit on number of dogs. There is a dog Walker in our area whi walks SIX!!! dogs with a waist leash. She would not be able to control the dogs if something happened and they would all be at risk.
- If you can name one legitimate "dog walker training school" then yes they should be trained/qualified
- Not to be permitted to take a dog previously identified as aggressive on a pack walk with other dogs or to an off leash park.
- none. stop micro managing EVERYTHING
- It does not matter to me so long the dogs are under control. I have never ran into a dog-walking business that did not have the utmost control of their dogs. They tend to do a better job of controlling multiple dogs(because its their job they take it seriously)than most owners of a SINGLE dog.
- No keeping dogs in vehicles.
- Ensure that they have no history of animal abuse.
- Liscening dog walkers is ridiculous.
- Be able to control all dogs, and pick up after them
- Too many dogs means you cannot reasonably pick up poop off-leash. Holding dog walkers responsible for dog waste.
- I think the standard of dog walking business should be left up the the industry not really a city task. However I do think there should bge some guildlines to obtain a business license .. balance I guess
- ensure dogs are healthy enough to walk.
- That they effectively supervise the animals they're charged with taking care of.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Insurance
 - safe transportation
 - Dog walker - pack is taught and stays with her,
 - remove pack
 - If dog walker walks dog they are responsible
 - Walker should have insurance
 - Too hard to handle a large pack of dogs
 - Defecation not picked up
 - Bad dog walkers not picking up - needs enforcement. Dog walker must walk over 6 dogs to stay in business - will discourage experienced dog walkers and less experienced will be doing job.
- - Private off-leash, they pay to get in, run by the city
 - outside of calgary
 - Obedience, CDC level of training -> allowed off leash
 - must pick up defecation
 - who is going to provide training? A course?
 - certification by who?
 - limit is the # you can control only walk licensed dogs
- Must clean up all the feces of dogs they are walking. This is a problem when they take them to unfenced, hidden from view off leash areas. Have seen this in my neighbourhood
- have the damn dogs *under control* on leash or off
- Pick up after themselves
- If there aren't restrictions then make statute based compensation claims for anyone affected by out of control animals. The number isn't really key it's the control over the animals' behaviour.
- Criminal background check. Dogs are part of our family, this is the equivalent of child care. Also, they are likely given access to a person's home when they are away at work.
- Must be fully responsible for the actions of the dog or anything that happens to the dog or caused by the dog while under their care. Must be fully in control of all dogs at all times.
- It is ideal if all dogs have their tags but they do fall off or you assume it's in date but it's an old tag. I think this is up to the city to educate and any repercussions needs to be to the owner not a business. Dogs should be vaccinated as per a veterinarian schedule when in public use areas.
- not allowed to walk multiple dogs in areas where public have an expectation of walking in peace, ex. public parks and gardens
- Carry insurance to pay for the damage that may occur
- Ensure dog has chip or tag with owner name and number as backup
- Off leash only in off leash areas
- I believe dog walkers should be able to walk as many dogs as they see they are fit to handle. It should not be on the dog-walkers responsibility to have the dog license
- Rather than training, I think they should have to complete an online test to prove they understand the bylaws and rules. In fact, this should be done for anyone applying for a license.
- bags to clean up messes, rules "not allow dogs to run on citizens grass/yard"



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- police check since they may enter a person's home
- Ensure all dogs are microchipped/ can be ID'd
- Be able to show effective control over all dogs in their care and control.
- Liability insurance
- The limit on number of dogs being walked is totally dependant on the walker. It is not about number of dogs but about ability to control the dogs.
- There should escalating fines for not cleaning up after them.
- Be in control of their dogs. Already too much regulations in this world.
- Have certified first aid training for animals
- Amount of dogs off leash should be reasonable - walker can keep an eye on all of them at all times. Recall is vital but often lacking
- Must have and demonstrate use of litter bags
- Severe license consequences and stiffer by law fines for those companies and individuals that do not clean up after the dogs. There are so many that are walking dogs and leaving their poop everywhere or walking so many that they're not seeing the dogs poop. I saw this all the time in the bowmount off-leash area. They get angry at you when you pointed out to them. As well there are many that are walking so many dogs, it's dangerous. There's no way they can control that many dogs. An incident can happen with a child or another dog very quickly and that group of dogs is a pack. We are lucky that nothing bad has happened yet. Or that I know of. A dog walker as an individual should not be walking more then three dogs. Span of control is already limited. Please don't let an individual dog or a child or person get hurt. Please don't let them be responsible. Fine both the dog walker and The Business
- Ensure dogs are properly dewormed and vaccinated or vaccine titers were performed and the dog is healthy in that sense
- Why would the city make additional rules for this specialty small business but not others? This is really going too far.
- Dogs should be required to be chipped, not licensed. That's a one time cost. The dog could have a tag that says it's chipped, for easy identification.
- vaccinated for all required shots
- Have every dog under control at all times, and if off leash a reliable recall for every dog.
- Steep fines for non compliance.
- When off leash, be able to demonstrate they have control of all the animals.
- Be insured as a business. Carry WCB for its employees.
- Pick up after their dogs. Identify the dogs in their care. Restrict the dog walkers from multiple animals at night.
- Have a background in behaviour, there needs to be more regulation in animal care professionals
- they clean up after all the dogs in their care, deposit waste appropriately
- Higher fines if an incident should occur.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- spending tax money enforcing this??? All dog owners that utilize a dog walker must have their dog get an accredited canine good citizen course that can receive an enrollment discount when liscenced. Promote responsible ownership... do not discourage. We want the dog walked! The people that do this are highly likely responsible owners, encourage them not discourage them!
- no matter how many dogs they walk, they must have them under control. if they cannot control the dogs, they shouldn't be walking 1 let alone multiple
- They need to respect homeowners property and not allow the dogs to urinate or excrete on homeowners property for example their lawns. They should only be off leash in designated areas such as a park.
- Absolutely a limit on number of dogs. There is a dog Walker in our area whi walks SIX!!! dogs with a waist leash. She would not be able to control the dogs if something happened and they would all be at risk.
- If you can name one legitimate "dog walker training school" then yes they should be trained/qualified
- How about you stop over legislating everything?
- Not to be permitted to take a dog previously identified as aggressive on a pack walk with other dogs or to an off leash park.
- none. stop micro managing EVERYTHING
- It does not matter to me so long the dogs are under control. I have never ran into a dog-walking business that did not have the utmost control of their dogs. They tend to do a better job of controlling multiple dogs(because its their job they take it seriously)than most owners of a SINGLE dog.
- No keeping dogs in vehicles.
- Ensure that they have no history of animal abuse.
- Liscensing dog walkers is ridiculous.
- I find the biggest problem with dog walkers is that they bring numerous dogs to the dog park, and then socialize so much that they don't do a good job picking up after all the dogs. I find them to be the biggest contributors to dog waste that is left around the off-leash areas. There should be higher expectations on their responsibilities as a service provider.
- Be able to control all dogs, and pick up after them
- Too many dogs means you cannot reasonably pick up poop off-leash. Holding dog walkers responsible for dog waste.
- I think the standard of dog walking business should be left up the the industry not really a city task. However I do think there should bge some guildlines to obtain a business license .. balance I guess
- ensure dogs are healthy enough to walk.
- That they effectively supervise the animals they're charged with taking care of.
- Absolutely a limit on numbers. Maybe 4 max on leash. Two max for off leash.
- Insurance as in liability for hurting anyone while out with the dogs
- Pass a course showing understanding for dog behaviors and ability to take control of a situation if walked dogs were to bolt, attack or otherwise disregard commands.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Penalties if they do not act responsibly when other people's animals are in their care, including dogs getting into fights or running away. I've seen dog walkers with way too many dogs with them at the off leash park. They don't watch all the dogs and sometimes there are altercations or dogs defecating and it is not cleaned up. These are not acceptable for anyone. If you're not able to watch all the dogs in your care and ensure appropriate behaviour and clean-up, you shouldn't be caring for that many dogs.
- Pick up and properly dispose of poop
- Background check to be employed (especially if service allows entry into a home).
- PPE Regulate equipment (flexi leashes etc) Pick up Waste
- PPE. Regulate equipment (flexi leashes etc). Pick up waste
- People think they can just set up a business without any kind of training or responsibility. They take too many dogs at once because they make more money if they can walk 5 dogs in one shot. Realistically they cannot handle multiple dogs. When things happen there is no way one person can control 5 dogs when some dogs are in a state of fight and others are fleeing. You can only grab one dog, which one do you choose?
- Make this industry regulated
- Pick up waste, regulate equipment (no flexi-leashes), appropriate clothing/safety gear.
- There are businesses and helpful kids/neighbours who walk dogs. Two different things and both welcome. If someone is running a business they need the same as other businesses including insurance. Can't imagine how you'd "qualify" to be a walker...is there such a thing? Who does it? No limit by number but by level of control. Some can walk a dozen without issue, some can't.
- Look to see if there are any problems. Then you know if there needs to be a license. Best to stay out of this unless there is a problem. Don't make this a make work project for more people at the City.
- PPE, Pick-up waste, regulate equipment (no flexi leashes, etc). Businesses should be held to a higher standard to avoid exploitation of animals for profit.
- Abide by all the rules that apply to any business, plus the knowledge that like other businesses successful legal suits can be brought if you transgress.
- Is it the dog or the walker? If complaints add up then disciplinary action is enforced.

What are your expectations for individual dog walkers?

- Be trained to handle multiple dogs and animal CPR for emergencies when walking dogs in a pack ALOT can go wrong!
- Many dogs are allergic to the aluminum in the city tags. I would love to see a rubberized or stainless steel (I know there is a cost difference) used instead.
- Conduct a background check to ensure that they are not animal abusers.
- Be able to control the dogs they have with them
- That they are actually in control of the dogs with them and that they are picking up after their dogs.
- Be trained in animal behaviour and qualified to work with animals for the purpose of protecting both the walker, the dog (s) and other animals and people they may encounter.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Limit 2 dogs. We see too many times when the pack of dogs either on leash or off leash become out of control due to wildlife or other dogs. It's scary to be close to that occurring.
- Specific regulations about liability for dogs under their care, should those dogs attack a person or animal.
- All dogs microchipped.
- Increased responsibility for care and control and interactions with other dogs especially with more than one dog.
- PICK UP AFTER THE DOGS!! too many dogs per walker means lots of 'presents' left behind for the rest of us to deal with while walking our dogs.
- Have control of the dogs they are walking.
- What about dogs that are visiting the city and unlicensed but staying with family that has other dogs or hired by a dog walker? Individual dog walkers should be qualified/trained to do the job. Fines for people who do not have control over the dogs
- By walking the dogs the dog walker can not negatively impact any other Calgarian, failure to do so being a bylaw offense that is subject to fine
- They should be insured. They should be trained/qualified.
- Must clean up feces and actually enforce it please. No one cares about your signs in the parks. There is poop everywhere. Alllll over this city.
- Trained to do the job. Have permit or license.
- Have a background check
- Individual dog walkers - meaning family dogs owned by a family member or friend, not for pay. I assume off leash walking means only in designated off leash areas.
- dogs SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED on individual properties/lawns (at least)..our lawns are not their pooping/urinating places
- That they are licenced via education for how to care for multiple dogs at a time and what the dogs' needs are.
- walking etiquette bth on leash and off leash. Good recall if off leash. Respect other people walking their dogs, not every dog you meet has to be friends with dogs they meet.
- Must have there dog training .We need free licensing for all senior citizens.The benefits are huge for the dogs and the health of the person.
- Difficult to know whether a dog off-leash is being supervised by a dog walker or not.
- Same as above
- Just to let an individual walk their dog without being hassled by the city.
- Again ability to safely manage the dogs they are walking.
- Have a permit or identification on them
- Safe vehicle for travel that can safely and comfortably accommodate the numbers of animals for transportation
- Must have current pet first aid.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Anyone walking a dog in the city of Calgary should have the same expectations regardless of how many dogs they have under their control or if the dogs are theirs or a paying client's.
- Business licenses
- Have control of dog at all times
- Pick up poop, have control of all dogs.
- They MUST have an understanding of dog behaviour and have experience dealing with all types of dogs.
- Insurance
- allways on leash and have poop bags
- Same as sbove
- If the dogs stay at the walkers residence they must be kept quiet. Multiple dogs will bark and play with each other, however they don't need to be barking all day long, every day.
- Required to read a list of the rules and bylaws and sign a document stating read and adhere to them.
- Same as above....unsafe to wear the tags.
- Ensure they pick up after their dogs
- Have adequate waste bags, not allowing dog to defacate on sidewalks
- I do not believe dog walkers should be allowed to gain their income by the use of city parks. They are conducting a business and should not be doing so in public areas.
- Responsible for picking up as above
- As above
- Restrictions on car safety with dogs.
- As above
- Have control of the animals at all times. This includes being able to call the animal and have it return to them when in an off leash situation.
- Keep a log of the dogs they have in their possession. This means identification photo and the dog owners contact information. Should the dog ever go missing or requires Veterinary Care
- All the dogs must have their shots to ensure their health and the health of the dogs they're in contact with. Also walking small and large together in a clump could be dangerous. People want their animals to enjoy the walk - walking in a clump around someone without time to sniff, pee or BE A DOG is not a fun walk. Walking while distracted by their phone (not paying attention) is so wrong. Taking over the sidewalk is also unfair to other users. I cannot believe people think they're doing a good thing for their dog by hiring a glorified post that moves. If you can't look after and enjoy your dog — give it away!
- Be qualified to do the job.
- Be qualified to do the job
- None of the above. This is not and never has been a problem.
- have control of their dog
- Pick up poop and don't leave the bag behind.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not the cities job to police such a business.
- Be experienced
- I have walked 3 dogs at a time...I would not want to see the number any lower than 3. But its really hard to make a blanket statement...its more about the level of control and training vs the number. A well trained group of smaller dogs could be as many as 6 walking together
- Pick up after the dog
- Really???
- Pick up after their dogs and have the dog under control
- LIMIT THE NUMBER OF DOGS WALKED AT 1 TIME TO 4 or less. You cannot adequately monitor more dogs than that, and if there is a conflict with multiple dogs, you risk greater injury to the dogs or yourself...
- Are we going to license babysitting and walk scooping? I know that this is a career for some, but it's also a great first job for kids!
- I don't think the above are issues with individual dog walkers, or at least none I've seen.
- background checks/bonded if coming into your home
- I believe they should also have some sort of license/ID on them so if there are issues the public can report them.
- They should also be trained/qualified to do the job
- That they face penalties if they are found walking a dog off leash in a non-off leash area
- Have control over their dogs at all times. On leash or off.
- Not permitted to walk known viscous dogs
- As above, each person should be restricted to walking 4 large dogs at one time, on or off leash, and to 6 small dogs at one time. No one can have control of more than this number.
- They need to be insured should a dog in their care cause harm to another dog/person or property
- I would like a definition of i do visual dog walker. Are you meaning a pet owner walking their own dog/dogs? If so there should be no restrictions.
- Have liability insurance.
- Knowledge of training and able to control all dogs under their care
- Same as above.
- The have dog on a reasonable length leash and have full control.
- Dogs should be leashed and at heel when on the path or sidewalk. Dogs should be on the right hand side of the person walking them.
- Be qualified to walk multiple dogs at one time
- Criminal background checks, any issues with previous infractions regarding animals
- Whether on or off leash, no person or business should walk more dogs than they can control.
- Picking up after all dogs in their charge.
- Must be licensed as a business and have proof of training.
- Safely transport dogs to and from off leash locations
- Should not be allowed to walk dogs off leash at all



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- the dog(s) is/are under control
- Clean up after all dogs in their care. Keep aggressive dogs separate.
- Walk on the right side of the owner, on right side of path on a short leash.
- All dogs have to be licensed and under control.
- Require all dogs to be fully vaccinated and - if off-leash - that the walker is still in control of ALL dogs at ALL times.
- Follow the rules like unleash in unleash areas
- Same as a business - be licensed, trained, and carry a permit (if you're making money it's a business)
- Compulsory canine behaviour training
- None
- Be insured
- Ensure that they can actually control all the dogs they are walking
- I don't understand this question, if I own 5 dogs and they are obedient then I expect to walk them all at once.
- Must let the person know if they were going to have other dogs - no surprises
- That they are capable of controlling all animals under their care.
- Have the necessary means to pick up after all of the dogs.
- Know the dogs personalities and ensure reactive dogs are kept on leash and close to the dog walker
- Dog walkers need commercially insured vehicles, pet first aid, proper leash and body language training and more. Paw Butler is the highest standard walker and you should see the hoops they go through to ensure everything is top notch. They have serviced over 800 clients and have over 320 five star reviews. The one owner even owns a rescue. If companies aren't holding themselves to that kind of standard of training and operating we are going to have a major problem as dog walking fly by night companies are popping up left right and center .
- Don't leave dogs alone while shopping
- full responsibility of pets behavior should be on the walker. if pets misbehave or hurt someone, the pet should be returned to owner and walker should be responsible for any damages/injuries.
- They are able to manage the dogs under their care.
- Shouldn't have to pay fees to city
- All dog walkers should be licensed as a business, and have a training course.
- minimum level of training.
- Be responsible. Respect the on leash and off leash rules. I walk my 6 dogs better than most walk one dog because I train them. Don't group slap people treat each individual as they should be treated
- Some sort of training or Permit
- They should have a really good handle on the dogs, not be pulled around by the animals, and know basic walking training skills



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They should have a permit because they're placing a larger burden on waste disposal in her household, using a lot more water possibly? Using chemicals for dog washing in their households?
- Be qualified and trained to do the job
- Limit to 3 dogs on leash for walkers under 18. Under 5 dogs on leash over 18. I don't walk off leash and do not think it is a good idea for 1 person with many dogs to take them to off leash park.
- Dog walkers should be able to walk as many dogs as they want provided they can maintain proper control over the dogs they are walking.
- Have ID on them and must provide this info on demand (in event one of their charges is nuisance) Must be able to id walker & the dog.
- Ensure all waste are picked up
- They pick up after their dogs. Have proper certified humane dog handling. Business license number so can report someone abusing dogs or misuse of dog parks.
- Individual dog walkers should be in control of the dog and not be riding a bike with a dog. It comes down to bylaws that we already have but are not enforced.
- same as above. be mindful of others who occupy the space around you on sidewalks, in parks. have control over your dogs when off leash. people who trained their dogs and are aware of their surroundings can manage multiple while others can't manage one.
- Same as above
- I have an expectation they can handle all the dogs in their charge. Dog walking is a skill that not everyone can handle.
- If they are providing services for hire, they need to conform with normal rules of a business, e.g. consultants, such as registering, a permit of some sort
- Permit required: Criminal record check to get a permit that allows you to walk strangers dogs. What if you have three-five dogs yourself? Well they'll all be licensed to YOU, so no need for a permit.
- Must clean up after the dogs
- Vulnerable sector check (since people who have harmed humans may also harm animals)
- Must be able to recall and control any animal in their care especially when off leash.
- Be licensed as a professional dog walker
- Dogs that are off-leash need to be well trained so that the owner is in control at all times.
- If we are creating further restrictions on where someone will be allowed to walk multiple dogs, it is important that we create new spaces where it is allowed. Rentable private parks/green spaces are becoming popular outside of the city. I would like to purchase or rent land to do my own dog walks but am at a loss as to how to go about this. If this kind of service was accessible by the city renting out fenced land, I would take advantage of this.
- As with any dog handler - owner or not - well behaved dogs are not a problem while problem handlers should be dealt with
- Stop trying to regulate things
- I think the regulations for individuals should be more lax than for businesses: often teenagers walk their neighbour's dog(s) for spending money.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Owners/family/friends. (ie: no one is paid for this service) Homeowners insurance likely be valid here.
- Be qualified and trained to do the job
- some people can only handle walking 1 dog because of their restrictions or knowledge. others, can walk 2 or 3 well behaved/trained dogs with no problem. restrictions on where they are allowed to walk multiple dogs - people do not follow directions. people let their dogs off-leash in parks that are not designated off-leash!
- Heavier fines for not picking up poo. Let's not get too silly about how many dogs they can walk; it is a valuable service to the owners of those pets, and it is a decent job. I'd say 8 is a reasonable limit but I really don't think this should be legislated.
- Same as the other for dog walking businesses. I have seen people with their own persons, up to 6 of the same owner with vehicles that the dogs are the owners lap, moving throughout the vehicles when moving.
- Ensure they are responsible for problems they create. Aggressiveness, Waste.
- Didn't know there was a problem with Dog walking . Why don't you just leave them alone?
- Owners must have control of their dogs even in an offleash area. I have had numerous dogs run and jump on me in an off leash area and owners were not able to call back their dog.
- Minimum standards, by taking a free course from the City, in this skill, if walking multiple dogs, e.g., how to handle an aggressive episode, either from the dog that they are walking, or another, unleashed dog.
- ensure that the dogs are appropriately vaccinated
- Any person walking dog(s) must be in control, courteous and responsible
- no off-leash walking
- entirely prohibited from playgrounds, school grounds, athletic parks, natural areas such as Weasel head and reservoir. NO Swimming in Glenmore Reservoir or Elbow river feeding Glenmore R..
- Be qualified to handle the number of dogs they are walking
- All dogs are vaccinated
- Pick up poop
- If they cannot control their dogs, they should not be permitted to allow the dog off leash. Retractable leashes are a danger to everyone and should be banned.
- pick up after pets and be responsible should the dog have an incident with another pet
- all dogs should come when called by owners, they run all over the park and are aggressive
- Waste collection
- clean up after them
- Be qualified and trained to do the job. Have photo identification on them (in event of altercation). Have a community listing/registry similar to babysitting services. Create a mandatory dog walking course for individuals.
- criminal background check , to be certain no animal cruelty charges
- A mandatory training course on dog behavior.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs MUST be leashed in public areas. Sick and tired of loose dogs approaching me and my children in parks and at public events. HUGE outdoor nuisance!
- Make sure they are able to pick up after dogs in their care and have control at all times.
- All as above
- Individuals who decide to start walking dogs as a job or side business should have to register with the City of Calgary and have a permit or ID card with them at all times. If they do not register then yes, there should be a limit on how many dogs they can walk off leash at one time and where they are able to take a large number of dogs.
- At least register as a dog walker.
- There should be no limits to the number of dogs walked at once.
- Again don't let them off if they won't listen.
- I think that is a decision of the owner. If someone walks my dogs they only have them and I advise them where to go.
- be qualified/trained, be able to control the dogs easily so restrictions not only on number walked at once but size and strength of dogs to be walked at once
- They need a permit to show they are qualified or trained to manage dogs.
- They should have insurance in case a dog is injured in their care.
- Clean up after the dogs!!!!
- Ensure they have enough poop bags to clean up after all their dogs.
- Proven knowledge of dog behaviour and positive training methods.
- Cleaning up properly after dogs
- All dogs need to be under control to make to safe for others passing by and those with dogs.
- Pick up and properly dispose of feces.
- Can we please just carry our dog license tag? I have tiny dogs (under 10 lbs) and the City tags are very big for those little dogs. Or could there be an option to purchase small tags?
- Same as above answer. Dog walkers should be able to maintain control over their dog at all times
- Be qualified/trained to do the job
- They take on the responsibility of the animal in their control and should carry liability insurance for the animal if it is in public.
- Be licensed as a business
- Age minimum for more than one dog
- Ensuring they keep aggressive dogs on a short leash with identifiable markings.
- And if owning more than one dog basic dog behavior class
- clean up after their dog and not bring them to schools and playground parks. They should be walked on the street side of their owner to ensure they don't pee on neighbourhood lawns.
- maximum of 3 dogs on the 'walk'
- Don't feel individual dog walkers are an issue wrt # of dogs as it doesn't appear people have more than 1-3 dogs. Owners who do not pick up after their dogs, who let dogs off leash in areas not



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

specifically zoned for off leash, who allow pets to chase wildlife should all be fined. Repeat violators should be fined incrementally.

- Full Shots and vet check documentation
- Animals should be kept under control at all times.
- I think the restrictions above should apply to individual dog walkers if they are working with multiple dogs and functioning as a business. .
- No more than 4 dogs at a time. Many dog walkers do not pick up dog feces and it is impossible to control more than 5 dogs at a time. Since fees are different for all dog walkers they should be standard for everyone
- As with baby sitting there should be relaxation for kids walking dogs for neighbors for pocket change.
- Dog walker can be a friend out walking a dog? Would they be expected to have a license?
- I expect them to follow the rules at all times and City Hall have someone driving around parks and pathways and handing out tickets for non-compliance so the law-abiding citizens can have some faith in their local government and what 'value' they get for their over-inflated taxes they pay every year for these compliance services.
- They walk my dog for the entire time they are contracted for. Let the people make their \$30 and move along, City.
- Be qualified/trained, have a permit/Id, it's a business whether your 1 or 100
- Strict limits on numbers - not exceeding four.
- noi extendi leashes
- None
- All dogs must be under control (i.e., leash or command) at all times when off owner's property.
- Individual dog walkers should be licensed
- Respect other people and children's space in public areas
- No multiple dog walks/runs in off-leash dog parks. The limit of dogs per person should reflect the bylaws limitations for dog ownership.
- Make sure that they keep all the dogs within sight and availability to pick up their poop
- Pet first aid course. Proper training and certificate to verify such
- Limit of 2 dogs on leash. No off leash walking. This is protect them from any liability, especially as most individuals do this to help someone they know.
- I don't think this is important.
- Have control of dogs, follow rules, monitor dogs
- To clean up after each dog no matter where they are
- On leash in areas that require it. The city shouldn't make it more difficult than it already is for Albertans and Calgarians to work.
- I have no expectations
- Dogs must meet training checkpoints in high traffic areas.
- An easily seen license or permit. Not one you have to ask for or follow them back to their vehicle.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same as above
- They are able to control the situation.
- Clean up after the animals
- Keep their dogs off of other peoples property.
- Same as above Other comment
- Obey the bylaws at all times.
- Abide by the rules.
- All this needs to be backed up by the City. Why bother if I thing is monitored and enforced.
- Were it only possible to teach common sense....
- some people can walk more than one dog because they took the time to take obedience classes with their dogs.
- 2 dogs max, could be friend walking your dogs. once again not sure how this would be enforced.
- Maybe wait before stopping the kid next door from being able to walk his neighbour's dog for five bucks. Stop trying to squash entrepreneurship in Calgary.
- keep dogs off private property.
- This is a hard one. Many people do it as a part time for extra cash, like seniors. Some people are just really good with dogs and don't need training. I have seen some who are amazing with quite a large number of dogs (a dozen) even off leash. Putting on too much regulation will hamper already existing effective dog walkers.
- I expect them to be nice to my dog and I would choose an unlicensed professional that would probably be cheaper because the government is not involved in this person's business.
- Have proof of proper training at the bare minimum on them at all times
- Have an permit or identification.
- Be qualified/trained to do the job.
- pick up excrement.
- Be physically able to control strong dogs.
- To have all dogs under control when off leash. Not to walk dogs with poor recall.
- Pick up after their charges and be respectful of others in the park.
- City should stay out of it. There is no value for more intervention.
- Keep the animal under control and clean up after it.
- They should read my body language, facial expression or words and not try to engage with us when I am walking my dog(s) unless I behave as if I want interaction. I will reciprocate.
- Again don't hog the sidewalk
- Companies like Rover are not good because they do not require the individuals to be trained in dog walking and or handling of animals.
- Restrictions on when dog walkers can walk multiple dogs at specific times of days (such as past a c-train station at peak times)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Living in Dalhousie and backing on to an offleash park, I see 2 dog walkers that walk up to 15 dogs each at a time. How are they safely transporting and watching the dogs and ensuring they are picking up the feces with that many dogs.
- City should not be involved in this.
- Responsible for composition and behavior of pack
- Ensure they have a licence for each be educated on city By laws
- They are able to exercise control of their pack and can recall all the dogs that are off leash
- Casual dog-walkers should still follow the same walking guidelines, but I don't believe they should have to be certified, licensed, etc. Defeats the purpose.
- again, it depends. If its small dogs or well-behaved dogs it could be fine, where as a number of poorly behaved large dogs would be a problem. I believe it about the ability to control, although I understand that is hard to regulate.
- How are you going to know if its a dog walker or a dog owner? Dog walkers should have specific areas to walk in and not just general dog parks or through fish creek or other natural areas they are suppose to be leashed but have them running at large in and out of contorl
- I also expect that an individual dog walker will have all the animals in his/her care under control.
- they know how to control the dog from sniffing/jumping on people
- any person walking a dog should be responsible for cleaning up after the dogs they are walking/ outings with
- See above. When you overregulate and want fees for every last thing you annoy people.
- Same as above
- None
- No off-leash dog walking, with the exception of a designated secured off-leash park.
- Dog vaccination information
- If walking multiple dogs offleash, ensure you would be able to control multiple dogs in the event of aggression. Dog behaviour is different when you introduce a pack vs. an individual dog than if two individual dogs meet.
- going to obedience classes teaches the owner how to walk their dogs on a leash, numbers doesn't matter if you are trained to different circumstances.
- Carry evidence (doggy-bags) that they intend to clean up after the animals - at least then they can act like they are going to clean up any mess.
- All dogs are on-leash in on-leash areas
- Pick up and dispose of properly dog waste
- Have complete control over all dogs at all times.
- Be able to control the dogs
- Walking dogs off-leash requires a lot of focus. Dogs shouldn't be aggressive, or approaching on-leash dogs unless they communicate with the other walker. Having more than 1 dog off-leash is hard to maintain control.
- I don't believe in any of this, some people can handle more dogs than others



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Licensed as a business if they are operating as such
- Qualified and trained to ensure they can deal with an emergency
- All dogs must be vaccinated and up to date on rabies, and must be in control.
- Obey off-leash/on-leash signage, pick up all defecation
- Proper control of dogs (recall, not allowing nuisance behaviour, etc)
- Dogs be on leash on city streets and all parks within city limits not specificall designated for off leash and higher fines for off leash dogs.
- I think a individual dog walkers can walk however many dogs they are able to in a safe way that does not infringe on the safety or wellbeing of the dogs being walked or the dogs around them.
- Pretty much same as above
- that if they know they have an aggressive or fearful dog they do not take this dog to off leash areas
- Pick up after their dogs
- Be qualified and trained
- I don't think dogs should have to wear theot license tag. Dogs have multiple collars, it's not easy to make sure they always have it on them.
- Insured. Bonded.
- As above regarding feces
- have the dogs *under control*, on leash or off
- Pick up after themselves, we've all watched them pretend not to see the mess.
- I believe that individual dog walkers should hold a business license as well as attend behavioural classes every 4 months.
- To have control of the animals in their care
- Criminal background check. Dogs are part of our family, this is the equivalent of child care. Also, they are likely given access to a person's home when they are away at work.
- Must be fully responsible for the actions of the dog or anything that happens to the dog or caused by the dog while under their care. Must be fully incontrol of all dogs at all times.
- not allowed to walk multiple dogs in areas where public have an expectation of walking in peace, ex. public parks and gardens
- Ensure dog has chip or tag with owner name and number as backup
- Off leash only in designated off leash areas
- Have some sort of proof of experience/training.
- Be qualified/trained to do the job.
- Have control of your dog at all times.
- bags to clean up messes, rules "not allow dogs to run on citizens grass/yard"
- not necessarily have a business license, but definitely some kind of dog-walker's license/registration with the city that also shows they had an up to date police check
- Ensure dogs are microchipped/ can be ID'd
- Since they do not have to have a business license - they should not be allowed to walk as many dogs as a person who is running an actual business



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Be able to show effective control over all dogs in their care and control.
- An individual dog walker to me is someone who has a pet and is walking them. Not necessarily for money.
- Individual dog walkers should also have some type of training in canine behaviour. Situations can arise when walking groups of dogs, or even single dogs and the walker should have the training to properly de-escalate these situations.
- If the individual is earning a living then they should be licensed and insured as a business. If the animals are under control at all times there should be no limits on the number of dogs
- same as a business
- Same as above
- Reasonable amount of dogs off leash in order to always maintain control of them
- Must have and demonstrate use of litter bags
- Strict penalties for not following rules and not cleaning up dog waste.
- Be kind toward the animals
- Ensure dogs are properly dewormed and vaccinated or vaccine titers were performed and the dog is healthy in that sense
- Why not wade into people's homes and tell them how to live? How people behave will not be changed by this. This will make Calgary the most unfriendly dog city in the world.
- Dogs should be required to be chipped, not licensed. That's a one time cost. The dog could have a tag that says it's chipped, for easy identification.
- as above...
- Control of dog and onleash when not in designated off leash area
- Carry proper liability insurance and a licensed, including walkers hired through an on-demand app.
- an individual dog walker could be a homeowner... if they are walking the dog or dogs and have them under control and clean up after them then who cares how many dogs they have and where they go.
- Clean up after their dogs. Restrict the use of long leads.
- Have a background in behaviour, there needs to be more regulation in animal care professionals
- Keep dog undercontrol and on leash if necessary.
- I think these people are responsible in their approach and hopefully, owners wouldn't use them unless they were responsible. Let's no over-regulate.
- Why, is it a problem... really, spend the cities money elsewhere!
- They are qualified to do the job.
- Not to be permitted to take a dog previously identified as aggressive on a pack walk with other dogs or to an off leash park.
- bugger off City of Calgary
- It does not matter to me so long the dogs are under control. I have never ran into a dog-walking business that did not have the utmost control of their dogs. They tend to do a better job of controlling multiple dogs(because its their job they take it seriously)than most owners of a SINGLE dog.
- The individual dog walkers should be able to safely handle all the dogs under their care.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No keeping dogs in vehicles. No being on the phone while walking the dogs.
- None apply
- No history of animal abuse.
- Liscensing dog walkers is ridiculous
- Teenagers should be able to do this without restrictions other than a limit on manageable amount of dogs at a time
- Pick up after the dogs
- don't judge everyone the same. we are all different people. some people can walk 4 well behaved dogs because they spent the \$ and time to go to Obedience Classes. Others can barely walk one because they refuse to spend \$ on learning how to properly walk your dog.
- I dont use the business but what one person can handle is different for the next as well as each dog is different sometimes you can handle 5 of one temperament but only 1 of another
- ensure dogs are healthy enough to walk.
- That they effectively supervise the animals they're charged with taking care of.
- Max of 4 on leash and two dogs off leash at one time
- These might be private untrained animals lovers earning extra money and helping those less able to get out and about so gentleness and limits on just taking a household of dogs out not combining other un related dogs into a pack set up
- Have understanding of dog behaviors with ability to take control of a situation if it were to get out of hand (bolting, fights, ignoring commands etc.)
- Penalties if they do not act responsibly when other people's animals are in their care, including dogs getting into fights or running away. I've seen dog walkers with way too many dogs with them at the off leash park. They don't watch all the dogs and sometimes there are altercations or dogs defecating and it is not cleaned up. These are not acceptable for anyone. If you're not able to watch all the dogs in your care and ensure appropriate behaviour and clean-up, you shouldn't be caring for that many dogs.
- Pick up and properly dispose of poop
- Pick up waste
- pick up waste
- Make this industry regulated.
- Pick up waste
- I don't see any reason to limit the truly gifted. If a walker can demonstrate they can handle a certain number they should carry on. Limit by skill level.
- the animals should be under control. Dont put a number on it: One pitbull may equal 5 yorkies. 6 border collies may behave better than one rotweiller
- Unless it is a problem, leave them alone.
- Pick up waste
- HOW ABOUT OBEYING THE LAW.
- Is it the dog or the walker? If complaints add up then disciplinary action is enforced.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- On-Leash Limit - 5 Dogs / Off-Leash Limit - 3 Dogs / Household Ownership Limit - 3 Dogs.
- - Licensed, yes but not wearing tags
- As above regarding feces
- have the dogs *under control*, on leash or off
- Pick up after themselves, we've all watched them pretend not to see the mess.
- I believe that individual dog walkers should hold a business license as well as attend behavioural classes every 4 months.
- To have control of the animals in their care
- Criminal background check. Dogs are part of our family, this is the equivalent of child care. Also, they are likely given access to a person's home when they are away at work.
- Must be fully responsible for the actions of the dog or anything that happens to the dog or caused by the dog while under their care. Must be fully incontrol of all dogs at all times.
- No restrictions as long as they are in control. From experience I can have control of 8 dogs better than someone else can be in control of one. Restrictions should only apply if someone is incapable of control.
- not allowed to walk multiple dogs in areas where public have an expectation of walking in peace, ex. public parks and gardens
- Ensure dog has chip or tag with owner name and number as backup
- Off leash only in designated off leash areas
- Have some sort of proof of experience/training.
- Be qualified/trained to do the job.
- Have control of your dog at all times.
- bags to clean up messes, rules "not allow dogs to run on citizens grass/yard"
- not necessarily have a business license, but definitely some kind of dog-walker's license/registration with the city that also shows they had an up to date police check
- Ensure dogs are microchipped/ can be ID'd
- Since they do not have to have a business license - they should not be allowed to walk as many dogs as a person who is running an actual business
- Be able to show effective control over all dogs in their care and control.
- An individual dog walker to me is someone who has a pet and is walking them. Not necessarily for money.
- Individual dog walkers should also have some type of training in canine behaviour. Situations can arise when walking groups of dogs, or even single dogs and the walker should have the training to properly de-escalate these situations.
- If the individual is earning a living then they should be licensed and insured as a business. If the animals are under control at all times there should be no limits on the number of dogs
- same as a business
- There should escalating fines for not cleaning up after them.
- Same as above



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Anyone who is charging for to walk dogs on a REGULAR basis should have to follow the same rules as businesses
- Reasonable amount of dogs off leash in order to always maintain control of them
- Must have and demonstrate use of litter bags
- Strict penalties for not following rules and not cleaning up dog waste.
- Be kind toward the animals
- Ensure dogs are properly dewormed and vaccinated or vaccine titers were performed and the dog is healthy in that sense
- Why not wade into people's homes and tell them how to live? How people behave will not be changed by this. This will make Calgary the most unfriendly dog city in the world.
- Dogs should be required to be chipped, not licensed. That's a one time cost. The dog could have a tag that says it's chipped, for easy identification.
- as above...
- Control of dog and onleash when not in designated off leash area
- Carry proper liability insurance and a licensed, including walkers hired through an on-demand app.
- an individual dog walker could be a homeowner... if they are walking the dog or dogs and have them under control and clean up after them then who cares how many dogs they have and where they go.
- Clean up after their dogs. Restrict the use of long leads.
- Have a background in behaviour, there needs to be more regulation in animal care professionals
- clean up after all dogs in their care, deposit waste appropriately
- Keep dog undercontrol and on leash if necessary.
- I think these people are responsible in their approach and hopefully, owners wouldn't use them unless they were responsible. Let's no over-regulate.
- If any limit is placed on the number of dogs an individual owner is allowed to walk should be no less than 5. I have had 2 of my own dogs, my neighbour's 2 dogs and a friend's dog I sometimes look after out for a walk in on-leash and off-leash areas and it doesn't cause anyone any problems. I don't need big brother interfering with that and telling me I'm not at liberty to do that. To be reasonable, I'll accept the rule if the limit is set at 5, otherwise it's too restrictive on people's personal freedoms.
- Why, is it a problem... really, spend the cities money elsewhere!
- no matter how many dogs they walk, they must have them under control. if they cannot control the dogs, they shouldn't be walking 1 let alone multiple
- They need to respect homeowners property and not allow the dogs to urinate or excrete on homeowners property, for example their lawns. They should only be off leash in designated areas such as a park.
- They are qualified to do the job.
- Not to be permitted to take a dog previously identified as aggressive on a pack walk with other dogs or to an off leash park.
- bugger off City of Calgary



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It does not matter to me so long the dogs are under control. I have never ran into a dog-walking business that did not have the utmost control of their dogs. They tend to do a better job of controlling multiple dogs(because its their job they take it seriously)than most owners of a SINGLE dog.
- The individual dog walkers should be able to safely handle all the dogs under their care.
- No keeping dogs in vehicles. No being on the phone while walking the dogs.
- None apply
- No history of animal abuse.
- Liscensing dog walkers is ridiculous
- Teenagers should be able to do this without restrictions other than a limit on manageable amount of dogs at a time
- Pick up after the dogs
- don't judge everyone the same. we are all different people. some people can walk 4 well behaved dogs because they spent the \$ and time to go to Obedience Classes. Others can barely walk one because they refuse to spend \$ on learning how to properly walk your dog.
- I dont use the business but what one person can handle is different for the next as well as each dog is different sometimes you can handle 5 of one temperament but only 1 of another
- ensure dogs are healthy enough to walk.
- That they effectively supervise the animals they're charged with taking care of.

Rules for retail sale of animals

- On the spot checks since breeders have terrible conditions I wouldn't keep a rat in, let alone dogs and cats. No in tact pets to be sold, they're not money making machines, they're family members.
- Licensing, ensure the business is frequently audited for proper care of the animals and that they keep proper records of the animals.
- That they can assure the consumer that the animals are not from a puppy mill ie that they can guarantee the animal came from humane living / breeding conditions.
- none
- Animals should not be allowed to be sold in retail establishments. If this is allowed, the process should be the same as adoption - thorough screening and questionnaire. Animals should never be impulse purchases.
- Rescues only.
No breeder Mills. For all types of pets except maybe fish.
- Ensuring that the new owner has a licence for the dog/cat/urban livestock before they complete the transaction.
- Animals need to go for a vet checks before being sold!
- There should be no retail sale of animals period. I am disgusted that Calgary still allows this as a viable business strategy considering the documented supply chain for the very few that still do. I cannot believe that anyone on the council is ignorant enough to be in favour of this practice and the Nei himself agreed to address it and still hasn't.
- I don't have much of information on this topic to provide my input.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Humane care both during the time the business has possession, and in the place where the animals were born/came from.
- Breeders should be banned.
Animals sold by a shelter must be spayed or neutered.
Vaccine requirements.
- Safe breeding, no puppy mills, carry a licence, report how many puppies are being born at any one time, report sales
- Better Business Bureau with license
- Responsible acquisition of the animals. Monitoring of care of animals while in their possession
- where an animal can be sold
whether an animal must be spayed or neutered
the type of animal that can be sold
- The animal was legally obtained, the animal is safe to be around humans, the animal can be reasonably cared for by an individual (e.g., no extreme diet or space requirements), the animal is not endangered.
- Honesty. I would prefer animals not be sold in retail outlets.
- **BAN ANIMALS BEING SOLD IN STORES.** I'm absolutely disgusted that this is still allowed. If you refuse to do that, then at least make it mandatory that all animals sold in stores are already neutered.
- that the animals are sold to responsible and caring potential owners. If the owners cannot keep the pet due to some reason, that the animal is returned to the business
- I don't know about specific rules, but I think a business needs to conduct its sale in an ethical manner - in other words - animals cannot be used for consumption, excessive breeding, unethical practices such as dog fighting. The sale of animals should be conducted on approval of a background check and perhaps a buy back program should the new owner have to give the animal up again due to unforeseen circumstances in health or living conditions.
- no exotic pets should be sold. pet store should be more strictly controlled
- Retail sale of animals should not be allowed, as it dramatically contributes to the existence of puppy mills. Joint programs with local rescues to adopt animals should be expanded.
Selling pets of any kind should require a license that guarantees ethical breeding practices.
- There should not be retail sales of animals. There should be stricter regulations on rescues and breeders and only rescue adoptions and ethical breeders allowed. No Kijiji and accidental litters should not be sold, but surrendered and mandatory spaying and neutering without valid reason not to.
- responsible sourcing of the animals they are selling, such as ensuring that puppies aren't from puppy mills or supporting other businesses that are cruel or abusive to the animals they provide.
- Illegal to sell dogs from puppy mills. Online pet sales should be registered with the city and investigated before they are allowed to post.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Registered breeder. Dogs and cats for sale must be spayed or neutered unless sale to another breeder. Pet stores should not sell dogs or cats, only adoption. No sale of pets on social media (they monitor this I believe)
- The business should be knowledgeable in the care of pets, and ensure that the pets are healthy. I wouldn't want to specify neutering in the case of a reputable breeder who is selling animals for showing and further breeding.
- Maybe Calgary can ban the unregulated sale of animals (kijiji), animals can only be bought from registered breeders (registered with the city, with a business license and training)
- Humane treatment of animals for sale. Perhaps a neutering requirement would be worth investigating.
- Business's should have a home-visit to any prospective pet adoption individual or family to ensure their lifestyle and home are equipped for the type of pet.
- There should be NO retail sale of animals in stores.
- Spay or neuter prior to sale.
Microchipped prior to sale.
- Documented proof of where the animals were bred- aka no breeding mills!
- No retail sales of any animal! It encourages backyard breeding of any animal type and leads to very sick animals!
- Outlaw the sale of animals from puppy mills. Shut down puppy mills. They are inhumane
- Do not feel animals should be sold in stores. However, if they are to be sold in stores, they should have 24 hour care - they should not be left alone overnight. There should be accountability of the store owner to ensure the animals they are getting have been raised in a humane and responsible manner. Vet checks should be by independent veterinary practices, not by vets who are related in any way to the store owner. Maybe the City would determine who checks - and it should be the store owner who foots the bill for it. Part of their licensing fees to sell animals in the first place. This should also apply to those who are not store owners but are qualified breeders or backyard breeders.
- There should be a screening process, similar to that which is used in rescues.
- Proper housing for the 'breeding stock', not cages, or crates, or garages. No more than one litter at a time. Monthly inspections that are unannounced! That way the actual day-to-day operations are observed, not just what the breeder wants you to see.
- Spayed or neutered unless a breeding animal.
- Pet stores should not be selling dogs. Good breeders are not selling to pet stores. These dogs come from brokers and puppy mills.
- Mandatory inspections that occur several times over a year, and unscheduled. No puppy mills. Focus on adoption. Reputable breeders.
- Businesses that sell animals should be inspected by bylaw (maybe also voluntary veterinarians) to ensure appropriate care, disease control and animal welfare. Recommend consulting with businesses, veterinarians, shelters to establish reasonable practice checklists



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No sales at pet stores. - this causes impulse purchases and purchases like rabbits for easter that are then released
- Fully vet all employees as to whether any issues with previous animal abuse. Provide pet first aid course. Provide basic dog training course before allowing to be employed. Limited to one or two dogs at a time until proven their abilities to handle more.
- Not source their pets from back yard breeders. Should be able to provide all papers on the pups being sire and dam. What health clearances were done and demand certain health tests be done
- Legal businesses doing the selling. No puppy mills and the like.
- Health checks of animals before being available to public, checks but bylaw of facilities. Limits to volume of pets
- spade / neuter of all pets being sold. History of the pet
- Breeders should be a licensed business and have to register their litters.
- All breeders should undergo a plethora of examinations to determine they are ethical breeders. Puppy mill breeders should face imprisonment
- The city should ban the retail sale of cats and dogs, other than from licensed reputable breeders, especially dogs. Many of the puppies being sold are from Horrific conditions. I don't know much about the source of other animal so I don't have an opinion.
- They should not ever sell from puppy mills.
- No cats or dogs should be sold by businesses.
- All animals sold must be in perfect health and have all vaccinations required and recommended by all relevant Canadian authorities
- Animals should not be sold in retail.
- No sale of animals from a commercial breeder. [personal information removed] store is a disgrace to the City of Calgary. They lie to their customers. If a store sells an animal they should take it back if ther is any kind of problem just like responsible breeders would do.
- I believe in animal rights. They should not be considered property and so sale should be to responsible owners, no breeding 'farms' - properly licensed breeders, all should be spayed or neutered to prevent people buying a dog to over-breed it to make money, perhaps even 'owner' providing proof of obedience training after one year (part of first year license requirement).
- Animals need to be properly cared for while in the care of the retail operation. I would also like to see a limit to the number of animals stores can have on site as well as a minimum age of adoption (example no younger than 8 weeks). Mandatory spay/neuter should never be implemented, but I think individual rescues/retailers should be able to decide how they want animals sold.
- I don't agree with retail sale of animals (this should not be legal).
- The business must be able to demonstrate that the animals have not come for puppy or kitty mills.
- No pets in pet stores
- I think there should be restrictions on what types of animals can be sold retail
- there should be no sale of animals in retail outlets. Responsible breeders want to ensure the purchase of their animal is in the best interest of the animal, and is a good fit for the owner.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

"Breeders" who sell animals to retail outlets have no concern about the welfare of their animals.

Animal sale should be exclusive to responsible breeders and shelters

- Pet stores should not be allowed to sell dogs from puppy mills. Puppy mills should be shut down.
- For a BUSINESS I think that all animals should come from local breeders, and no animals that have been imported or have not been bred in captivity should be allowed. I also think that any breeder who sells to a petstore or directly to the public as a business needs to be licensed and fulfill certain requirements for the care and safety of their breeding animals.
- 1) They must be able to prove the animals are all humanely treated, unscheduled pet wellness visits to their stores.
- 2) They must be able to prove the source of all animals in the store, that they aren't from mass breeding facilities.
- 3) Preferably only rescues sold in pet stores.
- Adequate care of all animals for sale
- Ensure they are spayed/ neutered shots up to date. Microchipped. Proper documentation
- City of Calgary should not get involved in the private resale of animals - such as hobby breeders. For retail outlets such as [personal information removed], etc. there should be restrictions not allowing the impulse purchase of animals.
- Criminal background check related to abuse of animals or children. Financial check. Reference checks.
- Proper animal welfare. Ensure sales are only to people who haven't been barred from owning animals.
- Spayed or neutered, not purchased through a puppy-mill, no identified vicious breeds.
- animals should not be sold where parents are not available for viewing
- Pet stores should work with rescues when possible. They should not be able to sell cats and dogs. Stores should require a special license to have any other live animals and be inspected at least annually to retain the license.
- No pets sold in stores.
- No "retail business" should sell an animal. Rescue organizations have become retail outlets. The "prices" charged are inflated to cover more than shelter, spay and neuter. Retail rescues for profit need closer attention.
- Where animals can be sold and what the origin of those animals is
- Ensure the animals have up to date vaccinations and are healthy.
- There should be no retail sales of animals.
- - All animals that are being sold should be spayed or neutered
- - Thorough background checks if breeders are being used, by the city if possible
- Animals should be sourced from ethical, regulated and verifiable breeders. Sources need to be disclosed to the consumer. Transport needs to be safer and more humane. Animals need to be kept in species-appropriate enclosures and undergo frequent vet checks.
- ?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Rescue animals only (no breeding!!)
- Restricting my input to dogs: no pet store sales of dogs
- Ensure a dog breed isn't a puppy mill and the dogs are coming from a good home. Maybe all sale of dogs have to have a permit, where the city can approve whether their business is legitimate, and they aren't abusing the animals for profit.
- all animals must to be spayed/neutered as a condition of a sale including chipping the animal, unless they're for ethical breeding purposes but must be chipped as well, then they must have a license..
- Whether if they could be bred or not and a spay or neuter contract.
- That the care and health of the animal are first and foremost. The business and management require licensing via education for each type of animal that is sold, and have to prove at any given time there is adequate space provided for the Health and safety of every animal present.
- I don't think Retail selling should have specific rules. FYI Early spay neuter is not healthy for the animals and should not be something our city needs to get involved in. Responsible persons that sell animals have contracts in place for return/health info etc. It is the irresponsible people that do not - and they won't follow rules anyhow so not worth penalizing the good for the occasional bad.
- Any sales of animals should require a business license reviewed by the city. Other sales should be shut down.
- No puppy or kitten mills please.
- All must have a current veterinary exam. All must be microchipped. All should be sold a city license at time of purchase.
- No pure breeds only rescue animals
Full vaccination of animals as per their age requires
No same day adoptions or sales
An interview by a rescue as to the conditions the animal will go into
- Retail sale of animals should not be permitted
- Unless the store can prove that the parents of all puppies they are selling have had the proper health checks (eyes, cardiac testing, hip and patella, genetic testing in certain breeds) I don't agree with pet stores selling puppies. They often get puppies from unlicensed breeders who are often "backyard breeders or puppy mills".
- Only rescues. No more breeding animals when so many are put down. And mandatory spay neuter
- NA
- All should follow and be registered ckc. The rare breeds are not on ckc list and will need to be exceptions. All people breeding mix dogs need to be monitored not sure how to do this ? This will reduce the theft of dogs for fighting and breeding. Fines for this need to seriously reconsider.
- City of Calgary contract added for traceability and consistency.
- I believe the current rules are sufficient. I am an experienced responsible dog owner. I don't want a vendor telling me how I must care for my pet.
- I don't believe any retail sale of animals is acceptable. Too many pets are injured, diseased and suffer for profit. It supports bad breeders and small animals and reptiles become toys that get



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

discarded. There are enough shelters, rescues and Humane societies that have plenty of animals available. The city should be a responsible and leading example on encouraging adoptions for small animals, reptiles, amphibians, birds cats, dogs etc. I also don't think fish should be sold at most stores because of a lack of training and proper facilities.

- Licensed and reputable breeders, limit on number of animals, no exotic or endangered animals, buyers must purchase city license and chipping with sale, only spayed/neutered animals may be sold
- Type of animal is important. As much as I dislike gov't intervention, people push their limits. I don't want my neighbours to have a pet moose or something.
- *It should be illegal for pet stores to sell UNALTERED rabbits. Pet stores should be only allowed to sell altered rabbits so this population is not a problem. better yet they shouldn't be allowed to sell rabbits they should only be able to adopt out altered rabbits.
*Pet stores should be BANNED from SELLING (rescued altered cats/dogs okay) cats and dogs (they are puppy/cat mill animals not responsible breeders) Most pet stores have stopped selling dogs and cats on their own there is a only a select few who do and they are supporting horrible puppy mills to get the puppies [removed]
- They should follow the same general guidelines as for Responsible Pet Ownership, including caring for the animals appropriately, social interactions, maintaining boundaries, and providing enrichment activities (new environments, toys, etc.) Animals sold or waiting to be sold should have all adequate living conditions as required by the species. Animals sold or waiting to be sold should have regular veterinary care on a schedule dictated by species care best practices (ie. minimum annually for most species). Animals for sale should be in good condition, without obvious medical issues. Animals for sale with medical concerns/conditions should be addressed immediately and an ongoing treatment plan adopted. Animal retail businesses should be inspected by the City at least twice annually.
- Dogs should not be sold in a pet store. Often these are from puppy mills. Spaying and neutering is important but often the animal is being done too young, before the bone plates have closed when adopted through rescues.
- Stricter regulations for the conditions the animal will be kept in (should also apply to breeders)
- To ensure they go to a good home, that a cost for the value of the life is always requested (not for fighting/pet food), and anyone with pit bull have special license of ownership
- Accuracy in the animal's history, breed, medical info. Licensing.
- Animals must be healthy with stable temperaments. Facility must be clean and well maintained. Breeders should be held accountable if large numbers of dogs that that have bred are deemed dangerous dogs.
- Must not be from puppy mills etc. Preferably only animals needing adoption, not bread to sell.
- First off I do not believe that stores should be selling dogs or cats at all.
- The animal must come with a vet certification of health.
- sanitary and healthy conditions. Certified breeders
- Ensuring the animal is not part of a puppy mill. Conditions are clean. Owners are reasonable.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I do not believe pet stores should sell animals such as dogs/cats. Commercial breeding operations should not be permitted. Those that do breed, should belong to various breed clubs, Canadian Kennel Club, or organizations that encourage health testing on parents and guarantees on genetic health defects.
- Bad breeders will always fly under the radar. Don't legislate good breeders out of business.
- Reputable sales, proper licensed/certified, to prevent backyard type sales and neglect of animals.
- Take safeguards against the spread of disease. Check the animals haven't been bred by unsavoury breeders.

A person check to ensure the animal isn't being sold to someone who may engage in dog fighting, etc.

