

ANIMAL AND DOG PARK ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, August 12, 2021

8:00 am – 9:00 am

IN-PERSON LOCATION

Room 208 @ City Hall

VIRTUAL MEETING LINK

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84355790611?pwd=Ukd6MjVEdHI1ZWtXOG91NFJranRsZz09>

Meeting ID: 843 5579 0611

Passcode: 955378

DRAFT Minutes

Attendees		
Committee Members	In-Person	Virtual
Tom Lopez, Board of Aldermen	x	
Patricia Klee, Board of Aldermen Alternate	x	
Kathy Abel, Community Member		x
June Lemen, Community Member (Vice-Chair)		
Amber (Logue) Morgan, Community Member (Chair)	x	
Megan Villacis, Community Member		x
Bob Langis, Animal Control Officer	x	
Becky Longval, Nashua Humane Society		x
Staff	In-Person	Virtual
Deb Chisholm, Waterways Manager	x	
Julie Chizmas, Transportation & Long-Range Planner	x	
Sarah Marchant, Community Development Director		
Jason Puopolo, Parks & Recreation Superintendent		x
Noah Telerski, Mayor's Office	x	

The regular meeting of the Animal and Dog Park Advisory Committee was held in Room 208 at City Hall and via Zoom teleconference. The Zoom meeting link was provided on the meeting agenda and on the City’s website.

Roll call attendance was taken and those participating via Zoom stated their presence, the reason for not attending the meeting in person, and whether there was anyone in the room with them during the meeting, which is required under the Right-To-Know Law.

1. Approval of the [May 7, 2021](#) and [June 4, 2021](#) Meeting Minutes

- May 7, 2021 Minutes:
 - Motion: Amber Morgan
 - Second: Alderwoman Klee
 - Discussion: None
 - Yea: Unanimous by roll call vote
 - Nay: None
 - Abstained: None
- June 4, 2021 Minutes:
 - Motion: Becky Longval
 - Second: Kathy Abel
 - Discussion: None
 - Yea: Unanimous by roll call vote
 - Nay: None
 - Abstained: Alderwoman Klee
- Alderman Lopez recommended recording and posting the ADPAC meetings for public viewing. A roll-call vote was taken and the committee agreed to record meetings moving forward.

Next Steps:

- Julie will get guidance on the best method and platform for recording.

2. Animal Regulations: Proposed Revisions to [§93-14](#)

Bob has consistently pointed out that “currently the only animal with a cap on a fine is dogs. If a chicken, cat, horse, hog etc. gets loose the judge currently has discretion to fine up to \$1,000 per offense. Dog fines need to be placed with the rest of the animals.” Therefore, the change proposed to the ordinance is pretty simple – we just want to strike the last clause:

[93-14 Violations and penalties.](#)

[Amended 5-14-1996 by Ord. No. O-96-11; 8-11-1998 by Ord. No. O-98-42; 3-23-1999 by Ord. No. O-98-90; 8-12-2003 by Ord. No. O-03-191]

Any owner found violating any provision of this article shall be guilty of a violation and upon conviction thereof shall be punished as provided in § [1-12](#) of the City Code., ~~except that violation of an ordinance relating to dogs shall be punished by a fine of \$25.~~

Alderwoman Klee is sponsoring and Alderman Lopez is co-sponsoring this revision request. Alderwoman Klee sent the proposed revision to Legal for their review on August 12th.

Next Steps:

- Alderwoman Klee and Lopez will bring this request to the Board of Alderman for reading and referral.
- Amber will draft the referral response.

3. Dog Waste Clean-up Campaign

The City did not receive the AARP Community Challenge grant that would have purchased waste stations and bags.

The dog waste station at the Salem Street tot-lot was vandalized - it looks like the cover was used for target practice. However, there are still bags there and they being used. Jason will go take a look.

Director Marchant asked the Legal Department whether we could install security cameras at tot-lots for children's safety or to catch dog waste offenders. Attorney Bolton replied he was not aware of a prohibition that would prevent us from doing so.

Cameras have been discussed for the Shattuck St tot-lot and the concern was that anybody can request a copy of the video and we aren't legally able to run a background check before releasing it. However, they would need to file a FOIA request and video is typically only retained for 48 – 72 hours before it's recorded over. We would need to post signage notifying people of the existence of the cameras. Residents do want one but asked if can only operate certain times of day like after 6 pm.

It was noted that it would be cost prohibitive to install cameras for just one or two dogs causing a problem and it would be good to identify locations with other issues besides dogs, like vandalism or other crimes. Cameras are all battery operated so we could move them around as needed.

Alderwoman Klee received a message from resident describing a recent issue with someone who brought their dog into the tot-lot and did not respond positively to a request to pick up their dog's waste. Bob asked her to send him the info and he will follow up.

4. Millyard Dog Park Feasibility Study Update

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment conducted by GZA was completed in July and found no surficial or historical evidence indicating the presence of recognized environmental conditions (RECs). The sale of the property to the City has not been finalized but is still moving forward.

The Feasibility Study sub-committee met on August 4th and the design and study continue to progress nicely. Meeting notes and slides were sent to the full ADPAC for their review in advance of this meeting and are attached to these minutes.

The committee discussed the proposed design and had the following comments, concerns and recommendations:

- The fence should be 8' high with sloped top to prevent jumpers from getting out.
- Concern about people without dogs using the picnic tables was expressed. Since this park will be open to the public, there is the possibility that will occur.

- The "Timid" and "Social" dog areas should be changed to "Large" and "Small" dog areas because big dogs can still hurt small dogs even if they are timid, which is why most dog day care centers, parks, humane societies, etc. keep large and small dogs separated.
- The floodplain is a very important consideration with respect to surface types. We want accessibility but also durability. Jason will set up a call with the consultant to go over the various options. We want something that requires the least amount of maintenance, and will likely have mixed surface types. We might want something like pea stone in high traffic areas such as along the fence line.
- Woodchips were not recommended for a number of reason, including they tend to have a lot of bees.

Other questions asked that the feasibility study will help answer:

- How will we verify licensing, vaccinations if it is open to everyone?
- Who will be responsible for maintenance?

5. Animal Shelter and ACO Updates

- ACO:

Bob provided an updated animal call report (summary attached).

Community policing category added at request of resident because of wildlife sightings and as a result, Bob has talked to many people about what to do when you run into wildlife.

- Humane Society: The meeting ended right at 9 am before this agenda item was discussed.

6. Other

Since the meeting ended before the following information could be shared, it was sent via email to the full committee:

On August 3rd, Amber, June and Julie met with Becky, Doug Barry and Jessica Carson from the Humane Society to discuss the Humane Society becoming the ADPAC's fiscal agent. The Humane Society offered to be the committee's fiscal agent for a very low fee (3%) and definitely want to support the committee's mission.

Next Steps:

- Amber will research and draft an agreement and send to the Legal Department for review.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 am.

Next Scheduled Meeting: Thursday, September 9th at 8:00 AM – 9:00 AM.

Minutes by: Julie Chizmas