

# Voice and Sight Monitoring-Public Review

## On-line Comment Form: All Comments

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Acceptance David R Bobko	<p>It can become very confusing when hiking in an area that has both voice and sight tag allowed trails and trails that voice and sight tags are not allowed in. Having gotten a ticket because I missed one small sign last year, this can be frustrating. Maybe a map showing which trails comply and which do not at the trailhead would help with the confusion.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>
alan ward	<p>Program seems to be working well. Wish there were fewer leash trails in Boulder as the green tag system alleviates the user conflicts without tethering.</p>
Aldona Siczek	<p>There is only one TRUE metric to measure compliance with the City of Boulder's Voice and Sight Tag Program, which is tabulating numbers of confirmed violations in each category (dogs harassing wildlife, behaving aggressively towards humans or other dogs, and so forth) that have been substantiated by OSMP staff and the courts. The table need to be posted on the OSMP website for public review and understanding of the problem.</p> <p>It was a revelation to me not long ago that OSMP did not keep track of tickets issued in OS as the best measure of compliance. I trust that this has changed.</p>
Aldona Siczek	<p>I am convinced that the GT works well. I would like to see how many tickets were issued in 2013 and 2012 for chasing wildlife and for aggressive behavior in OSMP. Please provide this information - it must be available ! Once when we all know the circumstance of the problems we can make recommendations.</p> <p>In general I strongly recommend a friendly outreach to the community - have a period of education on the trails; meet with the visitors and talk to them.</p>
Alexandra Weaver	<p>We have participated in the program since its inception. Overall, our experience has been that dog guardians are more likely to be aware of expectations and standards for dog behavior. When we ask others to leash or control their dogs, we find they are more open and responsive than they were 10 years ago. I do not know why this is, and I cannot say that the green tag program helped.</p> <p>I do know that the green tag program has been expensive for the city, and I would be interested to know if the income has covered its expenses.</p> <p>We continue to find many dog owners within city limits, not on open space, who are incapable of controlling their dogs, wildly unrealistic about their dogs' obedience skills, and allowing their dogs inappropriately to approach people, other dogs, and children. We live next to the Hawthorne community garden, and every one of the undesirable behaviors is demonstrated on a daily basis. The green tag program does nothing to address these behaviors.</p> <p>I would suggest that ongoing education for dog guardians is most appropriate and cost-effective. Eliminate the green tag program and work on educating everyone through the annual license. The same behaviors that work best everywhere in Boulder will carry over to open space, for everyone's benefit.</p>
Allan Rotgers	<p>I am so thankful for the opportunity to have my dog off-leash in some areas of OSMP. I was especially excited to hear about the recent addition of off-leash access to Bear Canyon - thank you!</p>

Name	Comment
Allyson Widlak	<p>I am all for having the monitoring program being updated to more severely punish those with dogs in violation, but I think it is important to maintain the availability of having an off leash dog, it is truly under voice and sight control.</p> <p>In order to improve data tracking and indicators, I think that there should be a data base of every ticket issued along side every dog registered in Boulder County. I think it should be a requirement to have a dog licensed within Boulder County for them to be accepted into the Voice and Sight program, and I think that those being caught violating should only be ticketed if they cannot visibly control their dog. If a dog is off leash in an unspecified area, b/c they are new to the area or misread a sign, they should not be issued a ticket if their dog is obviously under the owners control without the leash on.</p> <p>The changes I think that would help the program immensely would be having this data base, so warnings are entered in. As of right now, no warnings are given b/c there is no way of tracking them as part of the program. I also believe that having more trained professionals out there to watch for dogs off leash would be helpful. There should be more areas for dogs to be allowed off leash in Boulder County, but there should also be more people out there issuing tickets to those who can't control their dog when chasing an animal, or has a dog that can't instantly come after being called. It is unfair to mis-judge and ticket those who have a dog that listens. The program has been scrutinized for not working by non-dog owners who feel that dogs are not being controlled, but there are plenty of dogs and owners in this town that have followed the rules and have well behaved dogs that should not be punished because of people that do not have their dog under voice and sight control. Please consider this when making changes. Thank you.</p> <p>Ally Widlak</p>
Angela C. Brand	<p>I have never had any issue with the voice and sight program. People have always been conscientious and polite and I believe it to be a very important program.</p>
Anita Prinzmatal	<p>The old green tags are too bulky and noisy when paired with rabies and id tags, etc. I would suggest that the owners have a card that shows they participate in the program. Then, if a dog misbehaves, a ranger can ask to see the card.</p>
Annie Hannagan	<p>Thank you for considering comments before voting on any changes. I appreciate being include.</p> <p>I walk frequently on the Centennial Sanitas trails with my two Golden Retrievers. The ONLY violation I have seen infrequently are hikers leaving filled green poop bags along the main trail. In the interest of improving public relations/reputations, I ALWAYS pick them up and put them in the trash. My concern is stricter rules are being requested by the FEW complainers. This is in keeping with ""the sueaky wheel gets the grease"" model so evident in Boulder politics. Let's keep this in perspective. The MAJORITY, not vocal minority should have the greatest influence on policy. In my opinion, there are simply a few dog haters among the citizen majority who have made it their passion to eliminate dogs from open space. Thank you.</p>
Art Gabriel	<p>We don't need any more new compliance measures or enforcement. We trail users and dog owners can work out any conflicts without your meddling. No more nanny state stuff!</p> <p>You guys seem to have too much staff-try focusing on trail and access road road maintenance.</p>
Astrid Gifford	<p>Don't really know how to respond to those indicated questions, but all I know is that I hike with my dogs every day on the designated ""sight and sound"" trails and have never seen any indication of abuse of the program or owners not complying with the rules. The dogs are close to their owners, respond immediately to owners' commands, and cause absolutely no problem anywhere, anytime. I hope the day will NEVER come when owners with well-behaved dogs cannot enjoy the trails off-leash.</p> <p>Congratulations to Boulder, a truly dog-friendly town!</p>

**Name****Comment**

---

Barb DiPasquale

What changes to the monitoring method do you believe would improve data collection or statistical analysis of indicators?

As a longtime financial analyst, I found your ""data collection and statistical analysis"" to be inferior to any business/research in the real world. Your data collection did not consider typical variations within the user base, trail-type and application instances. Most of your audience, while unable to verbalize their disbelief of your findings, did not trust or feel this was an unbiased, professional analysis. So you need to stop calling this a statistical analysis - it clearly was not. Data collection, when observed/provided, by sources who are not impartial also provided a skew in your data sample.

I think you need to work in a more collaborative fashion to engage all stakeholders in your next effort and eliminate the obvious bias to any one party. OSMP should be an independent entity supporting all taxpayers in Boulder. It didn't feel that way to me in any of the few meetings I attended. Individuals were angry and combative.

Since you all have stated this controversy, you have managed to drive some of the bad actors from the restrictive trails to the Dry Creek area. Having now had the pleasure of walking my dog with some of these entitled characters, I can see where some of the complaints might be coming from. An easy solution might be to engage some of the regulars, who have a vested interest in keeping dog poop picked up and reporting untrained dogs to OSMP. Everybody wins and has an interest in monitoring their area - rather than increasing ranger patrols.

I've had to stop runners (they are the worst). How do you run and watch what your dog is doing ""behind"" you - and they don't pick up unless I stop them.

Why?

You need to improve your image, do an unbiased/professional analysis and build faith with all the interested parties within your constituency.

What changes to the statistical analysis do you believe would offer better information upon which to base adaptive management decisions?

Your assumptions were unrealistic, skewed and unrepresentative of the user base. Rather than building an analysis supporting your goal or view, take an honest look at what's going on and look for ways to improve. I don't think anyone was calm enough to ""listen"" to what was being said or ask ""why"".

What other methods to monitor compliance or conflict might OSMP consider?

As I stated above - ask for compliance volunteers who walk their dogs regularly in the same place. They see offender behavior and the offenders wouldn't know them as ""rangers"". They have a vested interest in the stewardship in their area - a win-win in my book.

Barbara Lish

I have read the plans and suggestions for the changes in the program and am not pleased. I think that the system that is in place is satisfactory. I have not in all my hiking/walking/enjoying open space had any problems at all with other dogs. I don't know where you get your statistics and information but I feel it is grossly inaccurate. I see no problems with keeping the system the way it is. Our taxes pay for the space to begin with, why are you trying to micromanage and cost us more money? This space belongs to the people and everyone needs to use it in conjunction with everyone else. To be punitive to a faction of the people is unacceptable. You need to go back to the drawing board and come out with something that provides equality.

Name	Comment
Ben Klaus	<p>I think more rangers out on the trails during busy times would alleviate most of the problems. I personally have rarely seen any sort of dog conflicts on the trails but I also don't go at busy times. If there were rangers out there giving tickets to negligent dog owners, it would likely change behavior.</p> <p>Most of this study measured whether dog owners were following the rules, not whether the rules were good. If all dog owners followed the rules, the problems would go away. So enforce the rules!</p> <p>I was also very disappointed to see you changed off-leash rules for the Lower Big Bluestem Trail. It is such a nice loop with the South Boulder Creek Trail West but now requires us to leash the dog on half of it, taking away some of the appeal of the hike. Again, if the rules were followed, I fail to see how there could be any issues on that lightly traveled trail. I'm guessing it is due to livestock. Livestock should be under no threat from properly voice-controlled dogs.</p> <p>Thank you. Ben Klaus</p>
Beth Cooper	<p>I think the City Open Space program is being very heavy handed with their approach to dogs on Open Space. I really don't understand what problem they are trying to fix. I am on the Mountain Park/Open Space trails 4-5 times a week and very rarely see any issues with dogs. The vast majority of dogs and people (even those without dogs) are extremely friendly. Far more people ask to pet my dog then make any kind of negative comment about dogs being on the trail. I really think the Park Rangers should focus on issuing tickets to dog owners (guardians) whose dogs are really out of control chasing wildlife or acting aggressive towards people. I am not interested in seeing the open space tax dollars being used to continually address this issue of dogs on open space/mountain park trails. Seems to me the staff and maybe City Council are making a mountain out of a molehill; surely we have bigger issues to deal with.</p>
Betsy Molnar	<p>I believe the monitoring program is fine! The majority of people respect others and their dogs. Yes, I have seen issues and yes I have seen people not pick up their poop. I walk my dogs every day off leash (except during extremely bad weather) I very rarely see problems.</p> <p>I have always had dogs and have lived here since 1989. Your biggest problem is with bike riders. ( I Ride my bike to work and on trails) I believe we should get Bike licenses. I would be very willing to pay 10 or 15 dollars,as I obey the rules and would love to see others do this!!!! It would add to Boulder revenue and maybe calm some of these bike riders who are so inconsiderate. They come upon you quickly without warning. They hit one of my dogs about 5 years ago then flipped me off. They ride on trails not designated for bikes. They make trails wider, and create new trails by not having to follow any rules! It is a huge problem Boulder refuses to address!! My biggest annoyance with dog owners is not picking up poop and that seems to be happening less. Most people really try to make the experience pleasant for others!! Thanks, Betsy</p>
Bill Shirley	<p>I support a requirement where we must demonstrate our ability to handle our dog off-lead in order to qualify for a Green Tag. Also, is it possible to have this program extended to the Boulder County.</p>

**Name****Comment**

blair norman

Dear OSBT members, I am writing this letter to object to some of the proposed changes to the Green Tag system and to request some clarification about the study that this proposal is based on. In looking at the study done by OSMP in 2012 it looks like most of the participants (how many, we don't know 10 or 1000?) complied with the most troubling of the requirements-keeping their dog within sight. What are the standards set in the Master plan that aren't being complied with?