Licensing

- That the animal passes a physical examination by a vet before sale, that health checks are performed on the said animal specific to their breed/or breeds if crossed.
- Proper vaccinations are up to date. Check up on previous owner experience through searches. Must provide the animals safety above any profit.
- There is a pet overpopulation crises. It's ridiculous for anyone to be breeding most domestic pets - either on purpose or by accident. Pets should be altered before maturity, period. The only exceptions should be animals that are not practical (ie: I am doubtful you can spay a bird or a snake). Anyone who wants to breed should be investigated, licensed and held to very high standards.
- Not allowed in pet stores. Only from reputable breeders, SPCA and other rescues. Backyard breeders should be banned.
- Any business that is selling animals should ensure they are supporting good responsible breeders, they should be sharing the breeder's information as good breeders offer ongoing support for their puppies and their families. They should also be educating their customers on how to recognize and avoid puppy mills.
- All animals should be spayed/neutered. If not, these pets should cost more to buy. Animals should all have proof of health by a registered vet.
- Again promote responsible pet ownership. Many EU countries do not spay and neuter their pets and do not have the problems North America has.
Forcing spay and neutering is detrimental to dedicated preservation breeders. And detrimental to the development of our beloved pets.
If the city actually supported responsible pet ownership by having vaccination clinics, affordable spay and neuter for those that want to, education done properly without the influence of Animal Rights organizations
- Ban the sale of dogs and cats except through rescues. It is a cruel practice and it needs to be put to an end.
- There should be no retail sale of animals in stores.
- The animals must pass a physical exam by a veterinarian, they must be up to date on their vaccines, and they must be in good health



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals should not be available in retail stores. They should be fixed.
- Confirmation of animal health - medical records if possible; registration as a legal entity; proper health and sanitation of the sale facility;
- I don't believe ANY responsible pet store would or should sell pets. Breeders should be properly licensed based on kennel club regulations for purebreds. Any other pet owners should be spaying/neutering their pets and if they do not and end up with puppies/kittens, they should not be able to sell them for profit. They should however be responsible for finding homes.
- They should NOT be allowed to sell cats or dogs
- No dogs for sale in pet store aka [removed]. Only rescue animals available for sale in pet stores. No mandatory spay and neuter for pets, but any non profit registered as a rescue can only adopt out altered animals.
- Respect animal rights /proper care, have liability insurance, some limit on # of animals onsite at one time, micro chipped animals sold, records of sales
- Contribute to City animal services
- There should be no free animals.... Ever. All animals sold should be healthy and be guaranteed for 30 days to ensure they are healthy.
- i think all businesses that sell animals should be monitored for the well being of the animal and I think there should be a limit to the dollar value an animal can be sold for.
- I think they should be spayed/ neutered and that animals should not be sold around Christmas time. I also think a business should make it clear the animal can always be returned no questions asked without refund.
- Exotic animals biz needs to be reduced. Too many are mistreated when entered in the pet trade from foreign locations. How many, like gold fish are released into rivers and become a huge problem?
- Proof of health, shots.
- Humane treatment of all animals.
- There should be a limit in the number of breeding bitches in the care of a breeder, one person can not do much with in respect to animal care with 10 litters of dogs Dogs should not be sold in stores and puppy mills should be banned
- It should be illegal to sell dogs and cats in stores. Small animals, reptiles, and fish are fine.
- Spay/neutered, where the animal came from, mandatory microchip and vaccinations included, very thorough application process, mandatory dog training classes as a condition of adoption.
- I do not believe in retail sale of pets. Rescues are the only way. We have too many pets in need.
- make sure that all pets vaccinations are up to date depending on age of animal, health records of individual animal and/or family.
- no animal mills of any kind
- Animals should not come from a backyard breeder or puppy mills.
- Must keep files showing where animal came from & this must be available to purchaser.. must have a license to do so



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Humane, animals kept safe and healthy.
- Ensuring animals dont come from unlicensed breeders
- Wellness and proper breeding. No animal cruelty.
- Animals should be implanted with a micro chip with information about the animal, all animals must be treated humanely , in a clean safe environment, all animals need to be given medical inspection by animal doctor to ensure a clean bill of health, animals need to be properly fed and watered, and nothing should be allowed that would cause an animal any undo stress or trauma.
- Stop selling, too many cats and dogs already needing homes. Too many puppy mills already. spayed/neutered
- evidence of ability to care...not sure how this would be done but maybe a screening process
- On small animals, I think having to guarantee genders would be beneficial. For example, rabbits are often hard to sex when young. This would help avoid unexpected litters and potential irresponsible wild release (especially because of how overrun rescue societies are with rabbits)
- Required application for importing live animals according to provincial and federal requirements.
- I think retail sale of cats dogs and rabbits should be disallowed unless they are rescue animals associated with a non-profit.
- Proof that it does not come from a puppy or cat mill
- Pet stores should not sell animals as they are acquired from puppy mills
- Animals are bred responsibly, animals not owned by breeders should be spayed or neutered.
- Must register to sell and transfer licensing at time of sale.
- Any business or individual selling animals should be required to provide proof that the animal has been obtained legally, and / or from a reputable breeder and is properly vaccinated, dewormed, and sterilized where appropriate.
- That the pets are well cared for. No overcrowding. Vaccinated. Fixed. The caregivers are registered.
- There is a huge difference between retail sales and sales from responsible preservation breeders and they need to be treated separately
Rescues should be considered retail sales as many now import for sale
- Not giving animals away for free (leads to abuse of pets) checking out the home/facility the pet comes from to ensure no puppy mill/abusive breeding home, ensure animals are vaccinated.
- Whatever might protect the animal from abuse, education of potential new owner, follow up.
- Not supporting unhealthy breeding practices.
- Licensing, chip and transfer of chip. All shots / immunizations.
- I am opposed to mandatory spaying and neutering laws. They do not take into account that some people breed dogs show them or do competitions with them. It also does not take into account the health of the dog nor allow people to make individual decisions with their vet. I am not opposed to the retail sale of animals so long as it's done in a responsible way. I believe that all rescues in Pet Shops are actually sales, and should be regulated that way.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Whatever prevents things like puppy mills, re-breeding too early, frequent sellers, scammers, etc.
- Need to ensure that pets that are sold are not being abused and are not kept in small cages. Any business selling pets should be licensed and subject to unannounced visits to ensure pets are being looked after. Same goes for Rescue groups, there are currently no rules in place for dog rescues and anyone can open a rescue group
- Do not buy from puppy mills.
Provide the breeders name, contact number to double check it's not a puppy mill.
- The company or individual should be qualified in all aspects to properly care for the animals.
- The animals are healthy or they will not be for sale.
- Spaying and neutering as well as having a licence to sell animals strictly for personal use
- Health and welfare of the animals
- I don't think retail sales should be allowed. If a retailer wants to "sell" pets, they should work with one of the many rescues in or near Calgary to adopt them out. Retailers use backyard breeders; if someone really wants to buy from a breeder, they should be going there to see the conditions the animals live in.
- Size of enclosures animals are kept in. There should be a limit as to how many can be kept in specific amount of space. The animals should have basic needs met; food, water, clean living space, mental stimulation.
- Spacious clean housing, not from puppy mills, ensure enough exercise & human interaction, not left alone over night or long periods ever
- Let's face it, there is a store in Calgary that claims to sell pets from responsible breeders. You absolutely know that is a bald face lie. NO responsible breeders sell their dog/cat at that store or anywhere on Kijiji or other selling sites. Why are they being allowed to sell PUPPYMILL animals?????? This is the crime you need to be focused on
- Retail sale of dogs just encourages puppy mills. Dogs should always be a rescue or purchased from a reputable purebred breeder registered with the Canadian Kennel Club.
- That the pet is sold as a non breeding animal and will be spayed or neutered, possibly include this in the price. The exception would be unless purchasing and paying more for breeding rights. Also the purchaser should be required to buy the registration/license on the spot.
- That the pets they have for sale must be sourced from ethical breeders. The pets should be vaccinated, vet checked, in good health and kept in humane conditions.
- Animals should be assessed for aggression. Not all animals are suitable as pets.
- Shouldn't happen at all with dogs and cats
- Animals should be vetted and certified vet checked to be sold as well as licensed prior so the owner is held to be accountable
- No puppy or cat mill animals to be sold. A limit on how many dogs you have and can breed. Must have humane conditions that meet expected standards. Business license and should be inspected.
- Care and well being of the animal is paramount
- Something to ensure the humane treatment of animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The health and safety of the pet should be number 1. There are too many adoptable animals out there so I don't see a need for retail sales
- No animals from irresponsible breeders, contractual obligations to spay/neuter and vaccinate all pets
- There shouldn't have to be any rules in place for a business to retail animals because stores like Petsmart, Petland or any pet store should NOT be allowed whatsoever to sell ANY animal!
- I don't know enough about the current rules to give an answer.
- No retail sales of animals as pets, period. Adoption only, via rescues and shelters. CKC or specific comparable breeders only.
- Vaccinated and spayed.
- I would love to see pet stores be encouraged to devote some space to rescue animals from shelters (eg from the city pound). Not as a regulation, but perhaps with benefits such as a reduced license fee or something similar. Strict rules about care and welfare of animals.
- Mandatory spay/neuter, mandatory permanent identification (microchip), available/accessible breeder information
- Adoption agencies revived higher percentage of retail space.
- Make sure store keeps them safe and clean
- Animals must be cared for while in the "care" of a pet store.
- Lemon laws for pet sales whether through a pet store or a rescue.
- Cats/dogs should not be sold in stores unless under the supervision of a registered charity with experience of deciding on the nature etc of buyers
- Provide proper education of the animal they're selling
- Animal history
- Regular and random inspection for quality of life/care provided to any animal, with public posting of results.
- They should not be puppy or kitty mills
- Lots of stolen animals so maybe proof of ownership, license documents, etc to prove you owned the pet. I don't believe in the 'must be' spayed or neutered with a puppy..I adopted an 8 week from SPCA and he was already neutered..that age for that XL dog type is basically criminal animal abuse
- Animals should not be sold for breeding so they should be spayed or neutered. More regulation should be created. Pet stores should only sell rescue animals. Tougher penalties for puppy farms. No fees
- Animals must be healthy and living conditions must be above grade
- No regulation needed
- They should not sell cat dogs rabbits and Guinea pigs unless They are spayed or neutered and from reputable breeders
- purchase pets from reputable sources
- Ethical breeding, care and sale practices ie do not buy from puppy mills, require that animals are vaccinated, spayed or neutered



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No puppy mills
 - Reputable, licensed breeders
 - Rescue organizations
 - No online sales (kijiji, Facebook, etc)
- the rules as they exist work. More rules and regulations and restrictions only end up negatively affecting legitimate ethical breeders. Unethical breeders do not care about rules and tend to fly under the wire so no one sees them.
- I don't believe pets should be sold as part of retail sales operations. I am a certified behaviour consultant and I cringe to think of the inability of a retail facility to provide the necessary socialization and training to produce a behaviorally sound animal for our community.
- As long as they are treated humanely. Emphasis should always be put on adopting from rescue foundations first.
- No puppy mills, proper breeding procedures, proper care of all animals
- Stop animal mills! There are plenty of animals available for adoption/rescue ... our dog was given to us and we found out she was from a puppy mill and has skin issues ... this added unnecessary costs in animal care
- Proper housing for the pet. Petland puppy windows are not appropriate.
 - Behavioural breakdown for pet owners (knowing the issues will likely result in less pets being returned)
 - A full vet work up
- not get their animals from backyard breeders who mistreat their animals and that don't genetically test them to reduce defects. All animals spayed or neutered so no backyard breeders can buy from a retail store. They can also help rescue facilities to find new homes for people as long as they are sociable pets and not aggressive.
- Vet proof for health history of animal and confirmation that animal came from a responsible owner/breeder or rescued
- No pet mills. Animals can be purchased from licensed breeders or adoption centres only that are under strict regulations regarding living conditions and animal care
- Condition of premises and care. Unannounced monitoring
- Safety and well being of animals (limits in number of animals in premises), inspections to ensure wellbeing
- I don't think they should be allowed to require spay or neuter. There is lots of research to show that waiting until a dog is 12-18 months is better for their health.
- Right to refuse sale to unsuitable home. Adoptions only for cats and dogs, no retail sales of cats and dogs in a pet store setting.
- Type of animal - not an endangered species or competitive species to our natural ecosystem.
- Not a fan of dogs being sold at pet stores. I am concerned about puppy mills or indiscriminate breeders being the supplier
- To make sure animals are healthy and vaccinated
- Ensuring the health of the animal is the top priority.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The rescue business is a profit making threat to the health and safety of animals and people in Calgary. These "agencies" should not operate in Calgary. Hobby breeders who are CKC members in good standing provide health tested, reasonably priced dogs bred for a specific purpose; and with generations of documented health history. CKC breeders need to be protected - not thrown under the bus with regulations that should be aimed at rescue groups that import diseased animals or that function out of commercial pet stores that operate within the City and sell dogs in breach of the Animal Pedigree Act's requirements.
- I think pets should come either from rescue organization or responsible licensed breeders. I don't agree with forced spay or neuter as I think it is the owners choice what is in the best interest of their pet. I don't think that there should be any restrictions placed on type or breed of dogs.
- The animal should be in good health. Regular vet checks would be ideal. Dogs, cats, and any bird larger than a budgie should not be kept or sold in stores.
- Proper care of the animal.
- Licensed breeder, no pets sold at Xmas time, vet inspected before sale with records, limits on amounts to prevent over breeding.
- Business must be conducted in a humane, safe, controlled environment and evidence of that must be provided to the city
- Reputable breeders do not retail animals.
- Stricter laws about how animals are kept in businesses. No one should be able to tap on a tank or plexiglass wall/window. Make handling of small animals illegal by children in pet stores.
- Accepting the return of any unwanted pet.
- no retail sales, breeders should be registered (free service but regulated as to amount of litters produced in a year and health and care monitored), breeding of pure-breed dogs to limit the amount of animals being bred for commercial purposes. rescues should be licensed and NOT allowed to import animals from outside of province
- No more importing dogs for resale/adoption.
- I believe the animal should be up to date on vaccines and microchipped.
- Maybe, in the case of a professional seller/retailer, a check that the purchaser is not subject to a court ordered ownership ban? Not sure though, if there is a database for that. Maybe make one, sell to other jurisdictions.
- no mills! humane!
- Subject to SPCA inspection. Absolutely sanitary. Not selling puppies or kittens too young to be weaned ie under 8 weeks old and before their first shots
- I believe in mandatory spay and neuter and feel this would be the single most effective strategy to end animal overpopulation and homelessness. I do not endorse the sale of pets on online or offline classified ads. On social media sites. Nor do I believe animals should be sold at auctions. I believe all breeders should be licensed and have restrictions in place to limit the number of litters per year they can advertise.
- Unable to comment not aware of problems
- Have to be a licensed breeder.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals should need to be spayed or neutered unless the buyer has a breeders license. This would help reduce the number of stray animals and animals who end up in shelters. It would also reduce puppy mills and other unethical, unsafe and harmful breeding activities.
- The retail sale of animals should be discouraged on social media. Retailers and breeders must be heavier regulated and under greater scrutiny to eliminate puppy mill practices. Heavy fines and legislated banning of pet ownership, boarding, or breeding needs to occur and be consistently and forcefully applied. All breeders and rescues must be licensed and have adequate sqft per pet regulations, adequate # staff/volunteers and have spay/neuter and veterinary care protocols well established. Accreditation protocols should be established and followed for all breeders and rescues. All adoptable cats, dogs and rabbits must be spayed and neutered, licensed, microchipped and vaccinated before being homed.
Sale or breeding of exotic animals should be banned in the city of Calgary and preferably the province.
The possession of exotics and should be banned and heavily fined as should any wild or non domestic animal. Eg: river otter, squirrel, racoon, fox, wolf cub, deer or fawn etc
- Breeding so they have to be a business or have a hobby license.
- I think there needs to be more of a process similar to what aarcs has in place for adoptions. Especially for warm blooded pets
- They disclose where the animal came from and that information is provided to the prospective buyer. That they have a 'return policy', they vet the seller and buyer; that they know IT'S A SENTIENT BEING AND NOT A PRODUCT.
- They must be well cared for. In an appropriate space. Must be checked by vet when sick regardless of size. Limit the people who can touch them. (This can be highly stressful for some animals birds, rabbits, small rodents. I see it a lot in pet stores.) Proper diet and exercise for all.
- Only regularly inspected breeders or rescues should be able to make pets available to the public
- I do not feel dogs and cats should be available for sale or adoption in a pet store type facility, it is stressful for the animals to be there and their well being needs to be considered too, most of us would agree our pets are family, not a commodity.
- The animal must come from a safe home and healthy parents. Must have had enough time with parents. We calgarians must not allow animal abuse and neglect to be considered.
- The proper care and treatment of animals. People trained to handle them.
- Unsure/haven't done enough research on this
- Knowing where the animal came from & its pedigree (ie no puppy mill, trafficed birds, etc.). Reputable pet store sales ok with me - generally lots of eyes to notice if animals are being cared for vs dank basement/garage operation. Ideally, should be spayed/neutered; perhaps offer redeemable certificate to participating vet as option.
- We do not need any more rules.
- I believe there should be regulations in place for people selling more than a litter of animal at one time. That is a business and should be licensed and subject to inspections to prevent animal cruelty.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Can the business prove the animal is not from a mill and is from a reputable source? If a dog, can you meet the parents? Businesses should not sell dogs in any event. Dogs should not be an impulse purchase.
- pet stores are unnecessary, breeders should be licensed regardless of where they sell their dogs
- The animals welfare is kept to same standards as humans a depressed animal can be as dangerous as a depressed person if they don't have treatment keep them happy keep us happy
- pets have permanent identification, microchips,tattooing
- All animals sold must have an identity chip, which provides details on who owns the animal.
- All puppy mills should be illegal. Anywhere that animals are sold should be licensed and undergo regular inspections.
- Be responsible for the animal you are selling
- CKC and TICA registered breeders should be exempt from regulation as they are governed by the Livestock Pedigree ACT of Canada and are overseen and regulated by their respective bodies of purebred animal registries. Having said that I believe if the city of Calgary had a « Breeders licensing » option where said breeders paid a set (reasonable rate yearly)which encompassed annual dog licenses for a breeding program that might be a good idea. This way the city could come and inspect kennel/ cateries operations as needed to make sure they were safe, not over populated, humane, clean and non crowded.this way the city could oversee and prevent puppy mills and caters mills. This could also apply to other purebred animals under the livestock pedigree act as well. Of note: I am a longtime breeder of purebred dogs and would state most breeders don't breed for the money but rather for the betterment of the breed and are stewards to their respective breeds, rather than money makers! [personal information removed]
- This is a very slippery slope. I do believe that there should be stricter guidelines on importation of animals for sale. Often the people doing this have more heart than brains and do not understand the behavioural issues associated with importing animals that have had no accredited behavioural assessments done.
The decision to spay or neuter should be between the owner and veterinarian. Spay and neuter has nothing to do with responsible pet ownership. Any study done in the last decade shows the detrimental effects of desexing at young ages. Many pets are rehomed for behavioural/health issues. Many of these can be attributed to early desexing.
- Regular inspections by city health.
- All must be permanently chipped and vaccinated before sending on to their new homes. More education and oversight to ensure animals are placed in appropriate homes. Dogs owners should be required to participate in dog classes.
- Dogs and cats should not be sold at retail pet stores.
- Sell pets only from shelters.
- nothing should change.
- There should be no retail sale of animals.
- Dogs should not be sold as retail. Go to a rescue organization and adopt or find a reputable breeder
- Ensure the safety of the animal...that criminals cannot adopt an animal

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Where the animal is coming from (no puppy mills) and for the animal to be spayed/neutered and to be in good health
- Don't sell dangerous breeds
- Genetic testing of animals so breeding is controlled n encourages adoption not purchase
- To be sold from a retail environment, the animal should be able to live comfortably in a retail environment. This excludes dogs from retail sale. They should also be bred and reared to weaning in an appropriate environment that meets their physical and emotional needs.
- Ensure the animal is up to date on all core vaccinations, is veterinarian checked for good health. Desex the animal if applicable (yes even for bunnies)... Or just stop the retain sale of animals in businesses. [personal information removed]
- Rules surrounding quality of care and cleanliness.
- All animals must be healthy.
- No importing from Mexico and foreign countries where they have street animal problems. I am all for supporting these areas and their overpopulation problems but Alberta has it's own feral animal problems and adoption needs. If companies sell animals they should have to come with licensing as part of the sale and purchaser should have recourse against the retailer built into the purchase if the animal is discovered to be a victim of mills.
- We need to ensure the breeders are ethical and breed humanely. We should ban the sale of puppy mill dogs.
- Background checks with bylaw for new animals. Laws in where and when animals can be sold or adopted. Extremely harsh punishments for those that violate sale or adoption laws.
- Licensed professionals such as pet stores should handle this.
- I don't think animals should be sold in Pet Stores. Only through a licensed breeder. No puppy mills ever@
- No retail sales in pet stores allowed, it just promotes hoarding and poor situations for pets
- I am not qualified to answer this question
- Pet shops of all kinds should be forbidden from selling dogs or cats. We don't know where these animals come from, and it encourages puppy mills. Dogs or cats should not be sold unless they are spayed or neutered. Qualified breeders can provide unspayed animals to those who also wish to breed or show. I also think that anyone buying a pet should have to show knowledge of the needs and care of whatever animal they want to acquire. A course may be required. Too many animals end up in terrible homes where they are neglected and/or abused. Not everyone deserves to have a pet.
- Where did this animal come from? Why is it being sold/re-homed.
- NO puppy mills, no pet sales on sites like Kijiji, etc, as they are often puppy mills or back yard breeders. Preferably sales at pet stores either, as most rescues have 'adoption' days at stores now so that is a much better and safer way to do it.
- Must be sourced ethically (ie no trafficked Amazon or African exotic birds and reptiles) , Kijiji sales of animals are pretty terrifying and should be limited to legitimate stores and/or licensed breeders.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Full interview with person buying an animal. Background check for animal abuse, number of animals already in the household.
- that they do own the pet; they are a reputable licensed business. I don't think you should limit spay and neutering pets, as some are purebred being sold as puppies
- Cleanliness, safety of others and pets. These business's should ensure pets aren't coming from puppy Mills who are in it for the money and not the concern of the animals
- No live animals should be sold in pet stores with the exception of the adoption of rescued animals from registered charities. All animals should be spayed or neutered.
- Proper licencing of animal before sale....might help theft of them
- All of the above
- To determine whether or not the animal to be sold will be used for companionship or breeding purposes. If companionship is the reason, the animal should be spayed or neutered.
- Type of animal, care of animal prior to being sold, ethical acquisition of animals for sale (no puppy mills for example.)
- Canine should not be sold out of a business as it encourages puppy mills to continue to raise animals in horrid conditions.
- Pet stores should not be allowed to sell animals [personal information removed] Puppy Mills should be illegal. Back yard breeding should be illegal as well as the agreements some breeders make for you to "foster" one of their dogs but return it several times to be bred (essentially puppy mills). Fee limits should be placed on all non purebread dogs (designer mutts) to discouraged even licenced breeders to Frankenstein 2 breeds together because they are "cute" or hypoallergenic - this is not years of carefully and responsibly furthering a breed standard (as a reputable breeder does) this is making a buck off of ignorance.
- Spay and neuter or licensed as a business if the owner is a breeder.
- If house is residential, there should be a limit on number of dogs/cats that can be owned UNLESS you are a breeder through CKC, AKC, etc.
Spaying and neutering guidelines are set by veterinarians and consensus has changed from fixing at 6 months, to waiting until the female has past her first heat and the male is 1-2 years depending on breed of dog. This should not be controlled by the city as the city are not vets and the laws are not changed regularly to meet the science.
- Some liability for retail sellers who fail to evaluate the purchaser about their ability to care for the animal, ultimately we'd want to avoid selling animals to people who're unlikely to be able to care for them or arrange for their care or people who might use them for criminal activity (like dog fighting). Similarly, they should be required to ensure a humane supply chain - avoiding animals coming from 'mills' and whatnot.
- Conditions the animal came from (ie. puppy mill), conditions animal lives in prior to being sold, quality of care including touch, food, engagement, time spent outside the kennel or cage, etc
- Not sure on this one.
- Businesses that sell animals (birds, reptiles, bunnies and hamsters, etc.) should be required to not only meet, but to exceed the expectations of animal welfare. They should be exemplars in pet care



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

and pet ownership. They should be required to work with only accredited rescues and reputable breeders.

Absolutely NO business should be selling puppies and kittens that are bred to be sold at a retail business. Puppies and kittens should only be available for purchase from reputable breeders and accredited rescue organizations.

- Breeders and rehoming organizations should be licensed and all pets sold in stores should be local rescues who are spayed/neutered.
- Proper living space when caged. Not being left caged with their poop in a closed in space. Be reviewed by a health code practice regularly. The cost for animals has gotten ridiculous and some breeds being classified as pure breed when have two breeds in them. Lots of scamming and get rich quick off animals and then they go to poor homes.
- Normal retail practices - the City should not be involved in this, other than providing business licenses. Many breeders are outside City limits - I do not think increased City involvement would be a good use of resources.
- Pets should not be sold in stores, end of story.
- Pets should be spayed or neutered. They should have to provide license information. No exotic animals should be sold except to properly licensed individuals. Retail locations should have to provide the city with proof they are not utilizing/buying from puppy mills/unsafe breeding practices.
- I don't have an opinion
- Cats and dogs should never be retail sold. Breeders or rescues only. All other animals being sold should be regularly seen by outside vets and the premises inspected regularly by the city.
- No puppy mills!
- Dogs and cats should only be adopted from rescue organizations - including pet stores.. All pets adopted through businesses should have a spay/neuter and microchip included in the adoption of the animal. Registered breed specific breeders that have registered animals should be exempted from this - but those animals should only be adopted through the breeder. People should not be allowed to sell animals on Kijiji.
- All of the above. If we are making bylaws to address issues after the fact, would it not make sense to try to curtail them before they become an issue? Of course it does!
- Proper care.
- Must be a certified business that follows the ruling of CKC or other purebred animal regulatory conditions.

All animals sold should have current veterinary records that are actually backed by the veterinarian in the case of an incidence of physical issue

The animals must be kept in plain view of the purchaser. Including parents of the animals.

Registration Papers DO NOT mean an increase in the purchase price of purebred animals.

Imported animals (from other countries) must possess appropriate quarantine papers and veterinary checks with follow up if required,



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Rescue organizations as well as breeders should have a 'cap' on how many animals in line with how many staff employed, so that animals have the ability to get proper care and governance to avoid that over population is kept in check.

- Retail stores should not be able to sell animals but instead support rescue organizations. Stores should educate owners as to why they need to look for in a reputable breeder /rescue group. Dogs, cats rabbits birds, exotics should not be sold in retail. The city needs a bylaw to end the sale of live animals such as dogs and cats like other cities have done.
- Ethical storage conditions - for example betta fish in pet stores are in tiny cups lining the shelves, with no proper water filtration or bowl cleaning, and can get sick very easily
- Animals should not be sold in stores as inventory. The city should randomly inspect ads on kijiji or ebay for breeders to discover unsanitary, inhumane conditions. The current enforcement is a joke.
- Spay/neuter, immediate licensing
- No opinion
- Anybody who breeds dogs or cats for sale should have a licence. Puppy mills should be banned, and enforced. Any animal sold over the Internet in Calgary should be spayed or neutered. Any animal who wanders away from their home more than once should be spayed or neutered.
- None. There is already provincial legislation about what animals are legal to own or not. The city should not over-regulate the pet industry.
- Sourcing the retail pets from ethical breeders, maintain the health and socialization of the animals in their care, have a vast knowledge of the animals being sold and be able to educate and prepare buyers for all stages of their new pet's life.
- Pets must be chipped, and examined by a veterinarian at most 30 days before the sale of any pet, at cost to the seller. Official results of veterinarian exam available to the buyer before sale finalized. Costs of chipping and exam may be passed on to buyer at seller discretion, but must be documented in receipt and terms of sale.
- Rabbits, dogs and cats should be spayed/neutered to prevent unwanted pet populations.
- None sold in stores that aren't rescues or from humane societies or city pound.
- Provide health care records, spay/neuter the pet or provide a discount for encouraging to do so, provide information regarding care and licensing of the pet
- Clear contracts, health guarantees. Type of housing provided for animals for sale.
- No inbreeding
- Use a reputable breeder, no puppy mills. Liaise with shelters where possible. The pet must be spayed/neutered unless it is being used for breeding purposes.
- No trade or traffic in wildlife. No sourcing animals from mills. Source of the animal must be accredited and meet every standard for the physical and mental health of the animal.
- All animals involved in the process should be in good health. Animals should not be alerted genetically or physically to fit with some kind of fad. Prices should reflect the cost of keeping the animal (and its parents) in good health rather than the "tendiness" of the breed. Animals must be kept in clean and safe environments while they wait for their new homes.
- humane conditions for the dogs a place they are loved and cared for



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- That animals are spayed neutered, have a recent health screen and current vaccinations, and not contributing to puppy mills etc
- No retail sales of dogs or cats, rescue only.
Any other animals sold should require proof that they were obtained from a responsible (licensed, if applicable) breeder.
- The biggest issue is whether the person is financially able to provide for the pet, or if their responsible enough to manage that pets needs... and these can not really be determined by a seller.. so its almost useless.
- Must be from licensed and reputable breeders and also have rescued animals alongside bred animals if selling bred animals. Bred animals cannot be sold online if not licensed.
- Animals should be spayed or neutered unless they are a registered breeder.
- Animals need to be well cared for and not come from breeders or puppy mills. Breeding animals should be against the law!! All animals should cost the same. No need to have expensive and cheap animals.
- If a retail store or broker is selling animals they must have to specify publicly where they are sourcing their animals from so that buyers can educate themselves on the breeder to prevent unwanted back yard breeding and puppy mills. Transparency is key.
- No puppy mills.
Anyone selling more then 2 animals, stores must have licence and must check in with city to advise info on how they access these animals etc. Audits done by city.
- Definitely do NOT require the animal to be spayed or neutered as this early neutering is now known to be detrimental to the health of animal. You could require sterilization techniques that leave hormones intact such as vasectomy or hysterectomy of puppies. No sale of dogs in pet stores. Cats sold need to have a City licence before being purchased. Any place, including cat/Dpg breeders and non profits in the City, should require the purchase of a City licence as part of the adoption agreement unless the owner's address if outside of Calgary.
- Animals should be spayed/neutered when sold. People selling animals should be licensed and there should be regulations on the animals living conditions and limits on prices for those animals that are being bred.
- Retail sales of dogs and cats should not be allowed.
- Provide proof the animals aren't from a puppy/whatever mill. Buyer should be required to provide proof of vaccinations and licenses within a certain timeline (age of animal) or have to return animal.
- Yes.
- There are too many abandoned animals. All animals sold should be spayed/neutered. No animal to be sold from a pet store.
- Something more needs to be in place for "backyard breeding". You must need special certification, business or criteria to be able to sell animals online etc.
- I don't think there should be regulations on spaying or neutering dogs and cats. This should be a personal decision between and owner and their vet. No puppies or kittens sold in pet stores, defined by 6 months of age or less.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be NO retail sale of animals. I think that rescues and reputable breeders should be able to have animals in pet stores, but that potential owners need to go through a screening process.
- animals must be in good health (too many backyard breeders are selling to Pet stores)
- Not sure about this one. I would like to see cats/dogs banned for sale at pet stores. Also, need some heavy duty by-laws and provincial laws regarding puppy/kitty mills.
- Must be spayed or neutered. All vaccinations up to date and a complete medical from a licensed veterinarian
- A business should never sell animals unless they are selling animals from a reputable breeder as too many businesses sell animals from the puppy mills where they are not healthy and the animals being bred are held in deplorable conditions and these puppy mills need to be shut down
- There should be a complete ban on retail sale of animals/kijiji/newspaper etc sales. Only small scale registered responsible breeders subjected to random regular inspections should be permitted.
- veterinary health certificate, licence requirements
- do proper research on where the animals come from and possibly on sell rescue dogs and cats
- If animals MUST be sold as retail...Business must be licensed & spot inspected for care of animals. Small pets only i.e. no dogs, cats or rabbits. Document who each animal is sold to inc. ID of purchaser. Animals must be vaccinated/parasite prevention by a licensed vet if of an appropriate age/species. All medical records shared with new owner. Failure to comply = not allowed to sell pets, period.
- Animals are not products to be shopped for in a store. Ban all retail of dogs and cats.
- They should be trying to rehome animals from rescue, many of these animals can be sourced from independent breeders which may be more realistic for the future
- Animals should not be imported and sold in Canada, this affects the health of other pets, especially when the animals are not properly dewormed/vaccinated. Also the breeder should be the responsible business selling the animals, not "brokers" that get animals from puppy mills. Animals should not be sold on Kijiji
- I do not believe in the retail sale of animals like dogs and cats - if people want to purchase one they should source out a shelter or reputable breeder
- Keep the animals cared for, in good health and proper environmental conditions.
- Spayed/neutered; verified source (no puppy mills); licensed on site upon sale; restrictions on the sale of dogs/cats, focus on adoption. Record of sale -determine if people are buying multiples of animals
- I am not certain this is something the City should be involving itself as it is difficult to have the same regulations placed on responsible breeders / rescue organizations / backyard breeders / Kijiji type sellers. I'd question how the City would plan on enforcing such regulations before deciding what those regulations should entail.
- I don't believe in retail sale of animals, even with breeders. We prefer to adopt.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I do not condone the sale of animals. Serving to house animals for rehoming and adoption may be different however there is a lack of understanding around how overstimulating and emotionally damaging those environments can be.
- No puppy mill puppies or kittens. Ever. Animals should be sold by breeders or re-homed (with appropriate adoption fee) by rescue organizations.
- All retail animals should be spayed or neutered before sale.
- No comment
- Ensuring the animal is free of zoonotic diseases,
- Animals should never be sold from a retail business. I believe all the shelters and rescues should be required to have the animals spayed or neutered before they are adopted
- quality of life, hours spent in a cage, size of cage, time allowed outside
- For retail of pets like dogs and cats they should be spayed or neutered
- Proven qualifications to ensure that the animals being sold are safe and healthy and have been properly cared for prior to sale.
- Cruelty free sales.
- Provide veterinarian and vaccination history, source of the animal , age, breed, dam and sire info,
- Do not ever have a breed specific ban. It's [removed], punish the owner not the animal. Improve regulations on the ownership of exotics, large cats and reptiles that could potentially be released in the wild.
- All breeders/rescues should be permitted/listed with the city. All animals should be sold with a contract and if an individual cannot keep a pet, they should be returned to the breeder/rescue. Any breeder/rescue not accepting the returned animal should be penalized.
- Health checked. Responsible breeding. Spay or neuter. Exotic pets -proper care and awareness of special needs. Safety of animals.
- The animals must be sold with the animal's best interest in mind, as well as be healthy, and will thrive in their new home.
- That a vet check is done and report is shared with potential buyer; that required immunizations have been given before pet is released to owner with documents to prove same; animal should also be spayed or neutered prior to releasing to new owner (exception: registered professional kennel/breeders); animals should be microchipped to be returned to owners
- All animals should be spayed/neutered and vaccinated. Focus should be on adoption of rescued animals.
- Nothing.
- businesses selling and caring for animals need to be inspected regularly, to provide safe and adequate support. the city should set detailed regulations. when, where, and the type of animals..
- I do not believe dogs should be sold in retail businesses and there should be stronger laws regarding conditions of animals in breeding facilities. I am involved in a rescue organization and have seen dogs coming from puppy mills and have seen their appalling physical condition, and even



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

more heartbreaking how mentally broken there are. There need to be stronger laws to protect these animals.

- No animals sold in pet stores - no responsible breeder would ever allow any of their animals to be sold through a pet store. Any individual breeder who sells an animal should be required to provide a buyer with access to the parent(s), have proof of good living conditions, provide animal health checks by a qualified vet, have a return/rescue policy, prove they are not inbreeding. Prospective buyers should be thoroughly screened to help ensure animals are going to a truly responsible owner.
- Rules to make sure they are not coming from a puppy mill type situation. Place needs to be inspected that they get the animals from to be humane
- I do not approve of the retail sale of animals
- Must be spayed or neutered, in good health, vaccinated. Should give space to local rescued animals, not just bred-for-sale animals.
- I CANNOT BELIEVE THE CITY OF CALGARY IS ONE OF VERY FEW WHO ALLOWS A STORE TO SELL PUPPIES - ANYONE WHO EDUCATES THEMSELVES KNOWS MOST PUPPIES COME FROM PUPPY MILLS WHERE THE PARENTS RECEIVE UNSPEAKABLE ABUSE. Who is being paid off? IT IS DISGUSTING!
- N/A
- Breeders should not be permitted, given the vast numbers of homeless pets that are awaiting adoption.
- Responsible breeding.
- Reputable and licensed. Have to be vet checked and documentation up to standard
- Business should be licensed to operate in Calgary, the animals should be in good health and come either with prepaid insurance or a health warranty. Small animals such as rabbits should be spayed or neutered to prevent population explosions in the event they escape or are released.
- Animals should be rendered incapable unless obtaining an exemption from the City. This would allow for breeders.
- None - regretfully, while in a perfect world this would be taken only for animals benefit, there are too many variables to make this fair to all ethical breeders/producers of animals, while also fair to rescues.
- Businesses that sell animals should be required to provide written proof of animal health, provide a spay or neuter voucher for young animals, have older animals altered already, not sell wildlife or wolf crosses, not sell endangered animals, provide written proof of origin of breeder.
- Animals must be healthy and well-cared for
- Retail businesses should have paperwork showing where the animal came from.
- All of the suggestions here:
- <https://www.humanesociety.org/sites/default/files/docs/ordinance-combat-puppy-mills-guide.pdf>
- Minimum space requirements for enclosures, business licence, vaccines and medical if applicable for the age of animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Spay/neuter unless selling for breeding purposes. Especially for animals that may roam like cats, rabbits. Not applicable to animals that are fully enclosed like hamsters and chickens.

- Stores should not sell cats or dogs or livestock
- Guidelines should be followed, breeders generally are good with this.
Animals sold online should come with a bill of sale, just to have record of who and where the dog was bought.
- Proof of where the animals are from, whether rescued or from a breeder. Use of puppy mills should be discouraged or any other situation where the mother animal is in a potentially abusive environment.
- **FOR A PET STORE THAT THEY ANIMALS THEY ARE SELLING DO NOT COME FROM PUPPY OR CAT MILLS**
- No exotic or endangered animals, clear and up to date paper trail for sourcing. A vet check before selling the animals.
- All of the above mentioned. Also source of animal; where or how did they acquire the animal to be sold? Ensure it was legally acquired. Do they have a breeders license?
- Yes, all animals should be spayed or neutered. There are far too many back yard breeders. This hurts people and animals. There must be more strict rules and enforcement
- I don't believe animals should be sold in a retail setting, rather through CKC registered breeders
- Animals should not be for sale in retail stores.
- This isn't a civic responsibility
- Animal welfare.
- **NO SALE OF ANIMALS PERIOD.**

Animals are not property to be owned, objects to be used, slaves to be taken advantage of, or machines to be put to work. NO urban business should be allowed to sell animals. All animals should be spayed and neutered, unless exception from a qualified vet. The type of animal should be restricted to domestic 'pet' animals. Alberta struggles with massive animal overpopulation and the sale of animals directly sabotages the ability to place animals already struggling/in care of rescues that support Albertan animals.

- I think there's some rescues [personal information removed] that need more strong regulations. I think that to sell an animal for adoption they should have to go through a big process to be allowed to do this
- To ensure health records of the animal they are selling are up to date and animals must have a certification stating so.
- Must provide proper care and should work with local shelters
- I think buyers of pets should be taken into more consideration. For example, someone with a history of animal abuse should NOT in ANY CIRCUMSTANCE be able to get another animal. Places that adopt and/or sell pets should have a way to see exactly who they are selling to and if they are fit to own an animal, for the safety and well being of said animal.
- All of these.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No puppy mills. Adoptions as much as possible. Check for diseases. Offer spay/neuter discounts or free offer. Microchip or tattoo. Ensure good conditions while waiting for sale/adoption. Offer education on how to look after an animal to avoid people giving them up right away.
- They should have a city license of what kinds of dogs they can sell and have records of sales.
- sufficient qualified staff to care for the number and type of animals they have; ethically sourced animals (no wild harvest); ethical breeders; all vaccinations and health records up to date
- As outlined above
- Legal limit imposed on the number of animals they are allowed to sell. As well, stricter regulations on who is able to buy animals (18+ with adequate proof of research and responsibility regarding the pet they wish to purchase).
- All animals, unless being purchase specifically with breeding rights, must be spayed or neutered to control animal populations!
- All dogs and cats must be spayed/neutered prior to going to their new home. Breeders should not be allowed to sell privately without a licence and being monitored for conditions. No pure bred" animals to be sold in pet stores. Rescues only. Restrictions on who can sell what types of exotic animals.
- I don't think you should be able to sell cats, dogs, or rabbits through retail. Rescues or responsible breeders only.
- They are properly vaccinated and are healthy.
- Most importantly I think the well-being of the animal and the conditions on where it was bred and raised/housed is paramount.
- " - breeding of pets, selling of pets, numbers of pets in a house, etc.
- Pets should not be sold in stores. Pets should come from a rescue organization or from a breeder in good standing with an accredited organization (ie TICA or CKC). Businesses like [personal informatin removed] store should not be in business.
- Spayed and neutered, animal history/breeding must be transparent.
- the well-being of the animal prior to sale is very important. I would also like to see it being mandatory for an animal to be registered upon sale so that people aren't allowed to have 15 cats and 10 dogs and 8 bunnies and take care of none of them.
- That they're well taken care of. Ideally I suppose there would be restrictions on breeding animals for sale, but I don't think that's going to stop anyone and they will keep going to breeders rather than adopting.
- All animals should be spayed or neutered before going to their adoptive homes. A microchip implanted and registered to the new owner.
- The animals must not be separated from their mothers prior to 8 weeks. All animals must be spayed/neutered before being sold. Animals may not be from a breeder. Animals must have their first set of shots. Owners must agree to mandatory training sessions with their pet.
- Not from a mill, not sold to pet hoarders
- Thoroughly screen the potential pet owner. Have appropriate housing for animal until they are ready to go to a forever home.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Humane conditions for animals being sold.
- Animals should be spayed or neutered.
- Unless for breeding all dogs and cats should be neutered or spayed, Cages and pens should kept clean with adequate space, water and food and toys.
- Care and treatment of the animals must be exceptional. All animals selling animals must have a current health card listing anything not healthy with the animal. Anyone purchasing an animal from them that gets sick from an illness that the dog would have had before being purchased must get a full refund of cost of animal and all vet fees refunded from that business. Also take into consideration temperament issues wit animal being sold
- Retail sale of animals should be banned in Calgary
- Regulations about where an animal can be sold, potentially a permit to sell an animal, and it would be a good idea to ensure sold animals are fixed unless given exception (breeding animals)
- Spayed/neutered. From a rescue or a reputable source (no mills).
- The sale of dogs and cats in stores should be prohibited. They are not a product to be traded. Many cities have emboldened bans on this type of activity and it is time for Calgary to finally follow suit. As for smaller animals such as rabbits, they should be spayed and neutered or licensed or their sale also prohibited. The cost of dealing with the unintended consequences (ie Canmore) are proof enough that something needs to be done to deal with this and punish the irresponsible pet owners releasing domesticated rabbits in the wild.
- Spay or neuter if the animal is not to be bred (license to breed required at time of purchase)
- -must be spayed/neutered
- -must be at least three months old to allow adequate time with the mother
- -must have business licence to sell animals to avoid backyard breeders
- -regular inspections of breeders
- No business should be selling an animal in a retail setting unless it is from a reacue
- no opinion
- All animals must have proper areas to live in. Sellers Should be vetted to ensure the animals come from safe healthy home.
- proper treatment of the animals prior to sale. No puppy mills
- Sale of animals from reputable breeders ONLY.
- Puppies and kittens should not be sold in stores. We need to adopt not shop. If we are purchasing a special breed then those breeders must be licensed, inspected and regulated.
- All dogs and cats should be spayed and neutered. No breeders only rescue animals in pet stores.
- I don't know
- There should be regulations on the accommodations of the animals as well as the number on hand at a given time
- Need ensure not puppy mills and that humane treatment of the mother and the puppies. Basic cleanliness and health certificates should be a must
- Fixed and from reputable rescue's. Not pure breeds



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals should be spayed or neutered, in good health, no breeds that have a history of vicious behaviour
- Sale of pets needs to be better regulated, from how animals are obtained to how they are cared for in stores, plus buyers/adopters should be better vetted to ensure they are willing and actually able to properly care for type and breed of pet they are getting. Personally, I don't think stores should be selling pets at all, especially with options from reputable rescues and breeders willing to help potential pet owners find a pet that best fits with their lifestyle. Breeders should be regulated as well, ensuring practices are humane and that they're following best standards. I firmly believe that pets should be spayed or neutered as a condition of sale or adoption. This would help curb overpopulation, and eliminate situations where owners suddenly find themselves financially unable to do so when the time comes.
- complete description of what's included with the sale.
guaranteeing health of the breed is kinda grey knowing once the sale has been made, you don't keep track as to how they are taken cared of by the buyer, compared to when they were with the breeder.
- Spay and neuter at proper ages
Clean and large spaces for them to be kept in
Water and food prices at all times
Do in-depth interviews for adoptions to ensure good people are adopting
- No retail sale. Adopt dont shop!
- That owners are educated about the animal they are about to get. Be honest about breed tendencies and try to make suitable matches of pets with owners.
All pets should be housed appropriately and be provided with species specific diet and enrichment and have adequate space to move around.
- Animals must be checked by a vet to ensure that they are healthy. The animals must be housed in humane spaces. Animals must not be on display all the time.
- Businesses should be regulated .
- NO tail/ ear docking. NO declawing. Unless medically necessary.
Pet shops must not sell puppies or kittens unless verified from an ethical breeder.
- Only accept animals up for adoption through reputable rescue foundations. No businesses should be selling any animal for any reason.
- All animals must come with appropriate documentation of their health/vet information.
- Ensure the quality of suppliers they use.
- No sale of animals at pet stores or other venues that prompt impulse buys (e.g. pet fairs). Mandatory wait period (e.g. three days) between decision to purchase and taking animal home. Stringent rules what constitutes a business when selling animals (e.g. private sales of dogs, cats and reptiles).
Better oversight over "rescues" and a clear distinction between licensed charities and privately run, for-profit sales.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Make sure they are coming from a reputable breeder with proper certification and papers; prioritise adoption over purchasing new animals; background checks on certain animals being purchased (exotics and certain dog breeds)
- I don't think pet stores should be allowed to sell cats and dogs, only act as a front window for an adoption agency. Other animals can be sold but there should be regular inspections for animal welfare and they should be required to prove they are acquiring their animals from reputable sources.
- The animals should come from a verified breeder, possibly approved by a vet or CFIA or bylaw officers. The needs of the animal must come first as many stores that sell exotics such as sugar gliders put the animals health at risk as they are nocturnal. Many stores and breeders operate in such a manner that causes great issue going forward in the animals life, from selling a sick animal, to a human aggressive animal that has become as such due to improper handling that the store has no control over.
- If selling as a purebred the business must provide: breed information, proof of health tested parents, genetic health guarantee, national dog association registry papers upon purchase, vaccinations appropriate for sale age, spay/neuter contract with age appropriate timing for breed growth rate, repatriation guarantee (so purchaser never takes unwanted dog to pound), city registration (forwarded to the city) with each registered animal. If selling breeding dogs the purchaser must be a registered breeder with the national dog association and registered with the city as a licensed breeder.

Rescue organizations should to be city registered. All animals must be veterinarian health examined/tested prior to sale. I think appropriate vaccinations and spay/neuter should be built into the sale price by way of a contract with veterinary offices who work with the city licensing program. ALL animals must be microchipped and should be registered with city tag.

- I don't believe retailers should be allowed to sell dogs, cats, or rabbits. For all other animals I believe they should have to complete a training workshop on how to properly maintain the animals.
- Must be licenced to sell animals. Must be spayed or neutered when pet stock. Permits required for breeding or showing in competition
- Dogs and cats should NOT under any circumstances be sold in retail outlets. If they are in pet stores and are up for adoption with the contact being a specific rescue that's fine. But there should be zero retail of dogs and cats allowed in the city. Existing retail stores selling dogs and cats or any age should all be closed.
- If it is a retail business, it must obtain the pets from a licensed and reputable animal shelter. They should not be allowed to sell animals they obtained for a small amount of money then sell for a massive profit. Example, a puppy is bought from someone for \$20, the sell it for \$1188 or more.
- LOVE THEM AND GIVE THEM CARE AND CLOSE DOWN PUPPY MILLS THEY DON'T CARE FOR THEM IN MOST CASES JUST FOR THE MONEY
- Information that is correct and verified about where the animal comes from, vaccinations, health concerns.
- The sale of animals should not be allowed. Rescue!



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stores [personal information removed] should not be allowed to sell animals. Kijiji has puppy mills and backyard breeders selling animals and proper medical care is not always happening for these animals.
- Source pets responsibly, sell only healthy animals, educate potential owners
- The pet must be fixed before going home with the new owner.
Breeders need more regulation - number of times animals may give birth specifically. 1-2 times only then the female should be spayed.
- spayed/neutered for sure. force breeders to carry certification so that not anyone can just breed and sell on kijiji.
- Responsible health testing for breeders. Humane conditions.
- No selling cats and dogs. The other animals should be kept in secure enclosures not allowing random people to manhandle them.
- They should not sell dogs, cats
- Sources such as puppy mills or Kiji non registered breeders should be illegal.
- No animal mills. Reputable. Spay or neuter included.
- Absolutely no regulation on spaying and neutering— the level of damage these types of laws do to a growing dog is horrendous and the fact govt thinks they have a say in the health of my dog is laughable. No.
No pet store sales of animals— even “adoption” is questionable at best as retail rescue is becoming more and more an issue.
While I appreciate the idea of regulating against backyard breeding, in practice this will open the door to far too many regulations placed on ethical breeders, and as such I stand firmly against.
Perhaps a way around these issues would be consulting with registries for purebreds, however even poorly bred purebred can get papers so this is not a fix-all.
- Pet stores and the sale of pets for profit should not be permitted by law. Domesticated pets, particularly cats and dogs, should only be allowed to be adopted through nonprofits (e.g. Humane Society) and registered breeders. Exotic animals (nondomesticated) should not be permitted as pets.
- Strict rules and regulations for the sale and adoption of animals.
- No retail sale by a business period... private only
- Spayed or neutered
- Should allow pet owners the option to spay or neuter their dog at an older age (such as by 2 years old) in order to allow crucial hormones for development.
- No puppies or kittens available for sale. Rescue or mature animals only. Proper animal husbandry for all including city inspections to ensure animals aren't in danger!!
- Transparency
Dedication to ensuring all animals in their care are taken care of responsibly.
- Dogs are always from puppy mills if sold at a store..no reputable breeder sells their puppies that need their moms to a store not staffed 24 7



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- All animals should be bought from the rescues or a reputable breeder. Having said that breeders should be more closely monitored and should have to pay high prices for licences since they charge enormous amount for animals.
- ensure they are sold to responsible owners and that they are spayed or neutered unless they are being entered in dog shows and are going to be bred to other purebred dogs.
- Animals should have to display their place of origin to deter illegal farmed animals from being sold commercially. All animals available for sale commercially should be spayed or neutered and certificates of proper health checks shown. (vaccines, etc.). Also the availability of pet owner education.
- They must provide the breeders name and contact information. Due to the large number of rescues, retailers must only sell rescues. Breeders should be licensed and have their breeding facilities inspected without notice. Breeding facilities should be available to show potential buyers Screening to ensure animals are going to reputable owners.
- No exotics that are wild caught should be allowed in Canada. Let's lead by example . Dogs should not be on crates on the 2nd shelf where the poop likes to fall below. That would absolutely SUCK to walk on.
Prior to being allowed to sell animals the by law should investigate the location the animals come from and give approval.
- Spayed or neutered; no animal that is compromised medically or is endangered/illegal.
- Animals should only be available from reputable rescues
- Have licensing and policies on the sale of animals. Do not acquire animals from a puppy mill. Should be subjected to random visits/check-ins to prove they are properly caring for said animals and following all policies.
- No puppy or kitten mills!!! Rescue ONLY until there is no fetal pet population left.
- No retail sale of animals. All animals in pet stores should be from rescues and should be adoptable animals.
- Health of the pet
- There needs to be clear rules about appropriate animal husbandry/care. Breeders should be able to be inspected anytime to ensure animal welfare.
- Registration as an animal retailer, must be clean, can provide proof of animals health status, not animal mills, have sound knowledge about animal care, treat animals humanely such ad walking dogs, animals not caged tightly with one and another
- Animals should not be sold in a retail setting.
- Where they obtained the animals from. Whether they inform and enforce proper care for animals, both physically and emotionally. Education. In a perfect world, a screening process to assess fitness of owning an animal.
- Where the animal was obtained, conditions it was born in/kept in, restrictions on breeding of the animal, restrictions on where the animal can be transported, requirement to return the animal if it cannot be kept by purchaser for any reason
- I don't think citizens need rules about these issues.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- as long as they are licensed, leave people alone.
- No animals should be for sale, rescue only.
- Inspections of all breeding and sales locations.
- Retail sales of animals should be limited to licensed retailers who have passed requirements to properly screen animals and potential adopters
- Have a license to breed and be held to a health standard in their animals
- There needs to be transparency regarding where the animals come from. There are many animals needing homes already, we don't need puppy mills contributing more.
I also think pets should all have to be spayed or neutered unless from a breeder with some kind of exemption or special classification
- Traceable origin of dogs and ethical and responsible breeding
- That they are procured by responsible pet breeders that take good care of their animals, or even better if they sell rescue animals.
- If someone is buying a pet they should have proof of license before they are allowed to take the animal home. Kind of like when you buy a car you need to have proof of insurance.
- Require breeders to be licensed and inspected. Pet stores should also require a special license and frequent inspections, must prove they get animals from ethical breeders. All animals should be spayed or neutered before being sold from ANY store, should not be allowing pet stores (ie [personal information removed] style puppy mill fronts) to contribute to further pet overpopulation. All cats and dogs should have to have received proper vaccines prior to being sold. Do not allow stores to treat living animals like disposable merchandise. Restrict sale of exotics, as most of these are not care for properly, people do not have the knowledge needed and they rarely receive medical care. Require people to demonstrate they have the specialized knowledge to deal with these species.
- I feel that only registered breeders should be able to sell pets. No pet store should be allowed to sell pets.
- That all of the animals' needs are met. That no endangered animals be sold. That no exotic pets that can't be properly cared for reasonably easily be sold (tigers, anacondas, etc). Where an animal can be sold (no kijiji, craig's list, etc). Type of animal that can be sold. Animals must be altered within X amount of time. The buyer's information should be recorded for future reference. A license must be purchased within X amount of time. How 'bout no animals sold at all. Only rescued animals adopted instead.
- To not allow mass breeders the ability to sell through them, that animals must have a wellness check and to make sure a person purchasing an animal knows how to properly care for them.
- No retail sales of dogs - supports irresponsible breeders. City should support reputable breeders and not BYB.
- Up to date vaccines. Following up on pets sold.
- Registration of breeders. Priority for pet stores to assist with adoption
- NO animal should be sold in a pet store. Buyers should be able to research the breeder, know the dogs lineage and where it came from. Pet stores encourage impulse purchases which lead to dogs



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

being neglected, sent to shelters or sold to random people on places like Kijiji when they become too much work.

Pet stores also encourage puppy farming where breeding operations produce hundreds of mix breed puppies a week leaving the moms to live entire lives in concrete runs or kennels.

Responsible breeders will take puppies back if they're not a good fit and want to vet potential families which means NO responsible breeder would ever sell to a pet store

- Adopt, don't shop. No breeders should be allowed to sell animals in store. Stores should only be allowed to host animals from the many rescue organizations in the area.
- Documentation
- Spay and neutering the dogs/cats
- Ensuring pets are healthy, vaccinated, not bred too much, licenced, responsibility to check out buyers
- there should be no retail sale of animals. Follow the pet smart model of partnering with animal rescue to profile abandoned creatures that need homes. If you do approve retail sale of animals then prove that the pet is from a registered ethical breeder
- there should be no commercial sale of animals.
- [personal information removed] type stores should be banned! Breeders should have regulations and pet stores should only have rescue animals
- All of the above - Spay/neuter, where sold, type of animals sold and I would add that not sold to people with previous complaints, fines or prosecution regarding pet ownership.
- Background checks, subject to visits by personal to determine whether it (breeding) is being done in a safe humane/ethical manner.
- Dogs and cats should not be sold in a retail store. These animals should come from a reputable breeder.
- No retail sale of animals unless rescue animals
- Ensure animal is from a healthy licenced breeder.
- Reputable breeding
- The potential buyer has the right to know exactly where that pet came from.
- No cat or dog should be sold for profit in a store. Animals should be spayed or neutered at an appropriate age, to reduce unwanted animals which places a burden on rescues and the humane society. Animals sold out of a house should have a breeder's license, and their facilities should be monitored frequently to reduce puppy mill situations. Proof of mistreatment of animals should mean that person cannot have animals in their lives, or work with animals for at least 5 years, and then kept a close eye on. Any violation should be a lifetime ban from working or having anything to do with animals.
- I think licenses should be sold at time of purchase (mandatory), I think if the animal is dangerous there should be special rules, I think if the animal is released in the wild and can be a danger or become an invasive species there should be special rules. Some cities that are a lot older than us have actually started banning pets and the number of pets people are allowed because they have realized it has become quite problematic.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No cats or dogs should be sold in stores, except in partnership with a Calgary-based rescue organization.
- Ensuring the animals are ethically bred and not forcing someone into debt for an animal.
- The facilities have rooms for the animals.
Facilities are clean.
Detail history of the pet background available
To have all their animals nurtured or spade..
- Cannot use kijiji or anything like that. Can not give them away for free. Does not use puppy mills.
Business should only sell shelter animals. No breeders.
Have qualified employees who are able to recognize a good or bad possible owner.
Does not allow animals of prey to be around predators in establishment s(rabbits around dogs) .
Strict animal safety supervision by qualified staff. Is not allowed to sell them as gifts. Steps to confirm that the household is not banned from owning animals.
- Safe treatment of healthy animals. There should be some assurances the pets are coming from reputable breeders not a puppy mill. I liked that I got a huge discount on my license when Annie was spayed.
- Adopt don't shop.... or purchase through reputable breeder... no back yard breeding for profit.
- Animals must be spayed or neutered upon sale or rescue unless being sold to a licensed breeder for breeding purposes. No breed restrictions. All animals being sold in a retail setting must come from a licensed breeder who passes a screening process or be from a rescue agency.
- No wild cross domestic pets like wolf dogs and serval cat hybrids etc.
Treat their livestock humanely and regularly get inspected to ensure the animals best welfare is being considered whilst also running their business.
- The animals MUST be treated with respect and dignity, kept in good health and adequate housing, and acquired from a reputable, TRACEABLE source. 3rd party audits to ensure good living conditions and ethics should be mandatory.
- Animals should be well taken care of --- healthy, vaccinated, vet check, free from parasites, fed properly, treated respectfully and humanely. Bill of sale and transfer of ownership. Legal authority that checks up on people who sell animals to ensure the human treatment of animals. Selling animals that come from the rainforest, oceans, jungles, etc is just plain wrong. Animals kept in proper housing not in tiny cages. Animals are groomed and allowed to exercise, properly fed and watered. Transportation of animals is done humanely. Buyer is educated in how to take care of the animal that they are buying. Seller only sells to a buyer who will and believes in the humane treatment of animals.
- Spayed/neutered unless a qualified breeder. We have enough animals for adoption.
- Animal should be neutered or spayed and have had a vet check up. Temporary living situation of animal should be important since it could potentially lead to an animal being in bad health.
- Businesses should have a responsibility to ensure that the animals they are getting are coming from ethical sources. Getting animals from places that treat animals like a product should be unacceptable in this day and age. I think it is everyone's responsibility- individuals, businesses, the



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

city/government - to do their part to ensure puppy/kitten/small animal mills are shut down, either by boycott or regulations, or discouragement.

- No puppy mills. Sell a quota of rehomed animals for adoption before being allowed to sell bred animals.
- I believe the sale of animals should be limited to rescue organizations, there are enough dogs and cats needing rescue there is no reason to have sales made in stores.
- Don't like the retail trade at all, but if going forward sales must be from regulated, licensed & randomly inspected breeder, animal must be health certified, microchipped, sterilized. Let's put unscrupulous breeders out of business.
- Prevent back yard breeders only looking to make a profit and not interested in the health of the animals.
- Retail sales of animals should be banned like they are in more cities. Licensed ethical animal breeders don't sell to pet stores. Also, there is an extensive shelter system in Calgary region that needs help. Puppy mill people are the ones who sell to pet stores. And we have pure breed dogs and know the difference. Pet store dogs come from questionable sources often.
- Not sourcing their animals from puppy mills; appropriate rest and exercise areas for the animals
- Business license and have set criteria of who they are selling too. Perhaps city rules should be distributed at the time of the retail sale. Retailers should provide the city of origin for their animals they sell.
- safe and healthy care of all animals while being sold. how to ensure that with bylaws? not sure. would love for animals to be spayed/neutered before sold but breeders won't like it and any option for them introduces loopholes for others.
- No retail sale of dogs or cats - only hosting adoption events with reputable rescue organizations
- verify responsible ownership, cooling off period before being allowed to pick up animal.
- I think that sale of dogs, cats, ferrets, rabbits, guinea pigs, and any other pets that are abundantly available in shelters should be banned. All pets should be spayed or neutered before being sold. There should also be strict regulations around any animals that are sold in a retail environment (i.e. how they are kept, how a suitable home is found, etc.).
- They're fine.
- No breeds proven to be vicious, poisonous, endangered allowed for sale. Dogs, cats, rabbits must be proven spayed or neutered pre-sale. No sales at markets
- All animals should be spayed or neutered if possible. Exotic animals should not be sold at all. Businesses should be fully licensed and accredited.
- Only registered animal shelters should be allowed the adoption of domestic animals with an exception of specialized breeders and out of country breeders but the person seeking to purchase out of country should need a permit and a complete ban of sites like kijiji advertising animals for sale
- Ethical treatment of animals
- I don't believe businesses should be allowed to have the retail sale of animals. It's cruel.
- Ensure they are properly cared for. Bigger cages.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be rules on where the retail business gets animals they sell from...puppy mills...not good. There should be licensing for those who sell animals to retail outlets and retail businesses should only be permitted to purchase from licensed sellers in good standing.
- d/k
- animals should be spayed/neutered.
- Sell no animals from breeders.
Sell only spayed or neutered cats and dogs.
- Pet stores should not be able to sell live animals. Period. There should be a registry for ethical breeders, where they need to pass a thorough inspection and renew yearly in order to be certified.
- Licensed breeders only
- Must be licensed to sell the pet. Must recommend spayed or neutered.
- Must be spayed and neutered. Have vaccines. No selling wild animals
- Proper space, proper handling, proper exercise and a qualified animal handler
- Stop the sale of retail animals. Get them from your local shelters!
- Ensuring they are either rescue cats or from reputable breeders
- -ensure that puppies are not from puppy mills - this means working with reputable breeders and disclosing where each puppy comes from
-sufficient space and care for puppies until they are sold
- All animals sold as pets must come from proven licensed ethical breeders and be spayed or neutered and health checked. Animals should not be able to be sold through open markets or "reselling goods websites". If an animal needs to be removed different rules should apply that take into account the nature of the animal and the home it requires.
- I feel that all animals must be accurately sexed at the time of the sale so minimizing the number of unwanted litters and that the retailers must be responsible for any unwanted litters within an appropriate time line for the species sold.
- Puppy mill operations need to be closed and stopped - and you know who/where they are once you see them. There should be more information about how to find a good breeder - there are really good breeders out there (ie registered) and they get a bad rap which is unfair. If we don't support good breeders soon certain breeds will be lost forever. Backyard breeders with no knowledge or scruples who are not registered get away with way too much with absolutely no consequences.
- For the love of GOD, Shut down the sale of animals in this city. [personal information removed] The shelters and rescues are FULL of unwanted animals looking for homes. [personal information removed] sells puppies for thousands of dollars that are from puppy mills. These animals are often sick, not socialized, and unaltered. [personal information removed] contributes the massive problem of unwanted pets in this city. Please put a stop to this. There is NO reason for the sale of puppy mill animals in this city! Disgusting.
- To ensure that the places where they take their animals from are safe and treat animals well. They should only take their animals from licensed dog reproduction centers.
Also they should not put abusive prices on dogs and they should only sell spayed/neutered dogs.
- That animals are raised and sold in circumstances that are the healthy for the animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No retail animal sales of companion animals. Dogs and cats are especially vulnerable to horrifying "breeding" practices that are not disclosed to the new owners. Other animals should have more regulation and restrictions around the "breeders" as well.
- All pets should be spayed/neutered unless the owner has a permit to breed. Animals should only be sold by licensed breeders or rescue organizations. Exotic species should need special permits to be sold/bought.
- I don't think any retail store should be selling "bed" dogs or cats anymore. Adoption through reputable rescue non-profit agency is fine.
- Just be ethical
- They should have to show where the animal came from with information about how many animals come from that supplier/breeder. Dogs and cats should be spayed/neutered.
- The sale of animals by dogs and cats at big box businesses should be discouraged or eliminated. Registered breeders (Canadian Kennel Club) and rescue associations are acceptable business for sale of animals. Problems arise from private sales for profit reasons (not surrender) and breeders of designer dogs.
- that animals come from safe, clean conditions and breeders
- Spay/neuter pets, only sell animals that are either rescues or from responsible breeders.
- Strict rules and penalties on puppy/kitten-mills, ban tail/ear cropping and other breed manipulations
- All pets must be kept in safe, reasonably comfortable and sanitary conditions enforced by unscheduled checks from bylaw officers. Checks to ensure only legal species are being sold.
- Inform customers of licensing rules & city bylaws.
- Proof that dogs aren't coming from puppy farms, actual vet monitored health clearances which should be paid for by anyone selling an animal, proof of provenance in appropriate cases to curtail theft of high value pets.
- Similar to rules just adopted in the UK, I think animals should only be bought/sold from where they were bred. No third party pet stores. Registered charitable animal shelters would obviously be an exception
- Breeding animals should be illegal. Retail stores should only be allowed to rehome rescues. Full transparency of how they got the animals should be required.
- endangered animals should never be sold
I feel animals are being spayed/neutered at too young of age....they should be but at the 6 month mark
- Not sure
- I think the retail sale of animals is inappropriate.
- All animals spayed or neutered. No endangered animals. No dangerous animals. Documented regulated breeders. Imported animals quarantined.
- Dogs and cats should be the only mammals allowed to be sold. Dogs and cats must be spayed or neutered as soon as medically possible.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- humane conditions for the animals and no use of "puppy mill" or similar businesses. Ideally stores would "sell" puppies and dogs from the local humane societies so those pets can be adopted/bought.
- The animals must be provided with space, exercise, food & water as well as human contact to ensure they are emotionally stable. Having animals in cages in a window is not healthy for the animal.
- Healthy source of animals and a waiting period so animals aren't bought or gifted on a whim
- No opinion
- Animals are sourced from humane breeders and are kept in humane conditions. Veterinary care should be available and subject to periodic checks for health and living conditions.
- That there is very good regulation that the animals sold are not coming from large breeding farms with no concern of the health of the animals and that they are in good or reasonable health and that these animals when sold be told to the new owners the health concerns and the steps to improve the animals quality of life
- I don't know if it is possible to control puppy mills, but that is a consideration. If it is possible to regulate that only spayed or neutered pets can be sold, that would be awesome.
- Check out person buying pets to ensure no abuse- past or current/future. Spay/neuter to ensure unwanted animals don't happen.
- That 50% of their dog/cat sales must be adoptions.
- No wild caught animals! The illegal pet trade is third after the drug trade and arms trade, and contributes to species declines and extinctions. This is especially true for parrots and reptiles. The City could use the Convention on the Illegal Trade of Endangered Species (CITES) to strength bylaw on this. I would also like to see only rescue domestic rabbits available for sale as pets to try to stem the tide of feral rabbits.
- Licenses and training on the husbandry of animals they acquire. Regular inspections by the city for the health of their animals.
- Do not sell cats or dogs in shops, offer preadoption courses or information about the care of the animal, offer post adoption support options, and ensure proper socialization of the animal
- It is the actions of the buyers are the key choices to be made. If people feel one way or the other this is their own path in life to follow. Supply & demand filter out eventually. laws & Regulations often can push potential issues simply underground.
- Pitbull ban
- Animals should be healthy, well cared for.
- Lots...but the big one is severe penalties and removal of creatures bred for sale that do not produce lively, healthy animals kept in humane places.
- Only qualified breeders should be allowed to sell pets. I'm not familiar enough with this to really comment.
- No sales of animals from puppy mills (anywhere), cats/dogs must be spayed/neutered when sold unless too young (put plan in place to get it done when safe for animal), inspection system in place for animal health/safety where sold.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Maintain animal health and provide appropriate mental and physical care. They must also prove where the animals were sourced.
- It is important for animals to be spayed/neutered, for a business to ensure that they are in good health, and raised/bred appropriately and responsibly.
- I do not believe there are any issues with the way animals are currently sold in retail stores.
- Calgary should ban ALL retail sale of animals, period. The only way that Calgarians should be able to get a pet is to rescue one that has been vaccinated, and spayed or neutered, by a licensed and reputable animal rescue group. Owners should also be required to complete a basic animal training course that will give them pet ownership skills and help to bond the human to the pet.
- all animals must be from a Rescue organization.
- **MUST BE ALTERED!** Even dog/cat breeders should only be allowed to produce so many litters - back yard breeders (the kijiji people) should be faced with surprise inspections, health checks and fines for overbreeding. Stores shouldn't be allowed to sell animals ! The staff is not educated or equipped to ensure any pet/bird is going to a qualified and caring home.
- The welfare of the animal should be of the utmost importance. Perhaps more regulation to ensure guidelines for care and adequate space and cleanliness? Inspections similar to food inspection?
- Be able to name the breeders and to have inspected the premise of each breeder themselves so as to make sure they are not promoting puppy mills (who make ill dogs and dogs with inheritable diseases).
- Animal welfare must be first and foremost and if proper sized enclosures cannot be provided or appropriate care and socialization received, the animals should not be for sale.
- Animals should not be sold for profit. if animals are being sold on behalf of a breeder, proper investigation into the practices of breeder should be documented and updated annually. Ensuring the care givers are suitable for the breed/type of animal being adopted even if it means saying no. AGAIN - animals should not be sold for profit.
- Should be spayed or neutered, chipped and / or tattooed and registered with the city. If being sold too young to spay/neuter, then have that stuff pre-paid with reminder follow-ups and fines.
- Rescue and Adoption sources as Primary source before breeders.
- When the babies are born, it should be added onto the animals license, how many were born and if they were sold. This would keep track of how many actual animals are in the household, the city and responsibility being taken if any at all. How many times have I read in the news about puppy mills with hundreds of animals, not cared for and being sold all for profit and no proper care was taken.
- Share breeder info to prevent backyard breeding.
- Normal business Cod of conduct.
- All animals must have up to date vaccinations.
- Should be no retail sales of animals.
- Background checks on all people, by the service selling animals, to ensure proper and safe adoptions/sales.
- I think all mammal pets should be spayed / neutered unless someone is a registered animal breeder.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Health inspectors regularly checking conditions of anyone who wants to sell a pet. License needed so private homeowners don't start breeding their dog just to make money
- They should be from rescue societies ONLY. Too many puppy mills and there are already so many rescue dogs that need love and affection
- Don't believe animals should be sold in a retail environment
- I don't think animals should be sold in pet stores.
- Animals (cats & dogs) should not be for-sale at retail locations as this promotes puppy-mills, etc. Animals should be available for 'adoption' at retail locations, if anything. Puppy mills should be shut down, fined and the people banned from owning more than one pet. Adopted animals should be spayed & neutered to help control the pet overpopulation crisis. People should have to apply to be able to breed cats and dogs and should have to follow strict guidelines to ensure the animals well being.
- Increased review of quality of care of the seller.
- Puppies and kittens should NOT be sold through pet stores, for profit (perpetuating puppy mills, very cruel). Pet stores offering adoption of animals from humane agencies is very good, by contrast. I am always concerned about any animals sold in pet stores (birds, fish, reptiles, small mammals). And I think that the City should be more active in monitoring the care of these animals, rather than relying on humane societies. (some horror stories in Calgary)
- periodic inspections,
must provide the name and address of the breeder from where the animal came and that breeder should permit inspections
animals must have age-appropriate vaccinations
- Depending on the animal being sold, the breeder has an option to request spaying or neutering or not. One litter/year is different than someone who has multiple animal litters for sale. The latter should have a business licence and their facility inspected annually. Zero tolerance for mills and bad pet ownership!
- Spay/neutering of non breeding stock cats and dogs, less restrictive reptile/amphibian regulations of species
- I'm not sufficiently familiar with the commercial aspect to comment.
- I think these business should be monitored of where they source animals from as well as how they care for animals while in their care. I do not want to see spay/neuter restrictions put on as these animals are often young and I do not support too early of spaying or neutering for the good of the animal; I would rather see spay/neuter contracts that are actually followed up on (as they often aren't). The biggest thing for me is ensuring that animals are not being sourced from places such as puppy mills.
- Retail - spayed/neutered. Vaccines.
- No retail of vicious breeds. No mass-breeding of female animals for faster profit. No large breeding businesses within city limits. Limit number of broods per female over a period of time, and limit number of broods per female in her lifetime. Limit number of animals per household. Health inspections, all vaccinations up to date. Manage waste, noise, odour and debris.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- must be neutered; must be through a registered rescue agency; must have a full vet-check and shots
- I am generally against retail sale of pet animals - it promotes spur-of-the-moment purchases by irresponsible owners. Pet stores must not support "puppy mills" or unethical breeders of any sort; animals must be healthy, spayed/neutered, and store **MUST PROVIDE HEALTHY CONDITIONS FOR ALL ANIMALS**; restrict sales to captive-bred animals, no collection from the wild. I support pet stores that feature animals from shelters for re-adoption; local animal shelters are full of pets needing homes and emphasis needs to be put on rehoming these animals.
- Businesses should not be able to sell bred in captivity animals or animals that are exotic trade animals. Really only rescues and strays should be able to be sold. There really shouldn't be any retail sale of animals. It's super messed up.
- I think restrictions on where animals can be sold is a good idea, but would be very hard to enforce with online marketplaces in play.
- I don't believe individuals should be allowed to sell animals - this should be the role of a licensed business only (including a rescue organization). Regulations around breeders need to be tightened.
- I'm against sale of animals, but limit the amount of time the breeder can produce a year could help.
- Responsible breeding practices. Health and safety of animals. Proper nutrition. No puppy mills or farms.
- Ethically sourced pets. Prefer if they have adoption policy for mature animals rather than sell puppies & kittens
- The City of Calgary doesn't need to micro-manage this issue.
- Spaying/neutering should be required for non-breeding household pets (dogs & cats). Breeding operations should be held to a minimum standard.
- exotic animals should be more controlled. retail sales of exotic animals needs more attention!!
- Animals should be certified to not come from a puppy mill, sales of animals that are not rescue should have a hire license fee. animals must be spayed or neutered unless go to an official breeder. Breeder licenses and registrations
- Animals should be neutered before sale. Period. If you are breeding animals you should have to be registered and licensed specially. And monitored. No free puppies and kittens ever
- All animals should be healthy, from a reputable breeder or all info supplied if a rescue. Shots should be up-to-date and ideally spayed or neutered.
- responsible animal ownership, registration to animal clubs and orgs, medical records on file
- Pet stores should not be allowed to sell animals. They should serve as hubs for rescues only. Puppy (and kitten) mills are unacceptable.
- Ensure they are not coming from a factory that will inevitably end up with health issues.
- All rules so many dog breeders seriously out of hand why they're being brought here when we already have too many animals to deal with are they healthy they should be put under quarantine once there here and nobody takes them why is the responsibility put on Calgary please restrict the amount of animals in the city and 4 Animals per person is ridiculous



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Type of animal to be sold, the animal is healthy and all shots up to date
 - Retail sales of animals in stores or storefronts should be stopped. The sale of pure-breed animals should require special permits and be taxed. A store may provide a location for animal rescues or non-pure breeds to be adopted not for profit.
 - No evidence of breeding mills. No other restrictions.
 - Don't get into the spayed and neutered debate...this is a personal choice of the pet owner. Leave it that way.
- More regulation around protection of animals that are being sold. All retailers should expect and annual, announced inspection to ensure healthy, humane facilities.
- If possible they should check if the purchaser has ever had animals seized and banned from owning.
 - - Type of animals (prohibiting wildlife/exotic animals).
 - - Requiring animals be vet checked/UTD with vaccines prior to sale.
 - Health and safety of the animals. The number of animals they are allowed to have for sale at a given time. What happens to unsold animals.
 - Animals sold are healthy and accompanied by information on care
 - Health of the animals ...
 - I believe retail sales must provide the location from which the animal was bred, that they should not sell them before they have had their early vaccinations, and that they should be spayed or neutered, and for sure a special license should be necessary for exotic animals
 - I don't think this is a city issue.
 - promote adoption instead of buying. must spay or neuter all sold animals.
 - No puppy mills. Licensed breeders only for retail sale.
 - Know the source of the animals, healthy animals, educate young new owners on animal care
 - Any one profiting from the sale of a pet should be a licensed business (limit licensing), only allow certain breeds, spay/neuter all animals, limit breeding's, no sales at pet stores, rules on acceptable care and housing, ethics course, city inspections.
 - Provenance of the animal must be provable and appropriate (e.g., reputable breeder, not puppy mill). Staff should be well-trained on animal care. Reasonable steps should be taken to make sure the animals are sold to responsible owners.
 - 1. All animals must be acquired from reputable, licensed breeders or from rescue organizations.
 - 2. No wildlife or exotic wildlife must be acquired.
 - 3. All animals must be examined by an AbVMA-licensed veterinarian and approved for adoption/sale by the vet prior to sale/adoption.
 - 4. All animals must be fully vaccinated and dewormed for pathogens of concern, as determined by the veterinarian prior to sale/adoption.
 - 5. All cats and dogs must be spayed/neutered prior to sale/adoption, unless the buyer is a licensed breeder for that species.
 - 6. No dog breed restrictions should be placed on pit bulls or "pit bull-type" dogs. This is a prejudiced practice based in fear, rather than evidence.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Adherence to health and safety requirements for rearing, housing, selling, etc., of animals. Record of periodic inspections. Follow good business practices. Accreditation if possible with an organization with oversight. Establish relationship with BBB.
- **ABSOLUTELY NO PUPPY MILLS.** All businesses that sell animals **MUST** treat the animals with total care and respect at all times giving them all the necessities of life until adopted out. This includes care and attention to the animals well being and security and the business is held accountable for every animal in their establishment. Random inspections mandatory.
- Proof of vaccinations, vet check, husbandry of breeding pair. I honestly think the more regulations the better. People are not the brightest when it comes to profiting from animals.
- Many businesses involving the sale of animals are from puppy mill type sources. Ideally, businesses selling animals would work with rescues and the humane society to help find homes for animals that lack one.
- Number of animals people can own should be limited. Animals should be spayed or neutered; breeding should be licensed.
- No exotic animals should be sold, papers of ownership and origin should be supplied.
- Licensed, inspected, certified, and animals other than those being sold to a breeder should be spayed/neutered
- I do not believe people should be allowed to purchase an animal and bring it home the same day. There should be a 24 hour "cooling off period" to prevent impulse purchases of animals.
- Animals should not be sold in a store environment, we know these animals come from poor breeding practices (back yard breeders). Animals should not be required to be spayed or neutered, especially with all the evidence on the negative health effects or early/paediatric spay/neuter. Importing of animals from abroad with little/no health clearances and then "adopted" by rescues should be limited or not permitted
- Educated personal.
- They should be required to account for the health and welfare of the animals from birth to sale, not permitted to sell animals that are easily available to adopt, and to always have information available about animal adoption opportunities. They should also not be permitted to sell endangered, at risk, or potentially invasive species.
- If a store is offering animals for sale, there should be documentation showing where the animal has come from. It's especially concerning when a business will not disclose what breeder/kennel a puppy has come from.
- - Animals must be bred by a breeder who is a member of a recognized organization (such as the Canadian Kennel Club) that has a strong code of conduct.
- Animals should not be used to make money. Make sure animals are going to good homes and being taken care of. Follow ups.
- Spray and neuter need to be required unless the dog is a a registered PURE breed for showing.
- no, that is the responsibility of the future owner.
- Dogs must be responsibly bred
- Animals should not be sold in stores. Small cages and cases should not be allowed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- There should be no retail sale of pets. Only adoptions
- Animals should have a reasonable amount of space with opportunities for more space to exercise and be stimulated. They should be cared for by people knowledgeable about their needs, signs of distress or illness. There should be a limit of how much time can be kept for sale.
- Type of animal. No wildies
- No puppy mills!
- That the animals are legally obtained and did not come from factory breeding operations
- Do not sell on social media
- - Require detailed records of where animals came from, subject to inspection at any time with consequences for not doing so
- - Requiring that animals that are sold via retail should come from registered rescue organizations (with some exceptions)
- Quality of care, source of the animal, limit the number sold
- The business should offer a guarantee on the health of the pet.
- Animals should have a regulated amount of space each. Cleanliness needs to be important. There should be a limit to the number of pets at a facility at a time, directly related to the number of staff available.
- Not allowed for sale in pet stores. Anything to reduce puppy mills. Strict fines.
- 1. No puppy mills
- 2. Spaying and neutering should be allowed to be deferred to 1 year, at that point if it's not done and not a registered kennel with a specific club then the animal should be removed from the home, no 'family pet' needs to be left intact.
- No opinion
- Talking of dogs only I believe health testing is the most important. The rescue groups are usually good with the dogs they manage. Otherwise I would only buy a dog from a responsible registered purebred dog breeders. Emphasis on responsible.
- there should be restrictions on types of animals available (ie no dangerous pets, no rare or exotic pets, no pets that if they escape could damage our environment or ecosystem), spay and neuter all pets that aren't specifically licensed for breeding, only licensed pet stores or breeders should be able to sell pets,
- There needs to be regulations to prevent puppy mills. Perhaps they should have a license that they meet humane standards and are monitored quite closely. Limit the amount of animals.
- Too many to list. I am sure many things are already in place.
- Traceable animals so that they are not using puppy mills. Regular humane checks. Once sold, information should be passed onto Animal Control for license follow up.
- Proper breeding practices to ensure healthy animals. Adequate shelter, food and water and exercise for all animals being held for sale
- Absolutely no puppy mills. No adopting from outside of Canada, we have enough dogs here that need homes



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- All those rules make sense. I would add that the seller must have a license to sell that type of animal and they have to treat the animals they hold/breed humanely.
- Anything to prevent puppy mills
- Ensure the new owners are able to support and care for the pet, their needs and the environmental impact (clean up) that comes with ownership.
- Where the animal is from (humane breeding), the size of the cage and the level of interaction needed for the animals well-being.
- They must be licensed and sell healthy animals. Often pet stores sell animals that are not healthy.
- Puppies require significant care and training, which a business, that shuts down at night cannot provide. Therefore the City should ban the retail sale of puppies under the age of 1.
- Provide proof of humane conditions of origin. We have too many animals in need of good homes and too many “designer” breeds being sold for a premium.
- I don't think animals belong in the retail trade. At the very least, businesses should have to prove that their 'stock' does not come from puppy farming and should provide warranties/guarantees/duty-to-pay-health-care-costs for animals that have problems resulting from poor breeding.
- Anything which secured the safety and wellbeing of the animal.
- Full & accurate disclosure pertaining to the animals origins, health and type. Humane care of the animals
- Animals should be adopted not sold. We hear of puppy mills often, and I feel there should be strict monitoring of those who sell animals, for the welfare of those beings.
- Spayed/neutered, healthy and vetted and not from a breeder. I think breeders of all kinds should be banned until all the stay animal populations are under control.
- Ensure potential owners have the resources and money to keep the animal
More checks should be in place like breeders do for potential owners
- no dogs from puppy mills.
the business owner must have open communication with the prospective pet owners that allows them to see their where the animal is coming from.
- Inspected for care of the animal.
Required to follow up with the new owner 3 months later.
- No sales of breeder/ puppy mill dogs cats or rabbits in stores.
- Ethically raised, verified breeders, or rescues- in an effort to curb puppy mills or backyard breeders
- Be licensed, provide a safe and caring environment for the animals, ensuring that good quality food types are provided.
- No retail sale of animals including online sales like Kijiji. Adoption only
- Safe conditions. Education for owners and training. Dog must be licensed when sold.
- No mills. Responsible registered breeders only. Vet checking.
- -Licensing
- -inspections
- -welfare of animals



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Spayed or neutered (if appropriate) prior to purchase
Type of animal available for sale.
Requirement to show city licensing receipt as part of purchase if required for the animal.
- Puppy mills should not be vendors! [personal information removed] type retailers should not be allowed to sell animals. Regulations should be in place to ban this practice, awful living conditions for animals to be in.
- Animals offered for sale or adoption should be healthy and anyone presenting them selves as a charity or non profit should be registered and regulated
- Pet stores not allowed to sell cats, dogs or rabbits, unless through a rescue, there are enough animals that need homes.
No puppy mills!!! [personal information removed] is a disgrace on this city.
All animals must be spayed and neutered before sale.
All animals must be vaccinated.
All stores must be inspected by a vet and animal control officers on a regular basis.
Employees must have training on care and husbandry.
Kennelling must meet aspcra requirements for housing and meet the five freedoms.
Medical advice cannot be given by petstore employees. Fines should apply to stores who break the rules.
- Know where the animals come from and the health condition of those facilities
- Pets should be born and raised in family type environments by responsible individuals. Breeders of all animals should have a license and a limit in terms of how many animals they are allowed to breed and sell. Exotic breeds should be banned from being sold in any kind of environment. People have far to little knowledge of them to give them appropriate living conditions. To avoid black markets, special licenses could be issued if certain conditions are met.
- Pets have to be fixed
- They should have to be evaluated to be sure it is adequate surrounding for the animal. Also the cost should be regulated to some degree
- Dogs and cats should never be sold through pet stores. Other small animals and fish should be responsibly cared for and bred before being sold
- Better back ground checks especially dog farms and poor breeding conditions.
- Ethical breeding, adoption options, rehoming of older pets
- Animals should come spayed or neutered. It must be ensured that all animals do not come from animal mills. Only animals needing re-homeing from shelters should be on offer at pet stores.
- Given the number of animals being housed by rescues, the sale of pets from non-registered purebred breeders should not be allowed. All animals, unless registered as breeding animals should have to be spayed or neutered by one year of age. All businesses housing animals should be inspected on a regular basis to ensure needs are being met.
- Provenience of the animal; making sure it didn't come from a puppy/kitten mill. Mandatory spay or neuter before the animal can go home. Mandatory education.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Do not allow the sale of endangered or rare species. These animals should not be kept in captivity. Do not allow puppy mills or similar places to operate. All animals sold should be spayed/ neutered and a background check should be done on the buyer to avoid known animal abusers or dog fighting ring operators from purchasing animals.
- Retail stores should not be able to sell dogs or cats
- Be fair to the animal by providing adequate space, stimulation, food, vet care. Can only have a couple of litters, then must spay or neuter.
- Ensure the animals are properly cared for in their care; do everything on their power to ensure the animals are going to a good home and will not be mistreated, abused, or used for cruel purposes. Reference checks and a qualifying process for purchasers of animals would be good. Checking in post-adoption for a wellness check would also be good.
- Healthy breeding, or just don't allow breeding as there are a lot of mutts who need homes.
- There should be accountability for where they get these animals. Inspections actually done and reporting bad conditions.
- Ethical sourcing of the animals
- Should be a responsible breeder or rescue that includes spay/neuter
- No puppy mills. Healthy and treated well
- Proper, clean cages, proper exercise, spaying/ neutering available, all pertaining vaccinations and tattooing done. You can't leave seller until buyer has a license.
- They must be verified by the city that they are not an animal mill. They are only wanting the best interest for the animals. Clean conditions, anyone selling animals as pets should be checked by the city of Calgary to ensure safe breeding.
- [personal information removed] I do not believe in hyper regulating everything. I don't think that model works well for European nations. I think our Calgary model has fantastic stats and is the envy of Animal Control over the globe because of its simple hands off simple "do what you want (number of pets, breeds you want etc) just don't be irresponsible".... the end. This is the best way to govern, anything. People don't need a million rules, they just need to be responsible for their pets and respectful to others.
- Stay out of it - other than enforcing laws regarding prohibited animals (ownership per federal or provincial, not per city bylaw) and care and condition of facilities and the animals
- Business permits required and breeders license...if it's a simple one off of kittens or puppies then veterinarians certificate of clean health...avoid the puppy/kitten mills
- Must have paperwork for all animals.
- [personal information removed] The CKC has a "code of ethics" that members commit to follow, including the need to have contracts with new owners, microchip all pups, and take the pup/dog back if there is ever a problem. I think those requirements for small scale breeders would benefit everyone. I don't agree with forcing spay/neuter but do agree that those of us that choose not to spay/neuter should have extra expectations -- higher licensing fee, maybe not being permitted in off-leash dog parks, and definitely having regular vet checks. FYI. I do not spay/neuter young dogs as I



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

do agility with my dogs and they do better if they are allowed to mature with full hormones (stronger bones and muscles) which can take more than three years.

- Proper care for the animals and responsible, verifiable sources for acquiring animals to sell.
- Ensure the owners are equipped to care for the animal and are capable of doing so.
- I think businesses should only be able to sell animals from shelters, and the breeding of animals should be strictly regulated. We have an incredible over population of animals and our shelters are overflowing, and people carelessly allow their pets to breed. It's frankly unacceptable that we allow anyone to breed their pets and I think you should have to have a license to do so. Unlicensed breeders should be heavily fined. Spaying or neutering should also be a requirement. I have spent years working and volunteering at a shelter and I wish more people knew how many animals come through those doors and how shelters struggle on a daily basis.
- Make sure the price is high enough that they aren't being bought for cruel purposes
- I think dogs should not be sold in pet stores.
- I don't think that retail should be allowed to sell cats or dogs unless they are rescued. Humane treatment and living conditions of the animals, while in the store, are extremely important.
- Mandatory training of the animal with set guidelines for when the animal and owner "pass" the course.
- Animals should be healthy, retail establishment should be knowledgeable about and meet the criteria for properly looking after the animal.
- Breeding/sale of animals for profit should not be allowed, especially from a private home.
- I believe so many of these issues could be avoided or could be reduced by regulating the purchase or adoption of a pet. If someone chooses to add a pet to their family they should be required to attend at least 1 puppy class or behavior coaching (in case of adoption done through owner to owner). This could potentially solve so many pet/owner issues including behavior at off leash parks, responsible pet ownership, etc. It's great to try and solve all these issues we have after the owner has decided to add a pet to the family, but in my opinion where there should be closer regulation of pet ownership should be from the moment a person or family decide to get a pet.
- There needs to be some way of transferring the registration to the new owner as a way of monitoring private sales of pets. Breeders should also have requirements to ensure the sales lead to city registration and requirements.
- Retail business should not be allowed to sell animals period. I would however, support adoption of rescue animals through retail business.
- Where the animal came from
- Be verified to sell.
- Dogs must have a vet clearance and first shots.
- Puppies are the proper age to leave their mother.
- An amendment in the contract stating if you are going to breed your new animal later on you must go through the proper channels of contacting the breeder or another certified breeder.
- Don't cross breed because it sounds cool (better regulations on minis or mixes)
- Safe and humane treatment of the animals



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The animals should be from a shelter or a registered ethical breeder and the person purchasing should be filled in on the duties and responsibilities of pet ownership
- Retail sale should be limited to licensed breeders with regular inspections and checks. No pet store sales.
- That the animal is from a proper breeder and prove it. They should only be sold through reputable, responsible, trained people. That the animal is not in a small kennel .
- where the animal comes from needs to be registered and regulated
- Quality care and not breeding for sale at place like pet shops- rescues only. If breeding for sale in small family sized operations I believe there should be limit on the number of dogs they are allowed to have for breeding purposes and that they live in home with the breeders.
- They should have access to a database of known animal abusers/hoarders and be required to ensure the purchaser is not in the database.
- Backyard breeders should be banned and fined for doing so. We have over populated dogs as is. They often breed dogs that have health problems or behaviour problems.
- Healthy animals with up to date vet records supplied with the animal to the new owner (animal maintainer). Animals should be electronically tagged by an authorized vet.
- There are too many unwanted pets. Pets should not be sold as a business. Too many businesses that sell pets are irresponsible and do not ensure pets are cared for properly. Out to make a \$ rather than caring about their wellbeing. Breeders should have a limit set as to how many animals they bring into this world on a yearly basis. Better yet stop breeding altogether. Every pet should be spay/neutered. Too many irresponsible people to trust they will get pets s/n on their own. Support local rescues by adopting pets.
- Should be a fixed price.
- The business should be completely ethical in nature, not deliberately breed animals that will have health problems, and treat all animals kindly.
- no endangered animals should be sold
- As with all rules this is a tricky balance of intent vs impact. I think whether to neuter (FYI it's spay or castrate, not pay or neuter) an animal should not be regulated. Though if there was a way to regulate numbers of litters per animals that would sure be nice (not realistic I don't think). I have seen limitations on where, how and what kinds of animals can be sold work to reduce puppy-mill, kitty-mill operations, and could probably help with birds (or other exotics) kept or bred in compromised living conditions.
- Transparency.
- No retail sale permitted except of adoption and Ethical breeders that you purchase directly from.
- The person selling animals must have a license to do so.
- Spade and neutered animals should always be cheaper than unaltered animals. Exotic wild animals should not be sold as pets. Pet stores must provide sufficient space for animals to live in appropriate enclosures. Only healthy animals should be sold.
- No Puppy mills or private breeders which is the same thing. Dogs must come from an inspected and licensed place



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Must be spayed.
- Not sure
- No interference from the city is required.
- That animals came from a responsible breeder and not a puppy/cat mill
- Investigation and elimination of puppy mills. Maintaining adequate living condition for animals and ensuring care, including compassion by the shop owners.
- No pet store should be allowed to sell cats or dogs. [personal information removed]. It is a horrible business and encourages breeding of dogs from unscrupulous situations with multiple genetic and health issues. The only places that should be allowed to sell animals are rescue societies (that have passed inspections) and certified breeders.
- They should be licensed with somebody to ensure there is no conflict of interest, such as past abuse of animals. They should be required to provide full vet records for the animal, and if no records exist, a check up at the vet before sale. They should have to list the source of the animal, or the animal's parents in the case of breeding. There should be special registration for businesses selling exotic animals, such as reptiles, and no sale of endangered animals, as well as a guideline for what types of animals can be sold (for example, no sale of monkeys in Canada). They should not be allowed to sell to minors, or during specific seasons of the year (Christmas) without some plan in place for returned animals.
- Pet stores should not sell dogs or cats or rabbits. They should help rescues adopt them like many but not all do
- Should be a commitment and follow up to spay/neuter. Breeding should be a permit process.
- All animals should be in good physical and mental health.
All animals should be provided for and all of their needs met.
Owners should be screened to ensure they are not only educated but also mentally and financially prepared for the care of the animal.
- Ensure they are going to a home that is equipped to take care of them.
- 1) the animals must be well taken care of, given proper shots and dewormed.
2) I think animals not intended for breeding should be spayed/neutered as a rule.
3) I would love to see regulation over cat and dog breeders. To control disease, overpopulation and inbreeding. There is way too many ""backyard breeders""
- I vehemently disagree with the sale of animals and think it should be abolished in Calgary. Adoption and sterilization are so important and Calgary should lead the charge to help educate people on the harmful practice of breeding for profit.
- I'm not sure
- Certify and guarantee the dog was born and raised in expected circumstances. Same for the mom.
- I do not believe pet stores should be selling pets.
The breeders should all be licensed and pay business licenses and all should attend mandatory courses. There are bad breeders and backyard breeders who are not ethical or responsible and are in the business to gain profits and don't care about the welfare of animals. They should be fined and if they continue in other cities and provinces should be banned from owning animals and given large

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

fines. Good Breeders should be able to provide registration or parentage papers, be affiliated with local and national breed clubs or national kennel clubs.

- Ethical and healthy breeding practices. shelters to charge reasonable adoption fees
- They should do checks to confirm if people rent or own. A lot of rentals don't allow so owners might lie to acquire the pet
- People that sell and breed animals should have a business licence. Then maybe we would not have puppy mills. This would show they are above board and legit.
- I'm not sure. All of the pets I have owned have been taken in from someone who had to give them up, so I haven't thought about this.
- I would like the world to move toward the elimination of mill breeding, so if the city can be on board with that I support that.
- They are not illegally imported and no harm to animals happened. They were bought or raised by registered breeders and all paperwork is valid.
- Add not purchased/sold for food (that's why you have the owner register the pet upon acquisition and advise when the pet is deceased). If it is two weeks apart well then ... there is no current bylaw that really knows one way or the other why someone is buying a lot of rabbits (or dogs for that matter, or cats) and how long they owned them for. They should be accountable to 'why' the animal is being purchased and that it is in good care.
- None.
- Animals must be traceable to breeder with ethical breeding standards. Animals must be sterile at time of sale.
- Dogs and cats that are sold for profit should have valid proof of health, vet check and up to date shots. No puppy /kitty mills!
- Use registered dog breeders only for supplying animals.
- They MUST provide a humane environment for these animals, upholding high standards of care. No small cages for dogs or cats.
- Must be spayed or neutered. Types of animals must meet CITES and Wildlife act requirements. Make it consistent and simple (ie ALL must be licensed) and then it is easier to follow and also easier to enforce.
- Some sort of accountability for selling sick, diseases, unhealthy dogs.
- That the business is part of an animal care group/association. Should have regular veterinary visits to ensure good health of all animals.
- Make puppy mills illegal with enforcement. Breeders must be licensed and inspected to ensure well being of animals. Encourage adoption. Asd incentives to alter animals.
- Breed is irrelevant. It's essentially what race is to humans. Type of animal should always be regulated, I.e no illegal animals. Pet stores and puppy mills should be eliminated. Registered and inspected breeders, and rescues only would be nice. But there will always be people selling farm kittens and puppies, kijiji pets etc. But perhaps a fee to post a pet for sale on kijiji would help reduce poor breeders.
- Appropriate and humane expectations and regulations from animal suppliers.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Dogs and cats, at very least, should not be available for sale at pet stores. The availability of "pet store puppies" in Calgary is shameful for a city so devoted to and proud of our canine companions.

- Spaying and neutering. Making sure the business is ethical and treats the animals well. Checking if potential customers have ever surrendered an animal and why.
- clearly identifying location of origin. even split of animals for adoption/breeder animals
- Animals must be spayed/neutered at an appropriate age for development, no more animals bred than quality homes available, take-back assurance if owner is no longer able to care for animal
- Only sell rescue animals
- Animals should be certified as coming from an ethical source - ie, not a puppy mill. Animals should be kept in humane conditions at all times.
- They are coming from a safe & healthy environment. Animals are not abused. That the new owner is vetted to ensure they are appropriate owners.
- That is the pet isn't working out for the family the business must be able to take the animal back and re-home it.
- Its bad rules about spayed/neutered: new medical research find association of injuries with early sterilization
- Making sure they don't come from places like puppy mills. This area is so unregulated it's unbelievable. I originally work in the pet industry within marketing and the amount of shit I use to see is still prevalent. There are so many loopholes. If people are choosing to purchase dogs than adopt, then they need to learn to purchase it through responsible pet breeders, these breeders weed out people they see as unfit and that can eventually contribute by preventing a lot of animals from getting dumped in the first place.
- A business should be adopting out an akma
- Retail and mass breeders registration of each litter and vendors penalty against breeding or fine for each animal placed in shelter
- Only sell to those over 18 and to those who pay for their own accommodations.
- No wildlife (wolf dogs, wild cats), endangered species, diseased animals, invasive species.
- Ensure animals are ethically sourced and healthy. Most/all should be spayed or neutered.
- All businesses who profit out of selling animals should be shut down
- Not sure
- I am not a believer of early spay and neuter because of growth and health issues. A certificate
- All pets spayed or neutered prior to sale including hamsters, gerbils, hedgehogs, rabbits, etc.
Ban sale of non-native snakes such as constrictors.
Ensure any store that sells birds can provide certification of breeding in Canada so as to stop the illegal import and sale of wild birds.
- I don't think retail businesses in Calgary should be permitted to sell dogs and cats. There are countless rescues overwhelmed by # of animals available for adoption. Calgary should permit and limit the # permits available to breeders. I also think calgary by-laws should mandate spay/neuter of all dogs/cats except under limited exceptions (medical reasons, very small # animals for breeding -



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

require permits). Breeding permit fees could cover cost of city doing inspections and checks on breeders.

- They have full vet checks, the breeder has been investigated to ensure safe breeding and pets are spayed and neutered. They also should not be left overnight in a pet store.
- Animal must be registered and license with the city before possession, must have all vaccinations, seller must provide guaranteed certification of health and warranty of 6-9 months.
- Only licensed businesses that adhere to strict standards. Breeding should be monitored so that animals are not forced to produce more than 2-3 litters.
- Businesses should not sell cats or dogs. They should be sold from responsible and ethical breeders and from rescues
- Need to come from a reputable source that has been verified by the city. There are still stores in Calgary who are profiting off of puppy mills and awful breeders. Not only is this a horrible environment for the animals but unfair to consumers as they are unaware they are supporting an awful business. You should not be allowed to sell animals in retail. That should be left to the reputable breeders in and around Calgary.
- Animals should be neutered or spayed. No backyard breeding allowed. Proper licensing and monitoring of care.
- I don't think stores should sell cats or dogs at all. Partnering with rescues is all I can support in that aspect. Rabbits other small animals need to come spayed/neutered and have proof of a reputable breeder. Other animals should all come with contracts and come from reputable sources
- Any breeder breeding cats must have a business license and regular inspections. No kitty-mills I believe it's the rescue foundations that should only be allowed to go into retail stores like Pet Smart or PetLand to have their animals adopted.

Form a bylaw: when adopting from a retail location or rescue foundation the pet you pick is reserved for 24 hours-come back the next day to pick them up. This will cut down on impulsive decisions to adopt a pet, will lead to less strays and less animals in shelters because during the waiting period (24 hrs) it will surface if the decision to adopt was impulsive or thoughtful.

- The requirement that the potential owner has a license before acquiring an animal.
- No selling of dogs or cats in pet stores. They are known to be supplied by puppy mills. To breed animals, there should be licensing requirements. Cats should be mandated spayed and neutered unless for showing.
- where an animal can be sold; whether an animal must be spayed or neutered; the type of animal that can be sold; rules related to health and safety of the animals
- **THERE SHOULD BE NO RETAIL SALE OF ANIMALS AT ALL.** There are too many homeless pets in shelters.
- No retail business or individual 'breeder' should be able to sell animals. Only registered adoption agencies who comply with regulations should be able to home dogs. We have far too many animals who need homes to purposefully breed for desire. It's crazy to euthanize perfectly loving animals because people want a certain look. No retail pet sales for certain!
- Cleanliness sufficient space for the animals. Licensing when leaving the store.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The rescue operations are just as bad as backyard breeders. People should be allowed to ask WHY the animals are there to be rehomed and their medical history.
- The rescue operations are just as bad as backyard breeders. People should be allowed to ask WHY the animals are there to be rehomed and their medical history.
- I don't think retail businesses should be selling cats or dogs. It encourages backyard breeding and the animals are not being born in, raised in, or kept in retail stores in proper humane conditions.
- None of the above listed.
- Sale of animals from facilities such as puppy mills should not be permitted
- Pet stores should not be allowed to sell puppies, kittens or rabbits. Other animals should be properly housed and cared for while in the store, and not allowed to be handled unsupervised by the public. A full history of where the animal originated should be available. Full health guarantees should be provided for at least 2 months on small animals, longer on larger.
- Reputable breeders will not sell their cats or dogs in a pet store, therefore the stores like [personal information removed] should be shut down as they deal with puppy mills. Other businesses need to ensure their animals are bred appropriately and check on their living conditions
- I'm opposed to the sale of exotic pets such as monkeys. If retail stores offer pets for sale or adoption, they should be licenced and require knowledgeable staff as well as proper facilities.
- Animals must be healthy and humanely cared for at all times. Animals must be licensed at point/time of sale. Anyone selling animals must be able to provide full and accurate information about required care of said animal. Full provenance for all animals must be readily available (where they came from)--ESPECIALLY for "exotics".
- Who is adopting
Making sure it is a good home
Spayed/neutered as long as the animal isn't too young, that case they can give the buyers a free spayed/neuter
- Sourced responsibly. Veterinary records from breeder/supplier. Quality of life. Proper socialization.
- Where an animal can be sold.
Spay and neuter mandatory.
- Spay and neuter. Ensure (first time) owner and dog have MANDATORY formal training. The best dogs get put down because their owners don't know how to handle them. Also, some sort of pet ownership bylaw test. Half of these owners don't know pet ownership bylaws.
- Once again I don't think that this is the jurisdiction of a city bylaw. This is something that should fall under provincial or federal jurisdiction.
- No puppy mills
- Verify that any puppies (that aren't strays) are from LICENSE VIABLE BREEDERS. If not both breeder and store face penalties. Also all animals have high care standards and restrictions on how many can be in a businesses care based on proper care ability
- City should supply a clear criteria for the retail sale of animals based on the statistics they have and where there are gaps.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Have suitable buyers
- Be inspected by govt vet or other qualified persons on a yearly if not more basis to ensure proper care and selling and to ensure animals come from proper breeders.
- There absolutely needs to be a welfare check on the location and place that the animals are being sold to ensure that there are no puppy mills or animal abuse happening this is even essential in pet stores
- Rules to support the longterm livelihood of the animal. Background check on the purchasers.
- Ensuring humane treatment and conditions. Ensure owners are prepared and qualified to own and take care of a pet.
- They need to be a licensed business to sell animals, they need to have all possible information of the dog especially if it is a surrendered animal. Spat and neuter all animals unless selling to a licensed breeder.
- I don't even know where to start with this. Puppy mills are a big concern I think you need to focus on both breeders and retailers to make sure animals are cared for right
- Ban sales of dogs at pet stores to eliminate puppy mills
- Animals should be spayed or neutered. A basic course or questionnaire to make sure the buyer understands basic care of the animal.
- Only adoption of animals. No breeding animals for sale. All animals to be spayed or neutered before adopted.
- None. Get as many adopted/sold ad possible.
- Humane practices
- Rescue animals should only be allowed.
- They must be limited to local and high quality pet breeders. Although breeders need high regulations as well. They should POST where they get their animals.
- Regular thorough animal welfare inspection, similar to food health inspection. Regulations for where the animals are sourced from, including veterinary care and animal welfare at the breeders. Requirement of an interview of potential buyers to determine safety at new home.
- Dogs should not be sold in stores.
- I do not believe animals should be for sale anywhere.
- Animals should not be sold in stores in this day and age.
- Condo/apartment owners need some type of restriction on owning dogs. (Businesses should not be allowed to sell to non poperty owners.) One it is not fair to the animal. :(Two, a condo owner has no time invested in looking after a property(yard) but can walk out the door and destroy as many yards as they feel fit. Take a look at what is starting to happen in the downtown area along Eau Claire and the East Village. High density housing (condos/apartments). Do not even think about sitting on any green section of grass or bench. Even the park in the area where the old hospital was located is public dog washroom. It's a park that is over used by pet owners living in high density housing. I feel sorry for the non-pet owners using that park.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs and cats should be rescues only - not from backyard breeders. Pet stores also shouldn't be selling exotic pets when they are not informed of their proper care and give wrong advice to new owners. Ideally pets should be spayed and neutered to prevent over population but not at too young of an age.
- Must be neutered unless used for breeding
- They must follow strict care regulations, uphold high standards of animal welfare, ensure that all needs of each animal in care is met, including mental stimulation. Animals should be habituated to the public to ensure they are used to being handled and cared for by humans, and they should be kept in enclosures that provide enough space for the species and breed to thrive. Terrestrial animals and birds should be provided with sunlight daily, and should always have access to sufficient food and water, as well as medical care if needed. When selling animals, businesses should interview potential adopters to determine whether the animal will have a good home and the person is aware of and capable of performing the responsibilities and duties of owning a pet of the species they are interested in. Similarly, animals should not be permitted to be sold as gifts for another person, as that contributes to the population of animals that have been surrendered to animal services and the humane society, so there should be regulations in place preventing that. Businesses should ensure that they are attaining their animals from a reputable source, and they should not contribute to the illegal pet trade, or exotic pet trade. An information pamphlet on care of your new pet should be provided to each member of the public, and they should be aware of all approximate costs of owning said pet prior to adopting. Lastly, businesses should not be permitted to attempt to cut costs on quality of care to maximize quantity of animals in care (ie. Puppy mills).
- It should be illegal to have dogs or cat stores in Calgary.
The only way you should be able to buy them is at Rescue Shelters.
- Ban puppy mills, and any type of animal husbandry that is considered abuse to animals.
- Spaying / neutering contract.
Buy licence when you get the pet.
- I don't think businesses should be able to sell dogs or cats.
- fine as is
- They are healthy and cared for.
- Breeders need to be licensed and trained. I have been to people have inbred dogs or bred dogs incorrectly with genology that causes health defects. This include people who mix breed dogs btw. Animals should be sold either by a licensed pet store that screens for these problems or a licensed breeder. Both who have to be audited for safety and breeding standards.
- I believe in free trade
- It should be done through a city site or a rescue organization. Other social media platforms have no regulations and many animals are exploited and in turn cause more to be surrendered or abused.
- Dogs and cats should be spayed / neutered I'd sold in a retail setting. A person should have to show proof of Animal Licensing upon pick up OR the retail store should have to license all pets for sale and transfer the license to the owner once sold.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Retail sale of animals should be forbidden. There are far too many animals that die every year in shelters. Retail sales also encourages unethical practices such as puppy mills or backyard breeders.
- Limits on the number of animals allowed for sale to each individual purchaser.
- I don't know.
- No animal mills.
- ensure animals are healthy and treated nicely
- Sprayed, neutered a MUST.
- They must be well cared for during the whole process. Cats and dogs should be from a charity first, and breeders second and breeders must be proper and in good standing.
- background checks into the business looking for previous illegal activity
- License comes with animal (no license no animal)
Spay/neuter a must
Limit sale of trouble breeds (high adoption breeds, no need to sell pit bulls at pet store when always lots at the shelters)
- Do not take more animals than sales are reflecting. Rescue animals are encouraged to take and sell at a reduced price
- Treatment of animals is by far number one, sale of animals that are what they say they are (too many fakes on Kijiji), true country of origin.
- That a family be fit to properly care for the animal. That they receive the best education on how to do that.
- No 'dangerous' (ie venomous) or 'inappropriate' (camels, pigs, rhinos etc) animals to be sold or traded in any way.
- I think all animals should be treated humanely and not stuck in cages for many hours in stores.
- Animals should be sold from licensed rescue groups, or licensed breeders only. No back yard breeders, no illegal breeders, no kitten or puppy farms should be allowed.
- only animals from rescues
- No puppy mills, responsible breeders.
- Ensure that they are not acquiring dogs from puppy mills and that they are vetted prior to being for sale.
- The current system seems to work reasonably well.
- licensed & legitimate businesses only. Private sales should be vetted by a licensed vendor.
This only works for those that are doing this legally.
- Ethical ways to obtain animals- rescue or reputable breeder only
- absolutely no in store puppies. Encourage rescues, or list of reputable breeders that are certified.
- I think animals should be spayed or neutered, and the cost of the procedure included in the sale of the animal, to ensure it gets done.
- If you are talking about breed-specific legislation (BSL) then stop right there. Worst idea in the world, and speaks to the lack of understanding of canine behaviour prevalent in society today.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals should only be sold by licensed breeders or Rescue agencies. I believe that they all should be spayed or neutered BEFORE they go to their forever homes or work with the families to be sure that its done soon after adoption. There are WAY to many abandoned unwanted animals that are stretching the rescues thin. :(
- Recall and fine if pet is not what they say it is. Limit number of pets in residential areas. Selling dogs should be a business.
- The animal must be warranted to be in good health at the point of sale and for a limited time afterward. The animals must be kept in a clean and healthy environment, which includes enough space and entertainment for the type of animal in question. All cats and dogs should be spayed/neutered before sale, unless specifically for the purposes of private breeding.
- Make sure they don't come from puppy or kitten mills. I think there should be legitimate pet farms that raise their animals with care for their health and well being without needing to be purebreds. They should be licensed and inspected and numbers limited to the size of their facility.
- absolutely no selling on kijiji/facebook marketplace. I mean, you imposed a business license on "short term rentals" (i.e. AirBBb) to cut down in irresponsible rentals. The same should be for breeders. They should only be able to sell in Calgary if they meet standards of provincial/federal regulations or agencies on breeding. I don't disagree with breeding (i prefer adoption), but there has to be a way to cut back on back yard breeding and exploitation of animals.
- Um dont utilize puppy mills or similar. And fecal matter should be disposed of properly.
- Behaviour testing
- No animals from animal-mills. That the place they get their animals is a licensed business where strong care ethics are being followed
- I believe that the City should not offer business licenses for puppy mill operations.
- If the animal is sold thru a business/retail outlet they should have to have the animal spayed/neutered BEFORE the animal leaves the store. It doesn't matter if the animal is a rescue or purebred.
- that animals cannot be sold for commercial gain in pet stores.
- No business rather than a professional breeder should sell pets.
- Ideally only adopt policies in big stores (adopt not shop) and that all intentional breeding Should be regulated
- I think that business must encourage the responsible ownership of pets. I think that if people were allowed to return un-wanted animals back to the pet store they would be a lot more cautious about who they sold to.
- Not puppy mill
- A rule of where they can buy them from i feel is the most important. This would hopefully prevent the continuation of puppy mills and such.
- Define a business? Is it a breeder, a rescue, a pet shop, an online presence of any of the above?
- They must be humane, that's all.
- The above are great



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I believe that all animals that are to be sold are to be spayed or neutered not exceptions. These animals are to be pets not breeding stock or show animals.
- Difficult to control underground sales
Not sure how that can be done
- Humane treatment of animals
 - - individuals should be required to provide proof of vet health and vaccination.
- If seller is a breeder (ie. an ongoing business), then a license and/or permit to operate should be visible to buyers or on random inspections/audits by City.
- All pets should be spayed or neutered, pets should not be sold in stores and background checks should be done for owners to prevent cruelty to animals. People who surrender a pet should not be allowed to get a new one.
- Any association with a puppy mill is out of course. Spaying/neutering is important. Dog training 101 should be required. A pre-requisite course about the animal for first time dog cat bird etc. owners should be provided at the retail space.
- I would just want to ensure that the animals they are selling are healthy, spayed/neutered (unless specialized license for THEIR PET, but still must spay/neuter the babies they have). Animals being sold should have proper immunizations and up to date health status. Things such as puppy mills are VERY concerning and many animals coming out of them are not taken care of properly and have many health concerns before they are even adopted.
Privatized sale of an animal is also something that erks me - there should be more rules in place for people who want to get rid of their animals.
- humane treatment - only purchase animals from certified humane sources.
- It should not be allowed. How is [personal information removed] or whatever that pet store still allowed to operate? Get rid of these backyard breeders!
- Animal must be spayed/neutered. No dangerous breeds for sale. No animals bred deliberately to sell. Rescued animals only.
- I would prefer to not have businesses selling animals at all.
- None.
- I don't think animals should be sold in retail/pet stores. I think not for profits should rehome pets and responsible breeders should find homes for the animals they breed. A dog should never be sold at a store and I don't believe a responsible breeder would do that.
- Parent animals must be treated well and taken care of. Puppy mills should be cracked down on.
- No comment
- It would be nice to target puppy mills and crack down on selling those animals.
- Humane treatment. Spaying or neutering should be the decision of the owner. Again, the city should stop being so interventionist and dreaming up reasons for new bylaws.
- All animals must be spayed/neutered or agreed to be spayed/neutered if still young (with exception of a purchase from a reputable breeder with a contract for breeding). Ban on puppy mills, adoption only at pet stores.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals are kept healthy and in humane conditions.
- Be licensed, high standards of welfare and care. Certified vet work ups and checks.
- Rules to prevent sales from puppy mills.
- Not sure...??!
- Ability to provide for animals and keep them healthy and happy in the event that they are not sold without surrendering them.
- Spay/neuter
- I don't think animals should be available for sale in pet stores. By all means have rescue animals in stores to allow for greater exposure to potential owners, but not kittens, puppies etc from possible mills
- Pet stores who get puppies from puppy mills should be shut down and the puppy mills should have to pay fines so huge that they are forever discouraged! They are horrific and disgusting and every measure must be taken to stop these mills. Pet stores should also be heavily fined and monitored or shut down. ADOPTION IS THE WAY ALWAYS
- Ethical and humane common sense rules only. Do not require spay/neutering. I have interest in certain rare purposebred breeds and I might want to own one and keep it intact for the purpose of sending/sharing it to breed to preserve the breed. Animal rights activists are trying to ensure that laws are passed so that pets cease to be a thing. Don't assist them in this, it is ridiculous and shameful. Ok, we don't want the sale of tigers and some reptiles, spiders etc. Dogs are too important to people's lives. My friend has her chickens are emotional support animals and it's a wonderful thing.
- Over regulations just force it all underground. Access to affordable spay/neuter programs is critical
- Verification of origin re puppy mills etc
- Health and Safety! Must be licensed and the SPCA should have the right to visit the premises and animals. Health check guarantee from all breeders. A limit to the number of animals allowed to breed at one time.
- Inspections and monitoring for care of animals while at the business, monitoring and expectations for where animals come from prior to being at the business for sale, number of animals at the business for sale
- That they are healthy
- Rescue animals should be the only ones allowed to be sold in stores. Breeders within the city limits should have to have special license to breed in city limits. All exotic animals should not be allowed to be bred in Alberta
- No comment
- There should be regulations regarding breeding operations. I know a border collie breeder who runs basically an upscale puppy mill, churning out 50 or 60 puppies a year and weaning them at 3 weeks so their mothers will come into heat quickly again and produce more puppies.
- End the commercial sale of non-rescue cats and dogs, require all animals to be sold with a minimum 1 year license, and pre-pay for the animal's spay/neuter at a licensed vet's office (if not already spayed or neutered).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Federal regulations
 - No puppy mills
- There should be no retail sale of animals at all. Any animal sold should be required to be spayed/neutered.
- I do not agree with enforced spay or neutering for all pets. There are a lot of different medical studies that argue both for and against, and it may be breed specific for health reasons.
- Must not be an invasive species.
- All saleable animals should come from rescues, not breeders
- Don't believe in retail sale of pets from 'puppy' mills or any place that uses the animals solely for breeding.
 - Must know and have proof of origin of each animal, have staff with adequate training in care of each species. Provide daily enrichment and exercise. Restrict unnecessary handling and directly supervise all handling and interaction to prevent stress and injuries. Provide regular health checks and care. Require purchasers to take basic training and care course prior to purchasing. Require purchasers to license or register each pet at time of purchase.
- Permit and regular inspections.
- Understanding care required for the animal
 - Provide a health check
 - Require micro chip to identify
 - Required training for staff
- All animals that are sold should be spayed/neutered and offer a return policy (a return policy may ensure that people STOP turning their domesticated animals out in the wild!)
- Have to provide the buyers the source of the breeder along with their location and contact information. Cannot have more than 4 puppies on the premises for sale, just like individuals, for the well being of the animals in their care.
- Same as responsible dog ownership above.. limit of stock as in puppy mill etc.
- I stand by adopting and not purchasing an animal. When adopting the organizations work with the families to provide proper education and ensure that proper care will be provided. If someone wishes to buy an animal the same process should occur.
- clean, safe environment
- I don't believe that stores/businesses should be allowed to sell dogs and cats. It leads to impulse purchases and feeds the puppy mill industry.
- I think independent breeders who are licensed and inspected should be allowed to sell animals, but I think it should be against the law for pet stores to sell animals for a profit. I think it is fine if they have adoptable animals in the store, but considering there is overpopulation already, pet stores should not be allowed to sell animals at all. It would be nice to encourage pet stores to work with rescue organizations to help find adoptable animals homes.
- - Breeding only healthy dogs (must meet a criteria)
- - Return policy within a set period of time if the new owner has issues/problems with the health of the dog



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- fair market price
- cleanliness and health standards
- That the animals are sold through a legal business. Health and safety regulations are followed.
- Dogs and cats shouldn't be sold in pet stores period.
- The animals should be coming from fully licensed, inspected, certified, ethical breeders, and NEVER from anyone who can't prove their breeding facilities and/or where they got the animals. In terms of type, I think this should be determined by Fish and Wildlife regarding what kinds of animals are endangered, what present a danger to local fauna/flora, etc.
- Limitation on number of animals breeders can keep on their property in residential areas. Practice good hygiene & removal of feces. Provide veterinary clean bill of health at time of sale. Maintain business licensing requirements.
- I don't know, ask the professionals who work in this industry
- Where, who and what kind of animals. Spay/neuter would apply for pets that are not sold for the purpose of a breeding program. Regular welfare checks on breeding programs would be beneficial as well.
- That the information about the pet is genuine and true
- License, animals are vet checked, health guarantees.
- Not to support illegal or non-registered breeders
- That the buyers have access to breeder information, information about the parents and family history, proof of AKC credibility for certain breeds
- Cleanliness, appropriately trained staff, safe treatment of all animals, collection of full details of purchasers, primarily use rescue animals or provably acceptable breeders.
- Those allowed to sell are providing safe and clean living conditions, include spaying and neutering in sale.
- A business selling animals need to be inspected and where these animals come from are important. Are they vaccinated and do they come from out of the country. Out of the country should not be allowed.
- There are no cruelty-free ways to consider dogs/cats as inventory in a retail setting. Retail store should only be able to host verified charities and no revenue should be earned for the sale of these animals.
- Respectful breeding (normal amount of litters)
Ensuring the safe adoption of a birthing mother
Transparent practice
Fines for puppy mills and keeping offenders information in a database
Licensing (no kijiji/ fb marketplace etc)
- I STRONGLY believe retail stores should ONLY be able to have adoptable (fully spay/neutered) animals in their stores, especially dogs.
- I don't believe any businesses should be selling cats or dogs. But if they do, they should have a business license. the animals must be well looked after prior to the sale.
- Animal source from a non puppy/kitten mill

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I believe that pets such as dogs and cats should not be sold, and that Calgary should not permit the cycle of breeders. Animals can be purchased from the humane society. Cats and dogs should be spayed or neutered, and if breeders and private business are allowed to continue operating they should be able to demonstrate that they provide quality care of the animals in their possession.
- Whatever calgary is doing now seems to work fine. If people want pwts they can get pets. If they dont want pets they can not buy pets. No one can by animals like elephants except thw zoo. It isnt broken dont fix it.
- Calgary should adopt the best policies of other cities. There should be restrictions on the type of animal that can be sold, and where the animal can come from. Spaying/neutering is always important, to keep population under control. Seller should have a license to sell animals, and be aware of and in compliance with all guidelines and restrictions.
- Health of the animals, spay or neutering to control pet population
- I dont know enough to say as I rescued my pets and dont think they have the same policy as a business would
- Animals must be in good health, vaccinated, spayed or neutered; and must not be left in a business overnight alone.
- Health report and family history of health concerns from breeders.
- They can prove the animal was bred humanely and safely.
- essentially end any sales that are likely coming from puppy mills - unfortunately it seems hard to track with kijiji etc. only registered not-for profit or licensed business should be allowed to sell animals - bred or rescued.
- Difficult question. For what it is worth I have a fear/hatred of "puppy mills" and would never acquire an animal from any one who seemed to be running one. Same thing for rare birds.
- Spayed or neutered, unless you're a breeder and selling the animal specifically for breeding. Making sure dogs aren't from puppy mills. Rescues work differently, in that they have the animals fixed (if not already done).
- The animal be spayed or neutered
- no dogs or any animals sold at businesses if animals come from irresponsible breeders and of licensed and must be inspected through bylaw people first.
- The animals must be kept safe, healthy-vet checked, well fed, not overcrowded- whether it's a breeder, adoption agency or retail store. It is up to the business if they choose to sell the animal spayed or neutered, that is owner responsibility. Breed ban biased rules should not be imposed. The selling of 'exotic' animals should be monitored for safety to the public/disease assessment to native animals and environmental impact.
- Out door roaming cats must be spayed and neutered. Dogs in off leash areas must be spayed and neutered. Putting laws in place to avoid puppy mills or raising dogs for organized dog fighting. Known breeds that have a history of unpredictability such as pit bills need more regulation such as owners must have completed a certified course with the dog for behaviour training.
- stiffer regulations on breeders. shut down puppy mills and limit a house hold to two pets to keep people from hoarding pets. spay and neuter for house hold pets. paper trail for ownership of exotics



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- training? education on selecting proper pet for lifestyles . long penalties banning owning pets again for those who have cause harm/distress to animals

- Spay/neuter
- Ensure animals are healthy before sale, including responsibility for a period of at least 3 months for any potential health issues. Have a clear return policy.
- In good health. Vet checked.
In a public facility they should be from rescue orgs or certified breeders.
- Puppy and cat mills should be curtailed. Pets should be Spayed and or neutered unless sold to a licensed breeder. The humane society has a good program for interviewing potential owners. Perhaps pet ownership education programs might be a good idea. Could solve a lot of homeless, stray, feral pet problems up front.
- Retail sales of pets should guarantee a pet is spayed/neutered to prevent unwanted litters and prevent or at least limit the ability of individuals to breed their pets as a business.
- I am vehemently opposed to the selling of pets whether it be pet stores or online.
- Animals must be fed, vetted and cared for to the highest standards. I'd love to see screenings done on people buying animals but I know that's a lot to ask. Not too many dogs at once - extremely humane conditions and animals must have access to food, water and outdoor space to exercise.
- All sales are humane
- Spade and neutered animals should always be cheaper than unaltered animals to encourage people to own fixed animals.
- auditing by the SPCA
- Spay/ neuter before sold is mandatory.
- humane treatment of animals, not selling dangerous or delicate animals to unqualified individuals, providing customers with information on proper animal care and laws/bylaws about licencing etc., will refund / exchange animal if the owner buys it and cant care for it (within a certain period of time), not selling unspayed/vaccinated animals, provide customer with animal health records
- Proper care, food, water, clean environment, veterinary checks.
- No puppy mills/animal mills
Pet stores sell shelter animals.
No import of ""rescue"" animals from other countries, it doesn't make sense, and encourages spread of animal disease
- Require spay/neuter, license and microchip, shots up to date
- Verifiable health (clinic) records.
- I don't think retail stores should be allowed to sell animals. I think they should only have animals available for adoption within the actual store.
- Be partnered with responsible licensenced breeders or adoption agencies, if the business is caught using puppy or animal mills, they lose their business license and all the animals and seized and given to no-kill adoption agencies to adopt out



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The sale of wild animals/exotics should be banned. It's inhumane to keep wild birds, amphibians, reptiles in cages/aquariums where they cannot move, socialize or live in their natural habitat. People often fail to understand the requirements and care needs of these animals, or the long-term commitment required. There should also be strict laws and enforcement for breeders, and how often they can breed, and "puppy mills" should be banned. The focus should be on finding homes for rescue animals/strays.
- No cruelty of animals. Some socialization and honest pet history
- Must be spayed/neutered sounds like a good one, but not sure could be enforced. Type of animal - certain breeds should have to have inspection by animal expert on their temperament. No foreign animals - we have enough rescue animals in Canada. Restriction on number of dogs a person can own or have in a single dwelling.
- They register pets for owners to ensure it gets done ... they register all sales. All neutered unless special case for breeding
- Proper Paper work and vet checks to help stop puppy mills, stolen dogs etc
- Animals for sale should be raised humanely. Breeders should need a license. Animals should be required to be spay/neutered. Animals sold for breeding purposes should only be sold to licensed breeders. Inspections should be required periodically by animal control officers.
- Ensure they're either adopting out dogs or assisting ETHICAL breeders sell their pets for reasonable prices to RESPONSIBLE people. But I believe as a business they should mainly support adopting out dogs of all ages.
- Only ethical breeders should be allowed to sell animals.
- All of the above.
- There should be no retail sale of dogs cats or rabbits, seriously the rabbit population in calgary is out of control and pet stores sell unfixed young buns who either end out outside or at the humane society which is not set up to handle the sheer number of unwanted rabbits. Exotic animals should not be sold either if they were wild animals in their home country it is cruel to make them pets. Pet stores should work with local rescues to highlight adoptable animals instead of selling. [personal information removed] should be closed, they encourage puppy mill like conditions for animals.
- Licensed and regular inspections, proper cages/pens, not accessible to people unless supervised.
- Not from puppy mill, have a permit to sell. If litter was accidental then they can be given to shelter for sale with penalty
- Dogs and cats should be spayed and neutered unless the sale is done by a breeder and the breeder has a business license.
- I don't believe we should have any business's selling dogs. Non-backyard breeders, or rescue's only. No selling of animals on Kijiji etc. Do we really need to bring dogs in from other countries? We have enough homeless dogs in Alberta to deal with, without bringing in dogs from Mexico, Korea, US etc.
- I think that all animals that are sold must be from a humane breeder and not a puppy farm.
- No more breeding! A program to promote adoption events for shelter animals instead of selling.
- where the animals have come from.. this needs to be monitored a lot more close



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- animals sold in stores must be from rescue.
- Extremely strict limitations on individuals breeding animals should be put in place. It should be illegal to sell animals on Kijiji but I doubt the city can stop that. Backyard breeders who breed their house pets are extremely dangerous and contribute to the ongoing problem of overpopulation and abandoned or neglected animals.
- a properly licensed and regularly humane-society-inspected business (ie not a home-based puppy mill). neutered. all vet shots. licensing done at time of purchase. What about the role of the Humane Society pet adoptions?
- spayed or neutered should be mandatory unless you are a licensed breeder.
- Unless the animal is specifically sold for the purpose of breeding the animal is to be required to be spayed or neutered prior to sale. Commercial breeders not allowed within the City Limits
- As long as rescues, breeders, or sellers are meeting current bylaws for the care of their animals and are not breaking any other laws I do not believe the City should be involved in limiting owner choice.
- STOP PROMOTING STORES THAT SELL ANIMALS. Outlaw animal sales! Promote adoption! Stop feeding puppy mills. I wish there was no way to buy an animal from a store. Only a licensed breeder or an adoption organization.
- Calgary needs to take immediate steps to deal with dog trafficking and puppy mills. Strict licensing and regulations need to be applied to people who profit off pet sales. Instead of Bylaw officers chasing down owners over leashing or licensing violations, they should focus on pets for profits, where there are significant victims and suffering.
- I do not believe that retail establishments should sell pets that have been bred for re-sale. Pet-related stores should partner with registered not-for-profit organizations to host rescued animals currently up for adoption. This would benefit the business and the organization by helping more homeless animals find their family.
- n/a
- I don't believe animals are property and don't believe that they should be sold to anybody who has a visa. Obtaining a pet should NEVER be an impulse buy. I own a pet store and would NEVER sell animals in my store. No reputable breeder would ever put their puppies into those situations. It's shocking that this is still going on in our city.
- Personally, I don't think people should be allowed to sell pets. There are way too many animals out there that need to be rescued.
- They need to be legitimate and registered as a business and not a puppy mill and the animals need to pass a proper health and fitness check.
- I believe that animals should be adopted. However, if people want a specific breed,, they should only be able to buy from licensed AKC Registered breeders. No pet stores should be selling cats and dogs.
- Only certified/ licensed breeders or animal shelters should be able to sell animals
- - partner with rescues to find homes for animals in need
- -no selling from breeders/puppy mills/etc
- - proper screening of buyers (much like what happens when adopting from a rescue)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Must be spayed or neutered.
- spay/neutered BEFORE sale, no pet store sales, breeders must be licensed as a business, animals cannot be sold on kijiji/craigs list etc (including licensed businesses).
- Only reputable breeders should sell animals
- Breeders and stores selling animals need to be checked out and monitored to ensure proper living conditions, treatment and health of animals. Spay and neuter should be encouraged
- Ethical breeding, not over breeding, healthy, safe, vet checks, core vaccines, contract for spay/neuter in a timely fashion, no inflated pricing
- All should be spayed or neutered and microchipped. If you want a show animal you are not buying from a pet store
- Rescue animals only being sold in stores.
- No retail sales unless from rescues
- Must take care of all the animals needs, vaccinations and health requirements up to the point of sale as per vet recommendations.
- There should be NO retail sales of animals such as dogs and cats as there are a high number of adoptables that could benefit from the exposure.
- Use ethical breeders
- I think that animals should be spayed or neutered either prior to the sale or as part of the sale contract. I also think that breeders should be held to a high standard to prevent backyard breeding.
- NA
- retail sales should only deal with rescues (ie, ARF, ARRCs, Meow foundation)
- I am strongly against any sale of dogs or cats except from rescue organizations. There are too many dogs and cats looking for homes. All dogs and cats should be spayed or neutered.
- That vaccines be up to date, the animal be spayed or neutered, and that they are going to a good home.
- The animals must be fixed except if sold for breeding and they should be registered as such, they must be vetted and vaccinated. They should require the new owner to purchase licensing prior to final sale with proof of such
- I do not support retail businesses that sell cats or dogs. Humane societies, rescues, breeders should be in the business of selling these types of pets. Other pets, I don't have an opinion on.
- Full documentation of the animal would be ideal, and a price cap as to not extort the consumer.
- knowing exactly where the animal is coming from, having a health certificate, rescues should always be spayed/neutered, selling animals in an unlicensed place and for private should not be allowed, only breeders and rescue organizations should be allow to sale animals
- We don't need new regulation. Simply enforce the current laws.
- Spaying and neutering for sure. And more due diligence on where the animals come from to avoid mills and illigal activity.
- You can not control spay/neuter that should remain to the pet owner, limiting breed is also a HUGE NO



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Rescues are ok but breeders need to sell from their homes where parents and environment of animals can be inspected by potential purchasers. And breeders should be licensed.
- Must be a sustainable source and not an endangered or exotic pet that might be endangered ie tropical fish
- i feel animals must be licensed by the city, have up to date vaccines and medications if any and should be fixed (spayed/neutered) if of age. I feel the retail sale of animals is OK but I think there should be modifications/inspections of the work place, staff, marketing, labor and pricing. I feel providing retail sales of animal shouldn't be allowed as we have shelters with animals searching for a home. by providing retail, these businesses feel they can over charge for pet purchases and not always guarantee the consumer satisfaction.
- That all animals/pets should be SPAYED/NEUTERED!
Outlaw and fine animal mills and irresponsible breeders.
- There should be rules around species that can be sold/owned (ex. cannot own a tiger, wolf, primate, etc.). Animals that are sold should be preferably from rescue organizations.
- There should be more regulations on breeders. Backyard breeding/puppy mills is a huge concern, these animals live in poor conditions and are often exposed to contagious infections. The Retail sale of animals should encourage adoption of animals that need homes, and not animals specifically bred to make money. Cats are also being bred and kittens are being sold on social media platforms and to retailers. There are thousands of animals who are available for adoption and need homes, and retailers like [personal information removed] are often selling animals from unlicensed breeders.
- I am all for pet stores that help pets become adopted. If pets were to be sold at pet stores I believe that the breeders should be monitored closely and have restrictions placed on them to insure the safety and wellness of the animals
- -must be spayed or neutered.
-type of animal should be limited (many exotic animals should not be pets)
-if a young animal, possible proof of a reputable breeding facility, and these places should be check on
- NO retail sale of animals in pet stores
- Must be an altered animal. No exceptions.
- There should be NO RETAIL sale of dogs or cats. I understand the need of livestock sale in agriculture, but no one should being selling dogs or cats for profit. There is no need for this in the city limits.
- NO sale of animals through Kijiji, Buy and Sell groups etc. No pet stores should be allowed to sell dogs/cats or any animals that come from breeders. Partnerships with local rescues are a GREAT alternative!
Any breeder must be assessed to ensure proper care and conditions are provided, they should be required to have a 'certificate' of sorts to prove they are reputable. Absolutely should be a limit of only one litter/female, and then they must be spayed. Must be able to provide documentation of all vet visits, and the vet must sign off on the health of the dogs used for breeding. NO BACKYARD



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

BREEDING. "Puppy Mills" and "Back Yard Breeders" need to have steeper fines and consequences.