OSMP's evaluation of the trial voice and sight program (2012) shows that compliance levels do not meet

the standards set in the Visitor Master Plan.

86% of off-leash dogs had Green Tags visible

40% of visitor parties complied with the requirement that only 2 dogs may be off-leash per guardian<sup>2</sup>

93% kept their dog(s) in their field of vision<sup>3</sup>

56% of dogs returned to their guardian within two separate & distinct commands to come<sup>4</sup>

15% of visitor parties participated in at least one conflictive behavior

46% complied with poop pick-up rules

(study session compendium pg

17). [www.bouldercolorado.gov/files/openspace/pdf\\_VMP/overarching/12-](http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/files/openspace/pdf_VMP/overarching/12-1113_Council_Study_Session_Compndium.pdf)

1113\_Council\_Study\_Session\_Compndium.pdf

15% of visitors participated in one conflicting behavior? What does this mean? Are you really suggesting to increase the budget from \$130,000 to \$700,000 to confront and punish these 15%? I see more people stepping to the side of the trails to avoid the puddles and mud than bad dog owners. Shouldn't we try and protect our trails just as fervently?

Boulder's 2010 Resident Survey shows that 44% of all respondents feel that dogs off-leash make their

visits to OSMP less pleasant. When asked about conflicts involving dogs and the impact of the Tag Program,

55% felt there was either no change or more conflict.

What percentage of these respondents own a dog? I walk my 2-year-old dog every day on open space and haven't seen a dog conflict with another person or wildlife in 2 years. What does no change mean? Was there conflict every time they hiked before or they encountered conflict 1 time out of every 15 times they hiked? What is a conflict? I would like to be totally alone on the trail. Is it less pleasant if there is someone hiking in my field of vision?

Approximately 73% of all violations issued since 2006 have been dog-related; and while the numbers

vary a bit from year to year, they are generally consistent over time. Ticketing violations and levying fines

have not resulted in changes of behavior.

Are the ticketed owners repeat offenders? If yes, then education is in order. If not then it suggests to me that the pool of offenders is constantly changing so you aren't educating them properly at first. Maybe have the video to get a green tag be accompanied by an online test to see if they get the answers correct before they can get a tag.

If my dog disturbs a bird in a bush is that a ticket-able offense? If she barks at a squirrel in a tree will she lose her green tag? Open space is for everyone and even if my dog is on a leash she can create these last 2 scenarios. I am not sure what these new regulations and one-strike-you-are-out policies are trying to accomplish. I think we should encourage more education rather than punishment of dog owners who want to enjoy open space.

Sincerely,

Blair Norman

Name	Comment
Carol Corsell	<p>Frankly, the system does not work. I have a dog that has a tag, yet remains leashed. The trails are crowded and I'm not happy when unleashed ""tagged"" dogs do not respond to their owner when called. Actually, I've lived here since 1978 and, other than a police dog, I've hardly ever seen a dog that voice listens to commands....Maybe I'm going to the wrong trails. I think it would be helpful if tag holders understand a little more; like when another dog is on a leash there is a reason and their guardian should be instructed that is also a time to utilize their (successful?) recall. Another dog walking isn't any different than a deer or a fox, etc that we don't want our dogs approaching or chasing. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Guardians of the ""meet and greet"" mindset (who don't really have a dog under control) should frequent our dog parks which are plentiful for those activities.</p>
catherine barnes	<p>I like the voice and sight tag system. My dog comes when I call her...many dogs do not. I wouldn't mind having her take a ""test"" in the outdoors with an official to show that she is ok being off leash. Please leave some spaces where I can take her off leash as it is important for both of us. Good luck revamping the system.</p>
Charles Goldman	<p>I believe that the program as is works well. The changes that have been covered in the press seem onerous and unnecessary. We have a really good thing going in Boulder -- let's keep it in place.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
Cheryl Gaiser	<p>1/monitor both cyclists &amp; dog owners</p> <p>2/have cyclists also purchase a ""trail etiquette"" test with #</p> <p>3/have a signage sheet at trail heads with ""tag #"" slot</p>
Chris Koniarczyk	<p>I think the voice and sight tag is a great idea. I had my dog registered with it. But I felt that it was too easy to get the pass (watch a short video). My dog is well behaved but I feel that it would be too easy to have a ""bad dog"" get the tag. If a dog that get the V&amp;S tag ends up biting or harassing others, the program might be revoked. I love being able to legally hike with my dog. And I just want to make sure that this program isn't shut down.</p>
Chris Wyeth	<p>I haven't lived in Boulder for several years, and both of the dogs I had registered with you are now dead, but I do think that the voice and sight tag system was great. I appreciated the fact that the local authority was prepared to trust responsible dog owners to control their animals and not automatically tar everyone with the same brush as the few that let their animals run amok. I wish this concept would spread to other jurisdictions.</p>
Conrad Lattes	<p>I think the voice and sight tag program has worked very well. Dog owners generally are very respectful and conscientious about their responsibilities. While I support leash requirements in locations and at times when they are warranted for protecting sensitive wildlife and natural resources, I am not in support of major changes to the program that are more restrictive because I they are unwarranted.</p>
Curt Honcharik	<p>1st question - I think it would be interesting to put ""voluntary statement"" forms at some of the trailheads to allow people to anonymously document conflicts they observe on the trail. these could be dropped in a box and collected at various intervals by rangers. this may lead to what are the most common conflicts observed on the trails by the citizens, and could also indicate what the most important conflicts are for the public (example: is not carrying a leash a part of the law that people actually care about, or are we more interested in observing someone having a dog off leash that is chasing wildlife).</p> <p>2nd question - I would be interested to see a breakdown of boulder county residents vs. non-boulder county residents by doing a sample of the population found to be in conflict with the regulations that were being observed.</p> <p>3rd question - with the exception to my answer of the first question, i feel the current monitoring plan for compliance is adequate.</p>
D. Niedringhaus	<p>I think the regulations regarding voice and sight are strict enough already. Compliance will never be 100% and increasing fines/penalties will do little to increase the rate of compliance with voice and sight regulations. Moreover, those of us with harmless, friendly, and well behaved dogs should be allowed to enjoy the open spaces that we help fund through our taxes. I know that a few bad apples always cause stricter regulation and penalties but most of us comply with voice and sight on a DAILY basis. Please don't make it more difficult for us to simply walk our dogs. Thanks.</p>

Name	Comment
Dan Weprin	<p>The green tag program serves no purpose if people can't control their dogs. People should be required to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Demonstrate effective recall ability BEFORE they can get a green tag</li> <li>2) If met by a ranger or officer, that ranger/officer should be able to request demonstration of an effective recall with financial penalties if not successful.</li> </ol>
Dave Roberts	<p>Personally I think the program is a huge success, don't change a thing. You guys are on to a winner here.</p>
Dave Smith	<p>Please STOP already with your over policing of EVERYTHING in OSMP. With all these OSMP rules and regulations you are quickly losing the public's support. I'm certainly not fooled with your cry for more funding. So don't even bother to ask for more additional support unless you change your ways.</p>
David Johnson	<p>Although I am discouraged by what I've perceived in the 20 years I've lived in Boulder as an antagonistic attitude towards dogs from OSMP and an apparent strategy to gradually erode dog owners' rights &amp; privileges, I am in favor of the Green Tag program, and in favor of better enforcement for misbehaving dogs and their owners when reasonable and effective.</p> <p>What makes sense to me...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased enforcement and fines for dog owners who don't pick up excrement or leave bags at the side of the trail.</li> <li>- Better outreach into the community to increase awareness of dog owners' responsibilities to foster a culture where someone should be ashamed to NOT do the right thing.</li> <li>- Organizing dog-owner volunteer cleanup days.</li> <li>- Increased fines for repeat offenders who violate clearly defined rules.</li> </ul> <p>What doesn't make sense to me...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A 2-strikes and you're out rule. The Green Tag rules are too vague to apply such a draconian rule. This especially makes no sense when OSMP wants to include dog-related violations outside of Green Tag areas in this count.</li> <li>- An expectation that dogs return ""immediately"" when called. Under normal conditions my dog will return immediately to my side, but the cases where calling is really needed are often not normal - there are noises, other dogs, or other distractions that require the owner to get the dog's attention before it will return. The survey criteria that failed a dog owner if he had to make more than two calls is ridiculous. What matters is that no matter how or how many calls the dog owner makes, the dog promptly stops whatever bad behavior it's engaging in and returns to the owner's side. I'd define ""promptly"" as within five seconds.</li> <li>- The definition in the rules of a dog chasing another dog or wildlife. Of course we don't want dogs harassing wildlife, people, or other dogs. But dogs chase other dogs all the time as part of normal play. I doubt that all OSMP staff, some of whom clearly dislike dogs, can reliably tell the difference. Likewise, if a dog chases a squirrel up a tree, or causes a Magpie to fly a few feet away to land in another spot, I would not classify that as harassing wildlife.</li> </ul>
Dean	<p>I think an improvement to the program is more of the why dogs need to be on leash in certain areas. I firmly believe that the public needs to be educated as to the why their pet needs a leash in certain areas (revigitation, wildlife, etc...). Perhaps more people will abide to the rules and regulations if they knew the why.</p>
Deb Fitzgibbons	<p>I'm happy with the tag system as it is now.</p>