- Do not buy puppies from Puppy Mills, maintain their health both physically and mentally. Only sell to good people.
- Dogs should not be sourced from puppy mills.
- I don't believe in selling animals for profit, so I'd love to see businesses in Calgary only selling rescue animals for a fee that covers the cost of their vaccinations, food, etc. I'd love to see private sales of animals outlawed, as well as commercial breeding operations.
- That the animals come from responsible sources, not puppy mills and poor conditions
- The place treats animals nicely
- I do not believe dogs or cats should be permitted to be sold from store fronts at all
- The sale of dogs/cats that are bred for sale should be banned. I support pet stores selling rescue animals. There are so many unwanted, stray dogs/cats in Canada its alarming. Calgary can help with that by banning the sale of dogs that are bred, I have fostered dogs from these breeding situations and it's not a healthy life for them.
- Proof that animals are not from 'mills' or large scale breeders with questionable ethics. Ensure the animal is allowed to be owned by person purchasing and that they have the appropriate set-up for the animal. IE: for reptile they can prove they have a terrarium. This could be because just purchased or photographs of set-up or discussion of needs and seller feeling confident the buyer is knowledgeable enough to handle animal appropriately immediately.
- No sale of exotic or endangered animals . Spay and neutering after growth plates are closed for non- breeding animals. Breeding animals should be registered as breeding and spay/neuter does not apply. People selling animals should have a license and be deemed a healthy/ethical provider of animals. This would mean assessing where they obtained stock as ethical too.
- My only concern is for the well-being and safety of the animals. So, they should be spayed/neutered; they should not be kept in small confinements; there should be zero "puppy mill" type operations where the animals come from; the money should always be reinvested into the animals' well-being before being re-homed, and into the care of future animals. I recently adopted a puppy from a rescue adoption event. It took three months of going back and forth to get my money transferred to a vet in Calgary, not an hour from my house in Airdrie. They promised things they did not deliver, and provided incorrect information from the get-go. With this sort of experience in mind, and the sale of the puppy I adopted, I don't know where the money went, but she certainly was not spayed when I got her, nor did I have the proper documentation of the vaccines she received. This should be a rule at the time of sale.
- Humane conditions in the businesses, practices in place to ensure animals are coming from reputable breeders, spay and neuter conditions.
- I don't think the retail sale of animals should be allowed at all. When there are so many beautiful pets looking for homes through the city and through organizations like MEOW Foundation and AARCS there is no justification for encouraging breeders and the sale of animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Dogs and cats should not be sold in stores. They should have to provide more transparency as to where those animals came from, and provide current proof of vetting (health certificate, deworming and vaccinations).
- Dogs and cats are not to be sold under 8 weeks old, and breeders should be required to provide vaccination details per specific animal.
- There should be no retail sale if animals
- Full disclosure on where the animal has come from- supporting rescue's and humane societies. Everyone else should be registered as a business or breeder, or surrender pets to the business and proceeds are donated to Animal Shelters
- No store should be allowed to sell cats/ dogs/ rabbits for profit.
I also believe breeders should require a business license in order to sell their animals in the city.
- No retail sales. Private registered breeders should be licensed and inspected and well as rescues.
- There should be no "retail" sales of animals. Especially with how many animals there are in shelters looking for homes. Spay and neutering should be mandatory for every animal leaving an adoption agency along with a microchip.
Families with children under the age of 6 should not be allowed to adopt a pet due to the amount of pets that are returned because the child became "bored", or the family "doesn't have time" for the pet, or they are "too much work", etc., etc...
Adoption agencies should be closed before and during the holidays when people get them as "gifts".
- Safe and humane.
- Stores only able to sell pets from organizations that rescue and re-home. Only reputable breeders allowed to sell directly or advertise without restrictions.
- I think people should NOT be allowed to breed dogs without being licensed by the city and having a home visit to ensure the dogs are in a safe space and have their needs met.
- I don't think any retail business should be able to sell dogs/cats. There should be breeders and rescue organizations. Nothing more. For small mammals, reptiles, fish etc. There should be regulations any and all business's should follow for the health and well-being of the animal and the number of animals they have for purchase at one time. There should also be stricter regulations in order to purchase animals from retailers.
- I do not believe puppies or kitties should be allowed to be retail products. Puppies and kitties are not products and usually come from a puppy mill when purchased for a store. I feel it should be against the law. I feel other animals should be checked in on by a regulating body to ensure proper care of all other animals.
- I don't believe pet should be sold in retail.
- There should be fines for pet stores selling animals acquired at "mills". I don't think you can tell a pet owner that they should or shouldn't spay or neuter their pet but perhaps there can be a cheaper licence fee if they do?
- I do not believe there should be ANY retail sale of animals. This is something that should be banned.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- DONT USE PUPPY/KITTEN FARMS!!!! Find animals in shelters that need homes. Babies only stay small for a short period of time. Many people give them up after they've grown only a year or two. Give those loving animals a home instead. They also need more space, how would you like living in a box hardly big enough to turn around in and be poked and picked up all day every day?
- None. City should stay out of regulating a business.
- Age of release to new owners so animal is optional health and temperament. Many release animals too soon from mom. Number of animals they may own for their business in a residence. I wouldn't want a dog or cat breeder with 4 plus animals next door.
- I don't think that people should be able to breed their pets and sell them for money. PERIOD. And if they do they have to be licensed and be liable for any health issues that are genetic that the owner was not made aware of. And no body should be breeding cats. there is a cat overpopulation crisis in alberta and its ridiculous that people are breeding cats. IF they weren't a dime a dozen people might take better care of them in the long run.
- The spay or neutering of pets is most important.
- Breeders must be licensed to ensure that they are responsible breeders. Regulations must be in place to ensure that the breeding animals have a human and quality life. Animals can not be used as reproduction machine, especially for female animals. It should regulate the interval between each giving birth and the age for stopping breeding. Have regulations in place to ensure that the animals who are not breeding any more lead a quality life. Breeders must provide an annual report of the status of the animals. Selling records shall be submitted too. Check breeders on site regularly to ensure the rules are followed. Animals are lives, not products, which can NOT be traded freely by anyone. Selling animals must be licensed and the individuals who are buying animals must be evaluated to ensure responsible owners to reduce animal cruelty and stray animals. We should speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.
- Pet stores should only be allowed to adopt shelter/ rescue dogs, cats , rabbits.
- Health and welfare of animals should be protected. Perhaps check if buyer is banned from owning animals based on previous complaints (background checks).
- Making sure the animal that they own it
- Spaying and neutering of animals unless the purchaser is given right to breed
- That the animals are healthy, spayed or neutered, and not from puppy mills or other environments that are damaging to the animals or their genetics.
- To quit bringing animals from the states and Mexico and support the strays we have here!! BARCS
- I don't believe retail sale of animals should be allowed
- Certification of Vet checks for animals health
- Animals should be spayed or neutered unless specifically chosen for breeding purposes. Potential owners should be screened for suitability as not all people are suitable pet owners (we wouldn't adopt out children without doing some background checks).
- Not encourage breeders. Only work with rescues to help with exposure. Do a thorough home check and f/u visits.
- Must be spayed/neutered and chipped



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals bred for resale are not sold in stores. Animal spayed/neutered before animal is 1. Exceptions should be noted example where surgery is too dangerous
- Businesses should not sell dogs, cats or exotic animals. They should work with responsible rescues to ensure they are not promoting puppy mills.
- Checking into the home situation. Maybe a short online class or seminar on responsible pet ownership or caretaking of the animal before sale.
Businesses should be regularly assessed and certified for their safety and cruelty free status in obtaining and keeping animals to avoid puppy farms, prolonged isolation, etc.
- Pet stores should not sell pets that were intentionally bred. Animals in need of homes (rescues, etc) should be adopted out instead. Breeders should sell direct to clients not through pet stores. Same goes for exotic animals and pocket pets.
Fish in my opinion are the only intentionally bred animal that should be sold in a pet store.
- I think only registered breeders should be able to sell dogs. There needs to be something implemented that stops promoting people to not fix their dogs.
- No business should be selling animals that were bred. All businesses who choose to sell animals are animal abusers and contributing to the cycle of violence against pets. Businesses need to partner with non profit organizations to rehome stray and feral animals
- Limiting live animal sales to only rescue organizations- retail stores should work with local animal rescue organizations
- NO store should be allowed to sell puppies or kittens. [personal information removed] This support unethical breeding and the owners care more about profit than well-being of the dogs. Pitching a puppy/dog, kitten/cat should be done by a reputable breeder or rescue organization. Not in pet stores or out of the back of a van in a parking lot
- Registered/licensed company. Signed contracts between business and customer. References from previous clients. Animals should be spayed, neutered and healthy. Business should offer to take the animal back should the adoption not work. No back yard breeders.
- I like that ordinary pet stores no longer sell cats and dogs. The rules seem to be good, as there is only one puppy pet store left in the city and it appears to be well run and it offers small dogs suitable for the city.
- Puppy mills suck! Animals for sale should be from a reputable breeder/owner, the animal must be spayed or neutered (unless buyer is a reputable breeder/owner), definitely the type of animal that can be sold...MUST come from a reputable individual! Commercial, big box stores should stop selling pets!
- up to date vaccination schedule for animals being sold.
- No business/retail establishment should be selling pets that have been bred for selling purposes. They should have adoptable animals with legitimate rescue organizations.
- This includes exotics. Unless the animal is certified for breeding by a vet, they must be spayed or neutered.
- Not from a breeder, unless the business IS a breeder, stores should house rescue animals only
- Proper care and treatment



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- What is the definition of business that the City of Calgary will use?
A preservation breeder should not be compared to a retail store who sell animals not should they be compared to a backyard breeder or retail rescue.
- Provide clear and truthful information as to where the animals came from, Forms with identification to deter unscrupulous breeders. Red flag and report to bylaw
- puppy mills are bad; crackdown on those?
- I believe that no retail store be allowed to sell dogs or cats that are not spayed or neutered and not from a shelter. I feel these stores contribute to puppy mills and do a disservice for shelters and Registered Breeders.
- I do not believe any animals should be sold in a retail business.
- Safety and care of the animals should be most important! Things to do with adequate space, sanitation, food, health.
- No retail sale of cats or dogs.
- Vet checked. Clean bill of health. Family history on the animals.
- If it's a business or breeder I think they should come spayed or neutered. If it's an owner rehoming a pet its understandable why this might not always be the case.
- I don't think you have any rights here
- Ideally people can report sellers if they sell an unhealthy or poorly cared for animal.
- that the animal comes from a responsible breeder (backyard or kennel club) - importance should be on the production of happy, healthy animals, restricting access makes it easier for puppy mills to thrive as ppl struggle to find places to purchase
- I don't think the city needs to impose rules. The market will dictate.
- -must be spayed or neutered
-Type of animal
-Breed
-From a verified breeder.
- Dogs and cats should only be sold by registered breeders or adopted. Sale of animals in a retail business should only occur if it is actually an adoption.
- know the source of the animals and health of parent animals and environment the animals come from
- I see no need for more regulations. We have excessive rules and regulations in this city.
- They must have compassion for the animals, not just see them
As a dollar sign. Ensure the home they do to are good homes Like the adoption places
- background checks
- Animals being sold are not coming from mills (puppy mills, etc.).
- Spayed and neutered, all shots given, chip insert. Same rules as the Cochrane Humane Society!
- Proper care of the animals, ensure animals are either fixed or sold only to breeders.
- adopt don't shop. must be spayed/neutered. No breeder animals sold at any retail store. Breeders should be investigated and licensed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals must be in good health
- To make sure they are following proper animal welfare standards for the animal being sold. Work more with animal welfare orgs to promote adoption. DO NOT work with breeders that aren't reputable. The city/ animal welfare orgs could work together in investigating breeders, those with top standards could be given a stamp of approval from city or animal welfare orgs, so pet shops and individuals know which breeders are best.
- No breeding facilities.
- This is a business that should no longer be permitted.
- healthy animals, not shady, making sure that the animals are treated well where they are sold.
- training on pet care for purchasers
limit on number of pets in store
- They should only be allowed to sell a certain # of animals/year and random inspections of the business to see how they care for the animals.
- I don't believe any businesses should be selling animals for retail. We have a large number of animals in rescue, they could be promoting rescue animals instead
- Businesses are not as much of a problem as Kijiji and the like who provide a platform for sale of puppy mill dogs.
- None
- -Mandatory Spay/Neuter 6 months for females and a year for males
-FULL knowledge of the origin of the animals acquired. (That they don't come from back yard breeders or mills)
-Mandatory class for first time pet owners
- No sales of dogs in stores, I work at a petstore and it would not be humane for us to sell dogs as we cannot provide a proper environment for them. No sales of wild caught reptiles, even if it hinders the sale of some reptiles. All corporations must provide proper enclosures for their animals, aka proper size, environment, food, etc. As an employee of a corporate pet store it pains me to see our small enclosures and I refuse to sell any animal that is not going to a suitable home
- Taking ID and if possible some kind of check which most people will pass no matter what.
- No exotic animals, boa constrictors, etc. or dangerous animals that if released into nature could be dangerous or affect local fauna, flora. I would want them to be given a home, no animal should be allowed to be sold that is a risk to our
- If anyone is going to be selling animals, it would seem best for everyone if that person is 'licensed to sell', to prevent 'over breeding,' selling diseased animals, prevent inbreeding. Etc.
- They should submit to regular check ins and inspections to ensure no animal abuse is occurring. They should also be forced to show proof that their source they are obtaining animals from is an ethical breeder.
- It shouldn't be allowed. But if it is, there needs to be proof that these animals didn't come from "mills". I or the wild. Adequate care should be provided at all times and potentially taught to new owners. (mandatory class) prices could be fixed so as to make selling pets less profitable.
- Animals should be spayed and neutered before being sold.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals should be properly and humanely cared for.
- I think commercial sales of pets should have to comply with the same standards of health and well being that apply to rescues like the Humane Society and AARCS
- They have to be from registered breeders if they are for sale not puppy mills etc. And if they are doing adoption have low adoption fees not where they also make a profit.
- No puppy mill bred animals, vaccinations up to date, must be licensed.
- Not allowed to sell from unethical breeders, should have a process in place to license ethical breeders and they must pass checks to maintain these. Must be a rigorous vetting process requirements to allow people to purchase animals
- Adoption should be encouraged for cats and dogs first and foremost and spay and neuter should be mandatory before cats and dogs are adopted.
- That they investigate where the animals are coming from. All animals for retail sale should come from reputable breeders who treat the animals with care
- No animals sold in pet stores
- Reputable breeders. Safety and health of the animal while in their care.
- I think it should be illegal to sell puppy-mill pups/cats and purposely bred animals of any kind (yes, even fish). No exotic or endangered species permitted unless for rescue/rehab purposes. Rescued animals up for adoption at a generally considered to be fair price.
- I don't know. A screening process for pet adoption/purchase.
- Health and welfare of all animals in this care
- ??
- Full support to banning retail sale which encourages pet abuse. Rather working with shelters to adopt and home millions of animals is preferred. Support to spay/neuter except where not possible due to health.
- All retail sale of animals should enforce the spay or neuter contracts if there are any. All dogs should be vetted and proof given to new owners.
- pets should not be given away for free, should be spay/neutered
- I believe Calgary should have these added. There are too many back yard breeders and irresponsible pet stores selling animals, spay/neuter should be made much cheaper and easier although I personally think it should be mandatory unless you have a license for breeding. Types of animals that are more specific should only be sold by licensed and reputable/responsible breeders.
- Registered breeder no animal mill pets.
- This is a difficult topic. Puppy (other other animal) mills are horrid places and is my primary concerns for the retail sale of animals. Is there a way to control the source of the animals rather than the retail operators?
- First, animals should not be sold in pet stores. Second, there should be mandatory licensing, regulation and inspections for ANYONE breeding a selling animals. And the current Animal Protection laws are a JOKE!!!!!!
- spay/neuter, maximum 3 pets, proof of licensing first



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They are able to show where they got the animals, and those breeders, etc. are willing to be contacted by city officials.
- Full health disclosure prior to purchase, copy of health records and vet contact info provided with purchase.
- I feel very strongly about this, stores should not be permitted to sell animals. Even my personal small animals- a bird and mice, came from responsible breeders and not pet stores.
- Dangerous or exotic animals and reptiles that a person cannot be reasonably expected to encounter on a regular basis should have regulations and only sold at a licensed retail business.
- Nothing that can cross contaminate humans like SARS or Covid-19, for example.
- Safe and humane treatment and living conditions of the animals
- The business should be subject to random checks by Animal control officers to ensure proper handling and care of the animals is in place. The business needs to be licensed.
- They should be completely transparent as to where the animals come from, and should have to give that info when requested.
- The conditions that the animals are housed need to be regulated as well as the conditions that they are raised in.
- Need to be able to provide proof (history of acquisition in obtaining pets) were done under proper channels and regulations and with the right licensing. This, in order to curb unethical and illegal means of acquisition for profit. I want to know that if I'm buying - it's not derived from poor inadequate conditions that are not benefiting the well being of animals
- Prioritize and promote rescue organizations; limit breeder-sourced animals especially if there are already pet overpopulation issues (e.g., cats, large dogs, rabbits); limit exotics/non-native wildlife
- Registration and licensing at point of sale.
Spat and neutering should be mandatory.
- I do not agree to the retail sale of cats and dogs when rescues and shelters are overflowing. Adopt don't shop.
- Health certification / guarantee for at least a few weeks post purchase or adoption. Those being sold as "purebred" should be required to provide papers proving the claim.
- No sale of dogs or cats
- They should be required to prove that the animal has come from a reputable breeder. These animals should not be sold for breeding purposes in Canada, unless they are being sold to a reputable breeder. Personally I believe it should be a requirement to have the animals spayed or neutered prior to sale, or have the new owner contractually obligated to provide proof of spay/neuter within a reasonable time frame.
- I do not believe Anna levels should be sold in retail stores unless there is very good documentation of where they came from it allows too many backyard breeders to profit
- Puppies and Kittens should not be sold in a pet shop.
- Must be spayed/neutered unless bought for breeding purposes, in which case there should be a paper trail, a license to breed and a letter of commitment.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

All these if not done should result in fines, removal of pets, suspension of ownership, and jail if necessary

- Do NOT believe in Pet Stores selling pets due to IMPULSE buying and these pets ending up in Rescue situations. Pets bought thru responsible breeders DO NOT have their dogs end up in Rescue as most have a stipulation that if you cannot keep the pet you bought it should be returned to the breeder.
- Definitely do not limit dog breeds because someone thinks all dogs in the breed are dangerous. Certain animals could require license and proof of proper handling. Like reptiles. I dont think you should force spaying and neutering but it should be encouraged. Rules around puppy farms and abuse, and neglect so animal can more easily be removed from bad situation.
- The source of where the pets are obtained from is more of an issue than Pet Stores selling pets. Typically it's an impulse buy and dogs and cats shouldn't be sold in pet stores.
- All should be spayed/neutered and not dogs allowed to be sold
- I don't know.
- I don't agree that puppies and kitten should be sold in malls. They should be acquired through breeders or rescue organizations.
- Where animals are sold, who they are sold to, when they are sold (ie not Xmas). Generally agree with thoughts items above.
- all animals being sold should be spayed or neutered, especially cats. Animals being sold in stores should come from shelters or rescue groups.
- History so they are not running a puppy mills. Anyone not licensed to sell pets should be fined
- Proper sale of animals includes the seller being willing to take the animal back in event of the new owner being unable to provide the right home for it (behavioral issues, health). Not all animals should be spayed or neutered as a rule before sale - it's been well researched that dogs should be fixed after a year and not before now.
- Humane treatment
 - All animals are vaccinated, chipped and fixed.
 - Animals should be provided with adequate space and shelter.
 - Animals should not be placed in loud and stressful environments for the benefit of human bystanders.
 - Cats and dogs should not be sold in retail outlets.
 - Prospective pet owners should be educated prior to purchasing a pet. Their details should be checked and kept on file.
- Regulations should ensure that pets must be purchased from reputable breeders, not from puppy or kitten mills. Retailers such as Petland should be forbidden to leave their small rodents in open cages that anyone can reach and grab into. I have seen rabbits, guinea pigs, hedgehogs and so on at these stores constantly harassed and even hurt by grabby children and adults. The animals deserve protection. If a buyer wants to touch or hold a specific animal, they should be required to be supervised by an employee at all times.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Encourage more adoption and rescue, limit the number of places where animals are sold, specify animals that can be kept as pets, require all adopted and sold animals to be spayed and neutered.
- It shouldn't be allowed, the sale of dogs or cats in pet stores mean they came from a breeder. We have enough animals needing homes, it should be banned.
- no puppy mill dogs, only sell rescue cats and dogs in city.
- Properly vetted with a standard protocol of tests, up to date in shots, display of registered owner, and licensed which can be transferred when sold.
- Puppy mills or breeding in hoarding type situations should never be allowed or used. Ethical breeding only
- Dogs that are sold in Pet Shops are usually from puppy mills and backyard breeders. However, with online classified such as Kijiji, those dogs are sold there as well. How do you stop that? As for mandatory spaying and neutering, you're in dangerous territory. It is not a municipalities right to say whether an animal should be spayed or neutered unless they are adopted from a shelter where you understand that this is the case when you adopt. There are several purposefully bred dogs that serve many purposes in our society. This includes service dogs, hunting dogs, agility dogs, obedience dogs. There is also a ton of research now that shows if a dog is spayed or neutered before they are 2, they are going to have major ligament and structural issues. Again if it is understood the animal needs to be spayed or neutered for adopted, that is one thing. If you choose to make this part of the Pet Shop industry, I don't think that's a bad thing either. But you cannot say that every dog needs to be spayed and neutered. There is a finite genetic pool for purposefully and ethically bred dogs. The City of Calgary does not have the right to impact.

It would be better is to have mandatory business licensing and inspections for these so-called puppy breeders that sell Pet Shops and on Kijiji. That way come with your mandatory inspections oh, you can control how many dogs they have, that they are licensed and must be microchipped. And that if conditions at the home do not meet the minimum requirements for the Humane treatment and keeping of animals, then you can shut them down. This is a much better approach then trying to punish the end buyer. You have to impact these people that produce puppies for profit. I think it would be very important to have mandatory veterinarian inspections along with the officers and business licensing. This way you were impacting the supply chain of improperly and unethically created puppies. You can also continue to educate the public on adopting animals rather than buying them at Pet Shops and through Kijiji. You will always have people that will want and or need a purebred dog for a variety of reasons. But impacting the supply chain of unethical and sometimes Criminal Behavior, you can have better impact on the community as a whole.

- Dogs and Cats should not be sold in Pet Shops. Responsible breeders who are current members of Organizations such as Canadian Kennel club, which are bound by their Organization rules, should not be put in the same category as business who sell unhealthy, untested animals purely for profit.
- We MUST start looking into this more closely to ensure that there are no kitten or puppy mills. There MUST be proper space, care, and hygiene. Animals need proper exercise intervals, outdoor time, and should not be kept in cages. I do not even think that most pet stores do this.
- that they are going to a good home and getting the care they need



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Lower number of animals in the program, that all animals are getting exercised daily and properly cared for, that breeding programs be licensed to ensure taxes are being paid and poor breeding standards are being curbed
- No retail outlets should be allowed to sell pets. It encourages the behaviours the bylaw is trying to prevent - irresponsible behaviour. Making profit on selling a living thing is just wrong.
- Anyone breeding or selling animals for profit should be registered and licensed. Puppy=mills should be strictly monitored for the number of litters and breeding health of the animals being used as breeders.
- If an animal is going to be sold, I want to know it's healthy. If a fee is wanted, I want the animal thoroughly examined with sterilization and vaccines on board, etc. If an animal is being given away, that's the recipients choice to do the above. Businesses (including "backyard breeders" and sellers on Kijiji) should have licenses to be able to sell animals, so that license can be taken away at any time if things go awry.
- All animals should be spayed or neutered unless they are registered as breeding stock. An animal registered as breeding stock should be licensed and chipped, since the purpose of that is to sell the animals which then becomes a business.
- I do not know
- I am opposed to the retail sale of dogs and cats. Exotic animals such as birds, reptiles and fish are hopefully regulated. If animals are sold, I expect their habitations to be inspected, and kept clean and safe. Adoptable animals available through pet supply stores should also be maintained in safe, clean environments.
- - do due diligence research to ensure purchaser has no record of animal abuse/unlawful breeding etc
 - ensure purchaser has enough information and resources to give proper care
 - ensure all animals they sell are legally and morally acquired
- All dogs and cats should be altered prior to sale if not a registered breeder. Sale of animals from puppy mills should be illegal. Hard to care for and exotic breeds should not be allowed in general pet stores. Pet stores should be encouraged to work with rescues for cats and dogs as opposed to breeders.
- Must be spayed/neutered before sale of the animal!!!
 - Not allowed to advertise on kijiji or fb marketplace.
 - Must be a registered business for selling animals.
 - Business must ask for prof of income to show new owner will be financially able to provide for a pet.
- Ban pet stores from selling dogs, cats, rabbits, any wild caught animal. The known history and health of the animal must be provided. There should be a health guarantee with full refund of the original cost of the animal, timeline will depend on the species, but should be at least a month. Should be ok for pet stores to display/advertise animals from registered rescue organizations.
- They must ensure a comfortable environment for animals while they get sold.
- Must be regulated and licenced by city.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Must be at least 8 weeks old. should have a contract between buyer and seller to protect both parties - ex, health guarantee, non-breeding contract, etc.
- Up to date vaccinations
- Must come with a health certificate from a licensed vet
- Ensure that the animals are from a regulated and trusted breeder and not an animal mill
- Not sure.
- Spay and neuter all cats/dogs/livestock if not licenced breeder.
- I'm not sure.
- Certified kennels. Spayed /neutered. No exotic pets. associated to a club/association as appropriate
- It is challenging to respond to this question because not all pet stores sell "puppy mills" while some "breeders" are borderline "puppy mills". Some rescue organizations act more as "businesses" and "sell" their animals in pet stores, and sometimes even "import" pets from other provinces or countries to keep selling pets. It's an area that would need its own set of Laws or ByLaws.
- MUST know the breeder and that the animals are well cared for!!
- Sale of animals only by licensed & registered rescue organizations or breeders - no retail sale by third parties (storefronts). Breeders must be regularly inspected and able to provide registration papers for all animals.
- rescues only (people looking for bred animals should go to the breeders), all should be spayed/neutered prior to purchase
- That the animal is going to a good home. I think that the selling of purebred cats and dogs in pet stores should be banned as these animals often come from deplorable conditions.
- They should be a licenced breeder. Puppy mills owners should be fined.
- there SHOULD not be retail options dogs and cats to be purchased from a pet store. Rescues should ensure accurate records (vaccinations, spay, behaviour) should be issued at time of adoption. Ethical breeders should provide proper paperwork also
- Retail sale of anything but fish should be restricted to licensed sellers or breeder representatives only. Sales in "pet stores" should be prohibited.
- 1. they must be well-kept, not crowded and must be exercised with comfortable beds and some stimuli. Their environment must be clean. Good food.
- No puppy mills
- Licensed business that follows health and safety rules.
- Animals must have their physical and emotional needs met. This means clean, comfortable areas in which to live, proper disease prevention precautions taken, social needs and training taken into consideration. Length of time where the animal is expected to live in a kennel. Contracts regarding the breeding or spaying/neutering of animals and the time frame in which they have to get it done. Homes and businesses should both be allowed to sell animals, but precautions should be taken that the animals are being raised and sold in an ethical manner. No puppy mills, hoarding situations or large scale operations (meaning 50+ animals on a property).
- Slay and neuter as part of cost to purchase



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Retail to include all Sales that involves the exchange of funds, this includes animal rescue. Follow health and sanitary rules . Animal must be produced in Canada (no imports) AND each animal licensed to business that is selling them, the transfer of license must be done by new owner... you can then track how many of these animals come into animal services. Should these animals that come into services will be charged a fee to the person selling the animal...
If the boogeyman is actually the sell of animals then make them pay for it.
- No selling in pet stores. All sold animals should be microchipped before going to the new home.
- Pets should not be sold in pet stores, period.
Dog breeders should be more regulated (we bought our dog from a registered breeder and it was severely malnourished with multiple parasites at 7 weeks old)
Pet owner application should include an interview and vetting process, like the Humane Society does.
You should be required to take a course on dog ownership BEFORE you qualify to buy a dog
Individual sale of a dog should be mediated by the city or an agency
- Properly treated animals .
- Proof of origin, full vet exam prior to purchase with all documentation on display for the public, no financing allowed, a waiting period to prevent impulse purchases, a moratorium on purchases in December (and leading up to Easter for rabbits)
- All animals sold in retail should be spayed or neutered. I also think there should be a limit to how many animals, such as birds and bunnies, can be sold at a time.
- Ethical sources
- Spaying and neutering for sure should be done, no exotic animals,
- Animals should not be sold to minors, identification should be required to be shown when purchasing an animal to check against a list of people who have bans from the courts.
- That they are healthy, socialized and kept in a clean environment.
- safe storage and care
- I do not support the sale of dogs or cats from commercial retailers.
- Where it can be sold (not kijiji! or online ads!) pet stores or vets only - and they must be spayed or neutered by a professional --
- They don't come from puppy mills
- Ideally, no business should be selling animals - restrict the sale/adoption of animals to shelters, rescues, responsible breeders.
Given current existence of pet stores:
 - Must adhere to the Five Freedoms. Should be subject to inspection by officers who can enact the APA. Must also divulge the source of their animal stock and those sources must also be subject to inspection.
 - All animals in their care must have health checks by a veterinarian. Must be vaccinated/dewormed (if appropriate), spayed/neutered (if appropriate), treated for any medical concerns and cannot be sold if these are not met.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If an animal is sold and turns out to be pregnant and had babies in new home (which has happened before!), the business **MUST** take the babies back if the owners request it (instead of forcing the owners to have to deal with rehoming the babies themselves).
- Should accept any animals that a customer wants to return.
- Store staff that are not licensed veterinary professionals **CANNOT** give veterinary advise to customers.
- Where animal can be sold and to have a license to breed and sell.
- knowledge of animal care, ability to teach customer. pets should be spayed/neutered/vaccinated, where applicable. instructions/references for customer for when the pet becomes applicable. adoption questionnaire.
- Application processes.
- The animals should be microchipped for ease of return if the animal becomes lost. Adequate food, water and clean shelter needs to be provided at all times.
- Humane and ethical treatment of all animals, no puppy mills.
- The health of the animal, should be spayed/neutered, buyer must be required to license the animal
- All animals should be kept in sanitary and comfortable environments. When selling an animal one should ensure the purchaser has everything they need to care for it.
- The animals must originate from humane breeders. Vet checks are required before sale and reports provided to the purchaser
- To make sure/follow up that pets are spayed or neutered by a certain age or soon after reaching maturity. That people who sell pets are licensed to breed and sell animals.
- Too complex to answer. Puppy mills are evil.
- I think animals should only come from reputable sources. This includes small rodents and fish. We all know about puppy mills but I think these animals should never be bred and raised in bad conditions for profit.
- Animals must be spayed or neutered.
No killing or harming of animals.
They must provide information on proper care, licensing, etc.
Animals must be kept in a clean and appropriate environment for their size and health.
Infant animals should not be separated from their mothers until they are mature enough to be.
- Since retail sales of animals breed puppy mills, it should not be allowed
- Extremely important that the animals are kept in good condition. It is important to ensure that the business owners are not just focused on the money and cut corners. Also ensure the animals come from reputable breeding.
- Vet checks, certificate of health, spay neuter before going home
- I think it's important that a business that sells animals can ensure it came from a reputable source. Dogs from puppy mills are more likely to have behavioural issues which places an added burden on both citizens and the City/Shelters.
- The only issue with limiting the acquisition of pets is that it goes underground, which is harder to regulate. We need to look to best practice (for example, what does Humane Canada say about



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

this?). Having worked in a pet store I know many people lack the knowledge to property care for exotics, so perhaps those limitations.

- They come from a reputable breeder that is licensed and regulated.
- rescue animals only for retail businesses.
- agriculture Canada , responsible breeders , this is a slippery slope I don't think the city needs to be involved in ... rehoming should be easier then it is ... EDUCATION on what and who to buy from should also be more available . responsible breeders are a good thing!!
- this is a very wide ranging topic, that would require much more space then this.
- No kijiji or online sales for any animal or living thing!!!
- it should be complex with safety and perpetual care of the animals.
- Supporting ethical breeders and rescues. No puppy/kitty mills. Clean bill of health.
- When sold they should inform animal services with the name of the new owner
- No retail stores for dogs.
 - no reg. for temperaments
 - consequences for bylaw sick dog -> ""lemon law""
- - against
 - no control of health control temperment like?
 - consequences when buying pet why buyer is responsible for the vet bills on puppy
 - Define what a business is first - retail outlet different than occasional breeder
 - Rescue - retail rescue vs true rescue - Define?
 - Spaying/neutering should be owner's responsibility
 - not related to retail sale
- Pets shouldn't be sold in petshops anymore. I'd like to see uit all go through an agency, like the Humane Society. They should be pre-approved by the authorities. Health safety limits # of animals in a location. Taking good care of animals. Safety of animals needs to be enforced.
- - want to know history and health
 - training
 - type of breed
 - Animals should be spayed or neutered
 - know the breed
- up to date vaccination schedule for animals being sold.
- Responsible breeding practices
- No business/retail establishment should be selling pets that have been breed for selling purposed. They should have adoptable animals with legitimate rescue organizations.
- This includes exotics. Unless the animal is certified for breeding by a vet, they must be spayed or neutered.
- Not from a breeder, unless the business IS a breeder, stores should house rescue animals only
- Proper care and treatment



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- What is the definition of business that the City of Calgary will use?
A preservation breeder should not be compared to a retail store who sell animals not should they be compared to a backyard breeder or retail rescue.
- Provide clear and truthful information as to where the animals came from, Forms with identification to deter unscrupulous breeders. Red flag and report to bylaw
- They do a background check on the person buying the pet. Repeat animal abusers should not be allowed pets.
- puppy mills are bad; crackdown on those?
- I believe that no retail store be allowed to sell dogs or cats that are not spayed or neutered and not from a shelter. I feel these stores contribute to puppy mills and do a disservice for shelters and Registered Breeders.
- I do not believe any animals should be sold in a retail business.
- Safety and care of the animals should be most important! Things to do with adequate space, sanitation, food, health.
- No retail sale of cats or dogs.
- Vet checked. Clean bill of health. Family history on the animals.
- I would like the retail sale of pets to be banned entirely. Calgary has several excellent pet rescue organizations which can fulfill the need of supply families with pets, including kittens and puppies. All pets sold or adopted in calgary should be required to be desexed.
I would like wild caught fish / all fish retails stores closed down as these animals do not belong in tanks. As well, most are wild caught - removing them from the ocean or lake ecosystem has far reaching affects that consumers do not understand.
- If it's a business or breeder I think they should come spayed or neutered. If it's an owner rehoming a pet its understandable why this might not always be the case.
- I don't think you have any rights here
- Ideally people can report sellers if they sell an unhealthy or poorly cared for animal.
- that the animal comes from a responsible breeder (backyard or kennel club) - importance should be on the production of happy, healthy animals, restricting access makes it easier for puppy mills to thrive as ppl struggle to find places to purchase
- I don't think the city needs to impose rules. The market will dictate.
- -must be spayed or neutered
-Type of animal
-Breed
-From a verified breeder.
- Dogs and cats should only be sold by registered breeders or adopted. Sale of animals in a retail business should only occur if it is actually an adoption.
- know the source of the animals and health of parent animals and environment the animals come from
- I see no need for more regulations. We have excessive rules and regulations in this city.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They must have compassion for the animals, not just see them
As a dollar sign. Ensure the home they do to are good homes Like the adoption places
- background checks
- Animals being sold are not coming from mills (puppy mills, etc.).
- Spayed and neutered, all shots given, chip insert. Same rules as the Cochrane Humane Society!
- Proper care of the animals, ensure animals are either fixed or sold only to breeders.
- adopt don't shop. must be spayed/neutered. No breeder animals sold at any retail store. Breeders should be investigated and licensed.
- Purchasers must be made aware of medical condition of pet - checked by veterinarian and any medical conditions disclosed.
- Animals must be in good health
- To make sure they are following proper animal welfare standards for the animal being sold. Work more with animal welfare orgs to promote adoption. DO NOT work with breeders that aren't reputable. The city/ animal welfare orgs could work together in investigating breeders, those with top standards could be given a stamp of approval from city or animal welfare orgs, so pet shops and individuals know which breeders are best.
- No breeding facilities.
- This is a businrss that should no longer be permitted.
- Spayed or neutered. The source of the animal should be strongly regulated. Rescue animals should be promoted and if we make it rewarding for businesses to choose rescues over breeders that would be positive!
- healthy animals, not shady, making sure that the animals are treated well where they are sold.
- training on pet care for purchasers
limit on number of pets in store
- The City has the opportunity to require the retail sale of animals to be rescue animals from reputable rescue organizations.
- They should only be allowed to sell a certain # of animals/year and random inspections of the business to see how they care for the animals.
- I don't believe any businesses should be selling animals for retail. We have a large number of animals in rescue, they could be promoting rescue animals instead
- No puppies or kittens under 6 months of age. Vet check not allowing the animal to linger all day in a kennel.
- -the source of these animals should be ethical (e.g. no puppy mills)
-the type of animals sold (some exotic fish are released into the wild creating problems for native species).
- Businesses are not as much of a problem as Kijiji and the like who provide a platform for sale of puppy mill dogs.
- None
- -Mandatory Spay/Neuter 6 months for females and a year for males



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

-FULL knowledge of the origin of the animals acquired. (That they don't come from back yard breeders or mills)

-Mandatory class for first time pet owners

- No sales of dogs in stores, I work at a petstore and it would not be humane for us to sell dogs as we cannot provide a proper environment for them. No sales of wild caught reptiles, even if it hinders the sale of some reptiles. All corporations must provide proper enclosures for their animals, aka proper size, environment, food, etc. As an employee of a corporate pet store it pains me to see our small enclosures and I refuse to sell any animal that is not going to a suitable home
- Spay or neuter before cats or dogs a bought.
- Specific breeds to require enhanced rules - aggressive breeds require more training, insurance . These dogs need to be properly trained.
- I don't think dogs and cats should be sold. There are enough rescue animals that the breeding of animals is unnecessary. Adopt don't shop. If this is not going to be followed, which I doubt it will, then a portion of the sale of each animal should go to the City pound or SPCA or other charitable animal organization to support them since they are contributing to the problem
- Taking id and if possible some kind of check which most people will pass no matter what.
- No exotic animals, boa constrictors, etc.or dangerous animals that if released into nature could be dangerous or affect local fauna, flora. I would want them to be given a again, no animal should be allowed to be sold that is a risk to our
- If anyone is going to be selling animals, it would seem best for everyone if that person is 'licensed to sell', to prevent 'over breeding,' selling diseased animals, prevent inbreeding. Etc.
- They should submit to regular check ins and inspections to ensure no animal abuse is occurring. They should also be forced to show proof that their source they are obtaining animals from is a ethical breeder.
- It shouldn't be allowed. But if it is, there needs to be proof that these animals didn't come from "mills".I or the wild. Adequate care should be provided at all times and potentially taught to new owners. (mandatory class) prices could be fixed so as to make selling pets less profitable.
- Proof of Health checks, The business should have regular inspections to ensure the animals are properly cared for and be able to show proof of where the animals came from whether they are rescues or puppy/kittens purchased from breeders. - Breeders for should also be subjected to inspections.
- Animals should be spayed and neutered before being sold.
- Animals should be properly and humanely cared for.
- I think commercial sales of pets should have to comply with the same standards of health and well being that apply to rescues like the Humane Society and AARCS
- They have to be from registered breeders if they are for sale not puppy mills etc. And if they are doing adoption have low adoption fees not where they also make a profit.
- No puppy mill bred animals, vaccinations up to date, must be licensed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not allowed to sell from unethical breeders, should have a process in place to license ethical breeders and they must pass checks to maintain these. Must be a rigorous vetting process requirements to allow people to purchase animals
- Adoption should be encouraged for cats and dogs first and foremost and spay and neuter should be mandatory before cats and dogs are adopted.
- That they investigate where the animals are coming from. All animals for retail sale should come from reputable breeders who treat the animals with care
- No animals sold in pet stores
- Reputable breeders. Safety and health of the animal while in their care.
- I think it should be illegal to sell puppy-mill pups/cats and purposely bred animals of any kind (yes, even fish). No exotic or endangered species permitted unless for rescue/rehab purposes. Rescued animals up for adoption at a generally considered to be fair price.
- I don't know. A screening process for pet adoption/purchase.
- Make sure no puppy mills.
- Health and welfare of all animals in this care
- ??
- I don't agree with retail of animals.
- Full support to banning retail sale which encourages pet abuse. Rather working with shelters to adopt and home millions of animals is preferred. Support to spay/neuter except where not possible due to health.
- All retail sale of animals should enforce the spay or neuter contracts if there are any. All dogs should be vetted and proof given to new owners.
- Animals need to be from a responsible licensed breeder or rescue.
- No animal for sale should ever come from a puppy mill! Only rescued dogs should be for sale. All animals must be spayed/neutered and private breeders should have to hold special certification in animal husbandry before breeding is allowed.
- Licensed business...paperwork showing acquisition and ownership...pricing in line with three market...health records for the animal..current vet sign off
- pets should not be given away for free, should be spay/neutered
- I believe Calgary should have these added. There are too many back yard breeders and irresponsible pet stores selling animals, spay/neuter should be made much cheaper and easier although I personally think it should be mandatory unless you have a license for breeding. Types of animals that are more specific should only be sold by licensed and reputable/responsible breeders.
- Registered breeder no animal mill pets.
- This is a difficult topic. Puppy (other other animal) mills are horrid places and is my primary concerns for the retail sale of animals. Is there a way to control the source of the animals rather than the retail operators?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- First, animals should not be sold in pet stores. Second, there should be mandatory licensing, regulation and inspections for ANYONE breeding a selling animals. And the current Animal Protection laws are a JOKE!!!!!!!
- Not be sold in a pet store [personal information removed]. Spaying and neutering is important but there needs to flexibility on age of animal when done and the ability for an individual to not spay or neuter depending on health risks and breeding.
- spay/neuter, maximum 3 pets, proof of licensing first
- They are able to show where they got the animals, and those breeders, etc. are willing to be contacted by city officials.
- Full health disclosure prior to purchase, copy of health records and vet contact info provided with purchase.
- I feel very strongly about this, stores should not be permitted to sell animals. Even my personal small animals- a bird and mice, came from responsible breeders and not pet stores.
- Dangerous or exotic animals and reptiles that a person cannot be reasonably expected to encounter on a regular basis should have regulations and only sold at a licensed retail business.
- Nothing that can cross contaminate humans like SARS or Covid-19, for example.
- Bio-security, have the dogs been screened for diseases/parasites that are prevalent in the areas that they come from, i.e. heart worm. Health of the animal. Have the had vet checks/screening for genetic disease. I'm opposed to the sale of animals in pet stores but believe rescues should be able to have remote adoption locations.
- Safe and humane treatment and living conditions of the animals
- The business should be subject to random checks by Animal control officers to ensure proper handling and care of the animals is in place. The business needs to be licensed.
- Animals should be spayed/neutered; restrictions on types of animals sold (ie: endangered species should not be allowed to be sold to general public); animals should be in good health; animals should not be allowed to be sold without permits (ie: backyard breeders). I think there should also be some kind of registry for people who have been charged with or convicted of animal cruelty in the past, and they should maybe need to go through screening before they are allowed to purchase/adopt more animals in the future.
- They should be completely transparent as to where the animals come from, and should have to give that info when requested.
- There should be NO retail sale of live animals. I have no problem with a pet retail partnering with a certified rescue to have pets for adoption on site
- The conditions that the animals are housed need to be regulated as well as the conditions that they are raised in.
- Need to be able to provide proof (history of acquisition in obtaining pets) were done under proper channels and regulations and with the right licensing. This, in order to curb unethical and illegal means of acquisition for profit. I want to know that if I'm buying - it's not derived from poor inadequate conditions that are not benefiting the well being of animals



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Prioritize and promote rescue organizations; limit breeder-sourced animals especially if there are already pet overpopulation issues (e.g., cats, large dogs, rabbits); limit exotics/non-native wildlife
- Registration and licensing at point of sale.
Spat and neutering should be mandatory.
- I do not agree to the retail sale of cats and dogs when rescues and shelters are overflowing. Adopt don't shop.
- Health certification / guarantee for at least a few weeks post purchase or adoption. Those being sold as "purebred" should be required to provide papers proving the claim.
- No sale of dogs or cats
- They should be required to prove that the animal has come from a reputable breeder. These animals should not be sold for breeding purposes in Canada, unless they are being sold to a reputable breeder. Personally I believe it should be a requirement to have the animals spayed or neutered prior to sale, or have the new owner contractually obligated to provide proof of spay/neuter within a reasonable time frame.
- I do not believe Anna levels should be sold in retail stores unless there is very good documentation of where they came from it allows too many backyard breeders to profit
- Puppies and Kittens should not be sold in a pet shop.
- Must be spayed/neutered unless bought for breeding purposes, in which case there should be a paper trail, a license to breed and a letter of commitment.
All these if not done should result in fines, removal of pets, suspension of ownership, and jail if necessary
- Do NOT sell at a retail business. Do NOT import "rescue" dogs. Do NOT force a dog to be neutered/spayed prior to growth plates being closed as per the recommendation of numerous studies.
- Do NOT believe in Pet Stores selling pets due to IMPULSE buying and these pets ending up in Rescue situations. Pets bought thru responsible breeders DO NOT have their dogs end up in Rescue as most have a stipulation that if you cannot keep the pet you bought it should be returned to the breeder.
- Definitely do not limit dog breeds because someone thinks all dogs in the breed are dangerous. Certain animals could require license and proof of proper handling. Like reptiles.
I don't think you should force spaying and neutering but it should be encouraged.
Rules around puppy farms and abuse, and neglect so animal can more easily be removed from bad situation.
- The source of where the pets are obtained from is more of an issue than Pet Stores selling pets. Typically it's an impulse buy and dogs and cats shouldn't be sold in pet stores.
- All should be spayed/neutered and not dogs allowed to be sold
- I don't know.
- I don't agree that puppies and kitten should be sold in malls. They should be acquired through breeders or rescue organizations.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Where animals are sold, who they are sold to, when they are sold (ie not Xmas). Generally agree with thoughts items above.
- all animals being sold should be spayed or neutered, especially cats. Animals being sold in stores should come from shelters or rescue groups.
- History so they are not running a puppy mills. Anyone not licensed to sell pets should be fined
- Proper sale of animals includes the seller being willing to take the animal back in event of the new owner being unable to provide the right home for it (behavioral issues, health). Not all animals should be spayed or neutered as a rule before sale - it's been well researched that dogs should be fixed after a year and not before now.
- Humane treatment
 - All animals are vaccinated, chipped and fixed.
 - Animals should be provided with adequate space and shelter.
 - Animals should not be placed in loud and stressful environments for the benefit of human bystanders.
 - Cats and dogs should not be sold in retail outlets.
 - Prospective pet owners should be educated prior to purchasing a pet. Their details should be checked and kept on file.
- Regulations should ensure that pets must be purchased from reputable breeders, not from puppy or kitten mills. Retailers such as Petland should be forbidden to leave their small rodents in open cages that anyone can reach and grab into. I have seen rabbits, guinea pigs, hedgehogs and so on at these stores constantly harassed and even hurt by grabby children and adults. The animals deserve protection. If a buyer wants to touch or hold a specific animal, they should be required to be supervised by an employee at all times.
- Encourage more adoption and rescue, limit the number of places where animals are sold, specify animals that can be kept as pets, require all adopted and sold animals to be spayed and neutered.
- That the pets are kept in good conditions and socialized well before sale. That customers are vetted to be responsible pet owners.
- It shouldn't be allowed, the sale of dogs or cats in pet stores mean they came from a breeder. We have enough animals needing homes, it should be banned.
- Humane treatment of animals.
 - Published/registered plan of the life cycle of their stock including disposition of unsold merchandise.
- Proper certification for the supplier of the animals for sale. Investigate the person purchasing the animal. Must purchase the proper license.
- no puppy mill dogs, only sell rescue cats and dogs in city.
- Properly vetted with a standard protocol of tests, up to date in shots, display of registered owner, and licensed which can be transferred when sold.
- Puppy mills or breeding in hoarding type situations should never be allowed or used. Ethical breeding only
- Dogs that are sold in Pet Shops are usually from puppy mills and backyard breeders. However, with online classified such as Kijiji, those dogs are sold there as well. How do you stop that? As for

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

mandatory spaying and neutering, you're in dangerous territory. It is not a municipalities right to say whether an animal should be spayed or neutered unless they are adopted from a shelter where you understand that this is the case when you adopt. There are several purposefully bred dogs that serve many purposes in our society. This includes service dogs, hunting dogs, agility dogs, obedience dogs. There is also a ton of research now that shows if a dog is spayed or neutered before they are 2, they are going to have major ligament and structural issues. Again if it is understood the animal needs to be spayed or neutered for adopted, that is one thing. If you choose to make this part of the Pet Shop industry, I don't think that's a bad thing either. But you cannot say that every dog needs to be spayed and neutered. There is a finite genetic pool for purposefully and ethically bred dogs. The City of Calgary does not have the right to impact.

It would be better is to have mandatory business licensing and inspections for these so-called puppy breeders that sell Pet Shops and on Kijiji. That way come with your mandatory inspections oh, you can control how many dogs they have, that they are licensed and must be microchipped. And that if conditions at the home do not meet the minimum requirements for the Humane treatment and keeping of animals, then you can shut them down. This is a much better approach then trying to punish the end buyer. You have to impact these people that produce puppies for profit. I think it would be very important to have mandatory veterinarian inspections along with the officers and business licensing. This way you were impacting the supply chain of improperly and unethically created puppies. You can also continue to educate the public on adopting animals rather than buying them at Pet Shops and through Kijiji. You will always have people that will want and or need a purebred dog for a variety of reasons. But impacting the supply chain of unethical and sometimes Criminal Behavior, you can have better impact on the community as a whole.

- Dogs and Cats should not be sold in Pet Shops. Responsible breeders who are current members of Organizations such as Canadian Kennel club, which are bound by their Organization rules, should not be put in the same category as business who sell unhealthy, untested animals purely for profit.
- We MUST start looking into this more closely to ensure that there are no kitten or puppy mills. There MUST be proper space, care, and hygiene. Animals need proper exercise intervals, outdoor time, and should not be kept in cages. I do not even think that most pet stores do this.
- that they are going to a good home and getting the care they need
- Lower number of animals in the program, that all animals are getting exercised daily and properly cared for, that breeding programs be licensed to ensure taxes are being paid and poor breeding standards are being curbed
- No retail outlets should be allowed to sell pets. It encourages the behaviours the bylaw is trying to prevent - irresponsible behaviour. Making profit on selling a living thing is just wrong.
- Anyone breeding or selling animals for profit should be registered and licensed. Puppy=mills should be strictly monitored for the number of litters and breeding health of the animals being used as breeders.
- must have proof of breeding (where were they born and to who to prevent puppy mills); must accept animal returns; must do a check of the potential owners for previous issues with animals



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If an animal is going to be sold, I want to know it's healthy. If a fee is wanted, I want the animal thoroughly examined with sterilization and vaccines on board, etc. If an animal is being given away, that's the recipients choice to do the above. Businesses (including "backyard breeders" and sellers on Kijiji) should have licenses to be able to sell animals, so that license can be taken away at any time if things go awry.
- All animals should be spayed or neutered unless they are registered as breeding stock. An animal registered as breeding stock should be licensed and chipped, since the purpose of that is to sell the animals which then becomes a business.
- I do not know
- I am opposed to the retail sale of dogs and cats. Exotic animals such as birds, reptiles and fish are hopefully regulated. If animals are sold, I expect their habitations to be inspected, and kept clean and safe. Adoptable animals available through pet supply stores should also be maintained in safe, clean environments.
- - do due diligence research to ensure purchaser has no record of animal abuse/unlawful breeding etc
 - ensure purchaser has enough information and resources to give proper care
 - ensure all animals they sell are legally and morally acquired
- All dogs and cats should be altered prior to sale if not a registered breeder. Sale of animals from puppy mills should be illegal. Hard to care for and exotic breeds should not be allowed in general pet stores. Pet stores should be encouraged to work with rescues for cats and dogs as opposed to breeders.
- Must be spayed/neutered before sale of the animal!!!
Not allowed to advertise on kijiji or fb marketplace.
Must be a registered business for selling animals.
Business must ask for prof of income to show new owner will be financially able to provide for a pet.
- Ban pet stores from selling dogs, cats, rabbits, any wild caught animal. The known history and health of the animal must be provided. There should be a health guarantee with full refund of the original cost of the animal, timeline will depend on the species, but should be at least a month. Should be ok for pet stores to display/advertise animals from registered rescue organizations.
- They must ensure a comfortable environment for animals while they get sold.
- Must be regulated and licenced by city.
- Must be at least 8 weeks old. should have a contract between buyer and seller to protect both parties - ex, health guarantee, non-breeding contract, etc.
- Pet stores or any retail should not sell live animals
- Up to date vaccinations
- Must come with a health certificate from a licensed vet
- Ensure that the animals are from a regulated and trusted breeder and not an animal mill
- Not sure.
- Spay and neuter all cats/dogs/livestock if not licenced breeder.
- I'm not sure.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Certified kennels. Spayed /neutered. No exotic pets. associated to a club/association as appropriate
- It is challenging to respond to this question because not all pet stores sell "puppy mills" while some "breeders" are borderline "puppy mills". Some rescue organizations act more as "businesses" and "sell" their animals in pet stores, and sometimes even "import" pets from other provinces or countries to keep selling pets. It's an area that would need its own set of Laws or ByLaws.
- Background checks of individuals to ensure no previous history of animal cruelty or abuse.
- MUST know the breeder and that the animals are well cared for!!
- Sale of animals only by licensed & registered rescue organizations or breeders - no retail sale by third parties (storefronts). Breeders must be regularly inspected and able to provide registration papers for all animals.
- I don't believe pets should be sold by pet stores, they lack the ability to ensure that they are going to a proper home. I would like to see a ban on the sale of rabbits, they are frequently adopted by people who do not understand them, or used as food. It leads to people believing they are disposable and they are frequently neglected. They have a lifespan of 8-10 years (not 2-3 years, if they die that young, it's probably the owner's fault due to neglect) and bond for life . They are often left neglected in cages that are too small.
- rescues only (people looking for bred animals should go to the breeders), all should be spayed/neutered prior to purchase
- That the animal is going to a good home. I think that the selling of purebred cats and dogs in pet stores should be banned as these animals often come from deplorable conditions.
- They should be a licenced breeder. Puppy mills owners should be fined.
- there SHOULD not be retail options dogs and cats to be purchased from a pet store. Rescues should ensure accurate records (vaccinations, spay, behaviour) should be issued at time of adoption. Ethical breeders should provide proper paperwork also
- extra fees for animals sold that can still reproduce, no fee for an animal sold that is spayed or neutered
- Retail sale of anything but fish should be restricted to licensed sellers or breeder representatives only. Sales in "pet stores" should be prohibited.
- we should be insuring a safe home, that they have the minimal assentials for the dog on purchase, spyeding is a good idea and if they want to breed prove they know how and have the ability to do so as a condo owner may not.
- 1. they must be well-kept, not crowded and must be exercised with comfortable beds and some stimuli. Their environment must be clean. Good food.
- License to sell animals so that buyers can see that they are not supporting puppy mills or backyard breeders.
- There should be regulations on this. There are far too many health problems that pets (esp dogs) that are bred develop.
- No puppy mills
- Licensed business that follows health and safety rules.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals must have their physical and emotional needs met. This means clean, comfortable areas in which to live, proper disease prevention precautions taken, social needs and training taken into consideration. Length of time where the animal is expected to live in a kennel. Contracts regarding the breeding or spaying/neutering of animals and the time frame in which they have to get it done. Homes and businesses should both be allowed to sell animals, but precautions should be taken that the animals are being raised and sold in an ethical manner. No puppy mills, hoarding situations or large scale operations (meaning 50+ animals on a property).
- That's a tough one. I don't think dogs or cats should be sold at pet stores. Any animal in a pet store should be kept in clean, humane conditions, properly fed and watered, etc.
- ALL animals should be spayed/neutered as a condition of sale. Vicious breeds limited or banned. All vaccines up to date and vet checks performed. Only the sale of rescues or animals from shelters.
- Slay and neuter as part of cost to purchase
- No retail sales should be allowed.
- Retail to include all Sales that involves the exchange of funds, this includes animal rescue. Follow health and sanitary rules . Animal must be produced in Canada (no imports) AND each animal licensed to business that is selling them, the transfer of license must be done by new owner... you can then track how many of these animals come into animal services. Should these animals that come into services will be charged a fee to the person selling the animal...
If the boogeyman is actually the sell of animals then make them pay for it.
- No selling in pet stores. All sold animals should be microchipped before going to the new home.
- all animals must be health tested. all business must be able to provide proof that the animals do not come from puppy mills or indiscriminate breeders.
- Pets should not be sold in pet stores, period.
Dog breeders should be more regulated (we bought our dog from a registered breeder and it was severely malnourished with multiple parasites at 7 weeks old)
Pet owner application should include an interview and vetting process, like the Humane Society does.
You should be required to take a course on dog ownership BEFORE you qualify to buy a dog
Individual sale of a dog should be mediated by the city or an agency
- Properly treated animals .
- Dogs should not be sold in pet stores.
- Proof of origin, full vet exam prior to purchase with all documentation on display for the public, no financing allowed, a waiting period to prevent impulse purchases, a moratorium on purchases in December (and leading up to Easter for rabbits)
- All animals sold in retail should be spayed or neutered. I also think there should be a limit to how many animals, such as birds and bunnies, can be sold at a time.
- Ethical sources
- Buy from a CKC breeder
- Spaying and neutering for sure should be done, no exotic animals,

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals should not be sold to minors, identification should be required to be shown when purchasing an animal to check against a list of people who have bans from the courts.
- That they are healthy, socialized and kept in a clean environment.
- Prefer dogs and cats NOT be sold in a pet store or business location. This removes accountability and first hand background on breeding, expected personality, capability and health. Instead, it promotes puppy mill activity and irresponsible backyard breeding in anonymity. Public education of responsible breeder practises vs irresponsible and unregulated breeding for profit would be a positive first step. If allowed to continue, retailers should be required to provide accurate documentation of origin of pets and access to those breeders. Humane care is of utmost importance and regulation is required. Exercise, nourishment, positive reinforcement training, affection, roomy enclosures and reduction of fear stimuli are the minimal requirements.
- safe storage and care
- I do not support the sale of dogs or cats from commercial retailers.
- Where it can be sold (not kijiji! or online ads!) pet stores or vets only - and they must be spayed or neutered by a professional --
- They don't come from puppy mills
- Ideally, no business should be selling animals - restrict the sale/adoption of animals to shelters, rescues, responsible breeders. Given current existence of pet stores:
 - Must adhere to the Five Freedoms. Should be subject to inspection by officers who can enact the APA. Must also divulge the source of their animal stock and those sources must also be subject to inspection.
 - All animals in their care must have health checks by a veterinarian. Must be vaccinated/dewormed (if appropriate), spayed/neutered (if appropriate), treated for any medical concerns and cannot be sold if these are not met.
 - If an animal is sold and turns out to be pregnant and had babies in new home (which has happened before!), the business MUST take the babies back if the owners request it (instead of forcing the owners to have to deal with rehoming the babies themselves).
 - Should accept any animals that a customer wants to return.
 - Store staff that are not licensed veterinary professionals CANNOT give veterinary advice to customers.
- Where animal can be sold and to have a license to breed and sell.
- knowledge of animal care, ability to teach customer. pets should be spayed/neutered/vaccinated, where applicable. instructions/references for customer for when the pet becomes applicable. adoption questionnaire.
- Application processes.
- The animals should be microchipped for ease of return if the animal becomes lost. Adequate food, water and clean shelter needs to be provided at all times.
- Humane and ethical treatment of all animals, no puppy mills.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Breeders' homes, etc. need to pass a strict inspection before they are allowed to sell to retailers (ie NO PUPPY MILLS, etc.). Breeders need to care well for their animals, too.
- The health of the animal, should be spayed/neutered, buyer must be required to license the animal
- All animals should be kept in sanitary and comfortable environments. When selling an animal one should ensure the purchaser has everything they need to care for it.
- The animals must originate from humane breeders. Vet checks are required before sale and reports provided to the purchaser
- To make sure/follow up that pets are spayed or neutered by a certain age or soon after reaching maturity. That people who sell pets are licensed to breed and sell animals.
- Too complex to answer. Puppy mills are evil.
- I think animals should only come from reputable sources. This includes small rodents and fish. We all know about puppy mills but I think these animals should never be bred and raised in bad conditions for profit.
- Animals must be spayed or neutered.
No killing or harming of animals.
They must provide information on proper care, licensing, etc.
Animals must be kept in a clean and appropriate environment for their size and health.
Infant animals should not be separated from their mothers until they are mature enough to be.
- Since retail sales of animals breed puppy mills, it should not be allowed
- Extremely important that the animals are kept in good condition. It is important to ensure that the business owners are not just focused on the money and cut corners. Also ensure the animals come from reputable breeding.
- Mandatory obedience training. Discounted fees (or free) for obedience training.
- Must be licensed and bonded and offer a money back guarantee if the animal becomes sick
- They should be spayed or neutered and sold in good health. As well, if vaccinations are required then they should also be done.
- Vet checks, certificate of health, spay neuter before going home
- I think it's important that a business that sells animals can ensure it came from a reputable source. Dogs from puppy mills are more likely to have behavioural issues which places an added burden on both citizens and the City/Shelters.
- The only issue with limiting the acquisition of pets is that it goes underground, which is harder to regulate. We need to look to best practice (for example, what does Humane Canada say about this?). Having worked in a pet store I know many people lack the knowledge to properly care for exotics, so perhaps those limitations.
- They come from a reputable breeder that is licensed and regulated.
- Verify that the pet is licensed and health checks including vaccinations are completed. The owners have completed mandatory training before buying a pet.
- rescue animals only for retail businesses.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- agriculture Canada , responsible breeders , this is a slippery slope I don't think the city needs to be involved in ... rehoming should be easier then it is ... EDUCATION on what and who to buy from should also be more available . responsible breeders are a good thing!!
- this is a very wide ranging topic, that would require much more space then this.
- Non-profit dog and cat adoption. There are similar bans in place in hundreds of other North American and European cities; Canadian cities that have a similar ban include Toronto, Vancouver, Ottawa, Mississauga, Burnaby, Westminster, among others. The reason that this ban is important is that pets sold in pet stores are sourced from puppy mills and irreputable commercial breeders where dogs and cats spend their entire lives in small wire cages, being bred over and over again, in filthy conditions, with no veterinary care and often in poor health. They have contact with humans and other dogs only for breeding and nursing purposes. They often have genetic disorders that are passed onto their puppies that are sold in pet stores and that owners only discover after they are attached to their new pet. As the many rescue groups in Calgary are aware, there is already an overpopulation of dogs and cats. Commercial breeding only adds to the problem.
- Please provide me with an email address where I can forward you a copy of PIJAC Canada's Best Management Practices for Pet Retail Establishments. The Best Management Practices (BMP) document outlines the principles that everyone involved in the keeping and selling of animals and fish, including through pet stores, must use to protect the welfare of the animals in their care.
[personal information removed]
- Regulating where an animal can be sold; whether an animal must be spayed or neutered; the type of animal that is sold, who is selling the animal.[IE - Registered, certified breeder,]
- Retail stores should only be able to have rescue/adoptable cats and dogs (from reputable rescues) in their stores!! No selling kittens or puppies from breeders!!
- No kijiji or online sales for any animal or living thing!!!
- it should be complex with safety and perpetual care of the animals.
- Supporting ethical breeders and rescues. No puppy/kitty mills. Clean bill of health.
- When sold they should inform animal services with the name of the new owner
- Humane conditions. Not cages and crowding
- Spay and neuter all animals to control the population and help regulate behavior. Animals that are being sold by breeders should require the breeder to provide proof of business and certificates of health by a registered vet.
- All animal's sold in retail stores should have reliable and vetted sources for all acquisitions. All animals sold should be coming from reputable sources to ensure that the pets are all of safely bred and raised stock. This should include veterinary inspection of breeding facilities and breeders.
- I think 100% of the animals should be spayed/neutered. Businesses should NEVER support puppy mills - adopt don't shop!
- The animal should be free of disease. the animal should not be an endangered species. The animal should not be vicious in that it is bred for fighting or killing. I dont think modifications are needed on Kijiji
- They should be guaranteed for good health



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Properly vaccinated and healthy animals be sold.
- I do not feel that individuals or businesses should be allowed to breed, sell, import, or resell any sentient being for financial gain.
- I only use rescues, I have no opinion on this
- I don't know.
- Ok if your talking pet stores selling animals yes.
If your talking responsible breeders and owners stay out of it. Hormone sparing surgeries done at appropriate ages and stages or at all is beyond the scope of the city.
- The health of the animal- early/young aged spay neuters be taken into account as damaging to growing animals and have this knowledge readily available along with alternate options (vasectomy and female equivalent. As well as the purpose of these animals in terms of working, sporting or others etc. taken into consideration.
Breeding licensing available online for all species of breeders around Calgary districts- easily able to register each animal to keep detailed records if so desired- but require ID number, gender and age for each animal.
- Certificate of health. Humane living quarters while waiting for sale. Include first year of licensing in the cost of purchasing the animal.
- No retail sale of animals. Especially rabbits.
- Unless you're a licensed, credible breeder, you should not be able to sell an animal FULL STOP.
The only way to ensure that animals have been properly cared for is to prevent backyard breeders and puppy mills from operating in our city. There should be extreme measures and home checks for licensed breeders, as well.
- I don't believe animals should be sold in pet stores for big profits, such as [personal information removed]. Breeders should be properly licensed and accredited.
- All animals are never ever to be sold in pet stores!
There are enough rescue places to get our pets and professional breeders for pure bred animals
We need to discourage puppy mills!
- Breeders must be licensed somehow to prevent irresponsible breeding. Pets to be spayed/neutered within a year unless a license/permit obtained. No removal of young before 8 weeks. Rules related to pen size and cleanliness in 'stores'. I wouldn't be impressed to se breed specific laws implemented!
- There should be a licenses to breed and sell ALL animals. Responsible pet owners spay and neuter their pets and should be enforced as ever way seen fit.
- Ethically sourced animals. Not from breeding mills. Affordable options for spaying and neutering to control populations
- They should check the microchip or license of the pet to make sure its actual owner has surrendered the pet for sale or shelter life, and contact them to be certain the animal wasn't taken by a family member and removed without owners consent or knowledge, and to make sure the animal wasn't stolen and sold.
- A thorough, expiring, health examination prior to entry



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Business license/permit

Quarantine period

- spay/neuter, and mandatory dog training
- I support restrictions on specific breeds based on statistically supported safety reasons.
- Highest regulations possible on all fronts!!!
- -business provide health care, vaccinations, food, water and shelter to animals
- -business have random check ups to ensure they are following the rules
- All of the above

Source

- 1 To have complete transparency about the animal with the interested party.
If they are not registered with CKC, and live Within the city limits. They should have to be registered with the city as a business.
- No mandatory rule for spaying/neutering (that's not the city's job), and wolfdogs should ONLY be bred/sold/bought by licensed wildlife owners.
- a thorough expiring health examination prior to entry
- business license/permit
- quarantine period
- I think retail sale of animals should involve rescue animals only (especially for cats and dogs) and should be checked regularly by the Humane Society or another authority to make sure animal welfare is a priority. There are too many homeless pets and breeding should not be a business.
- Animals SHOULD NOT be sold in retail locations and its unfortunate that they still are; animals should not be sold Kijiji or other site or "given away to good home for free"; its dangerous for the animals
- Regular health inspections. Vaccines records.
- There are too many mom/pop breeders of dogs/cats/rabbits who contribute to the overpopulation and unnecessary suffering of animals. Any breeder should be required to have a license. Suggest a higher fee & fines to discourage unnecessary breeding especially since our shelters are filled to capacity and healthy animals are being destroyed. This would also provide additional revenue for spay & neuter programs.
- Pets never sold in pet stores unless they are from a charity.
- I do not support pets being kept in small cages in pet stores, this should be eliminated. I would also rather support those people that are habitual breeders and have the laws, licensing and fines be applied to those people who are hoarders or are cruel.
- Humane operators that have sourced their animals through the appropriate methods and are reviewed by the city.
- Unsure
- Surprise City inspections of the premises & potentially places the animals come from.
- Business license/permit.
- Require health examinations by a licensed, practicing vet.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- NO PET STORE SALES of dogs/cats/mammals other than adoptions from rescue/SPCA. Spay/neuter is now somewhat controversial given cancer in dogs so I don't think you can insist on that. Also show dogs are never fixed. What about dogs who can't be fixed due to health issues? Keep it out of the conversation and deal with puppy mills, backyard breeders etc and leave rescues, SPCA, etc to monitor their animal placements by their standards. No one should be in the "business" of selling dogs/cats other than respected breeders, non profit rescue organizations, those involved in animal welfare.
- Dangerous breeds should be banned. The licensing fees should be tripled to discourage pet ownership in the first place. Licenses for rescued animals should be halved or waived for the first 2 years.
- Nothing the City needs to be involved in.
- Health and safety of the animals. No support for irresponsible breeders.
- ethical treatment of the animals is critical
- Animals must be spayed or neutered or included the spaying and neutering in adoption fee. The supply of animals must not come from a puppy mill or backyard breeder. Supply must come from registered breeders or preferably animal rescues/shelters only.
- Thorough, expiring, health exam prior to entry; Business license/permit; quarantine period
- Humane conditions. Verified humane sourcing of animals.
- No sale of exotic, restricted animals. Perhaps be open to return animals, refunding purchase on a sliding scale depending upon how long they have the pet. Hopefully to minimize simply dumping the animal out in the country somewhere.
- Businesses must be licensed to sell pets (not one off puppies); must be inspected annually to renew their licenses, have a police background check, no previous fines or infractions regarding pet ownership, must meeting financial solvency requirements to avoid poor treatment of animals because of financial hardships.
- Treatment of animals
Hygiene of facilities
- Puppy mills are a problem, but pet owners should be allowed to sell babies whether their production is accidental or intentional. No comment on how to regulate this.
- The retail sale of cats & dogs should remain prohibited. Large birds (macaws, cockatoos, etc.) should be banned from sale or commercial display.
- I don't think retail sale of dogs and cats should be allowed and dogs and cats should not be sold on kijiji. Any pets that are sold must be neutered or spayed.

Criteria for accepting imported animals in Calgary

- The usual, from outside Canada or areas of virus outbreak, blood checks, chipped, vaccinated.
- That imported animals meet health criteria and that exotic animals are strictly regulated.
- Tracibility to ensure the animals aren't stolen from another city and brought here to be sold to a new family.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If they have vaccination documentation and can cross the border, then the city must accept it at face value
- Stop accepting large quantities of rescue imports from random places.
- I'm afraid I'm not familiar enough with the current rules set fourth by the City and CBSA to comment.
- All required vaccinations. Mandatory quarantined period. And with thoughts around rescue groups which focus on high risk animals such as those from dog fighting rings a mandatory behavioural review from a trained expert.
- Needs to have all veterinary papers!
- I am actually horrified by the amount of animals that are imported illegally and without proper care. We have a crisis in this province and there is no shortage of animals for adoption locally or even within our own country. There should not be ANY reason to import dogs for adoption.
- I don't have much of information on this topic to provide my input.
- Humane care only. No endangered species or species that are not raised in captivity.
- Spayed/neutered, vaccinated, medical checkup and clean bill of health
- Health certification
- no ideas
- Health checks
- The animal was legally obtained, the animal can be appropriately cared for, the is just cause for importing the animal and not buying domestic.
- Why reinvent the wheel? Work with the animal rescue associations and CBSA
- Private individuals I have no problem with. I worry about the ethics of large scale rescue imports. There is no way to guarantee they are not importing from puppy mills or sick dogs.
- that they are spayed/neutered
- that they are vaccinated
- that the animals are free from disease
- Should not be accepted PERIOD.
- I have no idea.
- non exotic, proof that you want them as a pet. home inspection
- I do not have enough knowledge of this issue to offer an opinion.
- Stricter health checks by both importing and exporting countries and mandatory quarantine once arrived but with the individuals who brought them over.
- responsible sourcing
- NO puppy mill dogs
- Quarantine for a period of time. Same licensing as other animals. Must not be restricted or endangered or a nuisance to the environment if let loose.
- The animals need to be healthy, and have all vaccinations required in Calgary.
- None
- Only homeless animals imported by rescues, not organizations looking to make money on the sale of animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same as domestic - licensed, neutered/spayed and microchipped
- Quarantine and proof of health
- Mandatory week long quarantine where behaviour and health are monitored. Increased costs for multiple animals (not including adoption services).
- I can't comment as I don't know what type of animals are imported for commercial purposes.
- Unsure
- They must be thoroughly vetted prior to coming.
- No more than 3 animals imported per year for 'rescues', especially the backyard rescue businesses. Imported animals should be quarantined for 14 days to ensure they are not ill, and have recent vet check documents to show all vaccinations and a health check was done within 10 days of border crossing
- Why are we importing animals when we have plenty to rescue locally.
- They need to be more thoroughly screened. Imported dogs NEED to be tested for Brucellosis, heart worm and tick borne diseases. We do not need foreign diseases brought into this country.
- A quarantine period.
- Veterinary health certificate within 10 days of importation with appropriate vaccination records. A letter stating the reason for importation of these animals for sale which needs to be pre-approved prior to shipping.
- As above
- Imported animals should not be allowed at all. There are far too many cats/dogs etc looking for homes here.
- They should not be accepted. We have plenty of animals needing homes in Calgary and no need to bring in foreign pets with zoological diseases we do not have here
- No threatened species. Health inspection to pass and registration.
- High! Proper Health checks before sale! If fostered should be registered with city.
- spade / neuter of all pets being sold. History of the pet
- We should not import animals for sale. Rescue only
- Vaccinations
- There are so many dogs without homes available for adoption through the various rescues organizations right here in Calgary and Alberta, but they are mostly large breed. I think importing should be limited to fulfilling a need that we can't fill ourselves, like small breed dogs or non-shedding dogs
- I'm not qualified to answer this
- All animals imported must be in perfect health and have all vaccinations required and recommended by all relevant Canadian authorities *PRIOR TO IMPORT*
- Health check - not bringing in any hitchhiker critters, no pathogen that can be passed on
- Extensive health testing and quarantine for animals coming from unknown backgrounds.
- not sure what kind of commercial purposes you are talking about so can't comment. Provide a description or examples of what this means.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals imported should have to undergo a quarantine period and also have all necessary vaccines or titres.
- None. Why are we duplicating or adding layers of work already being done by Federal authorities?
- Import permits, CFIA import/export paperwork, health certificates, vaccine requirements
- The current CFIA regulations are more than adequate. Additional criteria and another level of governance should not be necessary
- Quarantine to verify animals are healthy for import
- I don't feel it is necessary to import animals.
- Importing animals for a commercial purpose should be VERY limited and for very specific needs. There also needs to be a strict quarantine for all imported animals.
- 1)At minimum they should be screened for all potential parasites and diseases from the exported country as well as a health assessment by a veterinarian within a few days of landing here.
2)Many other countries require a quarantine period, it would not be a bad idea
3)An import fee?
- health checks are completed.
- Must undergo quarantine to check for communicable diseases
- City of Calgary should not be involved in regulating the importation of animals. The CBSA needs to enact stricter rules to govern the mass importation of so called rescue dogs.
- Check what other, more developed and less archaic cities do in this regard. Calgary is so behind the times of protocols. There has to be a city on the planet that has mastered this issue. Some research would really help as the public probably isn't very well versed on this topic.
- They should be imported legally.
- Strict licensing requirements that involve spot inspections.
- Animals should be up to date on vax, med recs should be provided to the city. Rescues should be a reg business and be licensed to bring animals city. If they are investigated by CHS or do not follow protocols in places for safe transport or knowingly bring in sick animals, their license is revoked
- Mandatory quarantine. Assessment by a certified behaviourist prior to adopting out. Health check by veterinarian
- Are our pet shelters empty? Majority of dogs coming into the country are not properly vetted. Only dogs with proof of required vetting should be considered.
- None.
- Ensure the animals have up to date vaccinations and are healthy.
- I don't believe rescues should be importing animals from other countries to sell in Canada. It's risking the health of our own animals and stray animals here are not finding homes.
- - all vaccinations up to date
- animals should be spayed/neutered
- quarantine period
- Health checks upon arrival
- I don't believe we should be accepting imported animals. We have enough strays.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- fully vaccinated, free of parasites/bugs, in good health
- Dogs brought in as a personal pet or for an ethical breeding program - CBSA regs only. Importation of multiple dogs from USA / other countries as rescues - should be very limited and only under supervision of a vet with specific testing required appropriate to source, preferably not at all.
- Pet owner should be approved to ensure they can properly care for the imported animal.
- again, all animals must to be spayed/neutered as a condition of a sale including chipping the animal, unless they're for ethical breeding purposes but must be chipped as well, then they must have a license..
- Make sure they are properly vaccinated and quarantined.
- What are the conditions provided for the animal, are they adequate. Is the importer licenced via education to care for and have the required space/environment for the specific animal and amount of them.
- its not a city of calgary issue to get involved in. Federal only. CBSA has guidelines in place.
- Unsure.
- All must be examined by a veterinarian and quarantined for 14 days, two negative fecals, microchipped.
- Dogs should be below a certain weight so small in nature. There are many large dogs in Canada so import of small dogs is a different type of adopter. Dogs must not carry any blood born pathogens from ticks and this must be proven. Dogs must be sterilized prior to entry. Dogs must be rescue and have
- Health Certificate from liscenced veterinarian
- all dogs must have health clearance, dogs being brought in from other countries for rescue retail should not be allowed. There are enough stray dogs here.
- Animals brought in by "rescue" groups should be quarantined and testing repeated. There have been incidents of improper paperwork. Animals are bringing in diseases that ours have not been exposed to causing expensive vet visits and in some cases death. Have enough dogs here looking for homes.
- Mandatory spay and neuter
- NA
- We have military dogs being adopted, strays, disaster area animals needing homes. Rare dogs, show dogs ,new blood for breeding healthy dogs.I am still looking for a Bitch for my guy but She May need to come from Italy.
- Vaccinations current.
- I believe that as long as the animal has been checked by a Calgary Vet, in good standing, and has all required shots, it should be acceptable.
- Rescue animals from other countries should be restricted. A full health check and quarantine period should be required. There have been too many new viruses and infestations of new parasites introduced by the "do-goodness" bringing in street dogs and cats from other countries.
- Vaccinated and vet checked. No exotic species.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Only from reputable breeders. Imported strays only bring in diseases (dogs from Mexico). No imported livestock.
- Is the animal appropriate for urban living? Is it a danger if it escapes?
- Have to provide vet care provided upon arriving by a DVM in yyc.
Have to ALTER animals before reselling
Have business license that has to report all animals coming in, medical records and who they are being sold too
Prefer it be ILLEGAL to import to sell animals in yyc.
- They should require veterinary medical clearance to indicate they are healthy for import; and the receiver should have adequate facilities to house the animal(s). Importers should be encouraged to implement a 2-week quarantine for newly imported animals before exposing to other animals.
- That they have been vetted properly for health related illnesses that could be passed onto other pets. Should be required to be vet checked upon arrival.
- Dogs and cats should not be imported, there is more than enough in the shelters,
- Observing relevant quarantine periods.
- That they cannot push out natural wildlife. Should be natural to the area only. Ie: like what is happening in Florida with snakes.
- Accurate info on animals history, breed, medical info. Humane transport
- Top quality breeders, especially those in the US and Europe are hardly a problem, and many people in Calgary import high end show/performance dogs from other countries. Imported dogs/puppies from rescue organizations and low quality breeders are a very serious biosecurity problem.
- I feel like home quarantine is suffice. As long as they have all shots and paperwork.
- Any dog that comes into our Province or into Canada must have its full set of vaccinations. As well it must have passed certain help test for diseases like brucellosis heartworm and other diseases that can be passed on 2 the animals or wildlife in the city or country wherever they end up going.
- Don't bring in what we have enough of. Why import strays from other countries when we have plenty here. It only invites disease and over population.
- Quarantine for animals that are coming from an unknown background (most rescues).
- Quarantine and proof of all applicable tests being clear before being released for sale. Desexed
- Health check. Background information from where the animal came from. License/certified.
- Same as above.
- The animals should have to pass a physical examination before being given to the owner, multiple sick animals from the same importer should cause the importer to be flagged and fined.
- Vaccinations up to date, not a threat to humans or environment then all should be good
- The same as customs uses.
- I have concerns about imported animals introducing diseases that are not in the local population. I believe that it would be to Canada's benefit to a quarantine just like the UK does.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Health clearances. If they are coming from a reputable breeder they will have health clearances. The animals that are coming from out of country rescues...We have so many animals in need here...why do you need to bring in more.
- Ensure the animals are healthy and not bringing in diseases or parasites.
- Health of the animal is critical.
- Mandatory Quarantine
 - Mandatory behavioural inspection
 - Mandatory vet exam upon arrival and exit from quarantine
- If they could cause public harm if released
- UTD on vaccines. Quarantine if from out of Canada or USA for a certain amount of time. Heart work testing etc.
- The animals must pass a physical exam by a veterinarian, they must be up to date on their vaccines, and they must be in good health
- We should not be importing outside of Alberta/ Canada
- Confirmation of animal health; possible quarantine for a specified period if appropriate but not mandatory if not required; registration of importer and/or the pet where appropriate, especially for commercial purposes; adherence to banned animal transport
- If Similar animals are in local shelters, they should not be allowed
- This should not be allowed if it is for commercial purposes. It is different for nonprofits that have a mandate to rescue pets, but commercial businesses should NOT be allowed.
- Veterinary, we should be able to trace where to dogs are coming from to ensure that we are not importing dogs that are not reputedly bred or unethical rescues.
- No problem if the animal has appropriate health and medical documentation.
- No diseases, vet clearance at source, not pregnant, for canadian sources, and canada regs for foreign imports, micro-chipped
- If we already have them in shelters they shouldn't be allowed. We need to take care of our own first.
- I believe imported animals should be healthy so not to spread diseases. Upon arrival they should have an examination and be vaccinated.
- Imported species must be protected and their health and welfare regarded throughout their lifespan. So many have miserable lives. While one may not own local wild animals, why are we allowed to own imported wild animals?
- There are enough animals that need to be adopted here, so no reason to import any.
- Importing dogs can be important for breeding as it prevents inbreeding.
- Full vet check and behavioural assessment before being allowed to be adopted out. They should also be quarantined for a minimum amount of time to help prevent the spread of diseases not normally found in Canada.
- Approved health check of animal
- Customs should be the only one authority to refuse pets into the country. The only priority should be vaccines and having animals fixed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- need to know where they were from, any health risks associated with those areas, go under appropriate health assessments and vaccinations
- I think that the number of adoptable animals in the city should be considered before will allow large numbers of outsiders in ... maybe help and clean up our back yard first
- Must be registered with a reputable kennel club.
- Much stricter health testing for rescue animals & the animals should be quarantined on arrival . Paperwork should be checked for all animals crossing the border.
- Vet visit and if old enough shots before import
- Wellness checks.
- Use the same criteria as Canada Border Services, animals deemed to be potentially dangerous, need to be more scrutinized by the City Of Calgary, other wise the care and well being of the animal should be front and foremost , and the City of Calgary should make sure that this is taking place .
- Same as any new owner .Vet check
- immunized, clean spayed etc
- Proper medical inspection including vaccination as required in the province.
- I don't think cats dogs are rabbits should be imported into Calgary. Alberta has a huge animal overpopulation problem and this only makes it worse.
- Not for resale for a profit...we have enough animals here that need adopting because of irresponsible owners
- Make sure they are healthy and have all the shots.
- Quarantine. Imported animals are bringing diseases our country does not have vaccinations for. Imported animals should pay import fees and charges
- Animals are disease-free. It seems to me there are enough animals in need here already without importing more to "rescue" or sell.
- Don't feel it should be allowed.
- I think Canada Border Services does the job of ensuring animals are safe to enter Canada. It is quite costly to rescue and import an animal, and it would be a shame to prevent rescue organizations to be under any further financial burden.
- I don't think we should allow imported animals. They could bring disease to other animals or people. There are so many animals in Alberta that need help, I don't agree we should import them from other provinces/countries
- 30 day quarantine to their home premises and especially kept out of off leash dog parks until they can bond with their new owners (too many get away in first few days) and this gives time to ensure they are not brewing a disease (perhaps our local animals have no resistance to)and time for training
- Ensure vaccinations and disease free (by vet certification) before roaming in Calgary! and no dangerous breeds(pitbulls). Adopters must attend training classes.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't believe we should accept imported animals unless they originally left the country with owner and are returning.
- Don't agree unless shelters are empty
- Licensing, chip and transfer of chip. Proof of All shots / immunizations.
- I am concerned by the number of animals being imported by rescue groups, without always having Health requirements, or having improper or forged documents. I believe if a rescue group is importing more than a couple dogs for personal use that they should be in some form of quarantine upon arrival.
- Full medical check, shots and vaccines appropriate for our area.
- They should have to be neutered or spayed and have all their required shots and it should only be legitimate rescue groups that are allowed to bring in dogs.
- Rescues importing from out of country **SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED!!**
When our shelters/rescues have no more dogs/cats....then we can revisit importing from other countries.
- There is no need to import animals.
- Health certification by a licensed vet.
- Proper licensing and vaccinations
- Health and welfare of the animals
- I don't think it's a bad thing to help animals from other countries find homes.
- That they are free of disease.
- Immediately vet checked, all vaccinations up to date with proof, homes already in place
- Individuals importing animals to own as pets or for specific show/purebred breeding but some rescues are importing animals and no proper vetting is being done which brings in new diseases. Reputable rescues local are rescuing here. Reputable breeders are responsibly for the life of animals.
- These people can't find a rescue dog closer to home. I know of a couple who winter in Mexico every year then return to Calgary with rescue dogs. They get a tax write off on their vaca because of the rescues.
- Testing public behaviour or 'good citizen' licensing. Strict Immunization standards be met.
- How were the animals obtained and how will they be kept.
- They need to show both medical and behavioural clearances
- There are already federal regulations
- There should be proper paperwork but also proper vetting to Ensure that the animals are not bringing in unwanted diseases
- Licensed business/not for profit. Registered, all animals vetted both sides. Many "rescues" are popping up claiming to be not for profit and "adopting" out animals they claim to be checked that are not and charge "donation"



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Only animals which pose no threat to our environment or safety and are not available in Canada should be allowed to come into Canada. Must have special exemption status to overrule this and indicate why needed.
- We should not be importing rescue animals when there are rescue animals available across Canada.
- Proof that it was humanely acquired. Vet checks and vaccinations
- They should be 100% healthy and come with a certificate that they are coming from a reputable rescue. Too many animal (dog) brokers out there selling sick pets that are all coming from puppy mills
- Protect our citizens from disease and attacks
- I'm not aware of any additional criteria being needed (not sure current requirements aren't enough).
- So many animals need rescuing in this city. Let's focus on that. I don't understand importing animals and the cost when we have so much work to do here.
- Unsure
- Not for profit
- Animal welfare during transport and sale is assured.
- Mandatory spay/neuter, mandatory permanent identification, current health check and vaccines
- Zero import.
- No rabies
- Animals must not have a history of aggression.
This is a city, farm and other wild animals should not be kept as domesticated pets
- Rescues SELL dogs and should require trained staff and a business license. They should be forced to keep all imported animals in quarantine for at least 21 days. Some rescued dog have brought diseases and parasites to our city which we do not generally see in our area.
- No imported animals from outside Canada - we have no idea what diseases etc they bring in
- Provide proper education of the animals being imported
- That they are disease free however I believe it should be a relatively easy process
- Veterinary health inspection completed with requirement to pay for any treatment/care for any diagnosed conditions, or euthanasia.
- No exotic animals
- Canine good citizen testing...lots of dogs being imported from places where those dogs are not exposed to humans and yet adopted by families. Adopting a meat market dog from Korea will tug at heart strings but it's basically a feral dog. Health testing for diseases we do not have in Calgary
- Nothing should be changed. No fees should be charged. Calgary has a lack of small dogs and rescues bringing dogs and cats from over populated areas spaces lives. Dont make it more difficult then it has to be. As long as the dogs and cats meet health standards, then that's all the criteria.
- Animals must be healthy, have shots
- Nothing Canada does a good job
- Healthy animals obtained legally



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No animals should be imported. We have far too many in shelters and stray already.
- Require appropriate medical clearance and care. Require vaccines, spay or neuter
- Rescues!
- registered purebreds with health certificates should have no new restrictions. For animals brought in by rescues or 3 or more at a time should have to have a health certificate from export, PLUS inspections at a Calgary vet and quarantine for 4 weeks before homing AND rabies vacc +30 days
- 14 day assessment period in shelter or in a foster home before adopting out. This is considered the bare minimum to perform a behaviour assessment on an animal with an unknown or limited history. 30 days is considered ideal.
- I'd leave this to actual health experts to figure out.
- Imported animals should be banned if animal rescue and civic impound facilities are over utilized.
- They should follow quarantine procedures...if they are found to be contagious then fine the companies
- A full vet work up and clean bill of health
History of the animal (used in dog fighting etc)
- Tested, spayed or neutered by the rescue or business importing them. Socialization and proof of medical records to the correct authorities to ensure all protocols are done correctly before adopting out or selling animals.
- Vet inspected /checked/ quarantined before acceptable for adoption
- we have enough animals here that need homes. I'm not saying imported dogs don't need home just that we need to find loving homes for the ones here first. They need to be heavily screened and vaccinated for diseases!! Unfortunately other countries have diseases we don't have or want here.
- Health and disease
- Health (not carrying disease), number if animals
- Fully vaccinated and must not be aggressive.
- Behaviour assessments by qualified animal behaviorists.
- Type of animal - not an endangered species or competitive species to our natural ecosystem.
- Considered non-invasive, pose no threat to the local ecosystem
- Their shots need to be up to date and make sure their healthy
- Ensuring the owner is verified and the animal is healthy.
- The City does not have jurisdiction to regulate personal property (pets) that are imported into Canada (or Calgary) The Province has jurisdiction over personal property ownership rights; and the CFIA sets the regulations for import of animals. The City has no jurisdiction in this matter.
- I think they should have to have a full vet clearance from a vet in Calgary. People have been importing sick dogs that have supposedly been vet cleared. This is unfair to the new owners to have to pay for a sick dog.
- No idea.
- Just health regulations. When they are being rescued through a rescue agency they should receive help not hinderances



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Health of the animal and procedures to ensure its welfare
- Proof of health testing and to be disease free.
- Mandatory quarantine to insure the animals are not currently sick. All vaccinations must be up to date.
- They should not be accepted into Canada ...?
- rescues should not be allowed to import any animals from another province without health clearances to ensure health of local animals. not allowing the resale of rescues from other countries
- Require health and rabies certificates.
- That they have all shots that we give our dogs and cats here in Canada and they have a health clearance from a vet.
- Honestly, if it is legal, and the business is capable of handling them, there should be no further criteria.
- Spay and neuter, vaccines, placement into rescue or homes
- Quarantined for a minimum period of time to ensure they are disease free. If Calgary has animals available then rescues should be prohibited until they are looked after first. So stupid to feed the foreign rescue market
- Health and trade should be overseen by city
- I don't think we should import animals for adoption as we have enough that need homes here. they also bring new diseases from different climates.
- Health assessment by veterinarian, up to date vaccinations.
- Ban and consider illegal. High fines and or jail time for possession of exotics without proper papers or authorization. We should NOT accept imported pets..Rehabilitate exotic or wild animals at recognized specialty facilities with the expectation of re release to the wild or natural habitat
- Fully quarantined for a period of time.
- A lot of these are coming through for adoption and I don't believe a number of places are doing their due diligence before adopting them out, ej rescue, for example. There needs to be stricter rules in place for the adoption agencies
- They are animals that are acclimated to the climate they are coming to. That they are not endangered, dangerous, background on where they are from, truly why they have to be here AND that the same animal could not be adopted here (ie/ we have dogs here, why bring them from Mexico).
- They cannot be on the Endangered Species list. They must be transported responsibly. This includes cattle, pigs, chickens. They must not be electrocuted, punched, kicked, etc. or be abused emotionally or physically during transport. They must be comfortable. They must not be pregnant , nor deformed.
- Non profit rescues ONLY
- Quarantine period, extensive health testing to ensure they are not bringing parasites that infect other dogs in Calgary or humans! limited numbers, this has become a boutique thing and businesses are pretending to be rescues.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not carrying diseases
- The animal should undergo several tests such as behavioural tests and disease tests.
- Unsure/haven't done enough research on this
- No out of country animals - NONE. Thorough & complete history of animal (temperment, etc.) Up to date vaccinations & accurate health record.
- That they are healthy, not dangerous, and the owner can care for them. However it should not be the cities job to determine this.
- 1. Imported animals should be able to survive in a northern climate. 2. Imported animals should face a one time licensing fee to register the animals with the City.
- Proper vaccines and holding times before released but we are seeing diseases in Calgary not native to our area due to imports and that is beyond brutal.
- health checks/shots and quarantine for a period of time
- Keep records of the animals to avoid issues and deal with them as soon as they arise
- not sure
- Animals must get a certified medical exam from a veterinarian and have a identification chip.
- I love dogs but I am not sure this is always in their best interest. Some of these adoption agencies charge ridiculous fees and you know that they are about profit, not compassion. Perhaps a dog should be pre-adopted and certified as friendly and healthy before bringing them in.
- Depending on where they are coming from a 30 day quarantine
- Whomever does the importing should be responsible for the costs associated to ensure the animal meets all the regulations the City has in place. Including health, neutering and viciousness.
- Health and temperament assessments, along with strict isolation and quarantine until all clearances and treatments are complete. Limiting the amount of amount of animals imported yearly. Would also be good idea. Reasoning is these animals also import their respective countries diseases to ours!
- I'm fine with rescue animals, but there's no way purebred animals from outside Canada should be allowed. Only exception is if someone is a professional "shower" and wants to improve the bloodline. For that to apply, some kind of proof should be required.
- Until all Canadian shelters and rescues are empty, we should not be permitting the importation of pets for sale.
If you wish to permit this, there should be serious overhaul to the current standards and guidelines.
- Certified healthy by a vet.
- Seems to be working fine as is.
- This should not be allowed.
- Do not allow any animal as noted on the at risk, or endangered list as per CITIES.
- they should go into quarantine and have testing done based on the part of the world they are coming from. High risk = longer quarantine and more testing.
- Dogs should be on quarantine for 30 days in a home.
- NA



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't have enough information about this. However, I would assume that the Canadian border services agency would have stricter guidelines/rules than Calgary would/should
- Certification of good health from a vet
- Imported animals need to be quarantined for a minimum of two weeks and examined by a Calgary or Alberta veterinarian before being exposed to the public or other animals.
- Recheck immediately by a qualified Veterinarian and tested for diseases (ie heartworm, anaplasma, ehrlichia, distemper, parvo, demodex, the list goes on and on). Quarantine for x number days for things reportable like Canine Flu. Limit the # of imported animals. Focus on local rescue.
- Vet checked for health. Home quarantine for vet specified amount of time.
- I didn't read ahead from the last question where I brought this up. I am not in support of any importing of foreign street rescue animals into Canada, let alone the city itself.
- A thorough health exam, a quarantine period, medical history, behavioural history
- Consultation with bylaw about numbers and viability. Profit should never be a consideration.
- We have enough animals at the SPCA that we should not be allowing pets to be imported to Calgary.
- Vet checked. Spay or neutered.
- This should be limited if not stopped. We have enough animals in Canada that need adopting
- Should not be allowed.
- I am not qualified to answer this question
- **ABSOLUTELY NO IMPORTED ANIMALS FOR SALE.** This is animal trafficking and it should be illegal.
- Ensure they are checked over by a vet. Also ensure the paperwork from where they are coming is legal and checked out, along with whoever is on this end to accept the animals. Again, checking paperwork, permits, etc, so that they don't go into a puppy mill/back yard breeding situation.
- They must be sourced ethically as in not trafficked from the wild. I don't know why you would import animals when there are enough to adopt here already.
- Same as the border services - I believe in rescues and ensuring they get a great home.
- restrict countries of origin to countries we regularly work with; limit the numbers that can be brought in; preference to animals from the United States
- I believe we have enough dogs for adoption in Calgary and area that we shouldn't have to import from other countries.
- There are enough animals requiring homes in Canada without importing them. No animals should be imported for commercial purposes.
- Quarantine till deemed safe
- Healthy animals ONLY...
- Any animal that is imported to Calgary should be thoroughly inspected to ensure they have no diseases and are clean and safe
- For what end use is the animal to be imported



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Providing care of the animal before, after and during transport. Ensuring responsible breeding practices in the country of origin.
 - Calgary should not allow the import of Rescue animals that come to the city to be sold for profit.
 - Animals for adoptions should NOT be considered commercial goods - they are being rescued from horrible situations to become a part of someone's family by not for profit organizations. This is not "commerce" - adoption fees go towards the animals medical expenses, and they are spayed and neutered.
 - I don't think we should be bringing in dogs from other countries, too many parasites and health issues we may not know of. We have lots of homeless animals here in Canada, we certainly don't need any more. Special exemptions could be made for breeders or businesses.
 - Stop accepting dogs/cats for adoption from other countries - this should be at the provincial level. There are already enough unwanted pets from within the city and area to deal with that we don't need to be bringing them in by the plane.
 - Avoiding importing animals where there's a risk of them becoming an invasive species, and certainly any controlled (endangered or at risk) animals. Also adequate controls over disease spread.
 - % of surrendered animals already in Calgary requiring care
 - Do not import pets like dogs & cats!
 - Imported animals should not be available for sale. We have plenty of local animals in need.
 - Full testing and vaccination be done and cleared before entering city at owner expense. Should limit the import of animals as it just promotes more backyard breeding and stresses animals out being transported and uprooted to diff environments
 - None in addition to what the CBSA already does - this is not an area the City needs to be involved in, any more than the import of other commercial goods.
 - Healthy pets
 - All animals should be spayed or neutered. I believe the city should not be allowing the import of "rescue animals" when local shelters already have available animals.
 - I do not have an opinion
 - Up to date vaccinations and proper health unless going to a rescue intending on recovery and care.
 - I'm not sure
 - Animals should have up to date immunizations and be spay and neutered.
 - As long as its shots, etc., are up to date and its not inherently dangerous to our ecosystem, let them bring them in.
 - Free of disease.
 - These organizations need to be governed for pet population as well to only be allowed to important healthy animals.
- A Certified trainer or facility should be available to allow new adoptees the ability to train these animals or offer advice to new owners .



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't think the city can have much of a role aside from what the CBSA regulates .They set the standards and conditions so as long as those are being met I feel there is not role that city needs to play.
- Testing for infectious/communicable disease
- The city should ban the import of animals for pets from other countries. We have more than enough animals for pets available at our local shelters that demand dictates. Every animals brought in just adds costs to our already over supply of animals for pets.
- Checking vaccinations and health history
- For international arrivals, pre-licencing, proof of ongoing/regular vaccination (after the importation), mandatory spaying and neutering unless the importer is a registered AKC breeder in good standing.
- The provincial and federal legislation about permitted animals. City should have no role in this as it is already complicated enough to read the federal regulations and the provincial Act. City should take no action in this area.
- Must be in good health, fully vaccinated with no communicable diseases and undergo a reasonable quarantine period to ensure their is no parasite or disease incubating.
- Were the animals legally and ethically obtained.
- No crazy pets, kangaroos, chimps or exotic animals without a personal training license.
- no opinion
- For personal use only, rescues shouldn't be allowed to import animals. Introduces zoonotic diseases we have never seen here before!!!
- Local rescues should have priority over imported rescues. Quarantines need to be enforced, vaccination, spay/neuter etc.
- No trade or traffic in wildlife. No sourcing animals from mills. Source of the animal must be accredited (rescue facilitators included) and meet every standard for the physical and mental health of the animal.
- We should limit import of animals. Exotic animals that are not from our climate are unlikely too thrive here and animals from other countries "for adoption" are often street animals - how are we to knows their health and temperament before they arrive?
- good behaviour up to date on vaccinations
- They are have a proper health screen, they have all current vaccinations
They are able to be rehabilitated
They are spayed/neutered
- none. the owner and animal, as you just stated, have already been through a process to get here, why is the City always adding red tape and trying to be a control freak?
- Proof they were obtained from a responsible breeder or rescue organization
- A medical check to ensure good heath and the pets needs can be met while living within Calgary.
- Health checks by a qualified veterinarian
- Ensuring their health is up-to-date and they are registered and spayed/neutered.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Don't accept any foreign animals. We have plenty of our own. Have you ever seen how many animals are in shelters as it is? Rescue animals from local shelters first!!! Flying animals here is stupid!!
- Any commercial animals coming from outside of the country should be quarantined. We are receiving dogs in Canada that are spreading diseases that are not common in Calgary or Canada & our dogs are getting sick. Like canine influenza.
- I don't understand why they would be imported commercially for sale, they should only allow adoptions for regulated fees. For adoption, the animals should be spayed/neutered and have appropriate paperwork from a veterinarian stating good health.
- Animals should be treated by vet to ensure health, receive proper vaccinations, be spayed neutered, evaluated for behaviour, require new owner to license
- Ensure all paperwork is in order.
- Yes.
- That there is already an adoptee in place to provide the forever home. That there is little chance of the animal getting adopted where it was found.
- Animals imported for rescue should be spayed or neutered to minimize diseases such as brucellosis from being transmitted. Must be examined by a local vet to ensure healthy upon arrival to Calgary as when they come under the pretense of rescue many of them don't come as commercial imports.
- They should be immediately have a wellness exam in order to determine if they have any illnesses (especially those that would require a quarantine)
- Health certificates - my believe we are allowing rescue dogs/cats in from countries and they are bringing diseases with them
- Do they need to be quarantined? Is this the best thing for the animal? Couldn't they be adopted out closer to where they originated..
- Complete medical check. history if available. All vaccinations up to date. Spayed or neutered
- I strongly disagree with the importation of animals. Until there are tougher entry requirements to protect current animals from invading diseases and more humane transport requirements, i am strongly opposed to imported animals
- veterinary health certificate to assure vaccinations and no importation of dangerous diseases
- I do not believe we should import rescue animals at all, individual animals imported should follow the health regulations
- I don't believe you should import animals for commercial purposes. This is how new diseases and parasites are introduced to the area. There are already enough animals in the province that need homes.
- Much stricter testing and quarantine for tick borne diseases and heart worm. Quarantine animals that do not have proof of vaccination (rabies as well as distemper, parvo and others depending on the country of import).
- Animals have been health checked prior to entry, animals are licensed



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Much more rules on proper deworming protocols, and the animals should be tested for disease or parasites. I personally do not believe animals should be imported for commercial use, adoption or selling them. Their health and parasites are a danger to our local population.
- The safety of the animal. *IF* that animal gets free how likely is it that it will reproduce and cause problems in our wild spaces.
- The importing agency should be responsible for all costs. The animals need to be kept in proper environments and be well looked after.
- current shelter capacity rates at both the humane society and bylaw
- Unsure
- The city seems to have the misconception that imported dogs are feral and have behaviour issues (have been told this directly by a bylaw employee). This is false. ALL dogs are prone to behaviour issues should genetics and/or their environment fail them. Such ignorance is damaging.
- Don't know. I defer to people who do think about this seriously to make appropriate decisions. I can tell you though, that EXPORT of animals (horses or any other livestock) for meat is something that Calgary should make difficult. Conditions under which these animals are transported = deplorable
- Only licensed rescues should be permitted to import dogs/cats for adoption. Other buyers should be limited to number of dogs/cats they can bring in each year. Those animals should be purebred.
- A reasonable quarantine time is put in place before animal can be sent/posted for adoption/resale.
- Business that are importing animals for adoption should not be supported.
- Behaviour checks, no aggressive animals
- Quarantine for a period of time, vaccinations equivalent to Canada minimum for dog or cat
- Potential danger to people and pets already in the city. Potential for smell and noise that would affect others living in the immediate area.
- The animals must not be already for sale in Canada. It's just like immigration. You can't hire someone from abroad if there are capable workers here in Canada. Canadian business first
- Veterinarian and vaccination info, source of the animal, age and breed, dam and sire info
- So long as it does not have a negative affect on the rescue animals brought in out of country, I have no opinion.
- Commercially importing animals is a business. They must be quarantined, vet/health checked at Canadian standards for foreign disease at the expense of the rescue/business. Limit the overall annual number of animals accepted. As above, the business should be permitted and accept returned animals.
- Health checks.
- They cannot be a threat to our community.
- As above
- Rescued animals should be a priority over breeders.
- The guidelines regulated by Canada Border Services Agency. No need to duplicate. CUT COSTS!
- health and safety of the incoming animals. adequate new home supports available for the incoming animals.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Absolute proof that any animal imported is not from an animal mill, and has not been acquired through any illegal pet trade. It's a fact that the illegal pet trade produces laundered documents in an attempt to hide the true origin of animals, including dogs and cats, but especially exotic animals.
- No animals should be pets that are endangered. No dangerous animals that are wild like hippos lions, leopards.. etc. Ones that is they escape will not disrupt the eco system
- Same criteria as that of Canada Border Services
- We have plenty of animals here needing adoption, why are we importing other countries' problems? The lack of verifiable records on these animals is a problem.
- They should not be accepted to protect people from deadly viruses. It is not needed....It cannot be monitored properly. There are enough abused animals without importing more.
- N/A
- I do not believe animals should be imported until such a time that the local animal shelters no longer have homeless animals awaiting adoption.
- Has been checked by a qualified vet.
- Quarantine and valid vet checks. Must come from a reputable company. NO illegal imports of endangered animals, or prohibited animals
- Just to ensure the animal is either in good health or has prepaid insurance, and that they be licensed by the rescue or company as necessary.
- Must be rendered incapable of breeding
- Animal is healthy
- Imported animals should be reasonably healthy as specified by a full veterinary exam, no pitbulls should be imported, animals must provide proof they have never been aggressive toward other animals or humans.
- Animals must be healthy and well-cared for
- Proof of immunizations and the general health of the animal.
- Waivers for pet rescue organizations
- Quarantine period
Vaccines, spay/neuter
No invasive species
- Disease screening for zoonotic diseases from other countries
- Whatever the Border Agency deems rules and regulations need to be followed.
- THESE ANIMALS SHOULD BE UNDER QUARITINE TO MAKE SURE THEY ARE NOT CARRYING ANY DISEASES. THERE ARE MORE THAN ENOUGH ANIMALS HERE THAT NEED ADPOTING SO WHY DO WE NEED ANY IMPORTED AT ALL. AS THESE ANIMALS MOST LIKELY CAME FROM PUPPY MILLS
- Do we have a population of said animals here who need adoption already? If so, more stringent importation requirements for permits.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Importing animals should only be acceptable if there is an owner already for it. So a bill of sale to allow that animal to be imported. For pet stores, there should be a limit of number of animals imported.
- Exotic animals should not be imported for sale/adoption. Domestic animals should be quarantined for an appropriate number of days and all vaccines should be in place prior to coming into Canada.
- Vaccinated and healthy
- The status of the species in their country of origin. Not to support catching the wild animals from natural habitats in order to be sold abroad! That fuels animal poaching and extinction of species.
- **ABSOLUTELY NO IMPORTATION OF ANIMALS.**
The only type of animal importation should be animal rescue which provides Calgarians with a variety of dogs that are often not available here (ex. small dog imports from California via rescue). Albertan animals should be prioritized however.
- Making sure the animal is not carrying diseases unknown to the country and clean bill of health.
- I don't know what the current criteria is, but I believe that they should be healthy first and foremost, for the protection of the pets already living within Calgary.
- None. It is regulated enough by CBSA.
- Health certificates
- Must have provenance - no puppy mills, avoid stolen animals. No diseases and must be checked by a vet. Spay and neuter except if imported for breeding or showing.
- Local feral animals should be considered first. If people bring other animals into the country they should be licensed, and the animal checked for disease before entering the country.
- Proof of origin, history of the animal, ethical sourcing (no wild harvest, no "puppy mills"), health / vaccinations records
- Dangerous, invasive, exotic, infectious, endangered, inappropriate (elephant, bison), correct environment
- Limit on exotic animals able to be imported. And bans on the sale of animals considered endangered or at risk for endangerment.
- The same criteria required federally should be required municipally
- Health checks and make sure they are not being used illegally or for a mill type situation.
- Healthy dogs with all vaccines done.
- as long as they are healthy they should be allowed.
- Health check, consider quarantine.
- Ensuring the animal has been sourced ethically, and that it is not a threatened, endangered, or at risk species.
- They should be spayed or neutered. A health check and blood work done. A microchip implanted and registered to the new owner.
- The animal should be spayed/neutered, and the animal should be fully vaccinated. IN the case of exotic animals, the owner should agree to random spot checks, to ensure they don't release the animal into the wild if they get bored of it.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Documentation of health of animal.
- Checks for disease/parasites etc that may be introduced to the area that were not otherwise present.
- Calgary, nor any other Canadian jurisdiction, shouldn't be importing strays. There are enough strays already.
- Imported to or from a breeder.
- Absolute health and temperament guaranteed to person purchasing animal. Again full refund of animal price for sickness that animal had at time of sale or bad temperament
- Approval
- Licensed to import animals, or a permit. Imported animal is registered and inspected by a reputable veterinarian.
- N/A
- Same as Canadian Border Services. That they be healthy and vaccinated.
- Be sure animals are vaccinated/healthy before being given to owners.
- -we should only be accepting adoptable animals. We should be discouraging animal breeding
- Quarantine upon arrival. We are bringing in diseases from other countries
- I do not see the need to change anything at the moment other than importing rescue dogs and cats or other pets should be forbidden. There are enough pets in this province to save first before looking in other jurisdiction
- Nothing endangered!! Safe healthy conditions for animals before and after sale.
- imported animals should be for adoption only
- Again, reputable businesses only.
- if they go to a shelter then those shelters should be licensed, inspected and regulated. The fair and compassionate treatment of all animals must be paramount. They should all pass vet checks and ensure they are healthy and not able to spread disease.
- Rabies and a health certificate. I run a dog rescue there are more health concerns with dogs coming from the reservations in terms of diseases.
- I don't know
- Health check
- Need to pass health check to ensure free of diseases, up to date on vaccinations and licensed to enter city.
- No exotic animals
- Pets should not be imported for commercial sale. There are more than enough pets available in Canada for this purpose. Importing for adoption should be limited to places like Maui Humane Society, which doesn't have an adequate local population to support all their adoption needs.
- health inspection, homing/environment where the pet will reside.
- Please lower the wait time to receive an animal that is a family pet as it is frustrating and anxiety provoking for the animal and for the family to wait hours and hours for pick up.
Make sure they have their vaccines and pepper paper work.
- Health certificates



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Depending on origin that they undergo a mandatory quarantine or have documentation supporting that a quarantine period or proper testing was done prior to shipping that animal. Once in Calgary they should have to be seen by a licensed veterinarian within a certain time frame.
- no comment as I am not knowledgeable about this.
- That the people bringing in these animals are responsible for the wellbeing of these animals and if the client cannot fulfill expectations or cannot take the animals, the business should be responsible. People/businesses should prove that they are capable of providing what the animals require.
- The same as the TSA.
- Working service animals and animals that are from high risk euthanasia shelters.
- The same as any other retail sale if for a business a medical record, if for adoption the agency or individual must take the animal within 30 days or arrival to be checked.
- More checking re background of animals
- Would like to see CBSA, CFIA, the veterinary community and importers working together to identify infectious disease risk from import areas. Currently the consistently regulated disease is rabies, but as the volume of imported animals increases I would like clearer guidelines for other pathogens.
- Vet check ups, up to date on vaccinations, and spayed/neutered if a certain age before they arrive in the city
- Only that there's a home or space in a reputable shelter to take them.
- They should have proper health certificates, identification, and a piper quarantine zone
- Breeders must import with breed registration from home country, be members of our National Kennel Club (CKC), registered as a breeder with the City, pay the city pet license fee. Import Rescues need to vet certify each import , be city registered, pay license fees. All must Microchip for city tag.
- For dogs and cats imported, they should not be for retail sales. Only new owners, responsible breeders, and adoption organizations should be allowed to import dogs and cats.
- Do not accept importing to save the animals. Our local shelters have many animals for placement already.
- Up to date Health certificate, up to date vaccinations, already spayed/neutered.
- They must be fully vaccinated, vet checked and had been previously tested for disease.
- All animals should be quarantined and checked over by a vet before releasing them to a home.
- I personally feel that importing of animals should not be happening for the sale or adoption. If it is a dog that is being purchased from a licensed ethical breeder and all paperwork is in place then that is a direct dealing.
- Health certificate
- The animals (if a cat, dog, or rabbit) must be fixed before going home with the new owners
- that the origin of the animal needs to be verified and that organization deemed a qualified and humane commercial outfit.
- I don't think that rescues should be allowed to bring in animals from other countries because it risks introduction of disease.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They should not be imported unless they meet vaccination standards and are already purchased or have a home. Why the hell are we importing other countries' problems???
- They must pass a health check, be vaccinated.
- Healthy, safe
- Absolutely no importing of outside adoptable dogs without stringest understanding of reason (working, eg SAR, service, sport prospect). Bringing dogs in without owners lined up is unethical, bringing dogs in with owners lined up means the owners don't know what the dog's temperament is— unethical.
- Calgaryans should be allowed to purchase dogs out of province and out of country. But need to provide dog's ID and basic information plus how much was paid for the dog.
- The animal's individual welfare should be paramount. Who is importing the animal and for what purpose? If it is for any reason other than to enhance the health and welfare of the animal, it should be restricted.
- Consultation with bylaw. Not to be based on profit.
- Everything possible no commercial imports of any kind period... no exceptions.... we have plenty of our own right here
- Onky from within Canada
- We have enough, no additional required
- Transparency and excellent animal care
- 1 month quarantine
- We have enough here. Don't bring any more into the city.
- I honestly believe we have enough stray and abandoned dogs in Calgary that we should not be bringing dogs in from other countries. Once we get that under control we can look at other countries.
- Animals that are considered endangered or at risk should not be allowed unless going to a zoo or sanctuary. Proper medical records. We do not want infected animals to infect existing animals.
- The ability of the importer to provide proper medical attention if required and the ability to care for the animals in a clean environment. All animals must be spayed or neutered within 3 months of arrival
- Honestly it is so frustrating. The reason they are doing this is they can get the dogs free in Mexico or the states and they come fully vetted.
These dogs are not being temperament tested and there is no behaviorist here to help. This is scary when we have Canadian dogs we need to save. Bleeding
- Reputable animal rescue organizations, reputable licenced breeders.
- They should have appropriate shots (rabies? Not sure what else but I'm sure a vet could comment)
- Make sure animals are all licensed, vetted, and healthy. Make sure said animals are being cared for properly.
- Clear vaccination schedule, proper deworming, vet visit at point of origin and arrival. Quarantine.
- Health of the animal



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't think we should import 'rescue' dogs to Calgary. There are plenty of dogs in Canada that need our help. I do however believe individuals should be able to import specific dogs for themselves if they are looking for specific breeds/characteristics from breeders.
- Only zoos should import animals
- Must be spayed or neutered. Must have had all shots.
- Health checks.
- Frequency of imports from seller
- Health/condition of the animal
- Reason for import
- Health and safety
- make sure they don't have disease.
- If the CBSA allows them into the country, why is the city involved?
- They should require a vet check and a quarantine period (determined by a vet)
- Be sterilized prior to arrival with proper vaccines
- A health check
- Health checks
- No comment
- Only allow the import of altered and vaccinated animals. Must be imported from a humane and ethical breeder.
- registered dog rescues should be the only ones to bring in dogs
- Why are animals being imported at all? What animals are being imported?
- That they are vetted.
- Why are we allowing 'rescues' from other countries when there are enough stray pets here. Many bring diseases with them.
- Vaccinations before coming so no spread of illnesses to our pets.
- Vaccinated
- Imported animals should be required to be fully vaccinated, have a vet clearance for health and guarantee from the importer to cover any veterinarian expenses before being sold/adopted out to the public.
- Only animals from rescue situations in other countries should be allowed. But if imported, any animal should be quarantined until guarantee of health status is reached.
- The people should have a license. A portion of the money should be going to the SPCA or similar organizations
- Health of animal
- Ensuring pets are healthy, vaccinated, well taken care of during transit
- Subject to Canadian vet guidelines for vaccines and unless the pet is for breeding purposes (to a registered breeder in good standing) it should be spayed or neutered
- we should only open our borders to imported pets when our own unhomeless pet population is below a pre-determined threshold. Why bring more in when we have our own problem - overflowing



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

shelters. Also, imported pets have already introduced new disease here. We should look after our own back yard.