Name	Comment
Debra Lewis	<p>I feel there is a problem with the monitoring system regarding the removal of dog excrement. Since you only monitor for short periods of time, you don't get to witness many (if not the vast majority) people leaving their bags off the side of the trail and then picking them up again on their return from their hike. In fact, I know that I have picked up other peoples' bags as a simple kindness, and have had mine taken care of by strangers as well. I am not sure that this is understood by the monitors. Perhaps a better method would be to count how many bags are ""left"" in a certain area, track exactly where they are, what color, etc., and then return much later to see if those same bags have been removed. I suspect you will find that most, if not all of them are gone. After all, what is the point in taking the time and effort to bring and use bags if you're just going to leave them along the trail?</p>
Don Bergh	<p>My thoughts on the three questions pertaining to voice and sight tag monitoring.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Monitoring needs to be expanded, perhaps through volunteers or just through more eyes and boots on the ground.</li> <li>2) Analysis to include subgroups based on green tag or not, and living location. Are the abuses coming from people that do not have green tags on their dogs? Are they coming from those that live here and have green tags?</li> <li>3) Setting up more visible kiosks, signs or tables with instructions on acceptable dog behaviors might help. Clearly, having 'fines with a bite' would help too if a dog is found to be misbehaving. Signs to that extent might help.</li> </ol> <p>Thanks for this program. I want to encourage us to keep using it.</p>
Don Bergh	<p>I am fully supportive of this program and strongly advocate its continued use.</p> <p>The problem that I see has been enforcement. I tend to walk the trails at Chautauqua and Bobolink. On most weekend days, during the busy times of those days, over half of the off leash dogs do not have green tags.</p> <p>These dogs have presented more problems than those having green tags. Still, many dogs with green tags still misbehave.</p> <p>Overall, I'm struck by how few people seem to respect the rules. The same problem exists with respect to those that walk through closed trails. They still disregard signs.</p> <p>I suspect that having more people out with monitoring would help identify and correct these problems.</p>
Don Graefenhain	<p>The voice and sight tag program works very well. I have never seen dogs out of control or aggressive on the trails allowing ""green tags"". Dog owners on the Boulder Open Space trails are also very polite and courteous.</p> <p>The only issue I have ever seen is that a few dog owners are unaware of the Voice and Sight program and are surprised to see dogs off leash where allowed. These people need to read the rules and pay attention.</p>
Donna Karr	<p>I have hiked on Boulder Open Space every day for decades and I think the current tag system works fine. Dog guardians are almost always responsible and considerate.</p> <p>I recently moved out of Boulder because of the increasing rules and restrictions on dogs. It has become almost like a police state where you are constantly watching over your shoulder and can't enjoy being outdoors. Boulder has really changed a lot and not for the better. These new rules just confirm my decision to leave.</p>

**Name****Comment**

---

Dorene

Here are a few suggestions on a related issue. Dog behavior is certainly important, but so is responsible behavior on the part of the owners, especially when it comes to conscientious poop patrol. Maybe this is amusing to some, but it's serious to many of us who carry extra poop bags to scoop up other owners' dog droppings.

**Premier Poop Patrol (PPP)**

Volunteers in this PPP trial program would carry bigger-than-usual, biodegradable Mutt Mitt-type bags to pick up droppings left by inattentive, negligent or uncaring owners (as well as our own dog's deposits). The program would pay for and distribute PPP bags to volunteers who sign up in advance for 3-months' service at a time. Areas for poop patrolling may be assigned in advance or as decided by volunteer. Bags can be inscribed "Premier Poop Patrol" and colored bright yellow or pink < or whatever >.

**Associated Guilt-Inducing Device (GID):** This is to bring attention to the severity of the problem. Tiny flags on sticks, such as are stuck into lawns after landscaper applies chemical fertilizer, would be stuck by the PPP volunteers in the ground near where inattentive, negligent or uncaring owners failed to pick up their dog's droppings. Flags can be bright yellow or pink and imprinted with some shame-on-you type word or cartoon. Make choosing the flag word or cartoon a contest in the appropriate newspaper.

Decide how and when to retrieve the GIDs, and whether they should be placed while the dog deposit is still evident or after it's been picked up by a PPP volunteer to "mark the spot." Regular dog walkers can also be enlisted to grab a few flags from a community basket of some sort and stick 'em in the ground near a neglected poop deposit.

Solicit donations for the materials for a one-year trial period.

**Remind Runners**

Runners who like to exercise along with their dog often neglect to look behind them when Fido isn't running alongside anymore. Out of sight (to the owner-runner) is no excuse for not paying attention to Fido's deposits. Running is known to stimulate a dog's bowels.

Ed Hochstein

We urge the council to avoid making changes to the existing regulation, as we feel with the current proposals, would overpenalize guardians. Perhaps more enforcement of current rules would suffice. We want to continue to allow our well trained dogs and us, to utilize the green tag program as written.

Name	Comment
Elizabeth Allen	<p>I believe dogs now need to be on lease on open space most of the time. I feel this is the safest. I don't own a dog, but when I walk Chautauqua, for example, I get a little concerned when I see a dog coming at me and I don't see the owner. So far no problem, but there are times I really don't know if the dog is friendly. Also, for people like small children who if a big dog jumps on them because they are happy, happy and knocks them over it is not good. I think there were specific times and areas that dogs can be let off lease, and I agree with those too.</p> <p>So, if there are a lot of people around I, feel safer to see a dog off leash because I feel the owner is right around or there's enough people around to save me if a dog were to get aggressive. However, when I would see dogs at Farmer's Market, lots of times when they see other dogs they get too excited and start getting territorial and aggressive. I think they're not allowed at the Farmer's Market anymore, nor Pearl Street Mall and I think that is safest. Now I'm seeing lots of dogs inside stores - what is with that? Are that many dogs for the blind? The person with the dog doesn't seem blind. I understand dog owners feel they're pet should be allowed wherever they want, but I really think they forget any dog tends to get aggressive under many unexpected circumstances - and it only takes once to bring fear to the person without the dog.</p> <p>My final thoughts are, where dogs aren't allowed - it needs to be enforced. Perhaps signs with phone numbers to call for anyone to report people with dogs where they don't belong. I like dogs too, but they are a pet and how do I know a random dog is not going to get aggressive or is trained to behave around other dogs or other people. On walking paths I often see dog poop that someone hasn't picked up, so unfortunately that isn't good. I still see enough occasions of dogs getting aggressive when other dogs are around. I've seen big dogs knock down a small child on the Chautauqua walking path because the dog was excited - that could have been dangerous, if path led to a sharp drop. I've seen several dogs at once who were probably with several dog owners all run in a bunch and they didn't know to go around me - I had to rush to the side so that I wouldn't be knocked down. So, dog rules are important for the greater good and those rules need to be enforced - again, perhaps more signs around with phone numbers to report incidents where the rules are being broken.</p> <p>Thanks!</p> <p>Elizabeth Allen, Boulder</p>
Elizabeth Raba	<p>I fully support higher standards and aggressive enforcement of the voice and sight rules. Too many people do not do the training necessary and do not have actual voice control of their dogs. This endangers the future of off-leash programs and gives dogs and dog owners a bad reputation. While my dog has a green tag, I do not currently let him off leash because he is not 100% reliable, which I believe should be (and supposedly is) the standard. I do not appreciate out of control dogs running up to me and my dog as their owners yell ""He's friendly!"" Please hold people and dogs to a higher standard. Currently, Boulder says one thing and enforces another, which just makes those behaving badly believe that the regulations don't really mean what they say. People who are not fond of dogs and people with dogs who don't enjoy other dogs in their faces should not be the ones who have to manage off leash dogs or choose trails that require leashes (also not enforced). Test voice control and enforce it.</p>
Elizabeth Wrenn	<p>A good PR move for compliance awareness might be to offer positive monitoring via giving a scratch lottery ticket to people ""caught"" in compliance, i.e. with their dog's tag displayed, and &gt;&gt;demonstrating actual voice control&lt;&lt;. I believe the scratch tickets support Open Space, so there's that win-win aspect, plus, I bet there would be lots of press around this novel approach.</p>
Erika Arett	<p>I previously had 2 dogs in the program (they passed away last year). I have a new dog that i keep leashed.</p> <p>I have no problems with the way the program is working.</p>
erin williams	<p>I don't think added processes will enhance the program. All the dogs I run into off leash are very well behaved dogs</p>
Eva A. Malanowski	<p>I think the program is fine as it is. I think too much money is spent monitoring this program. There are not many problems with it, just leave it alone. Please spend the taxpayers' money on other things than monitoring the program and making dog guardians' lives harder. Spend the money on protecting prairie dogs, children's programs, rec centers, or improving the landscaping in the city which is overrun by dandelions.</p> <p>Thanks!</p>

Name	Comment
Frank Baylin	<p>I view the Green Tag program as simply a tax, a source of revenue, that is associated with a minimal education. As a dog owner I was surprised and I must admit pleased to not have to take a test to earn the tag. This latter requirement would, of course, make the program a money loser.</p> <p>Let me give you feedback about how the program is working for me in my area of town since I run with my dog four or five times a week and have been doing so for over 30 years. In the green-tag area above Chautauqua most people with and without dogs do perfectly well. Twice in the past 30 years I encountered a dog that was on a leash that actually managed to get into a fight with mine. The owners had clearly trained them well by keeping them on a tight leash and making them fearful of other people and dogs. Nearly all hikers/runner are pleased to interact in any way that occurs with dogs. Of course, experiences may be different from mine than in other more traveled parts of Open Space.</p> <p>I would suggest that you keep the Green Tag program since it provides extra revenues to support the Open Space program. I would suggest however, that you institute another program, let's call it the Red Tag program, that would open up trails that have recently made my 'life with dog' more difficult. This would involve demonstrating that one's dog does really obey commands, like mine does, i.e. a test. As I mentioned above I have jogged in my area for over three decades. Recent regulations have served to do nothing but ruin this experience for me. My run used to take me to the top of Mariposa and through the woods up to the road. A portion now requires a leash; on another portion dogs are banned. I see perhaps one person every three months or so on this trail so this seems ludicrous. My dog heels totally under control and is no threat to wildlife or humans. I'd would be glad to pass a Red Tag test so life could return to a better place.</p> <p>I have other comments concerning the effects of your sometimes misguided policy if you are interested.</p> <p>Frank Cell: 303-641-7408</p>
Gary Waggoner	<p>I agree with Clay Evans' column in the Daily Camera . Sunday May 19th, page 11B., entitled Open space not that open for dogs. The program works. More fees are ok to use for pick up. Otherwise there is no reason for a change.</p>
Georgia Fowler	<p>Got a ticket on Sanitas Valley Trail on 5/5 because my dog was off leash - temporary change in leash laws due to coyote activity. I parked in the back parking lot off the Dakota Ridge Trail and came down to the Sanitas Valley Trail from one of the small connecting trails. There were NO signs! Note to all park rangers that signage needs to be clear! I am moving from Boulder in 2 weeks and don't have time to attest the ticket.</p>
Greg Keeley	<p>We moved to Boulder 7 years ago since it was a ""dog friendly"" city. We hike many of the trails in SW Boulder including Mount Sanitas, Mesa Trail, Dry Creek, Shanahan Ridge, etc. We have never had a problem with our or other dogs and enjoy this immensely with several of our friends. We do NOT need more regulations; but we could use more instruction for new dog owners and more positive reinforcement of good behavior. Why not have monthly dog-owner meetings at parks where issues can be discussed, pet reinforcement of regulations reviewed and items passed out like waste bag container clips to encourage all owners to pick up after their pets. The responsible dog community should help enforce the dog regulations and report owners who do not follow the rules. We don't need ""big brother"" to watch over us, we can effectively do it ourselves. Bottom line is we do not perceive there is a problem anyway, so...if it ain't broke, why are we trying to ""fix it""???</p>