- Rabies shots
- There should, for example, only be adoption dogs from Mexico brought in when there are no more adoptable dogs in shyer in Calgary.
- Up to date on shots, not a stolen animal
- The age of the animal and if the animal is sick or has a significant medical history/requirement.
- I'm not in favour of importing animals
- Not sure
- They should have to abide by all the rules
- We need to take care of the ones we have here already.
- Health and behavioural inspection, and proper placement for when they arrive in Calgary, rescue or foster.
- I think they might need to be more strict, maybe it would cut down on the illegal dogfighting that I've heard going on.
- I don't know enough about this topic to give an informed opinion.
- Free of diseases
- The importer is fully credentialed and is not importing the animal to resell. No predators.
- That they can't negatively impact our eco system and are not dangerous to the general public.
- must be vetted prior to entry and pass a quarantine time. Animal must be accompanied by a bill Of sale and and proof of transfer of ownership of the animal. Animals should arrive in transport containers that are not crowded, well ventilated, with access to food &water &place to evacuate waste
- good health of the animal with vaccinations up to date. a plan to ensure the animal's future well being and ethical housing situation within Calgary.
- Animals should be well taken care of --- healthy, vaccinated, vet check, free from parasites and disease, groomed, humane quarantine. Bill of sale and transfer of ownership.
- For adoption is ok. Sale or breeding should have rules.
- Ensuring the health of the animal is in good condition
- That pets that we have here are not displaced by ones from outside sources. That those animals brought in commercially are healthy and not used inappropriately.
- Initial quarantine
- Nothing endangered except to zoos.
- This just should not happen, period. Animals are not commodities for retailers to financially benefit from.
- NO vicious breeds or behaviourally challenged or diseased animals
- Health standards first. And guidelines from Canadian and Alberta Veterinarian Associations. There has been an uptick in disease from imported dogs.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Licensed and legitimate organizations must be legitimate. Someone finding a street dog may have good intentions but no understanding of the health risks

- Risks to human or ecosystem health
- All animals deserve the best chance at life and be treated respectfully. We should limit the number of animals that do come into Canada to rescue organizations as we currently need to look after what is here in our own country first.
- some level of vet assessment/vaccines/quarantine if necessary to protect all of us from new disease.
- The number/capacity of shelters and rescue organizations.
- I'm not sure exactly but the criteria should be established with consultation with specialists in the area of disease control.
- importing animals from other countries for rehoming adoption should be banned we have enough here that need help
- I think that only rescue animals should be allowed to be imported.
- They're fine.
- Imported animals should not be accepted.
- Imported adoption animals should not be accepted in Calgary. There is no reason to bring in an adoptable animal when most of our local pet rescue businesses are at capacity.
- Animals that if escaped would have a poor effect on the ecological system should be banned and the place exporting should meet Canadian animal safety guidelines
- Ethical treatment of animals, address issues of consumption within the pet foodchain
- Mandatory vet-check + quarantine prior to licensing, and perhaps even an import fee.
- Ensure there is no harm to the local environment
- To me it should be the same as a retail sale scenario. The person offering the animal for sale/adoption must be licensed and in good standing. Vaccinations and other health requirement should be up to date prior to any sale or adoption.
- d/k
- Animals should be vetted with a routine exam.
- Health checks, vaccinations
- Unsure.
- Licensed importers
- Must spayed or neutered. Not have any viruses or known long term health effects (Valley fever as an example)
- as long as they are not a public health risk what benefit does additional regulations provide over CBSA? should be consistent across the province & country
- Animals should have owners first.
- No concerns here if rescues want to bring in animals.
- Vet checked, spayed/neutered
- Do not import strays/unwanted animals. We have enough of those in our own city/country!
- Imported animals should only be allowed if they are animals that are in short supply in Calgary



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals should not be brought into our country from other countries unless they have been thoroughly evaluated and health checked. If we have an abundance of domestic animals to be home imports should be limited. Any incoming animal should be genetically tested to determine breed background.
- Not endangered, not trafficked.
- The whole dog rescue from other countries is getting out of hand - it's become a fraud in many cases and people are fooled into thinking they are doing a good thing. I also don't believe that any exotics should be allowed in the country as pets - birds, reptiles, etc. should be left alone.
- Certain rescues bring in "trailers" full of dogs acquired from places like California. These animals are often not altered, unsocialized and sickly, yet they are adopted out without fully knowing the animal and it's background. Rescues that bring in animals from out of country should have strict
- They should be in good health and they should be of breeds that are not available in Canada.
- Complete vet check mandatory licence by importer
- I'm concerned about diseases in animals that come from other countries. E.g. heartworm has become more common with animals coming from other parts of the world.
- Don't allow import of animals for sale. We have lots here, if someone is bringing in an animal for sale it is effectively a business good and given the issues around the treatment of animals it is one more way to exploit animals and purchasers.
- The importation of exotic animals needs to be carefully monitored. Certain species should not live as pets.
- They should be health and behaviour tested.
- Heavy licensing fees
- There should be a tariff, similar to most imported goods. There's no good reason to import most animals when there are so many available locally.
- Quarantines. Health and safety check.
- I think CATSA probably has a handle on this.
- As there is not much that can be done about animals crossing the border, the city should discourage the import of exotic species which is a throw back to another time in history when exotic animals were seen as simply objects and signs of prestige - very outdated.
- Ensure they do not harm native wildlife or people if they get out.
- They MUST undergo vet examination to clear them, for the safety of all pets in the city, and rescue groups in particular must have proof in hand that imported animals have a confirmed owner destination. It defeats their purpose if rescue animals end up euthanized here for lack of ownership.
- Not sure. Owners should have education and knowledge about exotic species. Animals also shouldn't be 'wild caught'. People should also be able to document the animal has been examined by a veterinarian, etc..
- They should only be accepted if they are importing strays from other countries and rehoming them here.
- n/a



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No. I strongly believe that we have enough of a local animal base that need help in Calgary, without importation FOR PROFIT!
- All animals spayed or neutered. No endangered animals. No dangerous animals. Documented regulated breeders. Imported animals quarantined.
- There is no need to import any at all, we have plenty around already.
- Not sure
- Don't accept them! We have hundreds of pets in need of good homes right here in Canada!
- The same rules should apply for Calgary as for CBSA.
- Health
- We should not be importing rescue animals
- No opinion
- There are some serious problem importers masquerading as rescues. They should be subject to oversight and checks regarding health and living conditions just like a retail store. Older animals should have suitable temperament for the home it goes to. Veterinarian care should be provided.
- That they are not of possible endangered species or possible of wild caught animals and that they have a reasonable bill of health and if not the new owner is aware of these concerns
- I can't think of anything that wouldn't be covered by Canada Border Services.
- We have so many animals within Canada not sure why we have to import.
- Accept them all.
- Vaccination records, breeders' records (for animals that could have been wild bred, not domestic cats and dogs). Very important to stop the trade of wild caught animals as pets.
- Vaccination records, parasite checks.
- Same as Border services
- organizations should not be allowed to import animals into Calgary from other countries while be have animals waiting to be adopted here in Calgary already.
- We should not be importing animals when we have shelters full of animals in need of homes.
- Not one that is endangered or on the edge of that. No poisonous or dangerous creatures. No exotic creatures including fish.
- ooh boy. When our own shelters are full of animals awaiting adoption, why are we importing pets? I can't even think about guidelines or regulations because it seems silly to me
- Inspection system in place for health/safety of animals.
- The animals may need to be quarantined depending on where they are coming from.
- No comment
- Animals should only be able to be imported into Calgary if they have come from a rescue group and NOT from a business that is profiting from the unnecessary breeding of animals. Exotic animals should be required to be vaccinated against disease. All imported animals must be spayed or neutered.
- commercial purposes - do you mean cows, pigs to add to their stock etc...? that's what I consider commercial purposes.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I guess it depends on the situation. Imported animals for sale purposes is not ever necessary. Animals brought in due to disasters, over population or other situations for adoption situations should be a case by case criteria.
- Adequate care, which would have to be regulated and enforced, probably.
- I really think we have enough dogs in Calgary and surround. Why are we bringing in dogs from other countries? I would like to see the whole thing abolished.
- N/A - I don't believe this should fall under the city's jurisdiction.
- Clearance of any contagious diseases and viruses. Behaviour appraisal complete.
- Should be spayed or neutered, chipped and / or tattooed and registered with the city. If being sold too young to spay/neuter, then have that stuff pre-paid with reminder follow-ups and fines.
- Well to import these animals, they should have a home first, instead of the other way around. You are going to import an animal that can't be taken care of properly in it's home city where it was born, then try to find a home here in Calgary without any reassurances it will be taken care of properly
- Licences and training classes
- Prevent environmental damage for invasive species.
- Should be none of the city's business.
- City should be documented, check by vet, quarantined if necessary depending of origin and notifications to community that a animal is near. (there's a leopard that lives two doors down). Caps on how many are acceptable. Litters of animals can destroy property and neighbourly relationships.
- N/a
- They should already have an identified owner. Not sure why we are importing stray dogs that don't have a home here. Any animals should be disease free and spayed or neutered immediately and quarantined if required
- Tough question because although I think we should adopt alberta dogs mine is from Mexico. I wanted a small dog
- If the border says it's ok why would Calgary figure the federal regulations aren't suitable?
- Don't know.
- Clean medical records (tested in Canada) and licensed.
- Checked for zoonose diseases, legality, health.
- - certificate that a veterinarian has examined the animal and declared it healthy
- - certificates of age-appropriate vaccinations
- Healthy, appropriately contained and well cared for.
- Health, location, not wild caught
- Checked for diseases, has shots, not dangerous animal, etc.
- Don't allow imported RESCUED dogs other than a singular purchase....we have enough dogs/cats at our own facilities
- I think it's most important that these animals already have a home lined up before being brought in. If it is a matter of bringing them here to list them for adoption I think they should not be allowed as we already have so many animals here that need adoptive homes.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Should not be bringing in dogs from other countries
- Current legal requirements.
- No endangered or at-risk species. No species known to carry disease. Limits on breeding and number of broods/female. Manage waste, noise, odour and debris. Mandatory inspections on exotic animal households. No dangerous animals in homes with children under 12.
- no birds, reptiles, or any exotic wildlife should be imported for the "pet" industry. These are wild animals that do not belong in someone's home.
- I would support importation of pet animals for humane adoption purposes, but not for commercial purposes. That said, the local animal shelters are full of pets needing homes and emphasis needs to be put on rehoming these animals.
- I feel that a moratorium needs to be in place until we have control of our own issue
- **ANIMALS SHOULD NOT BE IMPORTED INTO CALGARY OR ANYWHERE JUST IN ORDER TO BE SOLD! PEOPLE SHOULD NOT MAKE A PROFIT OFF THE SALE OF ANIMALS THAT HAVE TO BE TRAUMATIZED BY AIR OR ROAD TRAVEL!! SUPER MESSED UP!!!!**
- Specifics for clearance of the animal laid out and confirmed at both ends of transit (eg vet check on both ends). Exotics require more regulation.
- Totally against.
- Making sure the commercial owners are responsible and can take proper care of the animals.
- Cats and dogs should not be imported into Canada or Calgary
- None.
- I have no idea what is appropriate. I'd be concerned about the health of the animals and invasive species.
- ban them
- I think as long as no issues have come about with the system so far maybe leave it be...
- Only for the purpose of adoption, Non-profit, animal welfare.
- These dogs have usually been in at least a 30 day quarantine and neutered before you can adopt. I feel that most rescue outfits are much more self regulated than the majority of local breeders. They have to prove the dog is vetted and healthy prior to adoption
- Licensed, checked by certified vet and given clean bill of health before entering city. Not sure about having them spayed or neutered - to prevent improper breeding.
- make sure that pets inside of Calgary have equal opportunity to be adopted . I think we should work on our own issues rather than bring more in for the City to worry about.
- I am completely against the import of animals for the purpose of ADOPTION.
- The import laws for bringing an animal into Canada already address any issues. No need for more municipal red tape.
- Local animals should be prioritized for sale/adoption. Imported animals should only be accepted when there is a shortage of local animals.
- That they have had a health check and all shots before shipping.
- Stop bringing the man when we have too many to look after already



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None let the CRA rule apply
- Pure-breed animals brought to the city with intent of profiting should be taxed.
- Any animals that have been proven a detriment to local ecosystems should not be imported and/or sold.
- Health certification, business license.
- - Vet checked and tested for foreign diseases
- Health checks. Type of animal - whether or not it is suitable for our climate.
- Healthy including blood testing for diseases endemic to region they are from
- Make sure there is business license ... impose tax ...
- I think CBS has pretty stringent rules, and that they are probably mostly enough, although adding that the animals should be spayed/neutered is a good idea.
- Should not be an invasive species if let loose and left to multiply
- I do not believe we should import at all, too many strays and unwanted here already.
- None
- Most importantly, local breeders and local dog charities should be given priority. if there is a shortage then I don't see a problem with importation.
- Rescue animals from other countries/provinces should have been examined by a veterinarian, and fully vaccinated and dewormed prior to importation into Calgary.
- Nothing to add above responsibilities of CBSA.
- Imported animals can be rescue animals which are being given a second chance at a life they could receive in Calgary. I strongly believe in these animals being allowed into our city because they are being brought in by reputable organizations who have the animals wellbeing and security at heart.
- I think it should be limited. We have so many pets that need homes in Alberta and Canada. Plus animals coming from more tropical areas have diseases and parasites that local veterinarians are not as used to handling and treatment can be an unexpected cost for pet owners and increase risk to humans.
- Behaviour of dogs - sick and tired of aggressive "rescue" dogs being brought in and then poorly controlled by owners.
- Ensure animal health and welfare. Also type of animal of animal being imported. Restrictions on exotic animals.
- Animals must come from a reputable, certified breeder and not be wild harvested or at risk
- The animal should be in good health, be properly vaccinated when appropriate, and unless the animal is being imported specifically for breeding purposes should be spayed/neutered.
- Import orgs should require better veterinary examinations prior to being adopting, rather than accepting the vet certificates from their countries of origin. Quarantine for animals from countries with know zoonotic disease. These "rescues" should not be allowed to operate as non-profits.
- Healthy, vet cked, purchase bill.
- They should also not be permitted to possess endangered, at risk, or potentially invasive species.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Imported animals should have documentation showing a clean bill of health and once in Calgary, be quarantined to be sure there are no health or behavior issues. Also, rescue organizations should NOT be allowed to import dogs for adoption in Calgary.
- - Full veterinary inspection
- - Full health history available
- - Life history available (including info on the breeder and intermediary owners)
- Check the organization carefully.
- Lots of pets to adopt in Canada - however if bring into country need to be assured are free of disease and going to a good home and not for profit
- Spay and neuter need to be required. Also must have PROOF of vet checks.
- importing remained allowed. but but adhere to federal standards. A municipality shouldn't be stepping in.
- Animal importation should be outlawed.
- Vaccinated, proven good health, quarantine period
- Does this question refer to exotic animals? If that should be Federally legislated? If the question is referring to domestic animals from other countries, I think we have enough local animals that need to be taken care of without going to the expense of importing animals from other countries.
- Must be vaccinated and in good health,
- Clear and verifiable medical and behavior histories
- Unless it's a cat or dog we should not allow imported animals - those that are here can grandfathered but no more imports.
- Proper vet checks and medical records
- - Proper vaccination with adequate records
- - Veterinary exam within a set length of time
- Stop importing rescue dogs from other countries. It is an obscene waste of resources in a city where animals and people are going hungry
- Making sure the animal is in good health. Making sure the breed is not a threat to humans or local wildlife.
- The number of pets brought into Calgary should be regulated based on the number of pets available for adoption through local shelters. If there are many pets in Calgary needing a home, then we should not be importing pets.
- Should be free of diseases, we have enough homeless animals here why are we bringing in more, my heart goes out to these animals but others are be euthanized because they don't get homes.
- No opinion.
- Imported animals should already have a home that they are coming to.
- all animals must be quarantined, checked for health issues, vaccinated, spayed, neutered, they should be required to carry proof of being checked by a vet for all of that BEFORE transportation and then should be checked on arrival. restrictions on the type of animal imported should be in place



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It's complicated. I don't believe exotic animals should be imported for sale. I'd rather see animals rescued than sold. I'd rather see local animals adopted. However we don't have resources to deal with this.
- Animals that are imported by registered breeders or retail stores should already have many rules in place. If you are asking about rescue animals for adoption, I do not feel we should take out of province or country animals for fostering or adoption. Those animals should be euthanized locally.
- This would be difficult to enforce since they can go to another community then CALGARY. Impossible to trace. Work needs to be done with border patrol to put in controls (aggression assessment, health checks and traceable background)
- Being able to trace breeding practices and verification of the animal's proper feeding, watering and exercising needs are met
- Age, temperament, vaccines,
- They would have to meet all criteria/rules previously discussed.
- Safety of that animal and others who may be in contact. Ex saving it from death/suffering is a great reason to import, but maybe quarantine to ensure we are not bringing illness
- Not endangered
Not taken from the wild
Not likely to have undergone unnecessary stress or death on travel.
- Quarantene if necessary. Neutered if the breed is more feral.
- Certification of where the animal is coming from and again, healthy animals (should come with a health inspection certificate).
- Animals imported from shelters or rescue organizations from outside of Canada should be quarantined. In addition, a Canadian vet should evaluate each animal and feral animals, as well as dogs raised as livestock, should be evaluated by a trainer for temperament.
- They should be rescues and not carry disease.
- Calgary should not allow the import of any at risk, threatened, or endangered species. People bringing in dogs from Mexico or Asia should have to adopt local strays on a one-to-one basis.
- The same guidelines that already have to be met by the Canada Border Services Agency. Why would you change or soften them?
- All shots, spayed or neutered, and only in exceptional circumstances *there are lots of pets to be adopted from Canada. I do not believe we should allow the import of ANY exotic animals, and only exceptionally dogs and cats.
- They are from a rescue and going to a rescue. Or an owned personal animal travelling. None for personal resale or for slaughter!
- A health exam?
- they should be not carrying any communicable diseases. They need to have their vet check up to date and their shots if necessary.
- Inspected.
Quarantine period.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Recognized importer that is licensed to bring in animals.

- Health check
- Appropriate quarantine time, proof of vaccinations after arrival
- Should be licensed
- No imported animals in Calgary.
- History of animal- aggression, health, where it grew up, why it is coming all the way to Calgary?
- Vet checking before entering Canada, with all shots updated. Quarantine.
- -they are not endangered animals
- -animals are not smuggled
- -animals are healthy
- -animals come from a reputable source
- Don't know enough about this to comment.
- Where and who are they coming from.
- This is how I got my dog. I love him but really feel the importation and sales of animals should be regulated. The animals should be healthy. The business should be clear if it's a non profit or a business.
- There should be a quarantine period.
All rescues must be licensed and in good standing with regulators before being allowed to import animals. If medical concerns are noted with the animals the rescue or individual must pay for all necessary medical care.
- Create regulations to ensure the animals come in from reputable sources and the animal health and well being is the primary concern
- Animals should never be imported for their sale. For adoptions, animals should be treated for diseases and illnesses before being homed in Calgary.
- Proper vaccines
- If they pass the border that should be enough
- Ensure all of these animals have been fully vetted and vaccinated before entering Calgary (or Canada at all for that matter)
- Animals must be up to date on Canadian Vaccine requirements.
- Spayed or neutered. Not from a animals mill.
- Vaccination is a must, but also believe that tests should be conducted to ensure they are not bringing diseases into the area that are not already present.
- Same as domestic sales.
- Health checks for the arrived animals and the shelter importing them needs to ensure they get all their vaccinations and get spayed/ neutered. I think most do that anyway. I think city should basically be supportive of animals being rescued from kill shelters in other countries.
- That they have been 100% treated or examined for diseases. Should also be checked for identifiers to ensure they are not stolen and being resold for profit
- Not necessary to import animals for commercial purposes.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If the animals are being imported for humanitarian reasons and are to be adopted out by a recognized charity or non profit group it should not be considered commercial.
- Healthy breeding practices.
- Make sure they are disease free and maybe a home quarantine for a period.
- No displacement of local animals.
- Should be moving with the family
- Healthy and treated well
- All shots done, vet inspection.
- The animals need to see a vet that clears them of foreign illnesses that can make the other animals in the city sick. They must also be approved by the city of Calgary if they are not within Canada. If within Canada a standard vet check should be required within 30 days of arrival
- I do not think the city needs to meddle in this at all. Again, I do not believe there is any benefit beyond appeasing chicken littles, in over regulation. Let the market decide if people want to adopt homeless imported purse dogs, instead of buying one at [personal information removed] or a kijiji breeder.
- checked for illness
- Same as any other animal - CBSA specifies quarantines and health certificates already
- Health checks; dangerous dog checks; and behaviour assessment.
- I think that commercial rescues should be licensed and required to have health tested dogs (as per CBSA requirements). But, bringing adult and non-social dogs into the City should also require standards around training and temperament. That testing should be done City staff, and when dogs arrive.
- Health checks and already spayed and neutered. I don't believe we should be importing animals (rescues) from other countries for adoption we have enough here to fulfill the needs. Papered purebreds are a different case however.
- I trust the CBSA to implement the necessary regulations. I don't think Calgary needs any extra.
- The animals should be healthy and be unlikely to be adopted in their country of origin. They should also go through a behavioural screening.
- Obviously vaccinations and clear from disease but that's all.
- I don't have any problems with importing pets, as long as they aren't endangered or threatened species. As long as they have a documented clean bill of health from a veterinarian, I don't see any reason to stop the practice.
- Mandatory quarantine period. Mandatory vet check regardless of animal.
- Federal rules. How would the city even monitor this if not at the federally controlled point of entry? Regulate what you can control.
- For cats and dogs, registration and rules on who can sell commercially, and ensuring there are minimum training requirements, etc. Limits to the number of pet selling businesses - we already have an oversupply.
- Commercial imports for resale should not be allowed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Safe and humane treatment; screen for illnesses;
- Making sure they are healthy and that they don't fall under the banned species act
- I really wish we wouldn't. Okay for an individual to adopt an animal elsewhere and bring them home. But I would say no to rescues that import dogs to adopt out here. We have our own pet overpopulation problems and have no shortage of local adoptables.
- That they have all papers to prove it is from a credible source and the animal is up to date with shots
- The the agency that is actively importing animals to be sold in Calgary need to also be actively rehoming local animals as well
- I don't know enough
- I'm not convinced that there is a need import animals.
- Healthy animals with up to date vet records supplied with the animal to the new owner and to the City.
- Stop bringing pets into the Country for commercial purposes. Until we are able to end pet overpopulation, unwanted pets, homelessness in our own Cities and Provinces we should not be bringing in pets from other countries. Allowing this is being irresponsible and adding to the pet overpopulation issues
- Medical exam
- Animals should be fairly and humanely treated. Animals shouldn't be vicious.
- Health and vaccination inspections/records - from certified/qualified veterinary organizations or individuals whose credentials are recognized in Canada.
- No feedback.
- This should stop. The opportunity for disease and abuse of the animal is too high.
- Their origins should be clearly stated so that people know where the animals came from. They should be licensed.
- Full Shots and vet check documentation
- Licensed and a limit on the number of animals allowed
- No sure
- Health.
- No comment
- They need full veterinary exam prior to acceptance and depending where they are coming from, potentially a certain amount of days for quarantine.
- Health of animal, reputation of importing agency, intended use of animal, whether the animal would naturally occur in Canada (like we don't have many native monkey species).
- Registered charity or business with the city. Ethical care. Existing foster home or adoptive home for pets. How many homeless pets on the city - should be taken care of first before bringing in more.
- All animals should be in good physical and mental health.
All animals should be provided for and all of their needs met.
All animals should be free from disease and parasites.
Animals should be quarantined upon arrival.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Steps should be taken to ensure animals wellbeing during travel.

- All their shots are up to date, they aren't stolen, they are taken care of.
- That the animals are all vaccinated and free of disease.
- I'm not sure
- Feeding and health possibilities in a place like YYC (weather, relation to wild life), possibility of vet care in town
- That all pets have the necessary vaccines and be disease free prior to coming here and what country did they come from and age of dog. Purpose of dog coming into Canada and who is receiving them at other end.
- Imported from a licensed breeder or adoption agency to ensure proper treatment of the animals
- Not sure
- These owners should have to prove their vaccinations, that they are going to a loving home and not going to be abused.
- The same as the national standards seems like the obvious answer.
- No health risk and no animal abuse.
- I don't think we should be accepting dog and cat rescues from anywhere outside of the province.
- There are more than enough animals in Calgary and the surrounding area that we don't need to import more.
- They do not carry disease, they are in good health or quarantined and treated to prevent the spread of disease. Animals are to be sterilized.
- Proof of health, vet checked, ensure no illegal importing.
- Domesticated animals only that have been cleared as healthy by a veterinarian.
- They've been humanely bred.
- Same criteria as if the animal was not imported.
- I don't know enough on this subject to have an opinion. So education seems to be lacking on many subjects
- No animals should be imported to Calgary as rescues. The only imported animals should be those that have been obtained by single private sale or private ownership.
- Compassion. Provide medical care to needy animals instead of rejecting them.
- I am not sure that commercial animals means. I'm guessing pet stores? Maybe rescues. Either way it should mean a vet visit immediately upon arrival and any required quarantine, up to date on required vaccinations before travel to Canada even occurs.
- not familiar enough with this.
- No opinion
- Unsure.
- Healthy animals with homes waiting for them.
- quarantine for 7-10 days, vet exam, appropriate vaccines and deworming and blood tests ie heartworm tests
- quarantine, appropriate blood tests for contagious diseases, vaccines and deworming



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't like commercial imports, special adoption
- that import from puppy mills should never be okay. What are these puppy mills doing that makes them so easy to by-pass regulation sometimes? it's mind boggling. And in general, I think we should also never allow import of endangered animal species.
- Appropriate shots and vet care prior to coming
- Deal with local issues first, before trying to take on another city's issues.
- Laissez-faire. Calgary is too cold for most imported animals to thrive in the wild. There are currently way too many regulations.
- Disease free, quarantine period, non-invasive, non-poisonous.
- Health testing, especially for infectious diseases. Ensuring they are headed to a place they will be well cared for.
- The same criteria for when humans from other countries flee to Canada
- Not sure
- Passes under the agriculture guidelines. Health certified and making sure they are not forged. Quarantined minimum two weeks to prevent diseases that are not normally found in North America that are coming in from unscrupulous animal rescue groups from Korea, China, Turkey, Romania and Mexico.
- Animals should Fully vaccinated, a full physical exam and spayed or neutered unless It is a purebred Animal from a certified breeder.
- leave it to CBSA.
- They shouldn't be accepted at all. We have enough animals. Unless they are for education purposes or breeding as they may become extinct.
- Not enough information available to provide feedback on this question.
- Health checks, many are imported as we seem to have many animals in foster care or rescue agencies already. Not really sure why people bring animals in when we have many already needing homes.
- 100% need to be behaviourally evaluated. Quarantine (in a home preferably) to check for any diseases ect
- License
- Zero exotic animals from outside of Canada. Rescue dogs from other countries should be closely monitored by local animal patrol and rescue organizations. We have so many dogs and cats available here for adopting and rescuing.
- similar to those used by The Canada Border Services Agency and that all municipal regs are met. If not covered by either of those, then health checks and vaccinations.
- They should be from countries with excess stray dogs for adoption here.
- Physical examination for ticks, fleas, mange, illness etc. Quarantine for those who need. Regulation of foster homes for numbers, care and license for animals.
- Same as the CSBSA
- What criteria is there now?



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- What criteria is there now?
- We should not be importing strays, there are enough animals already in shelters here that need homes.
- Quarantine and health inspections before the animal is allowed in. Proper holding facilities when the animals arrive.
- Rabies, vaccinations, spay and neuter is possible.
- Freedom from disease - appropriate vaccination protocols have been followed. No exotic animals.
- Again--full, documented provenance. And whatever it takes to ensure full wellness for the animals.
- Registration
- Absolutely stop importing stray animals from other countries. UK takes in strays from Guatemala, Romania ect. USA takes in strays from UK, China, Mexico, ect. Canada takes in strays from UK, USA, Mexico, China, Egypt, El Salvador, ect. Ect.Ect. Who is helping our stray population born in Calgary?
- All records of animals.
- There should be enough proof from buyers that they have researched the local market and tried to secure the animal from multiple sources. Probably something in writing from the sources they have reached out to.
- This is not the jurisdiction of the municipality.
- None, already sufficiently regulated by CBSA. Cities should not be limiting mobility of its residents
- Rescues must be checked for any illnesses and major injuries. No other animals need to be imported unless they're exotic
- They must be vaccinated and vetted healthy before being sold.
- Vet certificate of health
- Inspected for care and adoption to valid and safe adoption
- They should be vet checked and immunized as well as tested for their behaviour
- Ensure they are healthy, not introducing diseases, etc. Ensure they have good homes.
- Animals only imported by pre-approved and reputable agencies.
- Make sure they are not an endangered species(exceptions to zoo obviously), they do not put public at risk, they would be checked for all foreign or native diseases before leaving and entering Canada
- All shots up to date
- None. I dont agree with importing dogs for adoption. There are enough shelters already at capacity.
- Not sure when this should ever be necessary, based on my comment above.
- Health and shots
- Spayed or neutered - all shots- imported as a commercial livestock - increased licensing fee
- Quarantine until cleared
- Humane practices
- They are healthy
- We should not be importing outside of Alberta.
- Brucellosis testing, tick disease testing from the USA.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No idea.
- Health check, UP to date vaccinations, microchipped, mandatory spay/neuter
- Not sure. We don't have enough dogs here already?
- Animals should be up to date on vaccines including Rabies. Should also be vet checked and health cleared for any contagious diseases or parasites.
- Should be a pet that could be reasonably cared for by the owner
- The standards of care of the organization attempting to import the animals should be high, and individuals importing animals should be able to ensure the city that the animals were ethically attained and care for properly.
- I believe the animals should imported for adoption only. With a strict limited length of travel, that is safe for them .
- The impacts to the environment if they were to get out and how they would effect native species.
- Unsure
- Same as federal
- understanding of disease vectors and potential of public endangerment
- None
- All vaccines up to date and paperwork showing where they are coming from with history of the animal.
- All animals show proof of Municipal Animal Licensing. All animals be neutered/ spayed upon arrival. All animals be microchipped. Limit number of animals allowed to be in care and control of one person.
- There are sufficient homeless dogs here--imports shouldn't be accepted. Rehabilitate them and rehouse them in country of origin.
- All animals are vaccinated.
- Animals be required to be quarantined for at least 6 months and each individual animal have documents similar to a passport that includes pictures and vaccination records. All imported animals should be licensed before being allowed in this country
- I don't know.
- No animal mills. Disease free.
- not sure
- Sprayed, neutered and a health inspection to make sure animal is healthy and hasn't been abused.
- They should be done do safely and be in good health
- heavily taxation to prevent it
- Health and safety concerns only
- Through vet check. Microchipped and licensed
- If it's for a rescue, it shouldn't have any restrictions or fees (minus maybe a basic health check to make sure it isn't contagious with something)
- See above regarding retail sale
- Quarantine until all shots are up to date and they have had a vet check up.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If the animals come from a licensed breeder, then breeders paperwork should be included when licensed here in Calgary, including history of dog/cat and vet info. Animals coming from a rescue group outside of Calgary, paperwork as to the reason the animal is being relocated, veterinary details.
- proof that they have the required documents to show they have been vaccinated etc...
- Proper paper work.
- There are so many animals needing homes here in Canada that I feel their should be a few for out of country animals and they must have strict vetting so they aren't introducing disease and viruses to our animals here.
- Just that they meet CBSA guidelines, and that's already taken care of by CBSA.
- Same as any other animal, follow the bylaws.
- Ethically bred or rescued, no factory dogs
- Vaccinated, mandatory human/dog training at a credited facility.
You need trainign to drive a car, i think mandatory training upon getting a dog is a must.
- I don't know.
- Not sure I understand this one. I rescued a pair of dogs from St. Louis MO 10 years ago - would they be defined here as commercial imports? My niece has rescued a dog from Thailand - is this a commercial import? I need to understand "commercial imports" better before answering this.
- I have no issues with the importing of animals BUT for adoption only!
- Not bring sick or hurt animals in.
- Only animals that would not pose a threat to Alberta's ecosystem should be allowed for import. All imported animals should be subject to testing for disease.
- Ensure the health and disease free status of the animal. Identifying where it came from.
- I don't think they should be sold. People are buying animals (cats, dogs) from countries with lower standards than ours, exploiting animals by bringing them here and selling them on kijiji. If someone chooses to import a dog for themselves, fine, but there is no need for commercial importation.
- Vet checks.
- Full medical and behaviour testing
- The animal is healthy and not being abused or exploited
- The city should only look to numbers of animals in homes. As well, they should grandfather any homes that are above any new limits imposed.
- medical/vet check, spayed and neutered before being adopted out, pass a temperament test
- that they are a rescue no other type
- No species endangered or native from other places should be accepted as pets, only for a matter of conservation or so.
- All should be vaccinated and neutered/spayed or have the intention of being neutered/spayed unless imported specifically for breeding
- Do we already have an abundance of that those animals in the available in the city that need re-homing (i.e. Dogs).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Quarantined and ensure they are not in the list for endangerment
- Where they are buying them from (credited institutions etc.). Why it is necessary to be brought in from outside the country. If it is at risk to escape and cause issues ie. Rats and mice
- There should be no importing of animals for placement with a rescue group nor a foster home. Any pet being imported should be for the individual importing and for the personal use of the importer.
- Stop looking for ways to expand government.
- There should be a standardized vet exam testing for certain diseases (based on where the animal came from) that must be completed.
A Behavior assessment would be good too
- Again this seems a worthwhile cause but the animals need to be healthy and there should be an expectation of homes for these animals. Our shelters are always looking for forever home they do not need more competition for space.
- Health evaluations on all animals
Quarantined until they are evaluated
- - huge issue with the importing animals from International countries when we have local animals that need to be adopted. I'm also concerned about disease coming in from the imported animals but am not sure you can do anything.
- Whatever is in place currently; perhaps there should be a quota for imports if the City is aware that current un-adopted animal rates are increasing.
- They should be spayed/neutered and have a clean bill of health.
- I definitely think Calgary should not import loads of animals from other countries. If animals are being abused elsewhere let's try to help educate. If animals are being eaten, that is none of our business.
- Not versed on The Canada Border Services Agency. Animals should be healthy (vet checked) and quarantined for a period to name a few.
- is there a potential/real negative interaction with the existing ecosystem.
- They should be properly vetted, spay/neutered.
- No animals should be imported from other countries.
We have a massive animal problem on Alberta's FN reserves, which should be addressed first.
- No abandoned pets or dogs from other countries are to be allowed in Canada. No strays to be imported. No pit bulls in the city.
- I know that many breeders import dogs in order to have good bloodlines in their kennels. I think breeders should be registered and an association should be overseeing their work.
- Make sure they have complete checkups so that these animals are not spreading disease animals must be licensed and a health check must be done
- No comment
- Common sense criteria.
- No diseases
- I don't have any thoughts on this matter



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- None.
- health certificate, if there is space and resources to foster or shelter.
- 1. Quarantine 2. full vet inspection / review with necessary lab work to rule out parasites, etc
- I adopted a dog many years ago that was rescued and brought up from Hurricane Katrina. She was the BEST dog ever!!!!!! I was happy to have given her a home!!!
- Necessary, no suitable local options
- The animal is not an at risk or endangered species. The animal is healthy. The buyer is knowledgeable about the animal, they have the correct food, shelter, etc. There is a follow up visit with the owners after they have had the animal for a period of time to make sure all needs are being met
- I believe that the appropriate quarantine time(s) should be followed, for both the safety of the animals and people. I think it's absolutely fantastic that we can bring dogs from Mexico and other countries, I have so many friends that bring dogs into their homes from other countries, share LOVE
♥☐
- I feel strongly that there are plenty of domestic adoptable pets here so the importation of "rescue" dogs from other countries by individuals as their means of earning an income, should not be allowed. My 8 yr old dog came from a rescue. It's a racket. Diseases can be imported, we don't want that!
- Those regulations are federal and NOT municipal so stay out of it
- Health and Safety. I do think we should help other animals in need. I don't think we should be bringing exotics in for sale purposes.
- I don't believe imported animals for sale or adoption should be permitted
- Imported animals should have to have all their shots and should be spayed or neutered and microchipped prior to coming to our city and that includes birds and reptiles
- Pass Full vet exam.
- They should at least have had rabies shots.
- Ensure that individuals/organizations have sufficient demand that their imports do not exceed the city's given demand for adoptions - although serving other countries is important, we need to prioritize rehoming pets that are already in our community.
- I don't know, I would say safety of the animal & disease control.
- I am not a fan of retail rescue. We have enough dogs in our own country that need good homes. I'm also concerned about the diseases that are being brought in with these dogs. I'd like to see some sort of quarantine period and mandatory health testing and/or vaccination program in place.
- Invasiveness, & human health and safety
- All incoming animals should be fully vetted and quarantined for a set period, before being released to the general population.
- Licensing or registration of every animal imported for sale or adoption. Business license for commercial importers of animals attached to animal care and welfare standards.
- Health check and follow up if animal is not 100% healthy.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Microchip
- Health and wellness check
- Ensure they have a adequate living environment and resources for each
- Up to date vaccinations, no history of aggression****
- Should not be allowed to be imported for sale or rescue. Ever. We have enough it's here for sale and for rescue. Dogs should not be allowed to be rescued from another country for them be put up for adoption here. If individuals want to do it on their own expense and keep the animal, fine.
- Allowed but full health check and shots and quarantine. Training depending on age..
- making sure no diseases are being brought in.
- Health checks and quarantine the animals for 30 days.
- For sale--NO. For adoption--YES. While we are already dealing with animal overpopulation, some of the places that animals come from do not have the same infrastructure. If we can help, we should.
- - Visual inspection, temperature inspection, vaccinations, paperwork from source, tests to ensure free of disease
- That they be quarantined until vetted and cleared.
- N/A
- Ensuring all quarantine, acquisition, and breeding guidelines/laws have been met as per federal and provincial legislation before the animals can be licensed or permitted for sale/adoption.
- Tired of all the animal rescue groups importing animals into our city. We should care for the existing rejected & homeless & abandoned animals we have on Canadian land. Suggest whoever is importing animal must provide proof there is actually a quality home already arranged for animal.
- I don't know
- They must be proven to be healthy and the owners must be able to demonstrate knowledge of the breed/care of the animal.
- I don't think any animals should be imported into Calgary for resale. If someone wants to purchase a pet from another country, they should be required to go and purchase the pet themselves and bring the pet back themselves.
- Vet check, isolation.
- Ensuring all legal requirements are met
- Quarantine until health can be confirmed by a licensed veterinarian. Proof of salability/adoptability so that overpopulation and/or termination are avoided.
- That they are registered and or licensed with the city of calgary
- Not allowed unless from a reputable breeder who can show that all dogs are vaccinated and healthy. Other diseases exist in other countries. Brucellosis is a concern.
- Sustainability of the species in their native habitat. Conditions of capture, transportation, and sale should all be animal-focused and cruelty-free.
- -Unsure. In some cases animals can be rescued from other countries, however they can also be smuggled for personal gain.
- Description of prior ownership if any.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I've never thought of this. I will be interested to see what comes of it. I don't believe we should be importing animals for sale or adoption, there are enough here.
- I don't believe dogs or cats should be imported to Calgary. We have plenty of our own unwanted animals.
- They need to be assessed and treated for issues, conditions and diseases prior to importing them into Canada/CALGARY.
- The standard of care being provided to the animals that are being imported (ie, not permitting unethical breeders), and whether or not the animal that is being imported is already available locally. Importing animals is not sustainable.
- As easily as possible for rescue groups to import animals. No fees to do so. Ensuring the rescue is legitimate and in good standing. That the animals are quarantined and given veterinary exams to ensure health and limit spread of disease
- confirmation that the type of animal is allowed in Canada, and that all required vaccinations have been given
- Business license, well maintained conditions for animals, restrictions on number of animals allowed to sell
- People should not be allowed to bring in dogs from outside of Calgary for rescue, etc. Calgary has an overpopulation of dogs.
- Free of disease fixed and have a home to go to. There are so many animals already needing homes here why are we bringing more here?
- They must be examined by a veterinarian, vaccinated, and spayed/neutered.
- Safety and likelihood of it becoming an invasive species
- they get licensed once they are with their final home/owner.
- This should be strictly controlled. I have a friend who brought in a registered standard poodle for breeding purposes and believe she had to jump through some hoops to do so. She should have to.
- Shots up to date, spay/neutered before or in writing that it will be done after arrival.
- Be spayed or neutered
- The animals must have access to fresh water at all times. The importer must prove the animal has been vet checked and has had food/exercise at a reasonable time period prior or during shipping that is applicable for the species. The origin of the animal needs proof of domestication (eg not wild)
- Rescue animals will need to show proof of having been spayed or neutered by the owner within a certain time period of adopting the animal.
- health and well fair checks of all animals by responsible and reputable groups before allowing them into the hands of those who will make money off the sell of these animals. Better background checks and filing of histories of those that do harm or distress to the animals not to do so again by law
- Just don't accept rescue animals from other countries. We've got plenty of our own to look after



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Restrictions on number of animals, based on what is already available for adoption in the municipality. Why bring in more homeless animals if our shelters are already full? Ensure imported animals are healthy.
- Rescue dogs and cats should remain acceptable providing valid disease testing and vaccinations are done. Pets coming from registered breeders to be with new owners should also be allowed.
- Ensure immunization, spay / neuter. Ensure we are not importing additional future stray / feral animal problems to Calgary. Today's charitable a t could be tomorrow's stray pet.
- I think the number of animals being imported for sale locally should be dependant on the numbers of animals available for adoption at agencies like the SPCA.
- We should never be importing animals for events or circuses. I am in complete disagreement with importing animals with the exception of from Uber populated countries where there cats and dogs fervently need to be removed from that country
- good vetting and coming into good homes - vaccinated
- No endangered animals should be allowed as pets. They should get licensed before being released.
- ensure animals are vaccinated/healthy
- Free of disease and proper papers when arriving in Canada. Also monitoring the number of adoptable animals already in the jurisdiction without adding extra stress of foreign animals.
- Medical screening by certified vet
- Require spay/neuter, required shots for import
- Individuals should not be allowed to import animals for commercial purposes.
- wild animals/exotics should not be imported to Calgary for sale. It's inhumane to have these animals as "pets" living outside of their natural habitats.
- Care of pets is very humane. Priority - pets coming from natural disaster areas
- We should not accept imported animals, period.
- Unsure
- Proper paper work/ background checks on sellers
- If the animals a imported legally, no further regulations by the city should be required.
- Ensure they will not be sold for the wrong reasons and ensure there will be no potential risk to the other animals, humans or the environment in regards to exotic animals.
I believe there should be minimal restrictions for your average domestics as long as it's coming from a ethical source/breeder
- All required vaccinations need to be up to date. If animal is not for breeding purposes, it should be neutered/ spayed to prevent further unwanted animals.
- Imported animals should only be allowed once all adoptable animals of that species in City shelters, private and public, have been homed.
- we should look at why they are being imported? Exotic animals for commercial gain with no care for the animals well being should be banned. Imported animals from rescue organizations who transfer



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

animals from high risk areas to Calgary are okay as they are working in the best interest if the animal.

- We should encourage local adoption.
- Not from puppy mill but can be accepted if puppy mill was shut down
- See the previous. Dogs and cats should have all shots/vaccinations required in Canada and the City of Calgary before entering.
- I don't think we should be bringing animals into Canada from other countries for adoption/sale - we have enough!
- Animals must be free of disease and in good health. They should only be brought in if there is a reasonable assumption that the animal will be adopted
- NO unless from a breeder not a puppy mill
- as long as they have the proper documentation proving spay/neuter/vaccination then that is not a problem.
- They should be licensed and sterilized as a requirement.
- quarantine for diseases? otherwise the same as for retail stores.
- COC should have a point of contact with CBA
- Commercial breeders not to be allowed within the City Limits. Prior to any animal being brought into the city it is to be spayed or neutered prior to sale.
- I do not believe the city is the appropriate level to deal with this issue.
But, mandatory quarantine to ensure transmittable diseases are not present, and foreign imports /rescues over 3 months of age should probably be temperament tested, especially in rescue/meat market type scenarios.
- Ensure the best interest of the animals are being met, opposed to the best interest of the sales of these animals
- n/a
- People should be able to bring in a single pet for their own private home, but shouldn't be importing multiple animals for re-sale. This is supporting puppy mill situations and Calgary already has many, many dogs needing homes.
- Selling pets, NO!! No commercial imports!! NO. Bring animals that are strays in other countries for adoption- I am torn on this one. They need homes but we have so many domestic dogs and cats already in Canada that need to be adopted.
- If the animal is coming from a legitimate breeder with all its health checks then there are reasons to allow it but we honestly don't feel we should be bringing in stray animals from shelters in the USA when there are so many unwanted animals in our own shelters
- I believe they should be coming from licensed breeders, with a family who already owns them, or to a registered rescue for assessment and adoption. Exotics should not be allowed.
- Consult with veterinary professionals on what are acceptable species to be kept as pets, in captivity, in a home, etc. What veterinary services, if any, are available for the animals in question- if none, we should not be importing them.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

Source? -must be humane. I.e: not taken from wild

- Licensing vaccines spayed neutered
- Vaccinated and spayed/neutered prior to arrival in Canada.
- I believe dogs in and around Calgary should be finding homes first
- I believe Canada border services monitors this and animals being under municipal rules already in place is enough
- Clean and healthy, or at least plans to get there. Foster homes or adoption in place. I personally believe we should take care of our animals before bringing in anything from other countries
- No imports we have enough strays locally that need help
- They need to be severely limited. Far too many places are importing dogs to make profit while Canadian dogs suffer.
- The overall health of the animal. Must be in good health.
- that they should have all their vaccinations up to date.
- I don't like this practice. This is how diseases we never had here spread. There are enough local animals to adopt.
- I think the imported animal should be up to date on vaccinations and quarantined if any illness is present.
- Up to date on rabies and spay/neuter
- NA
- The animal is a rescue from elsewhere, there should be no fees. Rescue organizations are all by donations and volunteers. There are too many unwanted dogs in the world and rescues save lives.
- That vaccines be up to date, possibly temperament tests, and they are spayed or neutered
- They should be adequately vetted and vaccinated, proof of temperament from the vet as well, if sold or adopted they should have licensing proof upon pickup from the agency
- Ensuring the health of the animal is utmost.
- Is there a current issue with how it works now? It seems fine to me. So long as registering cat/dogs takes place and exotic animals that are permitted are clearly declared or whatever is necessary.
- the imported should have a permit and be limited on the number of pets they can import per year
- Shelters and rescues should have to follow all of the same laws as private importers do
- Health check.
- As long as vet checked I see no issue with this.
- Only licensed zoos should be able to import exotic and invasive species. Rescues for cats and dogs (and some farm animals) should have requirements that protect the public but not make it overly onerous.
- Make sure they don't have any communicable diseases
- Ensure these animals are not endangered or hunted for sport
- Animals should be seen by a vet before AND after importing, up to date vaccines and medications and behavioral consultation.
- Health check and quarantine period so no diseases are being spread.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Unknown
- Importing dangerous animals should result in confiscation and harsh fines/other punishments. Exotics should have a mandatory vet examination (owners expense) to make sure they are healthy.
- merging these last questions: program working with reputable rescues & allowing a free licence for a year. This would entice reputable rescues to get their imported dogs licensed right away. This would allow the city to then track problematic dogs, or problematic rescues.
- Full vaccination and temperament tests done by professionals holding CPDT
- Pet must be altered.
- I volunteer with a rescue and know the rules well. They are firm and steadfast, yet allow us to save lives and adopt healthy animals to Calgarians. The animals need to be healthy, vaccinated and altered, and if not proof of the vetting and alteration by the Calgary rescue. Commercial Sale-OUTLAW.
- Proper vet records.
- Some form of quarantine for health along with a longer foster period to ensure animals decompress from the stress of the move before being assessed to decide on appropriate home.
- Should be in good health, should have undergone and passed a behaviour assessment by a registered professional, should be spayed/neutered, microchipped and have all shots up to date.
- I don't know enough about how this works to speak on it.
- Fully vaccinated and in good health. They should also have an owner that is responsible for them.
- That they meet CFIA requirements.
- The animals are treated nicely
- I believed that all imports require to have a clean bill of health, and records to prove so.
- If a rescue is importing them and is authorized to do so, then I support it.
- Ensure it has had shots, spay/neutered, and doesn't have any diseases (like kennel cough) and that it cannot introduce new diseases into Calgary community (blood test to ensure no pathogens)
- Not allow strays from other countries
Appropriate vaccinations and healthy specimens from vetted provider
- They should be reviewed for any behavioral issues, cleared by a vet for proper vaccinations, and have some sort of interim license put on them for tracking purposes.
- Its none of the city's business. This is not your jurisdiction so don't start making it one! There are import rules in place and monitored and controlled by CFIA and CBSA. Let them do their job!
- If they fall within Alberta's law of non-prohibited animals and do not carry disease or illness that can be contracted by local wildlife.
- Proper vetting, quarantine and disease control
- If the animals are known to be aggressive, they shouldn't be accepted in Calgary.
- What would be the purpose of this? I think the question that should be considered here is what is the recourse if these animals do not meet the criteria? If they met the federal regulations how do you send them back? Where do they go? Do we become a mass euthanization city?
- Vaccines. Check for foreign diseases prior to entry such as heart worm etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Vet checks.
- I didn't know this took place so I wouldn't know where to start or what to say.
- -
- Dogs only. Vet checked, shots and sterilization completed before entry.
- -a licensed organization in Calgary must be responsible for neuter/spay and caring for the wellbeing of the dog so it is healthy and does not affect other dogs in the community (disease/aggression etc.)
- I think there should be regulations that any breeder or rescue organization have to follow. More so for the transport and pick up of the animal at the airport. I have personally witnessed rescue pick ups at the airport and its like a free for all. It's so unorganized and chaotic.
- Only that they do not bring contagious diseases.
- I don't believe we should be importing animals for sale or adoption. If so they should most definitely have a registered Charity.
- No opinion
- Health checks, quarantine periods, available placement
- Make sure they have a forever home ready before they arrive. Just Commonsense don't be cruel.
- Again, not the City's business.
- I haven't a clue about this area.
- why are we importing animals at all?
- What is the need to import animals?
- Import animals for commercial purpose & individual sale shall be baned. Import animals should be rescued stray animals for adoption & service animals . Animals are all lifes, which cannot be traded freely by anyone.
- Clean vet certificate, spayed/ neutered, shots up to date
- Healthy and not bringing any diseases in
- Disease free, health of animal.
- None
- Health check
Licensed
Spay or neutered
- 100% healthy, spayed or neutered, not vicious.
- I think dogs should be allowed if they are for a blind person or for someone in need. There are too many rescues bringing in dogs for profit from other countries and local shelter that support dogs found locally are at capacity and turning away animals.
- Not sure
- Animals should only be imported for adoption purposes to rescue them from life threatening situations. Pets have a much better chance at life in Calgary than other parts of the world so we should allow it as long as they are going into the care of a reputable animal rescue
- Not sure



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- As long as there is a foster or adopter for them when they get here, bring them in
- Vet checked
- Vaccinated
- Criteria should be restricted to who is importing and why. This is not something the city has the ability to monitor.
- Same regulation/certifications as for businesses as above.
- unsure
- Can a similar animal be adopted within the city or country? Could this animal endgame others? What is the purpose of the animal?
- Impact on rescue organizations- is the market already saturated
- A health check should be done. Personality and disposition rating done to determine potential for adoption.
- Individuals bringing in one animal for personal use. Special permission for registered breeding dogs. No "rescue" groups bringing in dogs from other countries.
- Up to date health/care records (vaccinations a must!) of the animal; Quarantine upon arrival; Training for the animal to see where he/she needs attention if any.
- up to date vaccination
- Should only be able to import rescued animals
- Not sure what we are talking about. Are they Alberta vet approved?
- Should only be rescue animals and healthy/vaccinated/vetted
- Health assessments with a fee to cover the cost.
- I believe that commercial imports (which is now every single import no matter who owns them, or whether they have belonged to that individual and just moved to our country). I would like to see a better definition before comment.
- All should be isolated for 30 days in a quarantine, not provided by the new owner
- just that the animal is healthy (will not spread disease) and will be going to a good home/be well taken care of.
- I feel if they are for a retail business to sell/adopt (since they are using this terminology now) that should not be allowed. If a shelter is bringing in dogs to help the homeless dog population in other countries that is ok or if a person is bringing a single dog in that is ok.
- Screening/vaccination history for disease prevalent in their home country
- Proper licensing to ensure animal care and safety
- Follow the Canada border services guidelines.
- Vet checks. Bill of health.
- ?
- That they have been health checked and not carrying disease NOTHING MORE
- It is fairly unnecessary in general to have imported pets in Calgary. However they should have to be quarantined and pass some sort of medical exam. Animals that cannot be cared for in the city should not be allowed



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- that the animal comes from a responsible breeder (backyard or kennel club) - importance should be on the production of happy, healthy animals, restricting access makes it easier for puppy mills to thrive as ppl struggle to find places to purchase
- I'm not sure
- -vaccination requirement (all possible)
 - vet records
 - vet letter, stating no outstanding illnesses (contagious)
- Thorough health check, possible quarantine time frame depending on country of arrival, have to update any missing vaccinations that are required in Calgary
- Ensure there are no contagious diseases.
- Should we really allow this? Do we not have enough local animals available that need a safe and loving home?
 - IF so, same rules as Cochrane Humane Society.
- No different than any other animal - if the CBSA people have ensured the animal is safe to enter the country why would the city need to do anything else?
- Inspection with a strict set of rules
- Animals must be in good health
- same as the federal regulations- all shots up to date, microchipped
- There is no exception
- Disease free and have a nearly guaranteed chance of adoption
- limit on number of pets in store
 - staff training/certification in animal care
- Quarantine the animals for a set # of days before being released into the public spaces in Calgary, each association should only be allowed a certain number of animals to be imported per year so that they are not over capacity.
- They should have all appropriate Health clearances, vaccines Etc
- **NO DANGEROUS BREEDS.** Adult pit bulls are coming without any history of prior incidents and aggression and are being adopted by unsuspecting people. Foreign dogs need to be quarantined. Parasites and diseases are rampant among street dogs.
- Leave it alone
- No comment
- After adopting a dog I found in Mexico I realized how many resources we have. I believe importing animals in need (high kill shelters, less fortunate areas) is necessary but not special breeds (designer dogs, etc) that are not in need. We have enough dogs in need here
- They should have a health check and should not be allowed if they can harm the natural environment.
- No animal should be imported that is a threatened species, or if released into our native environment, poses a threat to the natural fauna or flora.
- Complete wellness checks



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- If they are rescue animals, they should be accepted and handled accordingly if they have any ailments or diseases that need to be treated for. There should be no fee to import animals through rescues.
- Health/vet checks and quarantine where necessary.
- Animals should be tested for diseases. Animals should not be endangered.
- A check of the health of the animal
- I wouldn't want regulations that inadvertently limit the ability of rescue operations to bring dogs from other countries for adoption. I think Canada has good regulations around exotic and endangered animals already
- They are health checked to make sure they aren't carrying a disease. And make sure they aren't stolen etc.
- Immunizations should be up to date, animal should be neutered or spayed and in good health to ensure they are not transmitting any illness or disease. They should be checked to verify they are not aggressive or dangerous in any way. They should require licensing.
- Must be registered and approved rescues . No other imports other than rescues should be allowed commercially
- For agencies like mexpup or something - I feel that we have enough local animals that need help. if people would like to start an agency like this, there should be licensing of some kind to adopt out animals.
- Proper vet records
- Rescue animals only.
- Screening for infectious disease.
- Health and welfare of animals
- Importing animals for commercial purposes should be banned. For adoption should follow the same criteria CBA uses to assess health and then ensure responsible pet ownership once in the city through a mechanism of 1-2 checks after import.
- Proof of health, vaccinations. Some way to "register" keep track of the dogs as they are welcomed to the city and find their new home.
- I do not believe we should be importing animals from foreign countries. They bring in diseases. Our animals are not able to fight.
- This is already managed by the CBSA, the city should have no involvement in this other than to issue licenses to these animals.
- I have mixed feelings about importing animals. While I want to help the less fortunate countries with their issues, it can't be at the expense of resident animals. If imported, there should be a mandatory quarantine time in Canada.
- This is tricky because there are lots of rescue groups that could fall into this area and they do good work. I also am part of the equestrian sport and animals are imported regularly in a safe manner both for sale and to participate in competitions. I am not sure what rules are needed here.
- Transportation of such animals is adequate



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- deny exotics, and if you can't then, strict licensing and inspection of containment biennially, strict rules and proof of health and welfare from certified vet - if none of this then heavy fines that double each incident
- Show that the animal is better served by being brought into the city and could not be sold/adopted in their city/country of origin.
- Animals must be fully vetted and copies of health status provided upon arrival.
- Must be fully vaccinated and tested for contagions. Must undergo quarantine.
- Intent for sale, incident history of the animal and the importer
- Nothing that can cross contaminate humans like SARS or Covid-19, for example.
- The only animals crossing Canadian borders should be those accompanying families immigrating or relocating to Canada, or animals used in competitions or shows
- They should come into the Humane Society first (at a processing fee charge), be checked by the animal specialist there to ensure they are properly vaccinated and healthy. At that time a multi year city license must be bought before the animal can be released.
- If they're imported by a breeder there should be fees attached, if they're coming from a rescue they should have proper vet checks.
- They should be held to at a minimum the guidelines and regulations of Canada Border Services and the welfare of the animal should be the priority not the seller or the buyer.
- Proof or reasonably acceptable paperwork that mirror some of the important guidelines regulated under CBSA.
- Animals have received the appropriate health checks, as in any animal import stream. Animals are not wild-caught.
- Health inspections, registration and licensing should be mandatory.
- I do not believe that animal rescue has borders. I think the Canada Border Services regulations are sufficient.
- Quarantine and medical screen to ensure animals are healthy.
- No importation by rescues
- If we are referring to rescue organizations importing animals, I believe the rescue should have to prove that they have the human and financial resources to properly care for these animals. Too many of these organizations are over extending themselves and the animals suffer for it.
- Importing of animals should be very limited there is too much of it that is only for profit. There are lots of animals within our own country that need help before we bring in more it also opens this up to diseases and other things that we do not currently have in Canada such as dog flu
- Those of the Border Services.
- Vet health checks, license/chip, proof of behaviour assessment
- Imported from WHERE? Is the big question! I myself have imported 2 dogs from Hungary from Top Breeders in that country. One was the [personal information removed] that came to Canada to retire and be my loving pet. Dogs from countries with Disease and lacking health Testing and shots NOT ALLOWED!

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Leave it to Border control. I don't understand the problem. Are you trying to limit puppy farm dogs or rescue groups that bring in animals that would otherwise be put down. I foster. It is a non profit. We help dogs. It is a great group. Encourage it.
- What really is the purpose? Are they also importing disease. There are enough animals here looking for homes.
- Should not allow this practice unless we run out of animals that need adoption
- Medical checks for diseases.
- I don't know. We have so many animals that require homes here... this is beyond my ability to comment. I don't know. I have never met a rescue dog from abroad that I didn't like. All dogs are created equally and should have the opportunity to live in a loving home.
- Should not be done illegally. Same as above.
- they should not be permitted in Canada due to putting our animals at risk of new diseases.
- Ensuring the animals have been checked by a vet prior to being transported to ensure no transfer of diseases
- Entirely depends on the animal.
- - All animals should be fixed, vaccinated and chipped.
- Please stop importation of pitbulls. Otherwise, imported animals should be up to date in all vaccinations and should be subject to a health check by a vet before they are admitted to the city.
- The same rules that are in effect for responsible pet ownership.
- As long as the groups are doing it properly nothing needs to change
- Stop bring in pets from other countries that bring in diseases that aren't in Canada to prevent introducing new diseases to our domestic pets.
- no imported dogs or cats as long as we have dogs and cats in shelters and rescues.
- Should not allow it. We have an abundance of dogs and cats looking for homes.
- This is an important thing to offer unwanted, neglected, abandoned pets. They should be properly vetted/health checked before, upon arrival and a follow up a few weeks after arrival. This would help regarding parasite detection and treatments too.
- Mandatory business licensing, veterinarian, bylaw, and potentially fish and wildlife inspections. maybe fine when they arrived in Canada, but what happens in the business? How are they cared for? I have seen some horrible conditions in my job. create rules for the businesses that are going to profit
- Imported animals must have current health records and immunisation records.
- If animals are being removed from their families and natural habitats for us, that needs to stop. We should not accept these animals.
- that they are healthy and that they are going to good recourse that are looking after them and getting them into good homes
- I don't know enough about this topic to opine.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The city should be following federal and provincial biological rules here for anyone bringing animals, reptiles, plants, fish or birds into Canada. No none native species should be allowed. Why is the city messing into this area?
- Reviewed and licensed for the use and purpose of the animals in question.
- I feel that animals being imported should be quarantined, also subject to a battery of tests before being able to be adopted out. I also feel that there should be a limit on how many animals can be brought in to Calgary per month/year.
- Again, making sure the animal is vetted and healthy, and that there is a place for them to go and live a healthy life (not in a kennel or tied to a tree, etc.) We don't need more stray animals in the city or surrounding areas, we have our own to look after, but I do understand dire situations.
- Any imported animals should be required to be spayed or neutered. This is NOT a commercial enterprise unless the animals are destined to be sold, and that can be regulated by having the importing agency registered. Commercial agencies should be licensed, but rescue agencies should not.
- No idea
- The animals should be maintained in safe, clean, and appropriate places. They should receive suitable food, and prospective owners should be able to demonstrate that they can care for them. Businesses should have a plan for animals that aren't sold.
- There should be paperwork showing that the animal was legally obtained, and health records showing they have no communicable diseases such as parvovirus or kennel cough.
- Health checked
- Proper health exams, vaccinations and licensing or permits for resale or adoption. Is there a good place for the animal to go? ie not held for weeks in small cages etc.
- Non venomous, non poisonous, non endangered
- Complete health assessment and registration
- must be proven healthy, and adoptable (behaviour wise). Must have fosters/proper homes available to house them on arrival.
- Not sure
- What is currently in place
- The health of the animal and the welfare of the animal and it's purpose here.
- quarantine and enviro assessment
- If there is a way to ensure that the animals are ethically sourced and treated during transit.
- Ensure that the animal does not carry any infections diseases.
- I don't think we should period for commercial purposes. Rescue is different.
- I am ok with import of tropical fish, reptiles or pocket pets based on demand. However, I am not a fan of ""rescues"" importing unwanted dogs from other countries. Some are sick or have lots of behavior issues. Perhaps a quota on the number of dog allowed and behavior tests would be adequate.
- MUST know where the animals came from; licensed, reputable breeders, health checks, etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- From their locale licensed and registered breeder/organization. Quarantine and health evaluation by local vet?
- rescues only, health checks, spayed/neutered
- Animals should be adopted prior to allowing transport to Canada.
- I think imported animals should be limited. Rescues are THE BIGGEST issue. Ethical breeders seem to follow guidelines
- Only registered animal rescue agencies should be allowed to import animals in the city from outside Canada. Breeder sales should not be allowed.
- No animals taken from the wild - - ever. ---only domesticated pets like cats or dogs - - maybe a pet rabbit.
- Vet cleared
- Lawfulness and sensitivity to adoption demand here in Alberta (ie when our shelters and pounds have many dogs to adopt I don't understand why we're accepting dog adoptions from far away countries)
- Animals deemed as ""rescue"" should be non-profit only. They should be screened more to protect the local pop. fr foreign disease.
Commercial imports also include animals for exhibition/breeding purposes. These should be allowed easier access to encourage quality breeding and outsourcing.
- Spay or neuter non endangered or invasive.
- That animals imported cannot be resold or rescued in the town of Calgary. Only canines and felines produced by an accredited business / breeder in alberta. Oh wait you gonna need to make a liscence for rescue and breeder and charge a tax fee , yes! Or charge a huge tax/ surchar o import resells..
- All imported rescues should be in quaratine for 30 days. Tired of rescue dogs being brought in carrying new diseases that affect local dogs. Should be utd on all shots before they arrive..and at least 14 days prior to arrival (for dogs over 16 weeks)
- Up to date vaccines. spay or neuter AND some form of behavior assessment BEFORE entering Canada
- Rabies check
- Minimum standard of vetting and documentation, limit number coming in at one time (no vans full of 30 animals driving in from L.A.), animals can't be pre-sold or pre-adopted to allow them to be fully vetted and temperament tested first
- Vaccinations should be up to date, and a home/foster should already have been arranged.
- Find appropriate care
- no opinion
- Full background info should be mandatory for animals coming into the country (ie: previously vicious dogs from kill shelters in the States coming across the border to Canada with no records).
- No imports from countries like Mexico, Asia or third world countries.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not be exotic or endangered. The animal to be healthy with up to date health records, and a vet check on arrival.
- none. why duplicate what is already in place
- They must have a valid health certificate and be fully vaccinated.
- They don't come from puppy mills
- I think we need to take into consideration the animals that are here already and that they are not euthanized and one is brought from another country
- - Must have complete medical history, ideally should be reviewed by a veterinarian upon entry.
- - Relevant screening for diseases/parasites found in the area that the animal is being imported from in order to minimize risk of infecting local populations.
- - Possibly enact mandatory quarantine period
- We do not need out of country animals. Unless for breeding purposes and then make sure they pay.
- purpose of use. example, a non-business should not order 30 hamsters.
- I believe they are doing just fine as is.
- The animals should be vet-checked upon arrival.
- Must be quarantined for a period of time to determine their health and ensure they're not carrying a virus, new owner must license the animal
- Any animal that is in need of aid should receive it and thus adoption animals should be welcomed if they can find a home in Calgary.
- Vet checks are required before sale and reports provided to the purchaser
- I don't think we should accept animals from elsewhere - we have enough pets looking for homes already from abandonment / at large with no one looking for them / surrender. Animal rescues should and be able to rescue from CHS and City Animal Services to keep it local.
- Animal health and designated use. If an animal exists domestically that would fill the role of the animal being brought in.
- Cites appendices must be followed
- I do not know
- No puppy/kitten mills.
Animals must be raised in healthy environments for them.
Animals must be up to date with shots and spayed or neutered.
- Import/Export is not a municipal responsibility.
- I think it's great that organizations rescue animals from places where they would otherwise suffer and be put down. It is important to ensure that these organizations work and communicate closely with the city to ensure the most ethical treatment.
- Health certificate, spay neuter before rehoming
- Ensuring that the animal will be appropriately cared for is a huge factor, and that the person responsible for it can be held accountable if they don't act in the animals or societies best interest.
- I am most concerned about zoonotic diseases (for example. rabies).
- Tested for diseases, well socialized and only rescues.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- savings lives is what is important. Our rescues also send dogs/cats to other countries to new adopters. If it saves lives, do it.
- reference Canadian laws.. there is some good info there. I am not a fan of importing rescues and dogs coming from unknown sketchy sources. Health checks are really important
- safety and disease standards, definitely spayed or neutered.
- Must be reviewed for safety of humans and not adversely impacting our existing wildlife balance etc
- need improved criteria here that should be monitored.
- That our shelters are empty. Start local first.
- Shots are up to date and the animals are not considered dangerous
 - - There are dogs here already
 - - Have brought sick dogs to off leash
 - - quarantine
 - - Burcellosis, Rabbies - testing
 - - Zoological diseases
 - - temperament - behaviour testing
- - quarantine
 - diseases
 - big outbreaks
 - false health certificates
 - supersolosis test -> not tested when they come in
 - Rabbies
 - Commercial - is that for profit? Pet vs. commercial
 - define that means
 - quarantine
 - health cleanliness
 - verification of health ceritificates
- Quota. If there are lots of animals that need homes in Canada, we shouldn't accept as many from abroad.
- Healthy animals
- up to date vaccination
- Should only be able to import rescued animals
- Not sure what we are talking about. Are they Alberta vet approved?
- Should only be rescue animals and healthy/vaccinated/vetted
- Health assessments with a fee to cover the cost.
- I believe that commercial imports (which is now every single import no matter who owns them, or whether they have belonged to that individual and just moved to our country). I would like to see a better definition before comment.
- All should be isolated for 30 days in a quarantine, not provided by the new owner
- The animal being brought in should be healthy.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- just that the animal is healthy (will not spread disease) and will be going to a good home/be well taken care of.
- I feel if they are for a retail business to sell/adopt (since they are using this terminology now) that should not be allowed. If a shelter is bringing in dogs to help the homeless dog population in other countries that is ok or if a person is bringing a single dog in that is ok.
- Screening/vaccination history for disease prevalent in their home country
- Proper licensing to ensure animal care and safety
- Follow the Canada border services guidelines.
- Vet checks. Bill of health.
- Confirmation from veterinarians on the sending side that they disease free.
- ?
- That they have been health checked and not carrying disease NOTHING MORE
- It is fairly unnecessary in general to have imported pets in Calgary. However they should have to be quarantined and pass some sort of medical exam. Animals that cannot be cared for in the city should not be allowed
- that the animal comes from a responsible breeder (backyard or kennel club) - importance should be on the production of happy, healthy animals, restricting access makes it easier for puppy mills to thrive as ppl struggle to find places to purchase
- I'm not sure
- -vaccination requirement (all possible)
- -vet records
- -vet letter, stating no outstanding illnesses (contagious)
- Thorough health check, possible quarantine time frame depending on country of arrival, have to update any missing vaccinations that are required in Calgary
- Ensure there are no contagious diseases.
- Should we really allow this? Do we not have enough local animals available that need a safe and loving home?
IF so, same rules as Cochrane Humane Society.
- No different than any other animal - if the CBSA people have ensured the animal is safe to enter the country why would the city need to do anything else?
- Inspection with a strict set of rules
- Fully vaccinated, Rabies included should be mandatory, a 2 week self- quarantine at a minimum for international animals with no public access
- Animals must be in good health
- same as the federal regulations- all shots up to date, microchipped
- There is no exception
- Disease free and have a nearly guaranteed chance of adoption
- limit on number of pets in store
- staff training/certification in animal care



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Unless they are rescues, cats and dogs should not be imported.
- Quarantine the animals for a set # of days before being released into the public spaces in Calgary, each association should only be allowed a certain number of animals to be imported per year so that they are not over capacity.
- They should have all appropriate Health clearances, vaccines Etc
- Fully vaccinated healthy animals must be licensed by non profit until adopted (to keep track of). access to where animals are held ie conditions of home/shelter.
- -Check for disease
 - Determine whether the animals were obtained legally and ethically
 - Ensure that an accidental release of the animals would not have significant impact on native wildlife
- **NO DANGEROUS BREEDS.** Adult pit bulls are coming without any history of prior incidents and aggression and are being adopted by unsuspecting people. Foreign dogs need to be quarantined. Parasites and diseases are rampant among street dogs.
- Leave it alone
- No comment
- After adopting a dog I found in Mexico I realized how many resources we have. I believe importing animals in need (high kill shelters, less fortunate areas) is necessary but not special breeds (designer dogs, etc) that are not in need. We have enough dogs in need here
- Spayed and neutered animals only, checked if obeying and not aggressive.
- Existence of a health certificate, plan for care that is possible and appropriate qualification for the owner.
- Ensure they are not being used for entertainment purposes and that they will be treated well by those importing them. Do not allow exotic animals, or animals that would not normally experience Alberta's climate to be imported.
- They should have a health check and should not be allowed if they can harm the natural environment.
- No animal should be imported that is a threatened species, or if released into our native environment, poses a threat to the natural fauna or flora.
- Complete wellness checks
- If they are rescue animals, they should be accepted and handled accordingly if they have any ailments or diseases that need to be treated for. There should be no fee to import animals through rescues.
- Health/vet checks and quarantine where necessary.
- Animals being imported must be subjected to physical exam by a DVM. They should provide proof of health and deworming.
- Animals should be tested for diseases. Animals should not be endangered.
- A check of the health of the animal
- I wouldn't want regulations that inadvertently limit the ability of rescue operations to bring dogs from other countries for adoption. I think Canada has good regulations around exotic and endangered animals already



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They are health checked to make sure they aren't carrying a disease. And make sure they aren't stolen etc.
- Immunizations should be up to date, animal should be neutered or spayed and in good health to ensure they are not transmitting any illness or disease. They should be checked to verify they are not aggressive or dangerous in any way. They should require licensing.
- Must be registered and approved rescues . No other imports other than rescues should be allowed commercially
- For agencies like mexpup or something - I feel that we have enough local animals that need help. if people would like to start an agency like this, there should be licensing of some kind to adopt out animals.
- Proper vet records
- Rescue animals only.
- Screening for infectious disease.
- Health and welfare of animals
- //
- Health checks prior to import. Not imported for profit. Responsible organization importing and caring for animals prior to adoption.
- Importing animals for commercial purposes should be banned. For adoption should follow the same criteria CBA uses to assess health and then ensure responsible pet ownership once in the city through a mechanism of 1-2 checks after import.
- Proof of health, vaccinations. Some way to "register" keep track of the dogs as they are welcomed to the city and find their new home.
- I do not believe we should be importing animals from foreign countries. They bring in diseases. Our animals are not able to fight.
- I don't think that animals from outside of Canada should be brought here in huge transports for rescues to make money. There are enough animals within Canada that need homes.
- Ensure the dogs did not arrive from illegal puppy mills unless they have been rescued and are brought for adoption in Canada. They should be vaccinated and Spayed/Neutered
- icensed business...paperwork showing acquisition and ownership...pricing in line with three market...health records for the animal..current vet sign off
- This is already managed by the CBSA, the city should have no involvement in this other than to issue licenses to these animals.
- I have mixed feelings about importing animals. While I want to help the less fortunate countries with their issues, it can't be at the expense of resident animals. If imported, there should be a mandatory quarantine time in Canada.
- This is tricky because there are lots of rescue groups that could fall into this area and they do good work. I also am part of the equestrian sport and animals are imported regularly in a safe manner both for sale and to participate in competitions. I am not sure what rules are needed here.
- Transportation of such animals is adequate



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Must be tested to ensure not bringing in disease.
- deny exotics, and if you can't then, strict licensing and inspection of containment biennially, strict rules and proof of health and welfare from certified vet - if none of this then heavy fines that double each incident
- Show that the animal is better served by being brought into the city and could not be sold/adopted in their city/country of origin.
- Animals must be fully vetted and copies of health status provided upon arrival.
- Must be fully vaccinated and tested for contagions. Must undergo quarantine.
- Intent for sale, incident history of the animal and the importer
- Nothing that can cross contaminate humans like SARS or Covid-19, for example.
- Bio-security, have the dogs been screened for diseases/parasites that are prevalent in the areas that they come from, i.e. heart worm. Health of the animal.
- The only animals crossing Canadian borders should be those accompanying families immigrating or relocating to Canada, or animals used in competitions or shows
- They should come into the Humane Society first (at a processing fee charge), be checked by the animal specialist there to ensure they are properly vaccinated and healthy. At that time a multi year city license must be bought before the animal can be released.
- I don't know enough about this to answer
- If they're imported by a breeder there should be fees attached, if they're coming from a rescue they should have proper vet checks.
- Proper vetting - limits on how many are brought in. Possible quarantine
- They should be held to at a minimum the guidelines and regulations of Canada Border Services and the welfare of the animal should be the priority not the seller or the buyer.
- Proof or reasonably acceptable paperwork that mirror some of the important guidelines regulated under CBSA.
- I think that there is no way for the city to control that. People just won't register the animal if they are more hoops.
- Animals have received the appropriate health checks, as in any animal import stream. Animals are not wild-caught.
- Health inspections, registration and licensing should be mandatory.
- I do not believe that animal rescue has borders. I think the Canada Border Services regulations are sufficient.
- Quarantine and medical screen to ensure animals are healthy.
- No importation by rescues
- If we are referring to rescue organizations importing animals, I believe the rescue should have to prove that they have the human and financial resources to properly care for these animals. Too many of these organizations are over extending themselves and the animals suffer for it.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Importing of animals should be very limited there is too much of it that is only for profit. There are lots of animals within our own country that need help before we bring in more it also opens this up to diseases and other things that we do not currently have in Canada such as dog flu
- that they are imported humanly and have their vaccinations up to date. If they legally came over the border to be adopted it should be allowed
- Those of the Border Services.
- Vet health checks, license/chip, proof of behaviour assessment
- Multiple health tests should be done for diseases not common in CanDa and the dogs should be quarantined until they are proven to be disease free
- Imported from WHERE? Is the big question! I myself have imported 2 dogs from Hungary from Top Breeders in that country. One was the [personal information removed] that came to Canada to retire and be my loving pet. Dogs from countries with Disease and lacking health Testing and shots NOT ALLOWED!
- Leave it to Border control. I don't understand the problem. Are you trying to limit puppy farm dogs or rescue groups that bring in animals that would otherwise be put down. I foster. It is a non profit. We help dogs. It is a great group. Encourage it.
- What really is the purpose? Are the also importing disease. There are enough animals here looking for homes.
- Should not allow this practice unless we run out of animals that need adoption
- Medical checks for diseases.
- I don't know. We have so many animals that require homes here... this is beyond my ability to comment. I don't know. I have never met a rescue dog from abroad that I didn't like. All dogs are created equally and should have the opportunity to live in a loving home.
- Exotic animals should not be allowed in the city.
- Should not be done illegally. Same as above.
- they should not be permitted in canada due to putting our animals at risk of new diseases.
- Ensuring the animals have been checked by a vet prior to being transported to ensure no transfer of diseases
- Entirely depends on the animal.
- - All animals should be fixed, vaccinated and chipped.
- Please stop importation of pitbulls. Otherwise, imported animals should be up to date in all vaccinations and should be subject to a health check by a vet before they are admitted to the city.
- The same rules that are in affect for responsible pet ownership.
- That they are healthy.
- As long as the groups are doing it properly nothing needs to change
- Humane treatment of animals.
- Published/registered plan of the life cycle of their stock including disposition of unsold merchandise.
- Quarantine



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stop bring in pets from other countries that bring in diseases that aren't in Canada to prevent introducing new diseases to our domestic pets.
- no imported dogs or cats as long as we have dogs and cats in shelters and rescues.
- Should not allow it. We have an abundance of dogs and cats looking for homes.
- This is an important thing to offer unwanted, neglected, abandoned pets. They should be properly vetted/health checked before, upon arrival and a follow up a few weeks after arrival. This would help regarding parasite detection and treatments too.
- Mandatory business licensing, veterinarian, bylaw, and potentially fish and wildlife inspections. maybe fine when they arrived in Canada, but what happens in the business? How are they cared for? I have seen some horrible conditions in my job. create rules for the businesses that are going to profit
- Free of disease, licensed and tattooed in advance of importation, filling a need that can not already be met within the city (eg. importing dogs from foreign shelters doesn't make sense when there are plenty of shelter animals in Calgary).
- Imported animals must have current health records and immunisation records.
- Rescue animals should not be allowed to be imported.
- If animals are being removed from their families and natural habitats for us, that needs to stop. We should not accept these animals.
- that they are healthy and that they are going to good recurse that are looking after them and getting them into good homes
- I don't know enough about this topic to opine.
- The city should be following federal and provincial biological rules here for anyone bringing animals, reptiles, plants, fish or birds into Canada. No none native species should be allowed. Why is the city messing into this area?
- Reviewed and licensed for the use and purpose of the animals in question.
- proof of good health, proof of ownership, proof of belonging to an organisation, plan for the animals (adoption etc)
- I feel that animals being imported should be quarantined, also subject to a battery of tests before being able to be adopted out. I also feel that there should be a limit on how many animals can be brought in to Calgary per month/year.
- Again, making sure the animal is vetted and healthy, and that there is a place for them to go and live a healthy life (not in a kennel or tied to a tree, etc.) We don't need more stray animals in the city or surrounding areas, we have our own to look after, but I do understand dire situations.
- Any imported animals should be required to be spayed or neutered. This is NOT a commercial enterprise unless the animals are destined to be sold, and that can be regulated by having the importing agency registered. Commercial agencies should be licensed, but rescue agencies should not.
- No idea



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The animals should be maintained in safe, clean, and appropriate places. They should receive suitable food, and prospective owners should be able to demonstrate that they can care for them. Businesses should have a plan for animals that aren't sold.
- There should be paperwork showing that the animal was legally obtained, and health records showing they have no communicable diseases such as parvovirus or kennel cough.
- Health checked
- Proper health exams, vaccinations and licensing or permits for resale or adoption. Is there a good place for the animal to go? ie not held for weeks in small cages etc.
- Non venomous, non poisonous, non endangered
- Complete health assessment and registration
- must be proven healthy, and adoptable (behaviour wise). Must have fosters/proper homes available to house them on arrival.
- Not sure
- What is currently in place
- The health of the animal and the welfare of the animal and it's purpose here.
- quarantine and enviro assessment
- If there is a way to ensure that the animals are ethically sourced and treated during transit.
- Ensure that the animal does not carry any infections diseases.
- I don't think we should period for commercial purposes. Rescue is different.
- I am ok with import of tropical fish, reptiles or pocket pets based on demand. However, I am not a fan of ""rescues"" importing unwanted dogs from other countries. Some are sick or have lots of behavior issues. Perhaps a quota on the number of dog allowed and behavior tests would be adequate.
- The same as importing any foreign species ... vaccinations, licensing, quarantining.
- MUST know where the animals came from; licensed, reputable breeders, health checks, etc.
- From their locale licensed and registered breeder/organization. Quarantine and health evaluation by local vet?
- rescues only, health checks, spayed/neutered
- Animals should be adopted prior to allowing transport to Canada.
- I think imported animals should be limited. Rescues are THE BIGGEST issue. Ethical breeders seem to follow guidelines
- Pose no risk to public, public spaces, prove sufficient space and resources for humane care, and their locations zoned appropriately
- Only registered animal rescue agencies should be allowed to import animals in the city from outside Canada. Breeder sales should not be allowed.
- that a full physical is done from health to blood work. a sychological assessment to make sure of aggression levels
- No animals taken from the wild - - ever. ---only domesticated pets like cats or dogs - - maybe a pet rabbit.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- We have enough homeless animals. No need to import more. Only accept animals that are moving here with their owner
- They should have all their basic mandatory tests done.
- Vet cleared
- Lawfulness and sensitivity to adoption demand here in Alberta (ie when our shelters and pounds have many dogs to adopt I don't understand why we're accepting dog adoptions from far away countries)
- Animals deemed as ""rescue"" should be non-profit only. They should be screened more to protect the local pop. fr foreign disease.
Commercial imports also include animals for exhibition/breeding purposes. These should be allowed easier access to encourage quality breeding and outsourcing.
- No wild caught only bred-in-captivity animals should be allowed to be imported into the city for sale. This should apply especially to parrots and cockatoos.
- Unsure of rules now. Can't say but definitely spay/neuter/vaccines/vet checks
- Spay or neuter non endangered or invasive.
- Only for personal use and should have to apply for importation.
- That animals imported cannot be resold or rerescued in the town of Calgary. Only canines and felines produced by an accredited business / breeder in alberta. Oh wait you gonna need to make a liscence for rescue and breeder and charge a tax fee , yes! Or charge a huge tax/ surchar o import resells..
- All imported rescues should be in quaratine for 30 days. Tired of rescue dogs being brought in carrying new diseases that affect local dogs. Should be utd on all shots before they arrive..and at least 14 days prior to arrival (for dogs over 16 weeks)
- Health certificate, much the same as now. If this is for commercial resale, again...health certified. Restriction should be put on "rescues" due to the increased risk of disease to our own animals. Perhaps animals coming in from rescues should have a quaranteen period to guarantee health.
- Up to date vaccines. spay or neuter AND some form of behavior assessment BEFORE entering Canada
- Rabies check
- Health testing/vet checks. Quarantine if the animal is ill.
- Minimum standard of vetting and documentation, limit number coming in at one time (no vans full of 30 animals driving in from L.A.), animals can't be pre-sold or pre-adopted to allow them to be fully vetted and temperament tested first
- Vaccinations should be up to date, and a home/foster should already have been arranged.
- Find appropriate care
- Insure they are vet checked
- no opinion
- Full background info should be mandatory for animals coming into the country (ie: previously vicious dogs from kill shelters in the States coming across the border to Canada with no records).



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No imports from countries like Mexico, Asia or third world countries.
- Documented clearance for health and communicable disease. Capability of importer to provide vaccination, vet care, humane care and shelter immediately.
- Not be exotic or endangered. The animal to be healthy with up to date health records, and a vet check on arrival.
- none. why duplicate what is already in place
- They must have a valid health certificate and be fully vaccinated.
- They don't come from puppy mills
- I think we need to take into consideration the animals that are here already and that they are not euthanized and one is brought from another country
- - Must have complete medical history, ideally should be reviewed by a veterinarian upon entry.
- - Relevant screening for diseases/parasites found in the area that the animal is being imported from in order to minimize risk of infecting local populations.
- - Possibly enact mandatory quarantine period
- We do not need out of country animals. Unless for breeding purposes and then make sure they pay.
- purpose of use. example, a non-business should not order 30 hamsters.
- I believe they are doing just fine as is.
- The animals should be vet-checked upon arrival.
- Must be quarantined for a period of time to determine their health and ensure they're not carrying a virus, new owner must license the animal
- Any animal that is in need of aid should receive it and thus adoption animals should be welcomed if they can find a home in Calgary.
- Vet checks are required before sale and reports provided to the purchaser
- I don't think we should accept animals from elsewhere - we have enough pets looking for homes already from abandonment / at large with no one looking for them / surrender. Animal rescues should and be able to rescue from CHS and City Animal Services to keep it local.
- Animal health and designated use. If an animal exists domestically that would fill the role of the animal being brought in.
- Cites appendices must be followed
- I do not know
- No puppy/kitten mills.
Animals must be raised in healthy environments for them.
Animals must be up to date with shots and spayed or neutered.
- Import/Export is not a municipal responsibility.
- I think it's great that organizations rescue animals from places where they would otherwise suffer and be put down. It is important to ensure that these organizations work and communicate closely with the city to ensure the most ethical treatment.
- health checks to be free from disease.
- Must be kept in quarantine for a month or more



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Health certificate, spay neuter before rehoming
- Ensuring that the animal will be appropriately cared for is a huge factor, and that the person responsible for it can be held accountable if they don't act in the animals or societies best interest.
- I am most concerned about zoonotic diseases (for example. rabies).
- Tested for diseases, well socialized and only rescues.
- Vaccinations and health checks completed.
- saving lives is what is important. Our rescues also send dogs/cats to other countries to new adopters. If it saves lives, do it.
- reference Canadian laws.. there is some good info there. I am not a fan of importing rescues and dogs coming from unknown sketchy sources. Health checks are really important
- safety and disease standards, definitely spayed or neutered.
- Have all confirmation of having received all needed shots, record of ownership, past and current. Record of having complied with all international/ federal laws.
- they are updated on vaccinations and disease free - taken to a local vet clinic or animal services to be tested
- Must be reviewed for safety of humans and not adversely impacting our existing wildlife balance etc
- need improved criteria here that should be monitored.
- That our shelters are empty. Start local first.
- We shouldn't accept imported animals until all adoptable animals are taken care of.
- Shots are up to date and the animals are not considered dangerous
- All imported animals should undergo home quarantine procedures until cleared by a qualified veterinary professional
- not diseased. Quarantined at the border for health and safety reasons. the animal should already have their vaccinations etc
- We should not be importing dogs and cats into our city period. We have millions euthanized in Canada, bringing them in from Mexico and the like by 'shelters' should be illegal. Only show breeders should be allowed to import.
- Import properly vaccinated and healthy animals.
- Domestic animals only and only if the owner is relocating to Calgary. Continue to require rabies certificates.
- All must be fully vetted and approved and healthy. All must be spayed and neutered prior to entering Canada
- Health check at the importers expense
- Do not import outside of the province. quarantine all animals coming in from areas rural or otherwise that are feral and for sure out of side of Canada.
Written assessment done by a trird party trainer with behaviour training before any dog gets places.
- Medical and behavioral assessment by a qualified person(s)
- Certificate of health. Include first year of licensing in the cost of purchasing the animal.
- Health history



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement
June 29, 2020

Origin

- Appropriate vetting and paperwork to prove it: deworming, vaccinations, etc. Also a history of where the animal was before and what the environment was like.
- Health & temperament checks. Vaccinations. Exotic animals from the tropics should not be allowed in Canada.
- Ability to trace lineage and breeder of animal
If from a rescue then all immunization up to dates and no unspayed/neutered is allowed to enter unless have proven why necessary to be a stud
- Screening for transmissible disease.
- Vaccines, spayed/neutered, checked for diseases (URV, FIV, FELV, Parvo etc.) more serious diseases must be treated prior to entering the country.
- Consideration of the impact to local animals and environment. Is this a suitable climate for the animal
- health. that the animals already impounded in the city have been adopted out first instead of bringing in ones from outside the country
- Health
Behaviour/temperament
Origin
Vaccination history
Ability to thrive in climate (exotics)
- As long as the animals have been vetted and have received the appropriate vaccinations to enter the country, that should be sufficient.
- Importers should be qualified and licensed to assess animals and find proper homes.
- No animals are to be used for sport (fighting) or anything that will endanger them.
- -Check ups to make sure pets are being treated as the law states
-high licensing fees to detour importing animals
- Permits and licensing
I'm not familiar with the issue
- I've never liked the idea of animals coming into our country, given the fact we can't even take care of the ones we already have. I think that Calgary should not allow anymore adoption agencies that what to bring animals into Canada to be in business.
- Health and disease checks by a veterinarian specializing in the species in question, to limit the spread of diseases. Horses are imported all the time and quarantined/medically reviewed. It's a very reasonable and accepted process.
- health
behaviour/ temperament
origin
vaccination history
ability to thrive in climate (exotics)



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Precautions need to be taken to make sure there isn't infectious disease, or if there is, that the animal will be isolated and taken care of until it is cured. All animals should be treated humanely at all times.
- Quarantine the animals; permit or license to do so; thorough health exam
- check for diseases. DON't know.
- Animals should only be imported by animal rescues for "Adoption Only", be spayed & neutered, and not for any breeding.
- No exotic period.
- I believe there are enough unwanted animals in this city and yet there are so many rescue organizations that import them from Mexico, LA etc...Many come with behavioral and/or medical issues and could later cause expense to the adopting person or they become abandoned because of behavioral issues
- Working with the border services to ensure these animals would not pose any major risks to people.
- They are acceptable and appropriate pets. Not wild animals. That they are housed, fed, and cared for in a safe way.
- Quarantine period.
Require behaviour/temperament testing.
Business license/permit.
Require health examinations by a licensed, practicing vet.
- Common sense please...no endangered animals, no wild animals etc. Sale and adoption only if to/from reputable breeders/rescues. Must prove animal is not stolen, to be used as bait or other illegal purposes. Individuals allowed to bring in pet/show/breeding quality animals from reputable source.
- They should be heavily taxed (e.g. 20% tax)to encourage people to adopt the many many local rescues that need a home , revenues should be used to help fund animal services.
- Leave it to Canada Border Services.
- Follow legal guidelines
- CBSA does a good job, leave it to them
- All animals must be up to date on vaccinations and spaying or neutering arranged.
- Health of animal; behaviour/temperament; Origin; Vaccination history; Ability to thrive in our climate (exotics)
- Quarantine if necessary. Verified humane sourcing of animals.
- Perhaps not be allowed to import non-registered (exception if they can be registered) dogs or cats, for example, if there are similar size animals available at local adoption agencies. Need to be registered upon arrival. Seems contradictory that our dogs get euthanized and we bring
- Animals have their vaccinations, be chipped, limited to an appropriate number of animals
- No predators
- Uniquely the well being of Calgarians, and not the self indulgence of "animal lovers". It is vastly easier to bring dangerous disease ridden animals into Calgary than export beef to other countries.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No comment.
- I don't agree with the practise of bringing in dogs and cats from other countries for adoption. There are too many dogs and cats int his country that need homes – we don't need more from anywhere else.

City of Calgary role regarding imported animals

- If cattle, the number, safety, quality of life, space. If domestic pets or those flown in, the same checks as The Heathrow ARC do.. A world renowned import, export area for animals flown in and out.
- Depending on the animal, neighbors should be informed of their presence. I.e. living in a building with a person who owns a large snake.
- It should be a joint effort between the city and province to ensure animal welfare is upheld.
- none
- Stop accepting large quantities of rescue imports from random places.
- See above.
- Allow them but put parameters in place to ensure they are safe.
- I am not sure there is anything that can be done on a municipal level. There should be a provincial responsibility however.
- I don't have much of information on this topic to provide my input.
- Charge people who have animals they shouldn't have. Provide humane care/rescue for the animals that are located.
- Protecting the health and safety of local domestic animals
- Spay/neuter
- no idea where to start. China is banning wildlife sales = Corona flu from snakes, Avian flu from birds, ebola = monkeys. Responsible laws. Rescue adoption as first option.
- Ensure they are not bringing in disease
- Health checks and quarantine
- Monitor, regulate, and enforce criteria for imported animals.
- Licensing. once they are here, the same way we do with other pets in Calgary.
- Mandatory quarantine would be good, but I'm not sure how you enforce it.
- existing adoptable pets be adopted out before importing animals
- Ban
- Not sure, sorry. Don't know enough about this to speak into it.
- follow up to see animal is safe and secure. and in a loving home
- See previous answer.
- It should be via the border, not the city.
- ensuring that animals are imported properly, and sourced responsibly
- Must register imported animals to ensure they are not from puppy mills
- Just maintenance of licensing and/or responding to complaints.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- It depends. In the case of a reputable breeder, the breeder should have the knowledge to ensure that the animals are healthy and vaccinated. If the animals are being brought in as rescue animals from other countries, CBSA should ensure this. Calgary just needs to regulate the sellers.
- None. Allow these organizations to operate.
- 100% oversight - same as domestic regulations.
- Work with provincial/federal associates
- No comment
- Ensure veterinary checks have been done in Calgary - not just their point of origin.
- Nothing, this is a National matter.
- Require rescues to provide proof of blood tests for foreign diseases. Brucellosis, heart worm etc. NO exception.
- Verifying certification of shots and quarantine.
- Helping with disease surveillance and perhaps minimizing import of exotics/non-native animals for pet-trade, as well as regular pets for sale when we have our own abundance of healthy, suitable strays/surrenders available for adoption.
- Licensing, documenting
- Until all the animal shelters and rescue groups are out of animals no animals should be imported as a pet.
- Not allow them. Encourage these organizations to pull from local shelters for resale
- Maintain database of imported animals and their owners. Licensing.
- Limit volume
- Ensure that spade / neuter of all pets being sold. History of the pet is available
- Proof of purchase adoption from registered charity or breeder.
- Ensure they don't end up in shelters
- License them, require health testing.
- As above, not qualified to answer.
- Verification of their health and vaccination record (same as CBSA does for animals imported to Canada from a foreign country)
- Ensure nothing unwanted comes in and that we can actually provide homes for them
- Require health records and quarantine of animals coming from high disease areas. It is better for the animals and for our public safety to have stricter rules about these imports.
- No exotics or animals taken from the wild to be pets, labour, or other uses.
- I'm not certain of how many animals are imported directly into Calgary so I will not voice an opinion.
- None.
- Little to no role
- Defer to CFIA rules.
Large imports for retail rescue purposes should be inspected after the fact for compliance with health safety and welfare requirements.
- I don't believe it is necessary to import animals for any reason.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- See answer above.
- I would discourage it, we have so many strays and unwanted animals here that I don't think that we need to be importing stray animals from other countries, that potentially bring back disease and potentially can infect our animals and introduce new strains of diseases we think we have eradicated.
- Restrict certain animals based on environment.
- Require vet certification of health
- None. Leave this at a federal, border services and agriculture Canada department level to manage.
- Ensure there are no diseases coming with.
- Seize illegally imported animals. Ensure animal welfare.
- Involved in the inspection and monitoring of who owns the animals and where they are.
- Monitoring what animals are coming into the city. Require all animals to be licensed, clear vet checks and required testing for disease depending on where they are coming from. All groups importing animals should have a business license and be inspected.
- Mandatory quarantine; health and behavioural checks in place.
- If animals are coming in, the City should be ensuring the animal has met all vetting requirements prior. No exceptions.
- None. I feel that this is CBSA's domain.
- none
- None
- - the city of Calgary should have staff who can do background checks on the importing of the animals and ensuring that all criteria is met
- None if it is already regulated by other jurisdictions. Once here then the regular rules and guidelines should be applied.
- N/A
- Prohibit them.
- Education +++
License rescue organizations / education / regulations for importing rescues
- Ensure they are disease free.
- we believe the City pound animals need to be considered firstly..our pounds should not have as many pets therefore imported animals need to be secondary...our City animals are just as important as the imported ones, if not more...let's take care of our own first!
- Limit the amount of animals that are allowed to be brought in due to their are many that need help in Canada.
- You need to know what animals are present in your city. You need cooperation of owners. Therefore you need a system that isn't financially punitive OR time sucking so it encourages participation. Education is key, and social pressure will manage poor pet owners.
- None.
- I believe Border Services already does everything necessary for this.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Making sure they are microchipped, licensed, have been vetted and negative fecals.
Can the City not post off leash etiquette posters at the parks? Dr. Sophie Yin has some beautiful illustrated ones. Do's and don't at the park.
- Ensuring rescues are committed to my above described suggestions.
- controlling rescue groups who bring hoards of dogs up here to "adopt " out for a price. Most have little or no health clearances.
- Groups who do this must require a business license because for some people that is how they make money. Mandatory quarantine, repeat testing, health testing and temperament evaluation.
- transportation of all animals including agricultural should be limited in the amount of time there should be regulations on temperature water and food.
- NA
- Open for each dog to be looked at individually.
- Contract between individuals that is consistent - maybe via an app?)
- The only things that the City of Calgary should do regarding imported animals is ensure that the businesses importing them are licensed, and that the animal is licensed as required.
- Imported animals from a reputable breeder overseas need to be licensed the same as animals born here. Generally they have health certificates and vaccination records. Rescue animals need to be quarantined and health checked before being allowed to enter the country and then need to follow bylaws.
- Ensure no exotic species are permitted within the city.
- No business licenses for imported animals except under restricted conditions. Such businesses must have regular inspections and keep records of origin and sales
- Follow federal law and consider the type of animal. Is the imported animal appropriate for urban living?
- City of Calgary should make it illegal or at the never least enforce adequate care and business practices.
- Monitoring imports, providing education and information as needed, and dealing with illegal animals as needed. I believe the City is acting appropriately currently, and I have no suggestions.
- Ensuring they are licensed and vet checked.
- Aside for ensuring public health, none.
- To ensure they come from reputable breeders only and that proper paperwork is filled out by the seller and buyer.
- Revoke business licences for complaints
- None, let CBSA handle it
- That the health check includes not only a check for vaccinations but also held certificates stating the dog is not carrying diseases like brucellosis, heartworms, or other worm diseases which are highly contagious and easily transmitted.
- If they are going to allow them. There should be a quarantine payable by the importer and supervised by a vet.

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Rescues should not be permitted to bring in additional animals unless there are no animals available in the local shelters. It is becoming big business with more and more coming into existence.
- All Rescues should need to follow all of the rules that apply to good animal husbandry and animal welfare. Conditions should be monitored and if substandard they should be penalized accordingly.
- making sure the animal has been properly health checked and certified that the animal is healthy to prevent the spread of diseases.
- Protection of citizens.
Licensing.
Follow up if necessary.
- To ensure the animals being imported are healthy before being released into the general population.
- That the safety is paramount concern above anything else
- There's a difference between a pet owner moving here from the UK with the dog they've had for years versus someone bringing back a sick dog rescued off the streets of Mexico. The UK dog poses little risk. The Mexican dog should be health checked and quarantined at home for a period of time.
- I believe there are already enough animals in our shelters. Priority should be given to local animals
- I guess if they have passed through all the hoops to get here we can only license them.
- None specific to imported animals, this is a border security issue. Otherwise, they should be treated the same as locally raised animals.
- Policy development and enforcement
- Imported animals for what? Resale, including rescues? City should be enforcing the health of the population is safe from these imported rescues from high risk areas.
There are already safeguards and regulations for the importation of 1 pet from a reputable source.
- Minimal.
- Rescues should not be importing rescues internationally. We have enough dogs here that need homes and without adding new diseases to it.
City of Calgary should be ensuring rescues are under strict guidelines for importation.
- They must ensure the animal is healthy and not endanger the general public of both people and other animals
- We should not allow it
- Control of registration for organizer of imported animal and/or animal; ensuring banned animals are not admitted as a second line of check
- Ban the import of animals for commercial purposes. Ensure the import of animals for adoption is safe for the animals being imported and other pets.
- As long as proper health and documentation is there, it's not a city issue and resources can be focused on more important issues.
- Review at time of licencing
- don't allow them we have lots of animals that need a home.
- Don't let them in unless needed for film or short stay.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The city of Calgary should be able to reject animals that don't pass certain standards. I love animals but I wouldn't want to adopt one that was passed off as healthy and end up having to put it down because it was sick after spending money to own it.
- Better oversight. Exotics often have miserable lives; i: parrots, reptiles that grownup and are dangerous, gold fish, etc. Work with importers so exotic animals are registered. Report on the pet trade. Stats also.
- Not allow them.
- I don't think the city should have any role regarding import unless it is for breeding purposes. In which case, see question 9
- Strict licensing and regulation of businesses and/or individuals involved in importing animals from another country to be sold and/or adopted out in Canada. Those looking to make a quick buck adopting out sick or dangerous imported animals for hundreds of dollars would hopefully stop.
- Ensure animal has vet records approving health.
- Nothing
- make sure people who obtain animals and/or sell animals have a appropriate business licence, proper records of animal, and have clear guidelines to making sure the health of the animal is up to date
- if we have limited supply of adoptable animals here then the city can allow more in... specialty service animals should be except where needed....
- None
- The same as animals whom are here locally, health certification and rabies legislation but that's broader than Calgary
- More verification for rescue animals .. is there a home for them?
- Make sure they are well and disease free.
- To monitor imported animals that are deemed potentially dangerous, where they are being kept and ensure all safety precautions are being followed, as well as all the animals needs are being attended to,
and make sure animal has clean bill of health, and animal has information micro chip implanted.
- Same as new pet owners Vet checks and cost of ownership to be owners responsibility.
- screening/licensing process; endangered? health risks?
- Border control of importing animals only.
- Only worry about the ones being brought in for resale and health checks that they are not bringing diseases here
- I keep hearing the shelters are full and need people to adopt what we already have, why do we need to import ?????
- Enforce the rules
- I don't think animals should be imported for sale or rehoming.
- Not allow it, rescues must register with a City. We have enough of a pet problem with too many looking for homes.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Leave it up to Border Services.
- Any imported animals should be quarantined and checked by a qualified vet and not released until it is proven there are no issues. The city should oversee this, if allowing imported animals (which I disagree with)
- Enforce a quarantine...although then people will just not license for the first months sadly
- Enforcing the above.
- If they are allowed in the country then they should be treated as any other animal in the City, although the owner should prove they are healthy before getting a licence.
- Ensuring local animals are housed first.
- NONE. Absolutely none other than ensuring that a contractor is hired to provide this service to pet owners and bill them accordingly! This is not a tax-payer service or responsibility!
- I worry sometimes that by law is contacted, in order to avoid talking to a neighbour about a concern. I think that by law should be focussed on animal cruelty cases, not a noise complaint because one neighbour won't talk to another or cat tolerate a normal level of noise.
- I don't know enough about it to give any recommendations
- They should only allow legitimate rescue groups who have a license to import dogs into Calgary not a breeder or backyard rescue
- Proof of vaccinations
 - Full vet check to ensure no diseases
 - Full temperament check to ensure not vicious and can be handled.
 - Six months quarantine to ensure no disease.
 - Rescue must take full responsibility if the animal injures someone or an animal.
 - Better yet...just say no. Revisit later.
- There is no need to import animals.
- None
- Regulating and enforcing policy to provide proper records
- Health and welfare of the animals. Making sure illegal animals aren't imported.
- Ensuring the safety of the public.
- Restrictions on limits unless is being brought here due to owners being transferred here. We have enough strays without bringing in international
- Restrict Some rescues and individuals that are importing animals only for profit and bringing unhealthy animals in
- Wow, not so sure. I am concerned about out of country dog rescues and the new diseases that we have never had before.
- I'm not sure the implications. If border services ensures standards then that would be sufficient.
- License them. Require a certificate of being legally obtained. Not be an endangered species unless imported by the zoo, say, for legitimate reasons.
- Only from qualified breeders. The city has many rescues and animals that need homes. They do not need to bring more animals for rescue from outside of the province



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- there are already federal regulations.
- All should be vetted with all vaccinations, all licensed as well, quarantined or fostered in homes without exposure to other animals until vetted and behaviour checked.
- Ensure animals must be licenced before being released.
- To heavily tax these dogs to fund programs to help local dogs that need rehoming
- Nothing different than what current role is.
- Unsure
- Ensure vaccines and spayed, not allow for profit from this practice (rescue only)
- Regulating animal welfare and public safety.
- Inspections
- No imports into the city limits.
- None its cbsa role.
- I believe the city should not expand into any roles regarding imported animals or licensing dog walkers.
- Mirror the Federal guidelines regarding imported animals. Bear in mind, this is a city, not a farm; certain animal species do not belong here.
- I do not know how the City could know whether or not an animal is imported and therefore can't imagine how they could have a role in this area.
- No outside Canada imported animals all other animals should have health documents from vets
- limit the kind of animals being imported in
- Nothing
- Required submission of copy of record/findings of each veterinary inspection conducted, or copy of record of euthanasia if any condition cannot/will not be treated.
- Don't let them in
- Shelters are no longer just 'saving animals' and are turning into big business. They should be regulated, inspected, licensed like any other big business.
- Health standards are met by CBA so I believe the city should have no role.
- No role
- Proper paperwork
- Verify veterinary requirements are met
- Reputable rescue organizations
- making sure diseases are not brought in with the dogs. Making sure that rescue for profit, fake rescue and dog flipping is not happening.
- I think that stats on the movement of animals in general, into our city and from where (us, Mexico, rural AB) and the numbers on surrendered and at-home animals (through CHS, AARCS, Pos Match etc) should be captured and made public. I think this would give insight into how to manage our dog pop'n
- Exotic animals should be banned.
- Licensing and final approval



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Regulated what kind of animals (dog fighting dogs and what kind of health) are coming in
Keeping this register is important
- Cautious not to import pets with foreign diseases, vicious pets etc. Both Behavioural testing and health testing done at the cost of the business/rescue and provided to city officials to guarantee they are done and rules followed.
- Need approval before group embarks on journey to bring animals back. Limit number of animals and prove the animals will be provided and cared for without burden on current shelters
- I know rescue groups have good intentions for these animals. As Calgarians we need to know that our animals domestic or wild are safe. If the city is going to accept imports there should be paper work proving where the animal comes from and that it is of no danger to us.
- Rescue only
- Inspections and ensuring wellbeing of these animals, including safety for the public
- Ensuring all documentation is done regarding vaccines and doing a behavior test.
- Risk assessments of the animals temperaments as suited to a pet animal owned by a member of the general public. Temoelements should be assessed by qualified animal behaviorists
- They must be healthy and the Type of animal - not an endangered species or competitive species to our natural ecosystem.
- They should be sterilized if they are not indigenous to the area
- Making their licensed and healthy
- I don't believe the city has a role. I feel that's an area for border services.
- The City can stop the operation of a business by not granting zoning permission to run a "rescue" operation within its limits. It cannot regulate the acquisition of personal property. Dogs are, by common law, personal property; not within the City's legal jurisdiction.
- I think the city of Calgary needs to protect the people that buy these animals by requiring full vet clearance.
- No idea. Beyond my pay grade
- Help ensure the pets are safe and healthy
- Supervisory (ensuring the rules are followed) and mainly supportive
- Make sure people who want to have an imported animal have all the proper information.
- Stop the import of such animals
- limit non registered dog and cats being imported
- Upholding the law.
- To ensure animals coming in and going out meet the requirements. Maybe even have people get approved to be able to ship or receive animals to prevent any BYB breeders or puppy mills from continuing.
- License and inspect the business.
- Restricted tightly if we have animals available
- Veto power
- Ensure they are healthy before coming to Calgary



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ensure animals entering the city do not carry disease. License them. Ensure they are in good health and spayed or neutered unless the owner holds a breeders license.
- see above.
Restrict, educate and ban for any and all purposes.
- Unsure.
- Place new rules before the animals can be adopted out, and enforce them
- Again, SURPRISE welfare checks on the animal, background checks on all parties involved AND a database accessible to the public to keep track and check on those people involved.
- They must be more compassionate and take any and all animals believed to be under undue stress or to be used for things like ritual sacrifice. Food animals need more compassion too. The driver may not care. Make them more responsible for the animals they transport.
- NONE
- regulating it!
- We should be proud to bring neglected and abused animals to loving parents here in Calgary.
- Before a person can buy or adopt an imported animal they should have to report to the city so the city can assess the animal at that level.
- Unsure/haven't done enough research on this
- I don't think we have much of an idea of how many animals are coming in from what countries & what their medical histories are, etc. Especially with COVID-19 exposes risks bringing unregulated dogs from Korean meat markets, etc. Time to get a handle on this before we import a disease or worse.
- None. We need less government involvement in our lives, not more.
- Do we have to allow it? Maybe stricter regulations if so
- not sure
- As long as they don't involve animals that we are not able to have controls on such as bears and such big animals and records are kept on the small dangerous creatures we sometimes have fondness for spiders and such as well as antivenom
- safety of animal and public
- Ensuring they have been properly screened before being sold or released to local owners.
- I don't believe the city should be responsible for any costs associated with imported animals. If someone wants an imported dog, it should be up to them and the agency to pay all fees, include spaying, and include a compatibility assessment before ownership changes hands. Then license them.
- Enforce the regulations strongly.
- Other than purebred animal importation by registered CKC or TICA breeders (or other purebred animals registries)other retail importers and rescue animal associations should be regulated by city limits and bylaws.
- Work with CBSA to ensure no imported animals come to Calgary.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not your wheel house. Stay in your lane. It is far too easy to be swayed by animal rights activists. They do not have pets best interest in mind. You should work with the local kennel club in regards to pet ownership.
- We should be doing importing stray animals from our of country or city. We have enough animals in CGY to adopt, we don't need to import more.
- Health certificate required when applying for license.
- Unsure- none?
- Oversight for infectious diseases, protection of the animal and potential buyers
- Not sure.
- None of your business
- I'm not sure, perhaps ensuring that Canada's rules are being followed
- Ensure that all animals are licensed and in good health.
- Approval
- Importing animals is a business. These businesses should be licensed and have regulations in place to protect the animals coming in and the people and animals they could come into contact with.
- A more critical look at the condition of the imported animals. Awareness and wariness of diseases which are not prevalent in Canada, but are becoming more common due to the importation of dogs (Brucellosis, Canine Flu...) from the southern states or Mexico. Limit the number of imported animals.
- Stop the importing of rescue animals from foreign countries. I see this as unlikely so, Massively increase the fees for licensing and require permits to bring these animals into the city. We do not need more animals to be homed or abandoned.
- Ensure these animals are safe
- Limits
- Do not allow.
- Have animals vet checked. Spay and neutered
- If it's someone moving and bringing their pet with them, then, okay. Otherwise, no imported animals allowed as it brings in disease and we have enough here!
- Should not be allowed.
- I am not qualified to answer this question
- Seized at the airport, however i am not sure how cross-border entry could be stopped.
- Ensure all laws are followed, to ensure health and safety of the animals being imported.
- They must verify the paperwork to ensure the animals are not trafficked and are in good health so they don't introduce diseases.
- Ensuring they get homes or put into agencies that will ensure they get to a safe home.
- It is very nice to try to help animals such as Greyhounds, or Beagles who have been mistreated; but I think there should be some sort of limit in numbers. Those that bring them in should be licensed.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't think it should be the city's responsibility. The rules should apply to the person/group importing the animals.
- They should be banned.
- Utilize guidelines utilized by the Border Services
- Enforce the rules and guidelines and if it was up to me I wouldn't allow any amphibians or reptiles to come into the country.
- To determine the end use of the animal and then issue a license specifying that end use on that license. If found not be complied with, the animal should be removed from the ownership.
- I think the City should definitely try to watch businesses which sell animals and ensure they are meeting a good standard of care for those animals.
- Do not allow rescues to be sold for profit.
- same as any other animals - require them to be licenced etc
- See above
- None, unless the animal is to remain within the city. Then follow proper licensing requirements as with other dogs and cats. All other species are already controlled by the province or federal, no need for the city to also be involved.
- Trying to ensure animals in the city are safe, cared for humanely, and don't pose a risk to the people, animal populations, and environment
- Maintaining health standards of animals so as not to spread disease to existing population
- Take a strong stand & dis allow imported pets.
- We should not be a venue for the resale of imported animals. We have plenty of animals in need here.
- Highly regulate the practice
- None whatsoever.
- Monitor the process without trying to charge fees
- Limits to the number that can be brought in and the type of organization that is permitted to bring animals in. For instance a home based "rescue" should not be bringing in dozens of dogs that they do not have the space or experience to care for. Rescues should be fully licensed.
- I do not have an opinion
- I don't think the City of Calgary should play a role - it would be too hard to keep track of animals once they are in the city.
- As mentioned in the other slot, beyond the usual rules for other pets, just make sure that one getting out isn't going to upset our ecosystem. Treat them the same as every other animal.
- Nothing. That should be a federal responsibility.
- Personally, I think we have enough stray animals to re home locally ..
- I don't think the city of Calgary should be playing a role aside from supporting the CBSA to ensure their regulations and standards are being met.
- Not sure
- The City of Calgary should ban the import of animals for pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- City should have little to no role in this. It seems like a minor/non-existent problem that self-regulates.
- For international arrivals, registration upon importation, mandatory spaying or neutering unless the importer is a registered AKC breeder in good standing.
- None.
- Ensure animals imported into the city have appropriate vaccine records and have no contagious diseases that could spread to our pet or wildlife population. Ensure the animals have somewhere to be housed appropriately when they arrive and receive ongoing care from the importers
- Shouldn't allow exotic pets if endangered. Also people should have courses in understanding exotic pets.
- no opinion
- Rescues need to be limited on how many animals they can import and sell. Are there not enough animals in Canada to sustain rescue?
- Enforce no trade or traffic in wildlife. Enforce no sourcing animals from mills. Enforce source of the animal must be accredited (rescue facilitators included) and meet every standard for the physical and mental health of the animal. If by-laws do not currently allow for same they must be changed
- Limit importing animals for sale.
- none
- To license any organization that is importing these animals and proving laws for these organizations
- NONE.
- to ensure that the health of the animal is not going to be effected by Calgary living conditions. This cost should be to the importers or pet licensing... not to taxpayers.
- Make sure they are healthy and their welfare is being looked after
- Ensuring their health is up-to-date and they are registered and spayed/neutered.
- Don't import them in the first place!!
- The City does have a role in regulating imported animals. Animals need to be quarantined, licensed, have a health check etc before released. Licensing fee for the first year SB higher than for pets bought/adopted from CDN sources.
- Checking paperwork, charging import fees that can then be used to support our existing population.
- Ensure that these animals meet standards for health, vaccines, behaviour etc., but otherwise, these animals should be welcomed
- Well being of animals, not to make money like greedy idiots.
- Making sure there are homes in place for them.
- They need to be identified by microchip.
- To ensure that companies and individuals are caring for the wellbeing of the animals, and ensuring that diseases are controlled and treated properly.
- as above
- City shouldn't be doing it, but need to think about how to regulate it and keep the animals safe.
- Make sure the imported is licensed and reputable



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I believe in importing these animals to save their lives and give them a better life and home but they need to ensure these animals are healthy and not carrying a disease that can be passed on to other animals
- must be licenced (not just animal but seller as well)
- no role really
- Importation for commercial purposes should be banned. If it continues, animals must be given vaccines/antiparasitics etc. by a licensed veterinarian BEFORE they enter the province and have documentation to prove it. When arriving at the city, immediate vet inspection and licensing of each pet.
- Ban importation of animals to or through rescue groups. Should only be owned animals allowed. Enough rescue animals in Alberta, we don't need to import from other countries
- This should be a CBSA issue, the animals should be treated the same as all other pets if they have adhered to health and safety requirements of importing and transporting imported animals
- Education, people don't understand they may be supporting puppy mills, or that these dogs are potentially a health risk to our population. Also there should be strict rules on providing paperwork of tests done, parasite control applied, and vaccinations done.
- The safety of the animal and its impact on the city
- Ensuring the agencies are legitimate, licensed and living up to their responsibilities to the animals.
- License if dangerous or venomous
- Unsure
- There should be no role for the city other than that which they play with every other dog and cat in the city.
- Don't know.
- License and bylaw enforcement.
- No comment
- Follow the Canadian border service's set rules.
- Those businesses should not be permitted
- I haven't seen an option here, to not allow dogs at all in some of our more sensitive natural environment parks. Please note that Ottawa has such parks.
- Checks to ensure health and temperament of animals that are imported from out of country
- Must be preapproved by the city. Review on a case by case basis whether to allow the import
- Ensuring that the animal will be properly controlled and cared for. Limit the number of exotic animals for a single residence (eg. not allow 30 animals to be kept at a single residence.)
- Ensure they are not available in Canada first. Ensure they are licensed and disease free
- Only care when they're considered exotic and not being rescued.
- Stricter enforcement of numbers, quarantine period, vet/health checks and permitting with fines for non compliance
- Safety and well being of animals. Ensure that those importing and/or purchasing are reputable. Rescue animals need a different category.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The city should be protecting the animals who are from here first, and ensure the imported animals are not dangerous to the domestic animals.
- Should be subject to same rules
- All animals should be licensed upon entry and sale.
- Nothing.
- setting the limits and inspection of the support facilities. as well regular inspection.
- Enforcing rigorous standards and regulations on all businesses and individuals around the humane treatment, and legal sourcing of any and all imported animals.
- This is important. Not sure where they province and the country and the city all work on this matter
- This should be a Canada Border Services responsibility
- Ban imports of animals from out of country. Too many potential issues with diseases.
- They should not be allowed/confiscated. Why do we need to bring imported animals here? especially in light of recent virus issues, etc. This is 2020 not 1920.
- N/A
- Imported animals should not be permitted.
- Ensure they are well cared for and properly licensed.
- Enforce the above
- Minimal to none - occasional vet done health checks on big importers at maximum.
- The City of Calgary should ensure that reasonable regulations are applied as to the mental and physical health of these animals and in some way license and regulate animal rescue organizations.
- If this is handled by the border service, why does the City need to be involved? With proper paperwork that has been stamped/signed/approved by the Border service why does the city need to be involved?
- Assist rescue organizations logistically and financially. Screen and inspect commercial operations.
- Not sure
- Regulate it by the Importing groups have to have a license and document/ report the animals coming in. Including medical screenings
- None, its the responsibility of the Border agency and then the licencing etc for the owner.
- REJECT THEM
- To follow and enhance the guidelines of the the CBSA, such as ensuring that the local population of a pet animal (like a dog) is a priority over cause célèbre animals from another jurisdiction.
- Same as above, City needs to audit importer. They need to meet same guidelines as those retailers follow. City needs to question source of animals and ensure they are not being illegally acquired; that importer is reputable and meets certain standards in regards to acquisition/treatment of animals
- Licence only
- Importation of animals probably belongs within a Federal jurisdiction.
- None
- To check how they were caught and transported. Check above comment.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Should drastically decrease or eliminate importing of animals that is not for rescue placement purposes.
- Verifying the animal passes all import rules.
- Zero.
- Monitor provenance (no puppy mills), check for diseases, make sure they are going to a good place (not someone with too many animals already or a puppy mill).
- They should make sure the person bringing the dogs in are reputable, licenced and the dogs are not diseased.
- Work cooperatively with other jurisdictions to reduce the likelihood that animals are being exploited.
- Same as cats/dogs. Like game wardens or maybe should have game warden division.
- Greater regulation to ensure the welfare of animals and to help stop the problem of animal abandonment due to the sheer quantity of animals entering the city
- To simply make sure animals that are being brought in are healthy and going to places that will care for them in proper humane ways.
- That they are healthy.
- check on the health of the animal.
- Health checks
- Ensuring all are licensed and that those who are purchasing them have the capacity to care for the animal properly.
- Regulating the animals on coming into the City for adoption.
- Making sure the animal actually NEEDS to be a pet, most exotic animals should not be pets. Also, making sure the animal is spayed/neutered, and fully vaccinated.
- Not sure.
- Regulation, monitoring and enforcement
- Don't. Same as above.
- That they are registered with the kennel club and licensed
- As above. No imports from anywhere other than US with vet bills being what they are, our own Calgarian responsible dog owners do not need their animals getting sick from all the weird diseases being brought into our city
- Determine types appropriate animals that can be imported
- Provide licensing information and resources to importers, respond to reports of illegal import, track those that are licensed to import.
- N/A
- Nothing! This role is already being handled and no further bureaucracy is needed!
- Monitor and ensure rules are being followed
- -
- Rules that rescues must follow such as quarantine.
- ensure it does in fact meet the CBSA standards and rules and restrict rescues



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Maybe offer information or courses for new pet owners. What to expect, what they will need, how to care for pet.
- ensuring animals receive proper treatment and vaccines
- Ensuring that they are checked thoroughly to prevent import from mills.
- noted in the above question - licensed, inspected, regulated, health checks etc....
- None.
- I don't know
- ?
- See answers to number 10
- To ensure imported pets have met vaccine and other health regulations, are licensed, and already have a home to go to. They should not be imported only to end up in a city-subsidized shelter. It's not fair to them or the rescue groups already stretched thin.
- full health inspection and home/environment where the pet will reside.
- Getting them to thier families, making sure proper documentations are handled and had.
- Health certificates and licenses
- Reasons for importing need to be explained. If it is an unusual animal, potential buyers need to prove that they have the means to care for it. Animals may need to be quarantined .
- Refer to the last question. An active role.
- The same as TSA
- Provide more support to rescue foundations.
- Stepping in when a complaint or issue is brought to their attention
- Actually enforce existing laws
- I don't think import is a municipal issue, other than maybe providing information. I would like to see a better oversight over "rescues", and clearer distinction between licensed charities and privately run, for-profit animal sales (many of which import animals).
- Minimal.
- provide manditory Check ups to ensure the animal is in good health after it lands. Either a week or two after it lands
- Ensure breeders are registered so backyard breeders no longer exist. Imported rescues should have import quotas based on how many local animals are available province wide for adoption. IMO it is ridiculous that healthy local animals are being euthanized while dogs get imported and adopted.
- I think breeders should require a special license in order to breed animals that they intend to sell. They must not be allowed to sell animals to retail stores, but limit sales to individual citizens.
- Do not allow importing for rescue. Permits required for breeding.
- Ensure the people importing the animals are licensed and bring in only healthy animals
- I've no idea. Making sure they aren't going somewhere they'll be harmed?
- Restrict animals that may become pests if released
- verify CBSA's documentation and in particular that immunizations are up to date



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Screening to ensure that they aren't being imported from places that have diseases we don't. For example we don't have heart worm and several viruses here. Some rescues have infected whole communities of dogs with serious illnesses. Don't let that happen here
- Safeguarding
- As long as the animal is licensed and has past it's health checks it's not the cities business
- The safety of the public.
- Pro import for a purpose/from an ethical breeder elsewhere— no import for other countries' diseased, non-temperament-tested stray messes.
- Dogs should not be brought in by a third party for sale to Calgarians. We have many local rescue animals....mostly dogs and cats.
- Partnering with federal agencies to ensure the health and welfare of the animal being imported is prioritized and enforced after importation.
- Need to make sure they are taking care of ours locally before bringing more in to add to the problem.
- Limit
- No importation of any kind... none... stop all of it
- Licensing, inspection, monitoring
- not sure
- Oversight, why do we allow for imported dogs and cats from Mexico to come here when there are enough animals in our own city, province, and country that we should consider caring for first
- A check point.
- Limit rescues from importing so many
- Send them back where they came from.
- Ensuring they are sterilized before they are sold or adopted.
- Making sure the animals are not endangered or at risk and have all proper medical screening.
- Ensure the facilities that are bringing them in have the facilities and means to properly care for them. Ensure proper disease control.
- Quite frankly it's a hard one but maybe a rescue has to show a ratio of how many foreign vs how many canadian dogs they brought in.
- See #10
- None
- Make sure all animals are healthy and being well taken care of. Make sure they are going to a reputable place and they are all licensed and responsibility is taken by said importer for the animals.
- Education.
- Licensing them as other local pets
- Ensure animals are vaccinated and not bringing diseases into the Calgary dog population.
- Enforcing laws stopping the importation of animals.
- Mandatory licensing. Mandatory spay/neuter.
- Education of the public regarding animal care. This should apply to all animal ownership, imported or otherwise.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Control what is allowed to be imported. No endangered and no invasive species.
- Licensing, ensuring health criteria is met, monitoring the importing and exporting activities of the individuals in question
- Ensuring the animal is healthy.
- simply make sure they are licensed and healthy.
- Unless the City has a specific concern, stay out of it.
- They should defer to the expertise and advice of a qualified veterinarian.
- Ensure they are not going to negatively affect the health or safety of Calgary's current animal residents
- To confirm that they are healthy and are going to have a safe place to live until being adopted
- City should be involved to make sure that its citizens are safe.
- Restricting the import of non ethically bred stock. Ensuring that these animals are free from disease, and ensuring they are altered to help prevent them adding to pet overpopulation.
- That animals are brought in for the purpose of finding good homes and that they are not sold through pet stores or sold for illegal purposes
- Don't know enough to answer. Don't import animals for profit - particularly if the animals come from places like India or China or Thailand or any other place known for flagrant animal abuse or poaching animals for profit. Those practices are unacceptable we should not vote yes with our wallets.
- Some type of licensing program
- Keeping track animals are not going to animal fighting rings etc.
- None
- Regulation
- None allowed except from various countries where they need rescuing. Exotics have no need to be here, stick to basics. Why animals like a savannah monitor lizard are allowed here are beyond me.
- Making sure they are disease free and documented/licensed.
- Health checks
- Animals should be approved pets, not invasive or dangerous
- No different than other animals
- Restrictions. Regulations. Control stray, unhomeless pet numbers. These are people creating jobs for themselves...rescues are run poorly, dogs are mismatched to homes and problem animals are passed along to unsuspecting families. Stop the insanity. Its very poorly done currently.
- Nothing
- Unsure... Other than to prioritize local adoption.
- They are up to date on any required shots
- Consider the animals well being. Do not bring animals in that are very sick and put them through significant health care. If the animal is young and can be provided with a good life then it should be allowed. Priority should be to abandoned animals in the province first.
- I don't have enough knowledge to offer an opinion



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Engage with experts on the subject.
- Whoever is purchasing or rescuing the important animals they should provide proof that they have already tried to find an animal in Calgary already .
- Limit the number allowed. Make sure rescues are bringing in healthy animals
- I definitely think you should be monitoring it, Anything important can bring along with it diseases, etc. The SPCA seems to be very overwhelmed with the number of animals that are being given away as an afterthought definitely needs to be some kind of rules and limitations that are being monitored.
- I don't know enough about this topic to give an informed opinion
- To accept if they are from special breeders.
- Keeping track and following the animal during their lifetime
- Keep Calgarians safe
- Regulate, follow up with infractions
- Ensure they were sourced ethically
- Work with border screening agency and be a part of screening any animals along side border control and enforcing any bylaws necessary for that particular animal
- Not really sure how it affects the city tbh. It's between the importer/ retailer and the exporter/wholesaler
- prevent the introduction of infectious diseases such as rabies by testing/vaccinating imported animals. keep a digital record of imported animals.
- Keeping people accountable in importing pets that are healthy and rules are being followed.
- Monitor reasons so animals are not abused or used for fighting or puppy mills.
- The safety of the animal.
- I am not sure
- Regulate dangerous ones.
- Don't allow them in the city for retail sales. Imported rescue animals to be placed in responsible homes are the only ones that should be allowed. All others are removing wildlife from habitat to sell for their own profit. Heartbreaking to see Betas in tiny cups for weeks in pet stores, not natural.
- Major fines for violation of rules
- They should regulate it and protect the animals health and ensure animals are licensed and maintained.
- The city should keep abreast of trends in imported animals and act to protect those animals from abuse
- Treat it as a business and regulate it. It would be challenging as many animal importers are situated minutes outside the City of Calgary boundary. This would be a tough one to enforce.
- requiring some level of vet assessment/vaccines/quarantine if necessary to protect all of us from new disease. this could align with/defer to CBSA for as long as their rules cover the city's needs.
- Set rules around health and quantity
- The City of Calgary's role should always be keeping the safety and health of Calgarians foremost in mind. Again, respecting the rights of a few over the rights of the majority is NEVER acceptable.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- none should be provincially regulated
- Not sure.
- Minimal/none. A dog is a dog is a dog whether it comes from Balzac or Belize.
- Educate residents that import of animals is not allowed.
- Tighter regulations on the health of new animals being brought into Calgary (medical records & up to date vaccinations). A ban on all imports of adoptable animals.
- To grant permits to would be importers
- Ability to exclude animals that are imported legally but may cause harm to the people, pets, animals and plants of Calgary
- Regulation, tracking and health related affects.
- Registration
- Limited....the City should be more involved after the animal is imported...no need to duplicate services.
- d/k
- Support the shelters that are importing animals. Shelters know much more about the welfare of the animals and how to do it humanly.
- Regular spontaneous inspections to ensure welfare standards are being met. This should include the five freedoms.
- Ensuring that welfare standards are met at the importers end and during the transportation process
- Nothing.
- Should make sure that the animal is not a health risk.
- None
- Nothing, it should not be the business of the city aside from ensuring the animals are licensed the same as they are from breeders and shelter here.
- -importing animals who need to find safe homes should be a priority (e.g., animals who were abandoned, neglected)
- They should be able to say how many can be brought into our city that can reasonably be removed. They should also be able to license the importer and provide guidelines for operation and required care including Vet care.
- Take a stand and help to lobby for regulations.
- ... controls. Quarantine in a foster home before being made available for adoption, mandatory spay/neuter etc. Rescues that bring in animals from out of country should be "Licensed" as an animal importer and have strict protocols to follow.
- The should ensure that the animal is healthy and that the local businesses are not being damaged by this importation
- Mandatory license by importer
- Enforcing regulations around animal health and welfare.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Stopping the import of animals for sale, if the animal is coming in as a rescue the city should have a the rescue organization on file and someone responsible for the animal. And this should be checked to ensure the system and the animals aren't being abused.
- There needs to be guidelines as to what species of animals can be imported and the reasons they're allowed to import.
- This seems like humane society jurisdiction (provincial).
- License and track everything
- Charge more for licensing to discourage imported animals.
- Ensure that animals are properly cared for and do not put the public at risk.
- don't know
- Public awareness of regulations and an updated vision of the value of leaving exotic animals where they truly belong.
- Safety for the public & wildlife.
- Enforce the above criteria stringently.
- Not sure
- It should only be for strays, absolutely no import of specific breeds.
- n/a
- If someone imports them for \$ don't let them do it
- All animals spayed or neutered. No endangered animals. No dangerous animals. Documented regulated breeders. Imported animals quarantined.
- Importation should not be allowed, we have animals enough to attend to already.
- Not sure
- The same rules apply for both imported animals and domestic animals.
- Same as other dogs and their owners
- Ensure not diseases.
- Be very careful. I am no expert but I can imagine a lot of later in time occurring problems.
- Importers should be licensed to place animals in the city. Health and temperament checks should be required.
- Make sure all people import are in good standing with the law including here in Canada and else where in the world and that all animals have been breed and not been wild-caught in other areas that may have looser laws on those issues
- I can't think of anything that wouldn't apply to other laws or non-imported animals.
- Not sure.
- Start an animal shelter for the world in nose Hill park, bring in 1.5 million cats and dogs and release them there.
- In the case of imported dogs and cats, ensuring that the bylaws around licensing are followed.
- Ensuring the animals will be treated well.
- Same as Border Services
- The city should ban the importation of dogs for adoption.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ban the practice.
- City needs to know where all these creatures are so licensing very important.
- Seems like a federal issue to me because it has to do with border crossing and such.
- Regulate what is acceptable in Calgary, inspection system with effective penalties for infractions.
- Licensing and quarantine regulations.
- No comment
- The City should be tracking where the animals came from (bred or rescued), and ensure that they are not carrying disease.
- if animals are from another Rescue in another country with proper documents, being adopted by a person living in Canada, that is acceptable. If from a Rescue to a Rescue in Canada - acceptable also as lives are being saved.
- Perhaps an inspection process?
- Deny them entry into the city. If people want to save/rescue them, they should do so in the pet's country of origin.
- None. Treat them the same as other animals.
- Enacting and enforcing bylaws that keep it's citizens and their pets safe.
- Should be spayed or neutered, chipped and / or tattooed and registered with the city. If being sold too young to spay/neuter, then have that stuff pre-paid with reminder follow-ups and fines.
- Regulate the animals that are in the city in the first place, encourage people to complain if they see something suspicious or not allowed and then have animal control do something about it.
- Limit of numbers in one home/foster
- None
- Should be none of the city's business.
- They should have Segmented list of animals that show what is and what is not exotic pets and then have a data base . We only care about potentially aggressive , invasive and diseased animals that can cause a bigger issue.
- N/a
- They should have to immediately meet all requirements in terms of shots, they should be registered, and they should be neutered.
- Health monitoring.
- None, federal regulations should do
- Work with rescue agencies to support them and ensure that Calgarians adopting the animals know their responsibilities.
- The City should be monitoring the welfare and legality of imported animals, important that tgey are not depleting wild populations. Concerns about reef fish and other exotics.
- One of the biggest concerns is disease. I cannot imagine the city quarantining incoming animals, but we need to ensure that animals that come into the city are healthy. But then I wonder if there are cases of animals that come to Calgary in order to be treated and should they be accepted.
- Not sure other than ensuring there would be no danger to public if the animal were to get lose.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Sourcing (wild caught or not), legality, basic signs of health
- Should not import dogs, rescue or otherwise, from another country.
- Regulate?
- NO multi rescued dogs from other countries
- Current legal requirements
- Mandatory licensing and health/safety inspections.
- do not allow exotic animals in Calgary. we need to curb the rampant abuse of exotic animals; they belong in the wild. period.
- Very difficult needs to be a team effort with provincial and federal. Veterinarians need to have high level of input.
- They should not allow it for commercial reasons. Only people bringing their own pets over from other provinces or countries should be allowed to import their animals.
- Ensuring safety, spaying/neutering, and licensing.
- Not allow.
- Health and safety. Making sure the animals go to a responsible home.
- Prohibit them
- None.
- I don't know.
- i have no real comment to make.
- Stay out of it. The rescue sites need to be left to rescue. They go thru home inspections and meet and greets prior to allowing adoptions to ensure animals are placed in good situation. I dont know of any citizen breeders that do that!
- Limiting and restricting certain animals that might be harmful, carry harmful diseases or contagions, or if released/escape, would be detrimental to our ecosystem.
- i think the current laws are adequate
- None. It's already handled. Not our jurisdiction, so move on!
- Imported from where needs to be defined. if out of country none as should be done at the border. provincial importing is almost impossible to track unless permits are required.
- Take control and restrict the amount of animals in the city already
- just to be licensed if required
Less Municipal interference
- registration and ensuring the animal is spay or neutered
- Seizure of animals. Education to public about aggressively breeding animals that may take over an ecosystem.
- verification of health certification and issuing business licenses.
- Limiting intake if/when there already many local animals for adoption.
- Check on the welfare/health of the animal until it is sold. Not allowing dangerous or endangered animals to be imported.
- None