---

Name	Comment
------	---------

---

Howard Witkin	<p>To start with we have two large dogs, which we take onto City of Boulder Mountain Parks and Open Space especially around our home which is in the Chautauqua neighborhood. Our dogs are never off leash as we do not feel it is safe for them or ourselves as many dogs which are off leash are not trained and can be aggressive, and do not respond to repeated calls from their caretakers to return to their side. We have found on our numerous times on the trails where dogs off leash have been chasing and harassing wildlife, which is deplorable. This not to say all dogs off leash are bad or do damage, however it is a greater percentage than what has been publicly stated. Many of the dogs off leash are running and have occasionally run into hikers.</p> <p>We would propose a yearly fee of sufficient size which would pay for more stringent testing, one in which a dog must show they respond in the manner as outlined in the ordinance or act which allows off leash privileges.</p> <p>It may also be prudent for the City to consider not allowing off leash licensing to non residents.</p> <p>The bottom line problem is the population is growing both dogs and people. if we continue to allow the type of behavior we are now experiencing there could be greater problems in the future if we don't change our way of thinking and our program.</p> <p>Personally it is a great idea to allow dogs off leash; however with the privilege comes responsibility and unfortunately there are more and more people and dogs who are not responsible and are going to ruin it for the responsible dogs and people.</p> <p>One additional thought is more enforcement, which even under the best of circumstances does not seem to work; but if it is to be tried then our recommendation is to raise the fee for the "green tag" sufficiently to pay for the additional rangers it is going to take to properly "police" policy. The fee can be staged in various levels; city resident, county resident, and others.</p> <p>We applaud the staff and City for looking into what is becoming a very serious problem to one of greatest assets which we have as residents of the City of Boulder.</p>
Irina Overeem	<p>The voice and sight program is an essential part of the enjoyment I get from being on open space areas (with my dog). It makes running more fun for both of us and I really have a ton of appreciation for the efforts to keep dogs and hikers both happy. Dogs should never become nuisances to others, nor should overly diligent citizens become nuisances to dogs and their owners. We all have the right to access of our beautiful backcountry. Too much land has lately been banned.</p> <p>However, I think it is not too much to expand the voice and sight program beyond just a waiver and a webform; better compliance serves everyone.</p> <p>I would support an actual meeting with OSPM-ers and a 'test' of the voice and sight program, where the dog and owner have to demonstrate their control and obedient behavior.</p> <p>Thank you for being considerate of both hikers / bikers and dogs needs. Irina</p>
j.r. jemelka	<p>OSMP, once respected, is rapidly becoming Boulder's most hated institution. The shadow of OSMP's single minded pursuit of its unpopular dog goals will eventually darken all Boulder government. The new OSMP dog laws are underpinned by data obtained by filling in forms presenting a highly prejudicial and leading universe of possibilities. Conflict is extrapolated from a population pre-selected as 'offending'. To derive policy from such data is akin to characterizing human behavior based on data derived from prison populations.</p> <p>The Bekoff study, 1996, (link on <a href="http://b4ros.com">http://b4ros.com</a>) conducted by CU, examines a broader spectrum of OSMP users and fails to find the conflict reported by OSMP in its crusade for stricter enforcement of dog norms. OSMP's counter study using an offender-only population has apparently been generated solely to negate CU's broader and more dog-friendly conclusions.</p> <p>The rationale for OSMP's refusal to accept Bekoff and embarking on its own must be that Bekoff does not support OSMP's preconceived notion that dogs on open space are insufficiently restrained and that dog guardians need to be vigorously disciplined.</p> <p>Even where its data is strongest, OSMP's imaginative answer for Boulder's apparent lack of support for dog feces handling and disposal is, predictably, greater discipline and further punishment. Little thought is given to treating this as a littering problem requiring scientific receptacle design and placement. I invite OSMP to explore <a href="http://www.litter.ie">http://www.litter.ie</a> to examine alternative strategies to the dog feces littering problem.</p> <p>The hypocrisy of OSMP's fake data and phony process barely masks its true message: 'Get Your Dog off my Open Space'.</p>

Name	Comment
Jack Witkin	I think the program works well now. I think the majority of dog owners realize how fortunate they are that there are trails in Boulder where dogs are allowed off leash. Furthermore, I think the majority of dog owners are very good about picking up their dog's "waste". The only thing that you might consider is a re-green tag issuance every 2 years. Has the city received complaints about "green tag" dogs. Thank you
Jacqueline Simon	I have really enjoyed the privilege of the voice and sight tag program with my dogs. I do recognize the owners must be responsible for their dogs' action and behaviors. If I had unruly dogs that were aggressive I would not even join the voice and sight program since my dogs would not be appropriate for the program. Please continue this program.  Thank you.
Jan Whitt	Make more trails such as the Dry Creek Trail available to dog owners. I don't want to go to places that pit cyclists, runners, and dog walkers against one another. I pay taxes in Boulder County but avoid the trails.
Jane Adair	I am perfectly satisfied w/ monitoring system, as is. Most people on trail are very polite and we certainly don't need more oversight by officials, just to let the dog go for a run!
Jane Crothers	We were frequent visitors to the off leash Boulder County trails until our family pet was provoked and attacked by a pit bull on Marshall Trail last year. I am convinced that this may have been prevented if the pit bull had been altered and had also been leashed. The owner had no control of his dog and the dog was not wearing a green tag. We now frequent Simms Dog Park in Westminster, where dogs are not allowed in the park unless they have been altered. This is a good policy and will cut down on unnecessary dog attacks and unwanted vet bills. I recommend that City and County of Boulder implement a similar policy.
Janet Themanson Michels	I support the changes to the Voice and Sight Control Program. I would rather see all dogs on leash on all areas where dogs are permitted. I have seen many irresponsible dog guardians on OSMP trails over the years. I have a dog and infrequently walk him on OSMP trails (on leash). I also use the trail system without the dog.  I have seen far more irresponsible dog guardians and poor dog behavior than good. When an encounter with a poorly trained dog goes wrong, the consequences can be devastating.  All dogs should be leashed at all times. Short of that, the proposed changes will help curb irresponsible dog guardian behavior and as a Boulder tax-payer, I support them.  Janet Themanson Michels

---

Name	Comment
------	---------

---

Jennifer Peters Johnson

I think there are several overarching problems with the monitoring system.

First, the criteria are set up for dogs to fail. I once asked a trainer at the Humane Society whether he could help me to train my dog well enough to meet your definitions of no-conflict and they said it was not possible.

The following are my opinions, not the trainer's:

â€ In attachment 3, under Physical Contact by Dog, 5d (sniffing) is not a conflict behavior. It is an instinctual behavior. To label it that way is like calling the use of eyesight a conflict behavior. Of course, some people do that when they're looking for trouble, as in ""What are you looking at?"" This is similar.

â€ In attachment 3, under Physical Contact by Dog, 5e is ""other."" I appreciate the need for a catchall, but how is that scored? Who evaluates whether it is a conflict behavior? Also, as a dog owner who trains my dog to avoid breaking the rules, I don't really know how to train him not to do ""other.""

â€ In attachment 3, under No Physical Contact by Dog, friendly ""chasing"" between dogs and aggressive or unwanted chasing are not the same, and should be differentiated. It's not hard to tell the difference between aggression and play if you are familiar with dogs. My dog's behavior in the dog park consists almost entirely in playful consensual games of chase with other dogs of all sizes, breeds and genders. I don't allow him to play with leashed dogs, and if I'm not sure (I don't know the owner or haven't noted that the dog is already playing with others) I ask the other dog's owner if it's okay for them to play. But it is unrealistic to expect dogs to ignore each other and never initiate normal play. It's fine to expect owners to be sensitive to whether it's safe and wanted.

Before addressing my next concern, I'd like to conduct an honor-system, confidential sniff test and ask those of you who have reported on, had contact with, or worked in or with the city or county government or the Open Space and Mountain Parks (OSMP) department this question:

Does the culture of OSMP tend to be

1. unhappy about allowing green-tagged unleashed dogs on Open Space trails,
2. neutral on the issue,
3. or dog-friendly?

I think that using OSMP staff as monitors introduces the potential for significant bias to a degree that invalidates the results. Those who are in the position of making recommendations to the City Council on an issue in which feelings run as high as this one should not be the ones to gather the data on which they base them. I don't doubt their professionalism or intentions. But just as sniffing is instinctual for dogs, so is fitting into one's workplace culture and pleasing one's employers for humans.

I suggest that the city hire professional experts in dog behavior to develop fair, realistic criteria for disallowed dog behaviors and to do any future monitoring. CSU Animal Science Professor Temple Grandin would be my first suggestion. The training staff of the Boulder Humane Society would be my next, although they might be loath to step into the potential political night soil.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and in all sincerity, thank you for your public service. It's got to be tough listening to everyone's opinions and then taking the flak for your decisions.

Jessica Catlin

Tag program works well now. Please do not further restrict the areas for off-leash (green tag). There seems to be a vocal minority that does not enjoy dogs, but there are plenty of trails that such people can visit without further restricting trails for dogs.

Thank you.

Jessica Nicolella

I think that the program already does plenty of monitoring. I would prefer to see efforts and resources used toward free or low-cost education and training programs that increase the number of well-behaved dogs and owners instead of trying to ""catch"" people with rambunctious dogs who have responsibly taken their dogs out to an off-leash area to let them expend some of their energy.

Jim Manley

I lived in Boulder for 5 years and now live in Denver. I participate in the voice & sight tag program. Please do not discriminate against non-Boulder residents in the voice & sight tag program.

Name	Comment
Jim Zoller	<p data-bbox="480 258 1349 352">As a twenty year resident of Mapleton Hill with three dogs and a weekly routine of being on the Sanitas trail a couple times per week, I am amazed at all the stories of out of control dogs. I am equally amazed the we give people with such fear based issues the power to take the freedom to run freely from what many of us consider to be our best friends.</p> <p data-bbox="480 380 1349 453">Keep Boulder special and allow us the opportunity to maintain our enjoyment of open space with our canine friends being free to run and play. And we all should remember that dogs will be dogs and their disputes do not necessarily require to be settled by human process.</p> <p data-bbox="480 480 610 499">Long live FIDO!</p>
Joanne Keys	<p data-bbox="480 527 1349 741">I appreciate this program SO much and think it's a wonderful model and best practice to be shared widely. Two thoughts occur to me to help in the consistency of the owner-control quality: 1) have a simple test for dog owners that demonstrates their ability to control their dog in order to get the green tag. While this sounds like a headache, it could be administered by volunteers, maybe similarly to the way CSU does the master gardner program or something similar, and would incent owners to actually ensure they are working with their dogs for compliance to minimize adverse impact to the public 2) encourage local dog-training agencies (including Humane Society, but potentially others) and vets, etc. to offer 'get your dog ready' classes. We could even do such things potentially through Lifelong Learning or other easy and accessible avenues.</p> <p data-bbox="480 768 1349 835">Thanks for your consideration and work on this. I take the program and my responsibilities seriously and often hear other dog owners being baffled by how to even gain the simplest of controls, maybe these would help.</p>
Joellen Raderstorf	<p data-bbox="480 863 1219 884">I think the program is working well as it. I don't see any changes that need to be made.</p>
John Lynch	<p data-bbox="480 911 1349 982">From my perspective, the green tag program is working well. I'm a dog owner and a dog lover, and I have no had an unpleasant incident in several years, and I'm out there three times a week. From my perspective, other dog owners have their dogs under good control.</p>

---

Name	Comment
------	---------

---

John Seaborn	<p>I question the need for any studies, reports, staff involvement and the voice and site program. I own a seven year old Lab and have visited most trails in Boulder County, some on a daily basis. We had an interesting recent experience that may inform my opinion.</p> <p>We are just back from a Carmel California visit. Carmel prides itself on being dog friendly in fact marketing itself as such including dog friendly Bed and Breakfast, restaurants and art galleries plus one of the only off leash beaches on the California coast - which is one of the reasons we went. They have no tag program, no training requirement, no staff scurrying around writing reports and absolutely no trouble with off leash dogs on their priceless beach.</p> <p>You can put in layers and layers of requirements, rules and restrictions on dog owners but what is the point? Control? Bureaucracies naturally trend toward asserting control as the voice and site program demonstrates. Just make room for dogs and their owners on trails, ponds and roads, publish and post some common sense rules about dog use working with the FIDO organization and tell staff to get back to work doing whatever it is they do. If there are violators and problem dogs then enforce the rules on them. As it stands now your about to establish more complex rules which are punitive for 100% of dog owners as unenforceable as the current set.</p> <p>In seven years of daily trail walking with our lab I have seen exactly one situation which could be remotely called an incident. This would lead me to believe that 99% of dog use and owners are responsible users of the trail and park resources.</p> <p>City staff is trying to measure a problem that does not exist so, by artificially setting the bar low enough with questions about the number of sniffs and such, can generate some data, often to support their widely appreciated no-dog agenda.</p> <p>One suggestion is to enlist responsible dog owners to help with enforcing common sense rules. Peer pressure is much more effective than tickets. Enlist FIDO and dog owners to help with enforcement by fostering a abuse it and loose it proposition.</p> <p>One other item. The new open space complex being put together out on 63rd around Lagerman Lake and south has zero dog use planning. Why is that? If you want to lessen the impact of dog use then spread out the usage by opening new opportunities. As I dog owner I am tired of my rights being trampled on in the name of public safety, wildlife preservation, city liability, or the need to exert control. We pay taxes and vote as well.</p> <p>Open as many trails, parks and lakes to dogs as possible, make them off leash as common sense would dictate, work with FIDO to establish some rules, punish the offenders and stop trying to control every little detail no matter how attractive this unattainable goal is to the bureaucratic mindset.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>John Seaborn</p>
--------------	--

Julie Artist	<p>I might consider asking for feedback from homeowners who have properties that back to open space. We encounter dogs behind our home and even in our yards who have clearly strayed from the trail and their owners and who are not under voice control. We hear owners yelling for their pets quite frequently.</p> <p>Perhaps installing a short questionnaire box at trail heads for users to comment about events/ interactions with dogs who are not under control by their owners.</p>
--------------	--

Name	Comment
Julie Barrow	<p>I was not terribly surprised to see the disappointing results of the Voice &amp; Sight program since its implementation. I frequently walk and bike in Boulder County and commonly see dog owners leaving poop bags, or worse, not even picking it up. Imagine that, all the enlightened people who live in Boulder are pretty naughty when no one is looking. My back yard is 50 yards from a poop bag station and garbage can. You would not believe the number of people I see who, even being that close to bags and trash, willfully don't pick up their dog's poop. Unfortunately without threat of reprisal or even peer pressure, a lot of people, roughly half I'd say, simply don't care about doing the right thing. I'm not sure that you're going to change that behavior without some meaningful penalty. It's too bad, but people are people, and they tend to require enforceable laws to keep them in compliance. Just to be clear, I have a dog and I want to be able to take her off leash, and I do try to be a good dog owner. Sometimes she doesn't always quickly come when called, and I'm working on that. But there is no excuse for leaving dog poop on trails. It spoils the environment and the experience of being out in our beautiful open space.</p>
Julisa Adams	<p>I use this program every day with my two dogs and really appreciate having this privilege. I highly recommend simply enforcing the laws as they exist with more personnel. My experience is that a lot of people do not pick up poop, or have their dogs under voice and sight control. I think most participants are great, but the offenders just don't follow the rules and do not respond well to citizen comments. They need fines.</p>
Kara Larsen	<p>I personally feel the program is unnecessary. I don't have a dog and I've never had any problems with dogs on the trail. I find that people who have dogs that aren't good off leash will keep them on leash. There are dogs that wander off more then others, but they're never aggressive or overly friendly to me. I've never seen or heard of people getting tickets, so I wonder sometimes if the program even has people employed? The program should end. It's unfortunate that Boulder chooses to limit dogs so much compared to other cities just for a small percentage that voice their complaints.</p> <p>Thanks!!</p>
Keith Mountain	<p>I have a small dog and often walk her off leash in the appropriate spaces - usually in South Boulder Creek Trail, Chataqua trail system or Green Mountain trail system. I am concerned about the relative importance or prioritization of incidence involving dogs on open space trails.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The surveys or monitoring may have been done with this as a primary guideline but it was not apparent to me. As an example - conflicts involving people are a major concern to me, chasing squirrels - not so much. Both are to be discouraged but their is a difference. And dogs know the difference.</li> <li>2. There should be a very convenient and accessible way for a visitor to report an incident at a trail head. Statistically this makes much more sense to me than OS personnel monitoring behavior. My experience is that certain trails will have significantly more issues than others. Visitors can then ""vote"" with their collective experiences and feel engaged in the process.</li> <li>3. I personally have had more conflict problems with dogs on leash than off leash. The owners with dogs on leash are often not prepared for impulsive behaviors. Also dogs off leash have ability to avoid aggressive behaviors by other dogs and give owners who are engaged with their dog the ability to get them back under control.</li> <li>4. If the mission here is avoid conflicts with people, dogs and wildlife then more information is needed. Let visitors provide the information. Rate trails and then create solutions.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. The OS&amp;MP team does a great job.</p>
Ken Wood	<p>One minor point - I serve as a volunteer patroller for the County and have observed a Service Dog unleashed and walking separate from its owner. The owner claims the dog is a certified post traumatic stress service dog and need not follow local regulations. My opinion is that this dog must be leashed where required and even service dogs for the blind must be hand held by the guide harness and not running freely when in leash-required zones.</p>

Name	Comment
Kevin Gallagher	<p>I believe you would have better compliance if you actually required more than watching a video to earn the green tag. As it stands, anyone can get one if they pay the fee and say they watched the video. Then we see their dogs chasing geese, ducks, deer, prairie dogs and pooping far off the trail. We appreciate and take the rules very seriously and when we say something to a violator, we either get a hostile response or a big sorry, he's a puppy...Oh well.</p> <p>We see violations regularly at Sage/Eagle Boulder Valley Ranch and at Bobolink, where we witnessed a dog knock an elderly jogger off his feet. How about less monitoring compliance and more enforcement (in plain clothes). When a ranger is out in uniform, the message makes it way up and down the trails very quickly and leashes get attached. If one violates the rules, take away the tag and impose a fine to pay for more enforcement. You don't even have to write a ticket, just get the tag number and send a bill.</p> <p>You guys are way too nice about it.</p> <p>And it not just on open space. I live near Bluff and 23rd and many in this neighborhood walk their dogs off leash and do not monitor where their dog poops. Visit the Whittier school yard any evening.</p> <p>There is a landscaper with a herd of off leash sheep dogs that regularly poop next to my house while he works down the street. He got ticketed last year. We know cause he bitched about loudly to anyone who would listen, but he is back again this year with no change. When I pass with my dog, they all run across the street towards us.</p> <p>And when it comes to enforcement, police/rangers seem to ticket only those who seem like they could pay or have ID. I've seen it in Scott Carpenter park where a friend got ticketed for unleashing his passive old dog to let it wade in creek, yet the homeless teens with tagless dogs running wild were not even approached.</p> <p>Yes, Boulder is unique in the approach to animal companion care, and that is great, but people are taking advantage and ruining it for the rest of us.</p> <p>Why not survey tag holders directly. Ask them if their dog or others has ever run off trail, pooped out of sight or disturbed people and animals. I think you'll find the responsible dog owners will have many tales of uncontrolled dogs on the trails,</p> <p>There are many spoiled people in this affluent town. Stop coddling them and get serious or go back to leashes.</p> <p>Thanks and good luck.</p>
Kevin Wiggins	Use RFID tags that could automatically monitor access/#of users with a solar powered station at each trailhead.
Leo Pedlow	I like the program the way it is! However I don't see any tag checks!
Leslie Anderson	<p>Please change my email address to the one given above.</p> <p>Comments: I think the program works just fine the way it is. I do not think we need major changes of any kind. We do need more open space and the closing of major sections to ""raptor nesting"" has hurt the use of open space considerably. I have never seen any raptors in that area in 20 years.</p> <p>With respect to dogs, I have noticed an improvement in the behavior of dogs and in owners' voice control over them so I would plead with you PLEASE DO NOT RESTRICT OUR ACCESS TO AND USE OF OPEN SPACE WITH OUR DOGS AND HORSES ANY MORE THAN YOU HAVE ALREADY DONE!!!</p> <p>However, I would offer one suggestion if, in fact, you do have any problems with dog behavior or dog fights. If one or several dogs have problems, rather than punishing all of us, I would suggest that Open Space authorities require problem dogs and their owners to get an AKC Canine Good Citizen Certificate. This is a very simple and basic certificate administered in many different places where owners can show that their dogs have a minimal level of good behavior. Singling out problematic dogs for this measure would be preferable to punishing all of us.</p>