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Proper license ... pay a tax ...
- I think this is mainly a CBS responsibility
- none.
- should regulate a max number per year and only by special permit with registered organization.
- Ensure that they have been fully vaccinated. If not, they should be vaccinated on site, not have contact with other animals and quarantined until deemed safe.
- None
- The city should levy a fee to ensure responsible pet owners are involved in importing. A license should also be charged right away.
- Ensuring that Calgary's citizens and resident animals are reasonably well-protected from introduced diseases, nuisance animals, etc.
- Limited when compared to that of CBSA.
- Work with the organizations bringing in the imported animals to ensure the animals are healthy and free of any disease that could harm or transfer to other animals.
- Set bylaw and standards. Promote education.
- Sick and tired of ill-behaved "international rescue" dogs behaving like a nuisance (barking, biting, growling) and owners excusing this behaviour due to background of the dog. Limit aggressive dogs being brought in!
- Make have passed health and safety checks and are legal.
- Probably the purview and responsibility of provinces or federal
- The animals licensing should be obtained prior to the release of the animal. Their health checks should be verified.
- Stricker regulations and licensing of import organizations.
Individuals importing one animal are typically doing a great deal of investigation on the pets they are purchasing, and should not be held to the same standard as ""rescues"" who import animals for adoption from other countries
- Liscenced. Vet certificate.
- Strict regulations, monitoring, and enforcement.
- "Rescues" should be banned from importing dogs to be adopted out, there is little to no vet care or behavior assessments done before they are placed in a home. This practice is a cash cow for some rescues and should be stopped.
- Ensure that animals being sold by businesses are from reputable breeders (meaning, they are members of the Canadian Kennel Club), and that they are audited & inspected by both independent veterinarians and representatives of the CKC.
- To provide more info and resources to help make informed decisions.
- Good neighbours
- Spray and Neuter requirements.
- the city has no role here. This is federal level governing
- None. Leave it to Humane Society or AARCS.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- To ensure they are not bringing infections to local animals
- I think this is a national issue.
- None. Canada's food agency does this.
- regulate and enforce the rules. I'm ok with paying more taxes for that. Please no more vicious pitbulls from the US.
- Establish bylaws preventing this
 - - Control retail operations and regulate rescues and humane societies
- To regulate it and to disallow importing rescue animals
- Looking after 10).
- The city should be prioritizing the adoption of pets from shelters of the import of pets. There should be documentation that the imported pet is not aggressive and/or carrying any communicable diseases.
- I don't think at this time they should be allowed, we have lots coming off the reservations to start with, There should be a legal limit of how many you can even own. I know of one lady who has 12 chihuahuas and 4 or 5 Aussie's they are not all licensed she switches the license between the dogs!
- No opinion.
- I'm not sure where the guidelines should come from - maybe provincial.
- be able to restrict the types of animals imported and require licensing for importers and sellers and requirements for the state of the animals that arrive here
- The normal. They need to abide by city bylaws. There is no way to enforce.
- Health checked and if not for registered breeding programs, they should be spay or neutered. IF OUR CITY POUND OR SPCA IS AT OR NEAR CAPACITY, NO IMPORTS SHOULD BE ALLOWED.
- Work with border patrol and continue strong enforcement of aggressive animals.
- Beyond ensuring the safety and well being of the animals, let the market decide. We have enough nanny state government as it is.
- Make licence fees high for pets that are not from canada
- Have the right to refuse imports into the city.
- Not sure
- Only allow this that are handled humanely and not taken from the wild.
- Charges for owning protected/threatened/non-domesticated animals.
- Responsible pet owners should be required to report imported animals when licensing.
- Evaluate the temperament of these dogs for adoption suitability as a fee for service. Review that the animal was quarantined safely and that it has been cleared by a Canadian vet, again for a fee.
- Oversight and monitoring.
- The City's role should always be to ensure the health and safety of all residents, human and non-human, domestic and wild. Personally, I think importing animals should be discouraged. Throughout history, it has caused nothing but problems.
- The City should be in compliance with Canada in recognizing what is allowed and what is not.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- They should NOT allow any animals imported from outside the country (unless personal pets whose owners are relocating)
- Checking where they're coming from and going and that they're being treated properly.
- Nothing other than making sure the pet owners and adoption business comply with city bylaws.
- Ensure importer is licensed.
- Unsure
- Public safety - bylaws prohibiting endangered animals or animals that pose a reasonable threat to the public (large exotic animals, poisonous, etc)
- Ensure imported animals are meeting certain health standards
- No imported animals in calgary
- Must have a record. If the imports and aggressive then the agency can be held liable. For example if dogs from BARCS are always biting people then the company should be held liable and perhaps banned from importing.
- More Regulation
- -they are checked out
- Not sure. More information required.
- Probably in the licensing phase or before to regulate potential risks to calgary animals. Disease or viruses.
- Ensure their health and safety. Some of these non profits are shady.
- Regulate who is able to import the animals and from where. Assist with the quarantine
- To follow the provincial and federal requirements and up hold the city bylaws
- The city should ensure animals are protected and go into appropriate homes with the means to provide well for the animals in a species appropriate manner.
- Not sure
- None
- Ensure they've been properly better and healthy and that they're being brought here for reasonable reasons
- Ensure documents and medical checks and paperwork are in order. Medically safe to cross boarder and back ground checks done.
- Enforcing vaccines and health
- Ensuring that all animals are spayed or neutered. Not from a animals mill.
- Ensuring all requirements are met prior to the animal being allowed within city limits.
- Require vet checks, provenience of the animal. If it isn't a food animal, make sure it won't be used as one.
- Regulations prohibiting the import of any rate of endangered species would be good. As for rescues bringing dogs from kill shelters in other countries, there isn't a need for the city to do much. Rescues usually ensure the animals get their health checks, vaccines and spay/ neuter anyway.
- I do not believe we should be bringing in strays/rescues from other countries, not sure how the City would patrol this, many rescues are bogus and are only for profit



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Limit it because there are plenty cats and dogs available here.
- Make sure it is done safely and through the proper channels to ensure the well-being of the animals . We have a humanitarian obligation to accept animals from other countries similar to how we accept refugees . Canada is about giving hope to those who want a better life for themselves.
- Don't know
- I think airlines should be reporting animals flying in and rendering a report and instructions for the pet owners. I think the city should validate the quarantine if there is one and organize the health inspection or provide places for them to book.
- To make sure local animals come first.
- licensing
- Licencing, regular inspection of any animal shelters.
- Imported animals without Canada should see a vet within the first 30 days of entering the province to clear it of any illness. An animal imported from outside Canada should be quarantined until they are deemed healthy. Owner must report within 3 days of animals entering the country.
- Nothing at all.
- city of calgary is not the crown. bylaws are not legally enforceable
- None
- Quarantine...despite the animal...quarantine it for 90 days...and get the city vet to do a health check...should be the rule for any imported animal
- Not allow for it.
- As noted in #10 above, the City should take a role in the beginning with respect to training / temperament testing. I wonder if using a formal international test like the CKC "Canadian good neighbour" test would be beneficial as a base to rely on for this.
- The rescue organizations should be licensed and vetted and backyard breeders should be licensed and vetted. All pets should be sold with a veterinarian signed health clearance and confirmed spay/neuter for non papered animals.
- Not much.
- I think the city should ensure that these animals are healthy and meet behavioural requirements. I think these programs can be very important for animals in other countries that would otherwise be euthanized.
- I don't think the city should be involved.
- Just making sure they aren't bringing diseases in to the country, and making sure they are not endangered or threatened species.
- Ensure mandatory vet checks are done to ensure health of the animal.
- The city does not have a role.
- Working with other agencies, ensuring rules and regulations are created and enforced, education of residents.
- Imported animals for the purpose of re-sale and profit should not be allowed. The City should be able to remove those animals and adopt them out to suitable homes.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals should be tested and all paperwork should show what this animal will be used for. It's healthy and will be properly cared for. No different than handing over a foster child to a stranger...
- Safety of the animals
- Verifying thw animal is in fact allowed in captivity
- Enforced quarantines, strict licensing, health and behaviour checks
- None
- They should be regulating and ensuring the companies and volunteer agencies that are bringing in homeless animals are taking care of homeless animals here as well
- I don't know enough
- Discourage or disallow.
- Dogs and cats are OK as long as they are healthy.
- Stop allowing it. Until we have our own unwanted & homeless pet issue under control, and then help neighbouring cities & provinces to do the same do not allow it. Then teach other countries how to solve these issues in their own backyards. Their is no need to import animals.
- Regulations in the medical exam.
- Ensure that animals are treated humanely and kindly.
- Business licensing (or equivalent for not-for-profits) that helps to ensure animals can be kept and trained until re-homing in adequate conditions.
- No feedback.
- Monitor where they are from and where they are going. What they are being used for. Ensure they have spay and neuter proof. Licensing.
- Maintain the bylaws. Act more appropriately when issues arise between neighbors. Follow up sooner.
- They should license them and only allow certain types.
- Nothing, They will want a Fee (Cash grab)
- This is managed federally the city doesn't need to step in at all.
- The city should be aware of where these animals are being sold and that it follows regulations to protect the animals
- Not sure
- No interference from the city is required.
- No comment
- See #10
- Maybe providing a list of reputable vets for examination of animals upon entry? Cost of using the vet would be the responsibility of the importing agency.
- Licensing, registering charitable organizations or businesses.
- Enforcing rules. Issuing fines when applicable. Educating and holding retailers to certain standards.
- Make sure they are going to good homes and aren't being used to fight, a breeding mill or food.
- I don't think the city needs to be involved at all, that is the job if the Border services agency.
- I'm not sure

Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Guaranteeing that those animals are safe as the ones not imported.
- Many rescue organizations in Alberta are in it for the money. I donated \$400. for a dog's surgery through [personal information removed] and did not receive a thank you or any receipt or acknowledgement. This dog was from Mexico. There are so many dogs that need homes in Canada. Why take other dogs??
- Ensure they are going to a safe place
- To ensure they are vaccinated and
- Responsible protection of animals and their rights.
- Inspecting and checking if an animal is sick or any harm is upon them and their paperwork is not fake and they are not illegally imported.
- Nothing.
- Lower the fees. \$400 because my cat opened the door??
- Ensuring rules are enforced
- Regulate and enforce!
- Supplier should be identified on licensing form when applying for registration and tags.
- I think higher fees on imported animals to help promote/encourage adoption within our own city/surrounding cities.
- Same criteria as if the animal was not imported.
- Certifying owners. Making sure they are adapted before allowing an animal to be imported
- There are already too many dogs in shelters in Calgary due in part to the economy and irresponsible dog owners who do not spay/neuter their dogs. This city cannot continue to encourage more dogs when we cannot care for the ones already here.
- Ensure compassionate and humane treatment.
- That's a tough one considering there's an airport here. I guess ensure the person/ business importing the animal follows all municipal regulations and registers the animal. I am drawing a blank
On this one, sorry
- not familiar enough with this
- Ensure health checked to prevent spread of disease and that animals not landing in shelters because unable to find quality homes
- No opinion
- Unsure
- Limit the amount coming in, and to make sure the animals are healthy and are not abused and/or abandoned in the city.
- develop appropriate guidelines and restrictions
- enforce criteria
- it should be illegal
- That's a tough one... in the face of financial cuts, all of my suggestions require more manpower and resources. so you wouldn't listen anyways. I don't have any cheap or budget friendly solutions at the moment sadly.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Checking shots/care sis up to date
- Limit and register imported animals
- Minimal.
- Support federal and provincial legislation. Preventative measures to control diseased or invasive species (quarantine, vet checks)
- Require permits. Prevent the spread of illnesses through health testing.
- Ensuring healthy non vicious animals and more puppy mill situations occur
- We have enough dogs in Canada that need rescuing that we don't need mass importation of say Korean meat dogs. I have and show a rare purebred dog and one was imported from USA. That should be allowed.
- It would be almost impossible for the city to police incoming animals,from other countries so the city's effort should focus on education and promotion of the adoption of animals from Calgary or Alberta or Canada.
- Leave it to CBSA. Too difficult to administer additional rules at municipal level.
- To know about them and where they are and the purpose for having them and if they will impact our eco system
- Not enough information available to provide feedback on this question.
- All imported animals should be licensed and spayed or neutered.
- Monitor and see what the population is like. Who is adopting these animals. Do we already have a lot or rescues needing homes? I'm not too sure.
- Limits on importing. A special liscense to import to show they will work with a certified behaviourist to screen these animals and also that they will follow proper quarantine protocol
- Ensure the animals are healthy, safe to the community, able to survive here, and proper licensing
- Working closely with airport authority and border patrols. Banning importation of exotic and/or dangerous animals.
- safety and health of both the imported animals and the people and animals who live here
- None, no need for the city to get involved.
- See above.
- Monitoring ensuring they are not invasive species or don't have diseases that could harm local animals.
- If they are endangered species. Make it really hard for them to be brought here. For other animals such as dogs or cats, that's a federal law not municipal. The city should back off.
- If they are endangered species. Make it really hard for them to be brought here. For other animals such as dogs or cats, that's a federal law not municipal. The city should back off.
- Prevent it as a business. Only allow existing family pets to be imported
- Be able to do inspections at any holding/selling location at any time.
- The city should not have any role regarding imported animals aside from ensuring rescues and adoptive owners follow the law
- The City should be directly involved.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Not my area of expertise. Last line of defense?
- STOP IMPORTING STRAY ANIMALS. Why are we evening paying for pure breed animals to be brought over? There are so many Canadian breeders. How are we assuring safe breeding and proper care and handling of animal's when the breeding is happening over seas?
- Same as dogs that are not imported.
- Same as any other animal
- There should be enough proof from buyers that they have researched the local market and tried to secure the animal from multiple sources. Probably something in writing from the sources they have reached out to. City should check that these criteria are met.
- I do not believe this is a municipal jurisdiction.
- None
- They must get paperwork from the vet stating they are able to be safely transported and are healthy/do not pose a risk.
- It should limit imported animals, as it fuels poaching and illegal importation overseas.
- Should be involved in monitoring
- As above
- I don't think imported animals should be a priority because there are so many animals in Calgary that do not have homes that could be adopted
- Not sure if it's a good idea to spend city resources to regulate. Perhaps just have best practice guidelines for the importers to follow.
- Regulation of imported animals, ensuring humane treatment and regulating commercial transactions within the city.
- Most imported animals are native to their country for a reason and I believe should only be brought to facilities like zoos or shelters to better their chance at life.
- Ban it. There is no reason to import animals for adoption when there is so many strays on the streets and animal shelters at capacity
- Increase licensing fees - make sure there is a business license- limit the number of animals that are brought into Canada for adoption- our own animals need to be adopted before we import dogs etc from other cities
- None
- Health inspections and background check of humane practices
- ?
- Higher regulations. Value of life would also be nice.
- Welfare of the animals within city limits should be considered. Imported animals in transit or prior to sale or adoption should be inspected for shelter, food, water, overcrowding, temperature etc.
- Make sure they're safe.
- Thorough inspections
- Not sure.
- Ensuring the above criteria is met.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Enforcement
- Ensuring that all of the needs of the animals are being met, and that businesses in Calgary are not supporting the exploitation of animals in order to make a profit on mass sales.
- Don't know.
- Ensuring they are not abused, that all sales are ethical, and that the owners are going to be providing a proper home/environment for the animal.
- Unsure
- Same as federal
- it's currently federal jurisdiction so no role if the Feds do their job properly
- None
- Ensure citizens are safe
- If imported they should be able to prove they have homes here and be treated like any other yyc pet
- No role - the CBSA screens for vaccinations and after they have cleared customs, they should be treated the same as an animal who is not imported.
- Similar responsibilities to CBA
- None, this should be federal.
- Regulating within the City limits
- restrict exotic animals that should not be hunted for this trade and treated badly and doesn't survive in this environment
- Tighter controls to make sure the animal and people receiving these animals are equipped to care and provide for the animal.
- Idk ensure safety and health?
- tax on them
- Protect health and safety of people and Calgary animals.
- Ensuring that it is a benefit to have this animal and going to the people that will give it a better quality life
- I don't really see it as the city's job to be honest but I guess the airport authority falls there so, just make sure it's done safely, humanely, and that their destination is a safe and humane one (ie importing exotic animals for food seems wrong)
- That they be licensed
- See above regarding retail sale
- None.
- Ensure animal has up to date vet care. A reason why the animal is being imported into Calgary.
- we should import animals, that is how you keep the livestock genes healthy - inbreeding causes deformities, unhealthy animals etc...
- medical checks, check paper work,
- Encourage Canadian animal adoptions first.
- None. You have CBSA's number.
- Enforce the bylaws.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't know.
- I need to understand "imported animals" better in order to offer an opinion.
- Im not sure honestly. Maybe to ensure that the rescue is legitimate? Would just love for the animals to be loved and treated well and safe.
- Not allow sick or hurt animals in. Limit numbers. Have to license and notify is selling.
- To reject at point of entry, any animal that is not eligible for import, and to test for disease any animal that is.
- Same as with domestic animals.
- this and the question above is beyond the scope of most lay-people. This is inter-jurisdictional regulations and laws when most people don't even know they are supposed to license their pets. At best I think the City could just ban private sales of animals.
- Dont let them be abused
- Follow up
- To make sure of the above
- Only as above
- only allow rescues
- To ensure that any species endangered or native from other places are not accepted as pets, only for a matter of conservation or so.
- Regulatory body
- I think the city needs to consider the endemic animal population and if we need more of certain types of animals. The city also needs to consider if the animal is at at endangered or poses a potential threat to native species if it is introduced (i.e. Bees)
- Not much it should be federal
- Detailed rules and forms that must be filled prior to importing. Plus checks on these animals to make sure they are not lying on the forms.
- Safeguarding the health and welfare of our local pet population by restricting import by rescue groups
- Is this a solution looking for a problem?
- Keeping diseases at bay
- The City should enforce the same rules as local animals. Maybe they could be cared for by seniors in a seniors complex or daycare or elementary school.
- Keep infected and or sick animals away from the general populations until proven otherwise
- Tracking. Rescue groups should be given a limited number that they can import and that should be balanced against what they have worked to adopt locally.
- Adherence of individual/organization to submitting a health/husbandry, aggression, and spay/neuter check (if applicable) and holding the individual/organization liable if found at fault for non-adherence.
- Let them find loving homes.
- If an immigrant is importing his/her pet, they should follow the same regulations as locals



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- To ensure animals are healthy (vet checked), quarantined and handed over to reputable agencies/businesses.
- ability to deny import if there is a potential/real negative interaction with the existing ecosystem.
- Strengthen legislation to _prevent_ animals being imported.
- Fine the individual and have the owner pay to euthanize the animal.
- Not sure. I am mostly thinking of exotic animals..... but I am not informed enough to comment.
- Verify the above conditions are met
- Registration
- Ensure that diseases are not brought in from other countries that could hurt local dogs.
- I don't have any thoughts on this matter
- Same as for non-imported animals.
- Regulate numbers and allow only certified company's on foster out or shelter
- Limit number of imported animals so they don't end up in our shelters.
- Not sure...ensure licensing maybe?
- Reducing
- Check that animal has been imported in a safe and legal manner, they are not an endangered species and they are not carrying disease.
- The city should be accountable to the animals brought in to the city. Veterinarians we'll provide a follow up check after quarantine and the owners are responsible for safe housing, healthy food, socializing, licensing and tons of love!
- Please see to it that there is scrutiny around these importers activities and perhaps a dis-incentive to them rather than the charitable tax incentive. Are they licensed? Can they be vetted before setting up shop? Something has to be done. Its too lucrative. Rescues are the new puppy mills.
- None
- I don't believe imported animals for sale or adoption should be permitted
- None
- That all imported animals are accounted for and do have to pay unlicensed
- No comment
- Ensure the people importing them are licensed to do so.
- Impose limitations on imports when appropriate
- None, border control has it covered. Don't create extra cost and bureaucracy that is not needed.
- As it is today
- I don't believe it is necessary to import animals, since our shelters are already at capacity with unwanted animals
- Ensuring care and welfare standards are met for import businesses as condition of licensing.
- health check and follow up
- Ensure they have no health concerns adequately
can provide for animal
have the training and resources required for the animal



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Controlling the quantity of ones allowed (as we already have rescues needing homes here, we dont need ones from other countries).
- Big one. Prevent rescue groups from rescuing dogs from other countries. Should not be allowed here ever.
- Checklist of the adopter of the pet on what should be done with regards to responsible pet ownership.. if imported then all paperwork presented to city to support responsibly.. importers have given clean bill of health when not healthy.. importers of pets need to take responsibility too
- I believe that if the amount of animals in care is already high then animals should not be imported until the animals in care have been taken care of.
- making sure no diseases are being brought in.
- Ensure the animals are not spreading disease.
- Ensure that importers of any kind are licensed and inspected.
- Ensuring the safety of the current yyc pet population and environment
- Communication needs to happen between the organization bringing in the animals and the City so license notices can be given out and the City has some idea of what is coming in.
- N/A
- Simply to provide a stop-check that the higher levels of government legislation have been followed. And, if not, that violators are reported to the applicable federal or provincial agencies.
- License required & proof of adequate safe clean accommodation.
- I don't know
- Beyond licensing, I'm not sure the City has much of a role to play in it.
- Discourage it
- Rules, regulations. Safety
- Business licensing
- Confiscate dangerous or sick animals
- Confirmation that the items in #10 have been completed.
- Regulation and seizure when not being provided healthy living conditions.
- Rules and regulations that protect the animals that are imported, the wildlife and the neighbourhoods. These rules need to be attainable
- License the owner and the animal to ensure proper care.
- -Ensure vaccinations, spayed/neutered
- Ensure the animals are healthy and free of disease.
- Ensuring the animals are checked and are disease free
- I believe that Calgary is responsible to ensure the sustainability of the industry it permits. I do not believe that animal imports should be permitted unless it is for sustainability purposes ie. importing wolves.
- Follow the rules the country already has in place. Enforcement ensuring new and invasive speicies are not imported... unless it is the zoo importing them.
- Not sure



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Support of cbsa rules and maintenance/oversight of business license etc.
- They should be banned.
- If the human society is full of animals needing adoption why are we bringing more animals in that need homes?
- There should be licensing and review of rescue organizations.
- only registered not-for profit or licensed business should be allowed to sell animals - bred or rescued.
- Strict guidelines to control the importation of any animal.
- None really, as most of these are imported by rescue organizations. They put all the money into everything the animal needs, before and after arriving.
- yes
- The City of Calgary should make reasonable rules but not be involved with the importation. I feel it would be better outsourced to a team consisting of veterinarians, agriculture/environmental experts who understand the needs of the animals first.
- They must pass a clean bill of health check before being imported and prove they have not come from puppy mills.
- grandfather those that are responsible now breeding here. No need to import exotics into the country.
keep proper/responsible breeding records for healthy populations. If they are professionals, educated and care truly about animal welfare it shouldn't be a problem
- See above
- Ensure restrictions on numbers and maintain health standards are meet.
- Nothing than the current bylaws
- See above.
- The City of Calgary should treat imported animals the same as those already in the city.
- Unless the animals are in certain distress or even danger we should not be importing any animals
- They are accounted for -
- Stay out of peoples business
- Make sure they get licensed and recorded to keep track of them.
- Same as above.
- Discourage
- No different role than local pets
- Unlicensed individuals should not be allowed to use their residence as a business for the purposes of breeding and selling the offspring.
- I don't think there should be a municipal role when importing animals.
- Unless it's a domesticated animal, the city should ban the importation of wild animals, and penalize people who do import wild animals as pets.
- Licensed within one month of arrival.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- State and set municipal bylaws to state no imported animals. We have enough in our shelters and on our reserves already.
- Monitor and restrict
- Depending on where the animal is coming .. the city should make sure all rules are followed
- Imported animals should be treated the same as domestic animals if they are deemed safe to enter the country by Canada customs.
- Ensure all imports will not present any potential danger in any way to people, animals or the environment if they're exotic.
Ensure all average domestic animals are coming from an ethical source and will not be inappropriately sold.
- Require proof of medical checks and vaccinations so illnesses are not brought in from abroad
- Ensure the health and safety of the imported animals.
- That once animals arrived are licensed, vaccinated, neutered/spayed or quarantined (if necessary)
- Ensuring that City of Calgary responsible pet ownership rules are met for all imported animals.
- Stop importing.
- They should require that all imported animals be imported by someone who has a business license.
- Support rescue agencies that are bringing in shelter animals for adoption.
- nothing
- if they entered the country with proper documentation, then they have obeyed the law and the city has no role in contradiction the country's law.
- To demand in any way possible that they are licensed and sterilized
- disease control
- COC should be making sure that CBA rules are not in contraindication to COC
- Prior to bringing a pet into the city, a perspective owner must obtain a license and to do so must demonstrate the animal has been spayed or neutered.
- None, I think this would be better handled at the federal level
- Ensure these procedures are humane, and for recreational enjoyment, opposed to negative reasons such as entertainment or butchering.
- n/a
- The city should be imposing strict fines on importing multiple animals for resale. This is a terrible situation and animals are suffering.
- Same answer as question #9.
- Make sure they are licensed and following the rules of responsible ownership
- I don't know what you can do. By the time you find out about them it too late. Fine threats or imprisonment are at least deterrents
- Ensure humane importation of appropriate species, ensure protocols/policies in place to prevent importation of disease.
- None
- Definitely limit amounts and have some sort of regulation or guidelines in place



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Nothing it is more a provincial or even federal issue
- Help limit it.
- N/A
- I believe we should help rescues as much as we can to re-home animals to good loving homes as much as we can.
- None.
- Stop them. It's a waste of money and resources.
- None, I believe that Border Services should enforce their guidelines.
- None
- NA
- ensure health records are with pets and pets are healthy upon arrival
- None, allow imports of rescue animals
- To ensure these animals are sold in good faith and have been licensed . Checking up on people or businesses than do volume importing to ensure in good faith (not for puppy /kitty mills/ dog fighting) adoption and sale paperwork should be able to be provided when asked for
- Licensing, regular vet visits required with proof. Proper training for handling is provided either by the city (for a REASONABLE cost) or provided proof of training from the consumer
- controlling it
- Simply make sure rescues are following the same laws and protocols as the rest of us
- Enforce the health checks, ensure they are legit, within reason obviously.
- Nothing.
- create reasonable rules that protect public and environment from disease and invasive species
- Making sure businesses dont sell endangered animals or stolen animals
- I feel we should limit the amount of imported animals allowed in Calgary due to the rise in surrendering animals to our shelters. Recently our shelters have had a spike in their population and this lead to them being overcrowded and ending up turning animals away.
- Health check and quarantine period so no diseases are being spread.
Must be or get spayed/neutered before being sold/adopted.
- Unknown
- Harsh punishments for those breeding exotic animals, exotics need specialized care and habitats, not providing for their specialized needs is animal abuse. All exotic animals should be liscensed and strictly enforced. Mandatory vet visits to make sure they're being taken care of properly.
- This would result in the mandatory renewal of the licenses by the new owners (unless adopted out of town) resulting in much higher licensing rates.
- The city needs to follow up on rescues importing animals. There is a lack of vaccinations, medical checks and health checks being done. Surprise visits to rescues asking for paperwork
- Limit people doing this for profit, but freely allow this for shelters.
- Regulate commercial animals being imported. It is unnecessary. As for rescue, Calgary needs no role, the Canada Border Services handles this job very well.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Animals should be properly assessed for any potential health issues, and they must be vaccinated and had their rabies shots etc. prior to coming to Calgary.
- Ensuring dogs are safe - medically & behaviourly before being adopted to general public
- Have a better relationship and/or more authority over rescue organizations that import animals.
- I hope the City is accepting of animals, and willing to help them get into loving homes, while holding sellers accountable for equitable practices.
- Help enforce CFIA requirements
- None, unless they would provide a way to get them imported. This is a free market treat it as such
- None. I fully support animals to be imported.
- If imported animals are already cleared for shots, disease and spay/neuter then I don't think city needs to worry. If Canada does NOT do those things then city should.
- The CoC's main concern should always be the safety of its current residents - human and animal. There should be some sort of program in place to assist these rescue groups who are saving animals, and simply trying to give them a better life. They should be healthy and safe before re-homing.
- NONE. PERIOD.
- To ensure that they're healthy before leaving CoC's care and being introduced to a new household
- Ensuring proper quarantine and disease control
- Incident based response. Any other assessment after the stress of travel/quarantine and the customs inspection would not be true.
- Require veterinary health certificates.
- Make sure they're not being brought in for food. Stronger rules and regulations should be made against backyard breeders.
- -
- None other than licensing.
- They should screen the organizations that are taking the imported dogs and ensure they have the financial means as well as space to take on imported dogs.
- To help regulate their arrival and make sure they are licensed immediately when arriving. Maybe there could be a fine or penalty of sorts. For rescue organizations, a temporary license could be provided to each dog. Then it gets transferred and renewed at adoption via the rescue.
- Simply helping to ensure safety.
- Not sure how we would be able to administer any regulations.
- No opinion
- Stay out of it.
- I don't know.
- to regulate it, to set limits, to restrict it
- Determine the need first before allowing them into the city.
- Ensure the Imported animals are for adoption and services for people with special need.
- None



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Quarantine animals if disease risk is high
- Assisting with information and helping with lost or adoption pets
- Knowledge they are being brought into the city.
Allows for licensing and health checks
- Stop it
- Not sure
- Not much of a role, as long as rules and due diligence of care are followed for the imported animal
- Not sure
- Immediate licensing. Rescues and fosters should be licensed
- Same as animals not imported
- I feel boarder patrol has it handled.
- None. That is already covered by Canada Border Services
- Not sure. More animal bylaw officers and visibility of warning signs for pet abuse or neglect so these issues will be reported by public more consistently and dealt with well
- I think this shouldn't be a municipal issue. Federal yes and maybe even provincial but not municipal.
- Any animal that has been commercially imported needs to have a special licence in case that animal is lost or abandoned
- Limit imported animals so rescued animals are front of mind
- Ensure business is a registered company.
- Somehow discourage importing strays from other countries.
- If a new animal, unknown to the city, is brought in then I feel that someone should provide details to the public so they are aware! Especially to those who are living near where the animal will be living!
- ensure they are not contagious and carrying diseases.
- Animals should be approved by Alberta vets. Not sure if this is enforced. Quarantine if not done until cleared to be in our ecosystems
- Healthy, vaccinated, vetted and from a rescue going to a rescue. I would rather see imported go through animal services/city pound, frankly. They manage their stuff incredibly well.
- Should be avoided until all local abandoned animals are rescued.
- See above
- Ensure that all animals are free from contaminants that may infect others. The cost to be minimal.
- Rescues need rescuing- it should be encouraged to import rescues.
- Only if it is a retail business for profit sale.
- None - CFIA issue
- Keeping animals safe.
- Follow the Canada border service guidelines
- The rules are good as they are.
- To make sure they are completely vet checked and are spayed or neutered



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't. I don't think you should be profiting off dogs, rescue dogs who would have been killed otherwise. SHAME ON YOU
- importance should be on the production of happy, healthy animals
- I'm not sure
- -ensuring the criteria is met.
- -confiscation of the animal and fine if illegally imported.
- Be involved in process to bring them in to help protect the safety of animals and people already in Calgary
- None. Canada Border Services already regulates this.
- To help them find loving homes
- Strict regulation and monitoring that this is being done.
- No different than any other animal - if the CBSA people have ensured the animal is safe to enter the country why would the city need to do anything else?
- Depends what for. If it is for future sale of pets, it shouldn't happen. If it is for rescue purposes, OK.
- Make sure that all of the animals are under the care of a vet and are vaccinated when they arrive.
- none
- Origin of animals, proof that testing for diseases has been done, vet checks if necessary and destination of animals and proof of who is bringing them in.
- monitor them VERY CLOSELY
- If pets are being imported into Calgary by associations, these licenses or permits should only be given under the condition of a certain limit of animals should be allowed to be imported per year so that these associations are not overflowing.
- They should be verifying that the animals are healthy and not carrying any communicable diseases
- Stop them or at least quarantine them.
- None let it be federal but
- No comment
- Assisting border agents in what is needed to cross the border. I had to educate them on the requirements when crossing with my new dog. Assuring that they are properly vaccinated and not carrying contagious diseases
- It would be very hard most people will just sneak them in so just a heavy fine for not declaring them.
- Quarantine, limit dangerous and no endangered species except maybe for zoo breeding or expand their numbers.
- Importers must be licensed or regulated and all imports monitored in case of any disease or problems.
- I believe that there should be paperwork inspection and animal health checks to ensure no risk to our livestock, wildlife or pet populations
- See above.
- Not sure



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think they should be coordinating with border services to make sure exotic and endangered animals aren't being trafficked to Canada. Rescue dogs should be allowed to travel from other countries for adoption
- Be very tight on the restrictions especially if there are any concerns with disease we don't need to worry about our pets contracting something that may harm or kill our pets.
- Regulate type of animals that may be imported, ensuring animals are licensed and up to date on immunizations.
- Na
- Licensing adoption agencies and ensure regular inspections are conducted of their records and if they have facilities, their facilities.
- Ensuring that the animals are free from illness
- Not sure
- No clue to be honest. Not sure how one would go about enforcing any kind of restriction without creating an underground railroad of exotics or whatever.
- Screening for infectious disease
- Unsure
- that the animals are cleared.
- Curbing illegal trade and capture of animals for commercial purposes and ensuring animal safety and health once in the city.
- Ensuring that the facility and well being of the animals is managed appropriately and in best interest of the animal until final ownership is established.
- If they are imported I believe a quarantine should be mandatory.
- No involvement, issue licenses to the new owner or the rescue bringing them in.
- I imported a cat once from over seas, the cat had to have vet paperwork and be examined by a vet at the airport, is this still the process? Should still be the same if not.
- Registration of the imported animals so we know what is being imported and that the health and safety of animals is protected and the public is safe from the importing of restricted/banned species.
- Mandatory licensing, spay/neutering and making the sure the group bringing in the animals is registered and responsible.
- strict licensing and inspection of containment biennially, strict rules and proof of health and welfare from certified vet - if none of this then heavy fines that double each incident
- work with Canada Border Services Agency to ensure the above and that animals who are imported are receiving quality care.
- Ensure animals have been fully vetted before being transported to rescue organizations, foster homes, or buyers.
- Enforce my suggestions above!
- There should be guidance around animals eligible for importing, documentation requirements, and fines outlined for noncompliance.
- Nothing that can cross contaminate humans like SARS or Covid-19, for example.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The only animals crossing Canadian borders should be those accompanying families immigrating or relocating to Canada, or animals used in competitions or shows
- As noted above. Need to ensure animal has proper vaccinations, is healthy and is not vicious. As well, it needs to be licensed.
- Checking the rescues have the appropriate paperwork, and collecting fees from those doing it for profit.
- Support rescue organizations! Compassionate action is a source of pride for many Calgarians, and the ambassadors have inspired so many to look after animals here AND in their countries of origin. City can check in that rescue groups provide health checks for the animals being brought into care.
- Ensuring animals are registered, provided adequate living areas, are in good health and are licensed.
- I do not think the City of Calgary should be concerned, as long as the imported animals clear a customs inspection then they should be accepted
- Quarantine and medical screen to ensure animals are healthy
- Rescue organizations should have to register with the city, and bylaw should be doing regular care checks on the animals in their care.
- I would like to see the import of exotic animals stopped and a cap on the number of animals that can be brought in by one individual person or company
- Treating them as any other pet. The adopter should be required to license the pet prior to taking possession.
- Free short term license for rescues that lasts until the animal is adopted. A program to ensure it is being done
- The CFIA is the one that needs to deal with Imported dogs. Would be hard for City of Calgary to keep track of all animals coming into Calgary as they can come in so many ways. It is Border Patrol that needs the training to shield Canada and our pet population from diseases we have not seen in years!
- Just to ensure the business importing are operating ethically.
- Strict regulations and guidelines. What is the purpose of the animals being imported. If I'm purchasing a pet in the U.S. because that's where the breeder is that should be allowed.
- Against it This brings in new diseases never seen by local veterinarians and we are already overrun with pets needing homes
- I don't know.
- I believe that all animals need loving homes.
- Should have an active role.
- i don't think the city has a role at all - it is the CBSA's responsibility.
- Requesting copies of medical records, birth records, where they are coming from (history)
- Again, depends on the animal
- Enforcing compliance with vaccinations and any other health protocols; preventing importation of illegal/protected species.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I'm not clear on what type of animals this includes but I feel the city should be able to restrict the types of imported animals and/or require all animals that come into the province to be registered and in accordance with our spay, neuter and vaccine requirements.
- Assuring dogs are licensed after they have arrived.
- stop imported cats and dogs from Mexico at the border and send them home.
- Not allow animals from outside of country and that includes rescues.
- As mentioned above. Their role should be as a support to legitimate rescues handling that process not taking it over.
- very clear understanding of CITES (convention on International Trade of endangered species). A collaborative working relationship with fish and wildlife in Alberta as well as provincial and federal counterparts. Many species that are brought in that are misidentified on paperwork and are protected
- I believe it is too late once they have arrived in Calgary. It's up to Border control to check the animals and their health and immunisation records.
- Remove the animal from the owner and give to a wildlife agency who might be able to rehabilitate the animal and return to their habitat. We need to do a better job of this.
- I do not think you should have to be controlling this. As the people are following Canada border services rules to bring the dogs here. Most are rescues that are trying to get them a good home that they would never have or they would die.
- I don't know enough about this topic to opine.
- The city should not be involved in this, there are other agencies that control this. The city of Calgary should support the other agencies' agendas for this line of activity and emphasize the hazards of such practices.
- The same as domestic animals with more stringent health checks required.
- I feel there should be a limit to the number of animals being imported into city. There are a lot of pets that are already here that do not have homes or are being rehomed. Accessive numbers of animals that are in limbo, which is unfair to the animals.
- Making sure they were vetted and brought over legally and they aren't going to end up taking up space at our local shelters/rescues. They need to have a place to go once they get here, whether it's a permanent adoptive home, or a foster home until that time comes.
- License and regulate any commercial agencies. Rescue agencies should not be licensed and to some degree they should be supported by the city due to the nature of their work. A Rescue agency is providing a very useful and valuable service to society.
- No idea
- I think the City should consider the care of these animals as if they were privately owned. The business should be responsible for the care and treatment of animals that it is selling, with oversight of the business by the City.
- With so much illegal trade in exotic critters that is unethical and hurting wild populations we need very strict controls on which if any animals can be allowed. If allowed, prove they are from an accredited breeder and the owners can properly care for the animal.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The city should ensure the animals were obtained ethically and should ensure that they are not bringing diseases into our city.
- Ensure they are healthy and have a good facility or home to go to.
- None
- Police all importers regarding health and placement of pets.
- should monitor organizations that import animals to ensure they have appropriate screening processes
- Limit wild animals as pets
- Regular pet regulations once Canada has accepted import
- Unsure
- regulation and monitoring
- Regulating the types and quantity allowed.
- Our duty is to the animal so wellbeing comes first
- A better control on the number allowed (it there an actual demand for these animals or is it just for profit?) and only accept animals who pass certain behavior and health tests.
- KNOW everything; how, what, when, where - medical check, licensing.
- Ensure that they are healthy and well treated.
- Enforcement of current laws.
- Id like to see imported rescues have much more control. The city should be doing visits with the SPCA. So many rescues are just glorified dog mills
- Wow - -that's a big question and I don't know the answer but you could ensure no wild animals are captured to be used as pets and respond to complaints. Communicate to the public - don't take animals from the wild and that includes fish. frogs, turtles, lizards snakes, big cats or other!
- Encourage the role responsible breeders play instead of penalizing them. The breeders, especially those who exhibit, are generally very selective about the quality of animals, but also the quality of the new owners.
Reduce unwanted breedings with assistance to spay/neuter, no for profit rescues
- No idea
- You mean domesticated animals...It's a provincial level ? Health concern must be addressed at provincial levels. The resale can be subject to huge surcharge/ tax (200)... this includes import rescue animal!!!!!!
- Stop importing rescues from outside Canada. There are lots in Canada.
- Setting regulations within the business, ensuring guidelines on the number of UNSOLD/UNADOPTED animals.
What happens if unsold etc?
- To make sure the animals are healthy
- Track what's happening to analyze the data. What breeds are coming in, why are those breeds coming in, where are they coming from, who is profiting, how often are they brought in, how many



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

are brought in (this includes rescues until such a time that we have a governing organization for rescues)

- I don't have an opinion on this.
- Sub contract a place that will rescue
- Make sure you know what is being brought in and why?
- No imports from countries like Mexico, Asia or third world countries.
- They should only be involved when animals are being imported in volume (eg. Rescues or Retail Rescuers)
- ensure they are treated well and are not sick
- As above
- - Providing health inspections to all imported animals at time of arrival.
- - Possibly enact mandatory quarantine period for all imported animals.
- We should stop and/or discourage all importation of pets unless for breeding purposes.
- enforce bylaws, fines.
- Nothing, the animals have already undergone clearances before arrival. There is nothing Calgary really can do that hasn't already been done. Its really overkill at that point.
- Other than licensing and ensuring the animal is being taken care of properly, The City of Calgary should have NO ROLE in people importing animals. If the animal is being taken care of properly, there should be no interference from the City of Calgary.
- I don't think it's any different from a domestic pet. It should have the proper papers and licensing as required.
- I believe the city has an obligation to it's citizens to have very stringent controls to protect people and other animals from either dangerous animals or sick animals
- Ensure they are safe and cared for.
- Enforcement of vet check
- For special bought pets - special licensing. I think the City should discourage bringing in strays from other countries again because there are enough local pets needing homes
- I think there has to be some monitoring and some information available on domestically filling the role that is being looked at.
- None
- Maybe regulate how the sales take place? Like it must be done by a business or charity and not an individual
- Ensure imports do not support abusive businesses.
The city should encourage the adoption/rescue of animals from organizations rather than purchasing.
- None
- The city should help and deal with imported animals with compassion, support and collaborate with these organizations to find those animals forever homes.
- Limits should be in place



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I certainly think the City should be aware of which animals are imported, and who is responsible for them. If an animal has the potential to be invasive, or dangerous then it should be tracked.
- I don't know.
- Know where the animals came from, who owns them.
- ensuring proper documents re: vaccinations, deworming etc...
- support Canadian law and request updated health checks in a fair time period ?
- ensuring they are spayed or neutered
- Strongly regulate!!!!
- it's like legal custodianship with all bases covered.
- Make sure they're legal - ie: not endangered, venomous, otherwise dangerous.
- Should be made aware of the animals brought in and who they have been adopted by
 - Home quarantine - 6 weeks
 - Stop it
 - Limits
 - Home quarantine
 - Stop it
 - Consequences needed
 - temperament
 - money spent
 - Business license required - verify if they are doing ""good business""
 - If city is a part, should be doing more to monitor these things
 - If it's too easy for dogs to come through, all rescuers will be using Calgary to move dogs through Calgary
 - Maybe license dogs
- Guidelines for kinds of animals. Criteria for illness levels. There should be rules about exotic animals.
- ensure they are not contagious and carrying diseases.
- Animals should be approved by Alberta vets. Not sure if this is enforced. Quarantine if not done until cleared to be in our ecosystems
- Healthy, vaccinated, vetted and from a rescue going to a rescue. I would rather see imported go through animal services/city pound, frankly. They manage their stuff incredibly well.
- Should be avoided until all local abandoned animals are rescued.
- See above
- Ensure that all animals are free from contaminants that may infect others. The cost to be minimal.
- Help the people who are going through the process. Things like this can be confusing
- Rescues need rescuing- it should be encouraged to import rescues.
- Only if it is a retail business for profit sale.
- None - CFIA issue
- Keeping animals safe.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Follow the Canada border service guidelines
- The rules are good as they are.
- To make sure they are completely vet checked and are spayed or neutered
- I don't. I don't think you should be profiting off dogs, rescue dogs who would have been killed otherwise. SHAME ON YOU
- importance should be on the production of happy, healthy animals
- I'm not sure
- -ensuring the criteria is met.
- -confiscation of the animal and fine if illegally imported.
- Be involved in process to bring them in to help protect the safety of animals and people already in Calgary
- None. Canada Border Services already regulates this.
- To help them find loving homes
- Strict regulation and monitoring that this is being done.
- No different than any other animal - if the CBSA people have ensured the animal is safe to enter the country why would the city need to do anything else?
- Depends what for. If it is for future sale of pets, it shouldn't happen. If it is for rescue purposes, OK.
- Limiting the spread of infectious diseases as much as possible.
- Make sure that all of the animals are under the care of a vet and are vaccinated when they arrive.
- none
- Origin of animals, proof that testing for diseases has been done, vet checks if necessary and destination of animals and proof of who is bringing them in.
- monitor them VERY CLOSELY
- If within their authority limit the import of animals as noted above. This may not work with exotic pets such as lizards or snakes, but maybe there are such organizations for those animals as well.
- If pets are being imported into Calgary by associations, these licenses or permits should only be given under the condition of a certain limit of animals should be allowed to be imported per year so that these associations are not overflowing.
- They should be verifying that the animals are healthy and not carrying any communicable diseases
- As long as non profits are ensuring animals care and feeding and mental health are good simply support group may providing free licenses until animal is adopted.
- Since the animals would be under municipal jurisdiction once they arrive, the City of Calgary should have a say in whether the animals are appropriate.
- Stop them or at least quarantine them.
- None let it be federal but
- No comment
- Assisting border agents in what is needed to cross the border. I had to educate them on the requirements when crossing with my new dog. Assuring that they are properly vaccinated and not carrying contagious diseases



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Same as #10.
- Require following of appropriate health regulations - passing a qualification to keep said animal with a plan for the care of the animal which is possible within city of Calgary boundaries
- It would be very hard most people will just sneak them in so just a heavy fine for not declaring them.
- Quarantine, limit dangerous and no endangered species except maybe for zoo breeding o expand their numbers.
- Importers must be licensed or regulated and all imports monitored in case of any disease or problems.
- I believe that there should be paperwork inspection and animal health checks to ensure no risk to our livestock, wildlife or pet populations
- This I am unsure about,
- See above.
- Not sure
- I think they should be coordinating with border services to make sure exotic and endangered animals aren't being trafficked to Canada. Rescue dogs should be allowed to travel from other countries for adoption
- Be very tight on the restrictions especially if there are any concerns with disease we don't need to worry about our pets contracting something that may harm or kill our pets.
- Regulate type of animals that may be imported, ensuring animals are licensed and up to date on immunizations.
- Na
- Licensing adoption agencies and ensure regular inspections are conducted of their records and if they have facilities, their facilities.
- Ensuring that the animals are free from illness
- Not sure
- No clue to be honest. Not sure how one would go about enforcing any kind of restriction without creating an underground railroad of exotics or whatever.
- Screening for infectious disease
- Unsure
- that the animals are cleared.
- Supporting those organizations that are importing animals as they are providing a service to the animals and giving them a better life.
- Curbing illegal trade and capture of animals for commercial purposes and ensuring animal safety and health once in the city.
- Ensuring that the facility and well being of the animals is managed appropriately and in best interest of the animal until final ownership is established.
- If they are imported I believe a quarantine should be mandatory.
- Ensuring the safety of the animals
- Having them registered and accounted for



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- No involvement, issue licenses to the new owner or the rescue bringing them in.
- I imported a cat once from over seas, the cat had to have vet paperwork and be examined by a vet at the airport, is this still the process? Should still be the same if not.
- Registration of the imported animals so we know what is being imported and that the health and safety of animals is protected and the public is safe from the importing of restricted/banned species.
- Mandatory licensing, spay/neutering and making the sure the group bringing in the animals is registered and responsible.
- Make sure they are up to date on their required vaccinations or titre tests, licensed.
- strict licensing and inspection of containment biennially, strict rules and proof of health and welfare from certified vet - if none of this then heavy fines that double each incident
- work with Canada Border Services Agency to ensure the above and that animals who are imported are receiving quality care.
- Ensure animals have been fully vetted before being transported to rescue organizations, foster homes, or buyers.
- Enforce my suggestions above!
- There should be guidance around animals eligible for importing, documentation requirements, and fines outlined for noncompliance.
- Nothing that can cross contaminate humans like SARS or Covid-19, for example.
- The only animals crossing Canadian borders should be those accompanying families immigrating or relocating to Canada, or animals used in competitions or shows
- As noted above. Need to ensure animal has proper vaccinations, is healthy and is not vicious. As well, it needs to be licensed.
- I don't know enough about this to answer
- Checking the rescues have the appropriate paperwork, and collecting fees from those doing it for profit.
- I am not sure
- None
- Support rescue organizations! Compassionate action is a source of pride for many Calgarians, and the ambassadors have inspired so many to look after animals here AND in their countries of origin. City can check in that rescue groups provide health checks for the animals being brought into care.
- Ensuring animals are registered, provided adequate living areas, are in good health and are licensed.
- I do not think the City of Calgary should be concerned, as long as the imported animals clear a customs inspection then they should be accepted
- Quarantine and medical screen to ensure animals are healthy
- Rescue organizations should have to register with the city, and bylaw should be doing regular care checks on the animals in their care.
- I would like to see the import of exotic animals stopped and a cap on the number of animals that can be brought in by one individual person or company



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Ensuring reputable organizations are importing them. If the border agency let them in they should be allowed.
- Treating them as any other pet. The adopter should be required to license the pet prior to taking possession.
- Free short term license for rescues that lasts until the animal is adopted. A program to ensure it is being done
- Quarantine until the dogs are tested and proven to be disease free
- The CFIA is the one that needs to deal with Imported dogs. Would be hard for City of Calgary to keep track of all animals coming into Calgary as they can come in so many ways. It is Border Patrol that needs the training to shield Canada and our pet population from diseases we have not seen in years!
- Just to ensure the business importing are operating ethically.
- Strict regulations and guidelines. What is the purpose of the animals being imported. If I'm purchasing a pet in the U.S. because that's where the breeder is that should be allowed.
- Against it This brings in new diseases never seen by local veterinarians and we are already overrun with pets needing homes
- I don't know.
- I believe that all animals need loving homes.
- Exotic animals should not be allowed in the city.
- Should have an active role.
- i don't think the city has a role at all - it is the CBSA's responsibility.
- Requesting copies of medical records, birth records, where they are coming from (history)
- Again, depends on the animal
- Enforcing compliance with vaccinations and any other health protocols; preventing importation of illegal/protected species.
- I'm not clear on what type of animals this includes but I feel the city should be able to restrict the types of imported animals and/or require all animals that come into the province to be registered and in accordance with our spay, neuter and vaccine requirements.
- I believe the border agency covers this, and the City adequately limits the number of dogs in any house already.
- Assuring dogs are licensed after they have arrived.
- Work in concert with Humane Society SPCA with enforcement and investigation into above.
- The person importing them is responsible for them & the new owner must be identified with the animal's ID.
- stop imported cats and dogs from Mexico at the border and send them home.
- Not allow animals from outside of country and that includes rescues.
- As mentioned above. Their role should be as a support to legitimate rescues handling that process not taking it over.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- very clear understanding of CITES (convention on International Trade of endangered species). A collaborative working relationship with fish and wildlife in Alberta as well as provincial and federal counterparts. Many species that are brought in that are misidentified on paperwork and are protected
- I believe it is too late once they have arrived in Calgary. It's up to Border control to check the animals and their health and immunisation records.
- Remove the animal from the owner and give to a wildlife agency who might be able to rehabilitate the animal and return to their habitat. We need to do a better job of this.
- i do not think you should have to be controlling this. as the people are following canada border services rules to bring the dogs here. most are recuses that are tring to get them a good home that they would never have or they would die.
- I don't know enough about this topic to opine.
- The city should not be involved in this, there are other agencies that control this. The city of Calgary should support the other agencies' agendas for this line of activity and emphasize the hazards of such practices.
- The same as domestic animals with more stringent health checks required.
- ensuring no animals with contagious illnesses are brought in; ensuring the welfare of the animals
- I feel there should be a limit to the number of animals being imported into city. There are a lot of pets that are already here that do not have homes or are being rehomed. Accessive numbers of animals that are in limbo, which is unfair to the animals.
- Making sure they were vetted and brought over legally and they aren't going to end up taking up space at our local shelters/rescues. They need to have a place to go once they get here, whether it's a permanent adoptive home, or a foster home until that time comes.
- License and regulate any commercial agencies. Rescue agencies should not be licensed and to some degree they should be supported by the city due to the nature of their work. A Rescue agency is providing a very useful and valuable service to society.
- No idea
- I think the City should consider the care of these animals as if they were privately owned. The business should be responsible for the care and treatment of animals that it is selling, with oversight of the business by the City.
- With so much illegal trade in exotic critters that is unethical and hurting wild populations we need very strict controls on which if any animals can be allowed. If allowed, prove they are from an accredited breeder and the owners can properly care for the animal.
- The city should ensure the animals were obtained ethically and should ensure that they are not bringing diseases into our city.
- Ensure they are healthy and have a good facility or home to go to.
- None
- Police all importers regarding health and placement of pets.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- should monitor organizations that import animals to ensure they have appropriate screening processes
- Limit wild animals as pets
- Regular pet regulations once Canada has accepted import
- Unsure
- regulation and monitoring
- Regulating the types and quantity allowed.
- Our duty is to the animal so wellbeing comes first
- A better control on the number allowed (is there an actual demand for these animals or is it just for profit?) and only accept animals who pass certain behavior and health tests.
- Licensing and policing.
- KNOW everything; how, what, when, where - medical check, licensing.
- Ensure that they are healthy and well treated.
- Enforcement of current laws.
- I'd like to see imported rescues have much more control. The city should be doing visits with the SPCA. So many rescues are just glorified dog mills
- ensure commercial entities have proven sufficient space and resources for humane care, and their locations zoned appropriately
- we don't want diseased or if the dog is highly aggressive to go to an average owner that can't deal with it as average owners could get other people, dogs or children hurt.
- Wow - that's a big question and I don't know the answer but you could ensure no wild animals are captured to be used as pets and respond to complaints. Communicate to the public - don't take animals from the wild and that includes fish, frogs, turtles, lizards, snakes, big cats or other!
- Help promote our AARCS and Humane Society so the people will go to them for pets and not "save" the rest of the world's animals when we have enough to choose right here.
- As long as pets have gotten the basic tests done, then I don't think the city should play another role.
- Encourage the role responsible breeders play instead of penalizing them. The breeders, especially those who exhibit, are generally very selective about the quality of animals, but also the quality of the new owners.
Reduce unwanted breedings with assistance to spay/neuter, no for profit rescues
- Not sure.
- Same as above plus licensing
- No idea
- Should not be allowed except for personal reasons. Canada has thousands of unwanted animals.
- You mean domesticated animals... It's a provincial level? Health concern must be addressed at provincial levels. The resale can be subject to huge surcharge/ tax (200)... this includes import rescue animal!!!!!!
- Stop importing rescues from outside Canada. There are lots in Canada.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I don't believe the role is any different that that of our own animals. quarantine period for rescue animals. health certification and documentation for people purchasing a dog from a breeder out of country.
- Setting regulations within the business, ensuring guidelines on the number of UNSOLD/UNADOPTED animals.
What happens if unsold etc?
- To make sure the animals are healthy
- Track what's happening to analyze the data. What breeds are coming in, why are those breeds coming in, where are they coming from, who is profiting, how often are they brought in, how many are brought in (this includes rescues until such a time that we have a governing organization for rescues)
- I don't have an opinion on this.
- Sub contract a place that will rescue
- Make sure you know what is being brought in and why?
- No imports from countries like Mexico, Asia or third world countries.
- Ensure safety for Calgary's pets from exposure to disease. Importer is responsible for costs and relocation.
- They should only be involved when animals are being imported in volume (eg. Rescues or Retail Rescuers)
- ensure they are treated well and are not sick
- As above
- - Providing health inspections to all imported animals at time of arrival.
- Possibly enact mandatory quarantine period for all imported animals.
- We should stop and/or discourage all importation of pets unless for breeding purposes.
- enforce bylaws, fines.
- Nothing, the animals have already undergone clearances before arrival. There is nothing Calgary really can do that hasn't already been done. Its really overkill at that point.
- Other than licensing and ensuring the animal is being taken care of properly, The City of Calgary should have NO ROLE in people importing animals. If the animal is being taken care of properly, there should be no interference from the City of Calgary.
- I don't think it's any different from a domestic pet. It should have the proper papers and licensing as required.
- Rescued animals should be allowed as long as they get the vet care they need.
- I believe the city has an obligation to it's citizens to have very stringent controls to protect people and other animals from either dangerous animals or sick animals
- Ensure they are safe and cared for.
- Enforcement of vet check
- For special bought pets - special licensing. I think the City should discourage bringing in strays from other countries again because there are enough local pets needing homes



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- I think there has to be some monitoring and some information available on domestically filling the role that is being looked at.
- None
- Maybe regulate how the sales take place? Like it must be done by a business or charity and not an individual
- Ensure imports do not support abusive businesses.
The city should encourage the adoption/rescue of animals from organizations rather than purchasing.
- None
- The city should help and deal with imported animals with compassion, support and collaborate with these organizations to find those animals forever homes.
- awareness. licensing.
- Have strict guidelines as to what can be imported and by whom
- Limits should be in place
- I certainly think the City should be aware of which animals are imported, and who is responsible for them. If an animal has the potential to be invasive, or dangerous then it should be tracked.
- I don't know.
- Know where the animals came from, who owns them.
- As above.
- ensuring proper documents re: vaccinations, deworming etc...
- support Canadian law and request updated health checks in a fair time period ?
- ensuring they are spayed or neutered
- Having received all confirmation for all needed shots, record of ownership, past and current. Record of having complied with all international/ federal laws.
- That they enforce the rules and entry requirements
- Strongly regulate!!!!
- it's like legal custodianship with all bases covered.
- Make sure they're legal - ie: not endangered, venomous, otherwise dangerous.
- We should ban them
- Should be made aware of the animals brought in and who they have been adopted by
- Oversee the transition between CBSA and when the animals have had a veterinary professional clearance to take them out of quarantine.
- license and registration upon arrival in collaboration with CBSA
- Shut down shelters importing animals
- Strict procedures with respect to vaccination and tendered contracted vets who examination imported animals on behalf of the city.
- I think importing is federal, not municipal.
- Nothing beyond licensing
- I don't know.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- Retail rescue bad but can you stop it or does it have to be federal. Import laws to bring in a dog are federally getting tighter
- Insuring all imports are going to people who understand the needs of that animal, as well as proper medical and behavior assessment given
- Oversight - proper treatment while in the care of the importer.
- They should set and enforce the regulations.
- Health & temperament checks, and vaccinations. The organization importing these animals should bear the expense, not Calgary taxpayers. Exotic animals from the tropics should not be allowed.
- All imported animals must be brought in Humanly and not an endangered animal
And not for resell!
- Nothing beyond the existing licensing, behaviour and quantity limits. It shouldn't matter where the animal comes from if it is cared for responsibly. Making it easier to get dogs from other areas would help with rescue efforts around the world.
- To ensure these organizations importing them have done their diligence and have safe practices for disease control and a plan for adoption.
- Ensure it is a safe and viable pet
- i dont beleive bylaws are laws that are lawfully enforceable.
- That they arrive in calgary safe and sound and are required to have care (such as an appointed vet) before the animal even arrives in calgary.
- Business licensing/permitting
- Continue to allow this. I have adopted dogs in the past from high kill shelters in the US and ones rescued from the streets in Mexico, all dogs were amazing and were a part of my family. Rescue knows no borders, every animal deserves a second chance at life
- Licensing of importers.
- Same as above.
- Close monitoring of the imported animals
High licensing fees
- They should all be licensed.
Bylaws should be enforced.
Fines should cover the cost of the program.
- Same answer as above.
- Whatever your role is for horses imported for competition, should be the same across the board.
- business licensing/permitting
- I don't know enough about this, but if having animals like birds, fish, and reptiles at pet stores impacts the environment they come from or their native populations or their are concerns about their treatment before they get to the pet store then their sale should be limited or banned.
- Business licensing/permit
- Wow big question. You probably know more than me. Check for vaccines, registrations, diseases, rabies etc.



Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw Review

Verbatim Report: Public engagement

June 29, 2020

- The city should take cautionary measures as to what animals & why they're being imported. For example; ban animals such as reptiles where kittens/cats are being used for their consumption, ban gold fish who are discarded into our lakes & rivers.
- No exotic ever. Large fines imposed.
- That perhaps they be examined or tested for fitness, health and temperament. Again this will cost money that likely would be passed on to taxpayers. We can't afford this extra cost in this day and time
- Stopping animals from being imported if they are wild animals and inappropriate for individual ownership. Not supporting puppy mills.
- If City has allowed the animals in, they should be responsible for surrenders & seizures.
- Ensure all animals are treated humanely, are being brought up for ethical/legal purposes, and are not introducing any illness/pests to the area.
- They should discourage them if commercial.
- Reporting them to Canada Border Services. Don't make more jobs and cost us more money when something can and should be handled by Canada Border Services. Don't waste my money, refer it back to the Feds.
- Manage complaints
- policing the retailers to ensure the animals are treated well and get proper care.
- Ensuring that they receive vaccinations and will be spayed or neutered
- Business licensing/permitting
- Verification of humane sourcing. provide quarantine if necessary, costs charged to company importing animals.
- May have answered, mixed with Ques. 10. Should require registration so they know they have arrived and identify what they are.
- Believe this is more a provincial and federal jurisdictional role.
- Regulate.
- See above.
- Once accepted they are treated like any other animal. Otherwise no comment.
- Need to know where animals are coming from, when they are coming and need to know where they have gone.