Name	Comment
Liela	<p>I love the sight/sound program as a owner of a GSP very high energy dog. Have never had any problems with  Other sight/ sound owners when I'm out with my dog.  If anything I've had people who are not in the program who have  Aggressive animals. I enjoy walking the Boulder Farm loop except  When the horses are out and leave piles of poop all  Over the trail. I wish this program would expand to more trails.  Love this program!!</p>
Linda Parks	<p>What changes to the monitoring method do you believe would improve data collection or statistical analysis of indicators? Why?  What changes to the statistical analysis do you believe would offer better information upon which to base adaptive management decisions?  What other methods to monitor compliance or conflict might OSMP consider?  My feeling on this program at first was one of agreement, but after seeing how easy it was to acquire a tag I have found the whole idea ludicrous. Yes some of us own dogs (I am a dog owner myself) who comply to the requirements and as owners take this seriously, other pet owners are truly in denial and take little interest in compliance. I think enforcement on dogs off leash should be harsh with extremely high violations \$\$\$ for owners who do not comply with the tag rules. An in person test, maybe on open space should be required to acquire a tag. If this can not be done more rangers patrolling on high use evenings and weekends. Most owners are pretty good, it is that small percent who need to be targeted for violation. What cracks me up and makes me shake my head are the owners running with ear pods in and they have no idea where their dog is nor can they hear if you are calling them to get their dog under control, same with the bikers and their dogs. I ride horses on much of the open space in Boulder, honestly I now prefer county who requires a leash after having so many altercations.</p>
Lisa Tousignant	<p>So far, I am happy with the regulations. I enjoy hiking on trails which allow dogs to be off leash and have not encountered any problem with other dogs or their owners. Sometimes dog waste is not picked up but for the most part, pet owners are responsible...at least on the trails I use most. Bear Creek and Boulder Reservoir.</p>
Lori Fuller	<p>I was heavily involved in the first V&amp;S monitoring study. The same concerns recently expressed by Council members, OSBT members, the media, and qualified scientists, were dismissed when I brought them up during the study's design. It is clear to me that the only reason I was asked to participate was so OSMP could say ""members of the community"" were involved.</p> <p>It would be unwise for any study regarding dogs to be conducted by members of the OSMP staff. There are too many concerns of credibility and bias for any results to be accepted by the community at this point. After all, this staff has been hyper-focused on dogs for the last 10 years, and has yet to provide a reasonable study on this subject.</p> <p>Ironically, the information that is important to everyone--the impacts of dogs--has not been addressed. While OSMP has devoted a great deal of resources to find out things like how many dogs have 4 paws of the trail tread for more than 15 seconds, there is no monitoring of native species. When members of the OS Board state ridiculously false claims about dog impacts, clearly a lot of work has to be done in order to correct these misconceptions (Frances Hartogh asserted that dogs chased Abert Squirrels off of Shanahan Ridge in a City Council Study Session last December).</p> <p>Although we all know there are Abert's Squirrels in Shanahan because we see them there regularly, OSMP has no monitoring in place to asses whether these species are thriving or declining. This is why there are so many diverse perspectives about the health of wildlife and how dogs impacts them. OSMP has not provided any foundation of fact for the community to build on, and extremists, such as Frances, make irresponsible assertions. They know OSMP has neither the will, not the evidence to refute them.</p> <p>Everyone is worried about impacts, it is time we study this information rather than the expensive, long-term, nonsense studies designed for dogs to fail.</p>
Louise Jobson	<p>Brilliant program works really well, no need to change it. Minority of people as always don't obey rules, but that is life. Let the dogs run and play in the beautiful landscape we have, just like we do and as law abiding citizens the majority of us have our dogs fully under our control, as expected. Love the program would not change it.</p>

Name	Comment
M. Miller	I resent the opinion that all Boulder residents are in the upper income bracket to which you refer, and fees ridiculously high. What about people who are disabled or live in low income housing? Your rules go against the natural behavior of dogs (i.e. squirrel chasing). There should be more space for off leash dogs in dog-designated parks. Fines for going outside of a small place with many dogs is not fair, especially when the shade is outside of the allotted dog space. Getting fined for comfort and avoiding skin cancer is unacceptable. I think your rules and fines too stringent for dog parks.
Marikay Shellman	I have often wondered if there was a complaint how one would register such complaint. Could tag numbers be a way? If offending party is not compliant, photo id might be another idea. Also puppy school & any training paperwork on file might help in figuring out which dogs actually do respond to call-response.
Marilyn Decalo	In my opinion 99% of dog guardians care deeply about their pets and care about the kind of interactions their dogs have with other dogs and people. You need to consider that and the fact that dogs do not have aggressive behaviors unless you put them in an insecure situation. Dogs off leash are much more friendly on the trails with other dogs and people than those on leash. If you help people understand the behavior of dogs rather than imposing further restraints on dogs and their guardians you will create a more positive situation than one based on fear. Give dog guardians/people the benefit of the doubt that they want peace and enjoyment on the trails and in nature just as much as those without dogs, and they will rise to meet the expectations.
Mark Heideman	I would hope that any additional enforcement/monitoring would be proportional to actual problems and not focus on enforcement absent of actual problems or issues.
Mark Robles	<p data-bbox="480 833 529 854">Hello,</p> <p data-bbox="480 882 1360 951">It is said that if you look hard enough for a problem, you will find one. To me this is what the OSMP has done since the inception of the Green Tag Program. I have seen the data compiled and any rational person looking a little deeper at it can see that it woefully flawed.</p> <p data-bbox="480 978 1352 1050">There is a vocal minority who are adamantly against dogs on the trails - be they a faction of Audubon or others -- in the case of Audubon, they are very organized and push hard for their agendas, but they are still a tiny portion of the trail users.</p> <p data-bbox="480 1077 1360 1194">Increasing the fines, penalties, and staff seems to be swatting a fly with a sledge hammer. For most people who I know a \$50 fine is very punitive. Taking up court time and costs with these issues, that are frankly, quite petty, are degrading to judges and a waste of court resources -- money. Creating a staff of ""dog police -- poop patrols"" seems yet another waste of resources for a city that wonders how to pay for it's current services.</p> <p data-bbox="480 1222 1360 1316">The Green Tag Program began as a half-hearted educational push toward solving some of the dogs on trails issues, but it didn't go any further than an online video -- little to nothing posted on trail heads -- an anemic effort in general. A creative and full-throated effort to educate people using the trails with their dogs off-leash would have been more effective.</p> <p data-bbox="480 1344 1360 1438">There are groups of dog enthusiasts who suggest compromising to solve some of the ongoing off-leash issues, but in the view of somebody who has living in this city for 40 years, the compromises have been made -- trail closings, limited and seasonal closing, and the Green Tag Program itself, in my mind, have been huge compromises. Yet, OSMP wants more.</p> <p data-bbox="480 1465 1360 1560">Finally, when we voted to fund more Open Space, there was no mention that these spaces would be off limits to human activities or designated as ""critical"" wildlife preserves. I know for fact if that was put forward from the beginning, that these funds would have never gotten past the public's votes. There is strong resentment against what OSMP has become, and it will increase further with these new proposals.</p> <p data-bbox="480 1587 537 1608">Thanks</p> <p data-bbox="480 1635 651 1707">Mark Robles 2115 Floral Dr. Boulder, CO 80304</p>

Name	Comment
Mary Roble	<p>I found this study very complete. The barriers that are described I think are the most important in trying to make this program work. In particular, I think the inability of people to control their dog stems from not knowing what to do and not taking any training instruction, rather assuming that they know what to do and refusing to look at the results of their stubbornness. As a result the dog is indifferent to the commands and does not have either reward for good behavior or limits of incorrect behavior. An ancillary comment-there are many dog guardians that fall into the category-"my dog needs off leash exercise and it is cruel to have to have the dog on leash in the wilderness" despite all other facts-such as the needs of others, the popularity of the open space, children,etc.etc. I think education and emphasis on consideration of others are the keys- but good luck with that-as evidenced by the abysmal responsibility for picking up excrement. I have a dog, I walk regularly in open space and I have worked with my dog and she does not even come immediately- especially on really hot days but if she does not she goes on leash. Thanks for your work- having the amount of OSP available for off leash is amazing- dog companions need to know what a great gift this is and how sad it would be to lose it.</p>
Matt Bruce	<p>Overall, I think this is a thorough, rigorous, and well planned methodology. Good job.</p> <p>The margin of error is a little large (there is big difference between 5% compliance and 25% compliance).</p> <p>Your methodology discusses data reduction, but did not say how you incorporated all indicators in the analysis. You could see if some indicators hold together by using factor analysis or other data reduction techniques. Maybe some indicators are strongly related to compliance while others are not. As you move forward, you could stop measuring the indicators that are weakly or are not related to compliance and still gain actionable results (or spend those resources elsewhere).</p> <p>Did you observe and interview the same visitors? That would be my suggestion if possible.</p> <p>In general, just keep in mind the big-picture goal of the study. Is it really just to monitor compliance? Maybe use this opportunity to better understand the steps you could take if compliance doesn't meet your threshold.</p>
Max Pritikin	<p>None of the statistics gathered or discussion around this program relates to the fostering of a non-confrontation relationship between dog owners and the broader community. Every aspect of this is currently designed around the oppression of dog owners (and their dogs) in favor of an anti-companionship position.</p> <p>Some concrete examples: OSMP should record the number of times folks without pets approach and request to interact with dogs. OSCMP should determine what percentage of the population would feel safer having a dog with them when hiking. OSMP should determine at what point excessive regulation negates the long term health benefits of pet ownership.</p> <p>Given the obvious prejudice shown in the current documents it is unlikely that any monitoring "improvements" will be an actual improvement. Instead they become an instance of bullying.</p>

---

Name	Comment
------	---------

---

MICHAEL HIGUERA I am writing to voice my concern about Open Space's sampling methods for determining compliance with the green tag program. I walk at Sanitas on average 3 days a week with my dogs. 95% of the time there are no issues with wildlife, dogs or other people. In fact I can't tell you how many times people comment on my dogs, that their grandma had a setter or lab, that they look like they are having fun, etc. This is valuable interaction with the folks in my community and it truly makes most these people happy to see wagging tails and to smile, exchange pleasantries, etc. This component of having dogs off leash and interacting is undervalued and not emphasized as a positive but it really is and it consist of the vast majority of experiences in open space. That's why I and others wonder if there is a hidden agenda when we see that Open Space is finding so much non-compliance and bad experiences. It is starting to make me question the program and continued support of it because it seems to be serving the needs of the few rather than the many.

I also want to urge you to figure out ways to canvass the citizens about how they want open space used in a way the is more accessible to busy residents who can't or don't want to attend public meetings, work sessions, etc. For example, the US Park Service was finding the same people at meetings time and time again and in order to get a broader opinion of the public they started doing random canvassing to get peoples' views on things and this picked up a sample of folks who had opinions but would have never been heard from through the meeting process. Of course you have to want to hear what people have to say and be open to whatever the answer is and it may be for greater use and less protection of the resource. There has got to be a way to use social media and similar technology to get the views of a great swath of Boulder. I would love to see our tradition of public engagement evolve with the times and lifestyle that we live and I think Boulder could be a leader in that regard.

Thanks - Mike

Michael Shepard I like the way the program has been run in the past. OK to increase enforcement and consequences for repeat offenders but let's assume people and their dogs are innocent until proven otherwise.

Mike Browning There needs to be more enforcement if we are to continue the green tag program. In all my years on the trail I have never seen a ranger, let alone anyone enforcing dogs that are violating the rules. More ranger would be best, but perhaps we also need to deputise citizens in some fashion.

I also favor establishing and enforcing an on trail corridor standard -- say 10 feet on either side of an off leash trail. That would allow better enforcement, and awareness of what is and is not allowed. Now people just claim that there dog is under V&S when they clearly aren't.

Mike Endicott First I'll address the three questions/issues requested

1) I feel the only way to improve monitoring is to have more unbiased (volunteer or Park emp.) eyes on the trails.

2) Analysis improvement - the initial studies do not indicate the nature and details of the conflicts. Experience and casual observation has shown that when a dog(s) have any exposure in passing to a "dog objectionist", just the presence of a dog is considered a conflict. Also the data collection is inherent due to the strong feelings of "dog objectionist" and their likely reporting. You will always hear more from the disgruntled vs. the happy. This will generally create a strong bias in any case.  
3) accepting video record for review, still, by nature will seem to show problems out of proportion.

Further comments-

I have enjoyed the use and exploration of Boulder open space on average of 4-5 days per week for over 35 years as a trail runner, hiker, biker, climber and occasional dog walker. I can honestly say that I have not witnessed more than 3-4 real conflicts with dogs with literally thousands of encounters. One conflict was my fault, a enthusiastic puppy in my control romps toward a side party of seated adults and gets in a couple of face licks. The reaction from the party was "over-the-top", my bad, but not "that bad". It is always a matter of perspective isn't it!

I feel the greatest issue is lack of poop pick-up. Primarily this seems to occur most often with younger owners. Though, this issue seems to be improving gradually.

Environmental Impact - Other than poop, pretty non-existent. I see much, much, more from hikers in muddy conditions, horse use and bike trail erosion, climbing approach trails, etc. Dogs chasing wildlife is pretty rare, I'm sure its happened, but I've never seen it.

My opinion in general is that a very vocal and influential minority has the ears of a public administration that feels obligated to "oil the squeaky wheel."

My two cents, thanks for asking. Feel free to contact me.

Name	Comment
Pamela H. Prescott	<p>Having rangers out checking for green tags is a good idea as a deterrent to keep people from other nearby areas from letting their dogs run free on Boulder Open Space and from not picking up after them. However, as someone who uses all the trails around Boulder every single day, I can absolutely attest to the fact that there are very, very few dog-off-leash conflicts. I will say that people don't always pick up poop and that explaining at the trailhead why it's important would definitely help.</p> <p>In weighing public comments, OSMP and the city should give much more credence to people who use the trails every day. One questionable experience of an infrequent user should not be allowed to drive policy. Please remember that a complaint or comment does not necessarily indicate a problem; it reflects one person's point of view and his or her level of reactivity. It does not mean that Boulderites need any more rules and regulations and closed trails for their dogs. The current system works.</p>
pandora richardson	<p>I think it's unfair that the dogs have to be on leashes on Sinetas fire road because of coyotes. It is enough to post a sign "advising" owners to leash their dogs for better safety--but to be handing out tickets is really "unfair".</p> <p>The fire road has been on off leash road in the 7 years i've lived here. It should be up to the owner whether the dog with the sight tag is on leash or off leash. No one is going to blame the city if their dog gets injured.</p>
Paul Baryames	<p>If the city has a green tag program who currently enforces it in the park (Chautauqua)? I am up there quite a bit and have not seen a Ranger outside of the office actually doing anything for years!They look good in their white trucks driving around. But they never Ranger anything. Look at all the new paths that have been established by people who just park their car and enter the park along Baseline.So what's the difference about a dog program at that Park. It's do whatever you want to do.</p> <p>I'd suggest that the Rangers get out into the Park, in the meadow area and actually "Ranger" the area. That would cover well over 95% of the issues that you are spending way to much time on trying to change. Get the people that are there to actually do their job. Pretty basic stuff.</p>
Paul Premtiss	<p>I see absolutely no reason to change the existing program. Some form of extended obedience testing is completely absurd.</p>
Renee Loria	<p>Here is my comment... If you could present the following questions in "plain English," the general public (myself included) might be able to provide good input. It seems the person writing your questions is speaking to other statisticians, not to those who just want to walk their dog off-leash!</p> <p>What changes to the monitoring method do you believe would improve data collection or statistical analysis of indicators? Why?</p> <p>What changes to the statistical analysis do you believe would offer better information upon which to base adaptive management decisions?</p>
Richard C Ackerman	<p>I have been Boulder/Boulder County resident for 40 years and a frequent user of Open Space, always accompanied by my dogs.</p> <p>In that time there have been changes in policy to correct problems that are already covered by statute/rules.</p> <p>It seems to me that an educational and enforcement program is required for any changes to be successful. That said, why not just educate and enforce the current rules before making these changes?</p>
Rob Nevitt	<p>I love your program. My dog loves your program. Together we obey the rules.</p> <p>But, many people abuse the program and do not properly follow the rules. I feel there should be an annual renewal or testing of some sort.</p> <p>Plus, I live in Louisville. Frequently, I see people in Louisville with green tag dogs who think it's ok anywhere in Boulder County.</p> <p>So, clearly, there is a lack of education. Or, maybe it's just ignorance.</p> <p>Thanks for your efforts to improve the program!</p>
Robert Bordasch	<p>If you continue to restrict the number of trails where dogs can go off-leash, this whole program will be moot. That appears to be your goal.</p>
Robert C Northrop	<p>My suggestion is to perform onsite surveys with participants of the voice tag program as well as other users of Boulder country open space trails.</p>

Name	Comment
Robert Collins	Make it easy for dog owners to pick up and dispose of dog poop. Other than that stay the fuck out of our lives.
Rose Pierro	<p>I have been very satisfied with the voice and sight tag program on the trails we have been to. Rarely do we encounter someone that is not following the "rules" and my husband and i are on the trails daily. It seems as if the dogs are being singled out and i'm not sure why? Perhaps there has not been any monitoring in the past and people have complained about an intermittent problem. I've only once or twice in about 5 years encountered a park ranger on a trail i have been on. Perhaps the money would be spent on people monitoring the trails once in a while? If you have a trained dog, one should not mind this and in fact appreciate it.</p> <p>Not to put two subjects in one space, however, we try not to use the boulder bike paths as pedestrians walking a dog as it is not safe. We and everyone i talk to agree our city bike paths are not safe for pedestrians any more. There is no training for bicyclists.i feel we are just waiting for a serious death or injury from a speeding bicyclist on our paths. the bells they use should be illegal, since no one with any hearing loss can hear these high pitched tones, and 9 out of 10 bicyclists that approach from behind on a path do not know they should alert the pedestrian of their passing.</p>
Sally Tarbell	Where is the data from the survey? I think reporting that a dog was called > 2 times before they came is a poor indicator of compliance. Would you hold a parent calling a child to the same standard? Are there significant numbers of reports of dogs causing problems by people visiting the open space. After 2 years of using this program, I have been impressed with how responsible most dog owners are. I think you should turn attention to bike riders who dont know how to yield to pedestrians and animals.
Sam	This is an excellent program and the administration of it seems to be fair and evenly applied. I don't think modification of the program is necessary, but additional research could be conducted electronically to gather use pattern data and other info that would help OSMP better understand program compliance, etc.
Scott Davis	As a dog owner and participant in the Tag Program, I have no problems with the current system. Some dog owners will always be irresponsible with or without the program. The tab program can at least identify who the more responsible ones are.
Scott Rudge	<p>The monitoring report is very interesting, thanks for taking the time to conduct the research and publish the report. It should receive more publicity, I think especially the information about dog conflict, which I think is the biggest safety issue on the trails. I would focus on the one or two issues that you think are the biggest issues for trail users.</p> <p>Everyone views their own dogs as "well behaved" and "friendly". The standard of dog behavior in the video is difficult to achieve without a fair amount of dedication, and even with this, at any instance the dog may or may not comply. I thought the definition of compliance was reasonable, two distinct calls. I believe my dogs meet this standard, however we know that one dog is not reliable when in the presence of other, strange dogs, and when other dogs approach, we leash this dog, in spite of her tag and her compliance under other circumstances.</p> <p>I think that the number 15% for dog conflictive events is way too high, and I think most dog owners would see that as a problem. I would publicize this number, I would get on the Denver news channels and discuss it, and talk about what dog owners should do to protect their dogs as well as wildlife and other hikers. I would take tags from dogs that exhibit this behavior, and I would probably not be in favor of second chances for those dogs. A fine would probably be a good idea as well.</p> <p>I think most people want to keep the mountain parks clean and usable, but I also think most people think the parks can bear the excrement burden imposed by their pets. Are there certain zones where this is demonstrably not the case? Can we focus on certain area, Mt. Sanitas for example, where excrement removal is mandatory? Could we get better compliance in particularly sensitive or over burdened areas in exchange for zones in which removal wouldn't be required?</p> <p>Just some thoughts. My family believes in this program, and I think we've done a good job complying and training our dogs to be within the strictest meanings of the statute. We do see plenty of non-compliance. Thanks for doing the study and publishing it.</p>

Name	Comment
Shane Oshetski	Things that would assist the program might include developing a dog owner network responsible for assisting the program in ensuring that dispensaries are full as often as possible, providing dog training on site to help educate, increase and disperse excrement disposal cans if possible, and implement tweets for reminders of rules as wells as tips and trick for dog owners. Creating a sense of community would go much further than developing stricter rules.
Sherry L.Olson, Ph.D.	I am disabled, and in order for me to walk on my favorite trails, the closest ones to my house just off of Cragmoor Rd connecting to the Shanaha Ridge Trails, I need to use two hiking poles. This would be fairly difficult, if not impossible, while holding onto my dog's leash. My dog comes to me when she is called and I do not let the space between us get far enough that a problem could occur. Please do not eliminate the privilege of access to these trails by the implementation of a leash requirement.
Stan Bessey	We have a golden retriever that is under the Tag Program. This is wonderful program because it is one of the only places on the front range that allows dogs that are under voice control to be off leash on the hiking trails. Dog owners that have trained their furry family pets not to be vicious and to be under voice control appreciate the freedom it gives their pets. We have never experienced a bad encounter with other dogs off leash on the trails.
Steve Cann	I believe that the monitoring should focus on the outcome that is desired from a management perspective. Specifically with regard to the standard for guardians to have voice control over the dog, it seems that the goal is for the guardian to be able to have the dog come to them in a reasonable time. The standard where the guardian fails if the dog does not come after calling its name two times does not fit the management outcome sought. I think a better standard would be to judge whether the dog responds within a short period of time, for example, 20 seconds.  When I am calling my dog to me, my command is continuous until she complies. I don't call her name once or twice and then wait to see if she complies. The performance measure that compliance with a voice control standard is that the dog promptly complies, not that the dog complies after one or two calls. If the dog complies in a short time window, it shouldn't matter how many times the guardian needs to call the dog's name. If after attempting to call the dog, the dog has not complied after say 20 seconds, that is failure from an effectiveness perspective.  If the guardian calls the dog's name one time, and the dog complies after a minute, that also seems to me to be a failure from the desired management perspective, but would have to be judged to be successful control under the present number of calls standard.
Steve Dodd	The program works fine in my experience and doesn't require further monitoring. Surely the City's resources can be better spent elsewhere.
Steve Durian	Since data collection techniques are very statistical and technical in nature, it is probably not meaningful to ask the general public open-ended questions such as these. Perhaps more specific questions about particular concerns would provide you with better feedback.
Steve Tocco	I really enjoy the program as it is and have never encountered a hostile dog. Are the incidents and severity truly in need of measurement/analysis?  Prescreen and monitoring seems more expensive than returns warrant. If you want to change behavior, make fees and fines a little higher. (Perhaps per annum rather than lifetime of dog)..  My only real complaint of the program is I feel more areas should be offered as off leash. I would pay for such additional access.
Stuart Weisman	I am not a dog owner. I feel the present program adequately meets the needs of the OSMP and the citizens of Boulder. A large majority of dog owners are very responsible and further restrictions or rules will not change anything for the better
Suellen Brenner	I know this is past the deadline for submission but I hope someone reads this. There are so many out of control dogs on Boulder trails that it is horrible! My dog (on a leash) was attacked by one two months ago. I have had others charge me and my dog on many occasions. People yell out ""my dog is friendly"" but then stand back as it gets aggressive with me or my dog. The sight sound program only works if it is enforced, which it in NOT! I am more afraid of the out of control dogs than I am of any type of wildlife I might encounter. Please add more enforcement if you are going to allow off leash dogs.

Name	Comment
Susan Baker	<p>I love that Boulder has a voice and sight opportunity for dogs and there guardians. My dog loves being off leash to play, run, and swim and I consider him 100% in compliance with the green tag regulations. Without this option I am not sure I would continue to have a dog. However, there are still many people abusing the recommendations. The most flagrant violations are, failure to recall a dog, not cleaning up after their dog waste, and let their dogs chase wild life. As usual there are a few thoughtless people who are ruining the privilege for the majority of dog owners. The current policy is clear on these rules. Any changes to the policy should address compliance of these guidelines. Having a two strikes is a good idea, but banning a whole household is not. Having more frequent renewal and higher fees is a good idea, but forcing vaccination requirements is not. Unfortunately I still feel like enforcement might be the only way to get through to some dog guardians. Fees from the green tags should go to this or solicit help from volunteer groups like Fidos to help with on-trail etiquette. In response to your specific questions I have made comments below:</p> <p>What changes to the monitoring method do you believe would improve data collection or analysis of indicators? Why?</p> <p>First of all don't expect a dog not to act like a dog!!!! Barking, sniffing, shaking off water, urinating on land marks are all dog behaviors that are nearly impossible to eliminate. I am in favor of trail side polls for dog owners and non-dog owners about behaviors they experience on the trail, limited to only behaviors that are expected from the green tag education program. Also observation of rangers trained in dog behavior and expectations under the green tag rule.</p> <p>What changes to the analysis do you believe would offer better information upon which to base adaptive management decisions?</p> <p>One thing that sounds trivial but has been a problem with several open space polls is that the squeaky wheel gets all the attentions. People adamantly against dogs in open space are a huge minority, but are very vocal about their opinions. Polls should be designed to assess the person's attitude and strength of attitude towards dogs. Given the number of green tags issued it should be clear that there is a huge number of taxpayers interested in the program.</p> <p>What other methods to monitor compliance or conflict might OSMP consider?</p> <p>OSMP should utilize user groups like FIDOS and the like to help educate dog guardians. For instance I used to be an equine park ranger for the county and part of my role was to educate other users about horses in the open space and etiquette that was appreciated around them. Rangers stationed at trailhead handing out literature or having demo to educate dog owners would be great to. Getting the humane society to offer a class specifically in compliance with voice and sight might help people with their dog. Or having seasonal workshops sponsored by the OSMP using professional dog trainer. Unfortunately there will always be a few people who will need a ticket to get their dogs under control, perhaps problem areas could be targeted and paid for by an increase in fees.</p>
Susan Stephens	<p>I am not comfortable with the "two strike" proposal. The violations listed are mostly about people behavior, not dog behavior. Even disturbing dog behavior is the responsibility of the guardians to correct. I think the two strikes and you're out is too harsh, and would be better addressed if guardians were required to take dog training classes.</p>
Suzanne Fetter	<p>The green tag program has worked well so far. Dog owners are much more attentive to the rules in place. Your latest set of proposals are very discriminatory to dogs and their owners, and many of them apply to situations in the city that aren't even Open Space issues.</p> <p>I have lived in Boulder (with dogs) for over 35 years. I find these new regulations to be really offensive and hope you will back off of them. You seem to be focused on ridding every open space area of dogs. Do you enforce biking infractions and closed area infractions with the same intensity that you do dog infractions? I've been paying taxes for a long time and have supported the Open Space initiatives, but this obsession with punishing dog owners is really changing the way I think about this program and my willingness to support future initiatives.</p>
Tammy Royce	<p>Have a clip board with paper and pencil at the start of each trail head and leave instructions for people to fill in the day they used the trail, yes/no are they part of the green tag program, # of dogs the brought with them, and have them sign their name. Might be a good way to monitor usage. Love the program. Wish they had it in California where we recently moved back to. Thanks, Tammy</p>
Todd Bickford	<p>I suggest you make less rules and allow people to sort out their own issues. Let the citizens of Boulder deal with their own dog issues face to face with other people. We don't need a mother hen monitoring us all the time. Save your money, and let us be a community instead of a police state.</p>

Name	Comment
Tom Wilson	<p>1) I think OSMP is spending too much money on studying this topic, with too much emphasis on data collection and analysis. Objectives #1 and #3 of the V&amp;ST program should not be objectives at all, but rather implementation details. The program seems more like someone's dissertation project than a reasonable way to spend city money to manage public resources.</p> <p>2) Changes to statistical analysis? The question itself tells me there are too many resources being spent on this issue!</p> <p>3) I think additional formal monitoring is a waste of time.</p>
Travis Metcalfe	<p>The statistics on non-compliance with excrement removal rules are inflated by the narrow definition of compliance. An observation of a ""left bag"" on a one-way trail would more properly be described as a ""temporarily left bag"" in most cases, since it is common (and reasonable) practice to leave a bag on the way up a trail to retrieve on the way down. A ""left bag"" on a loop trail can be considered truly abandoned. Overall, the percentage of visitors with conflictive behavior remains quite low, so no significant changes to certification or enforcement are warranted.</p>
Vanessa Villarreal	<p>I love the Boulder Green Tag Program. I haven't had any issues with it. I follow the regulations, and others I see on the trail are vigilant about following regulations. As a responsible dog owner, I'd hate to see this become stricter.</p>
Vicki Epley	<p>The Voice and Sight Tag program has worked very well for myself and my dog since 2006. I would hate to see it go as I rely heavily on it weekly for the health and well being of my dog and myself.</p>
w m hackman	<p>i you folks at Boulder Parks and Open Space have decided you are operating a wilderness operation and that dogs and their owners somehow encroach on this ""wilderness"". why do you have to make rules and regulations that are so intrusive and complicated? leave it as it is. it ain't broke. you already have a bunch of trails off limits to dogs off leash and a few trails where they are allowed off leash and a bunch of land where no 'un-natural' denizen of Boulder is allowed to set foot. leave your 'sight(?)' control and voice control regs as they are and tell people to buck up and get a life! your bureaucracy is plenty big enough as it is</p>
Wanda Stratton	<p>I still call the Mt. Sanitas trail ""First Ridge"" from the days when I grew up in Boulder and it wasn't a freeway for dog walkers.</p> <p>I got a green tag for both of my very well-behaved dogs, but rarely use the OSMP trails. My reason - way too many signs and rules that detract from the entire experience! Look at the trailhead at Sanitas - where you all removed 10 or 12 perfectly good parking spaces there are about 20 signs, fencing and big rocks! What a waste of money.</p> <p>I liked the old Boulder I grew up in so much more - people minded their own business, used their own common sense - and it was a much better place.</p>