

<michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Alexandra,

Thank you for your time, attention and review of our technical definitions and parameters for "unattended dog," "uncontrolled dog" and "voice and sight control" as an animal behaviorist very familiar with human-dog interactions there at Columbia's Dog Cognition lab. Our discussion on clear standards for recall in a natural setting were particularly helpful.

We had discussed the word "growling" as a form of defensive communication, and whether it could be replaced with something signifying threatening behavior to other visitors or dogs. Were you able to identify any similar observable descriptive words for such defensive communications that are typically construed by others as "threatening?" The ASPCA in NY and SPCA here both list "growling" as a defensive communication that precedes strikes/lunges if the other does not retreat, suggesting it may be appropriate as immediate signal to guardian (and others) the need to intercede and leash at least or control(?), otherwise, leading to more serious threat! We also discussed "howling" as more associated with an "unattended dog." Are there instances where dogs howl as form of threatening behavior when with their guardian?

Appreciate any insight that you might share.

Mike

[\(415\)561-4725](tel:(415)561-4725)

PS. Looking forward to meeting you on 11/11.

On Fri, Sep 23, 2016 at 2:43 PM, Alexandra Horowitz

<ahorowit@barnard.edu> wrote:

Hi Mike,

Tuesday at 12:30 is perfect. You can reach me on my cell at [646.924.6958](tel:646.924.6958).

Speak to you then.

cheers - Alexandra

On Fri, Sep 23, 2016 at 3:38 PM, Savidge, Michael

<michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Hi Alexandra,

Thank you for your time. An expert consult is providing technical review and/or input on a particular issue by a subject matter expert. In this case, we are seeking your 'technical' input on dog behavior as an animal behaviorist and subject matter expert on the use and application of defining technical definitions on 'uncontrolled dog' and 'unattended dog' for purposes and consideration in setting rules in a national park area. Would also appreciate your input on 'voice and sight control' as a method of managing dogs in public common spaces and coastal areas with resources.

Please let me know if either Tuesday, 9/27, at 12:30 EST (9:30 PDT), or Wednesday, 9/28, at 3PM EST (12PM PDT) can work for you and get your input on the attached material previously sent. Would also enjoy understanding more broadly what research you are involved in now. Also what would be the best telcon number to reach you then.

Thanks again! Hope you are getting out to enjoy one of our national parks in this Centennial Year!

Mike
[\(415\)561-4725](tel:(415)561-4725)

On Thu, Sep 22, 2016 at 7:56 PM, Alexandra Horowitz
<ahorowit@barnard.edu> wrote:

Dear Mike,
Sounds fine. What is the role of an "expert" consult?
I could speak next Monday midday (ET), Tuesday at 12:30, or
Wednesday afternoon.
Thanks & cheers - Alexandra

On Thu, Sep 22, 2016 at 7:38 PM, Savidge, Michael
<michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Alexandra,

Can we arrange a time/date to discuss your comments when you get a chance early next week as part of technical "expert" consult rather than just in email?

Mike
[\(415\)561-4725](tel:(415)561-4725)

On Tue, Sep 20, 2016 at 2:18 PM, Savidge, Michael
<michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Thanks, much!

Mike

On Tue, Sep 20, 2016 at 1:22 PM, Alexandra Horowitz
<ahorowit@barnard.edu> wrote:

Dear Mike,
I would be happy to take a look. I'm on the road but expect I will be able to get back to you by week's end.

cheers - Alexandra

From: "Savidge, Michael"
<michael_j_savidge@nps.gov>
Date: September 19, 2016 at 5:48:24 PM EDT

To: <dogcognitionstudy@gmail.com>
Subject: definitions for uncontrolled dog for public national park setting

Hi Dr.Horowitz,

We are in the process of setting behavioral rules for dog walkers, both commercial and private, to enjoy our national park while ensuring protection of park natural resources and wildlife, other visitors experiences and that of many dog walkers who complain about 'uncontrolled off-leash dogs.' These behavioral rules have been drafted with the intent and purpose of ensuring these protections noted above; otherwise, we would not be able to allow dog walking in our national park.

We are seeking behaviorists like yourself to review and provide us your technical comments on our behavioral definitions attached. If you would prefer to discuss them, we can arrange a convenient time/date to do so.

Thank you for any technical input you can provide on this.

Sincerely,

Mike Savidge
(Project manager,GGNRA)
[\(415\)561-4725](tel:(415)561-4725)

--
...sent via mobile, on the road

--
Alexandra Horowitz
Barnard College | New York, NY

• • • • •

From: [Alexandra Horowitz](#)
To: [Savidge, Michael](#)
Subject: Re: escalating signs of aggression; physical signs of human responses for public national park setting
Date: Wednesday, February 28, 2018 5:08:49 PM

Hi Mike -

There are lots of tells, none definitive. A dog who stops what they're doing and growls in the direction of an approaching person I would think should be leashed in a public place. Similarly with a dog who snaps at, lunges toward, or begins harsh, low-pitched barking at an approaching person. Some of this is in a chapter my lab manager and I published in a book for the ASPCA: we also described a facial expression that is considered an aggressive display: lips "pushed forward, forming a tight "c" shape of the mouth, as if a wind source behind the dog is pushing the facial features forward.... the top of the muzzle is wrinkled, and the eyes are open and hard."

In that chapter we also wrote the following, if it is useful:

"Fear and aggression are often connected. If pressed, dogs exhibiting fearful postures may freeze, continue to withdraw, or even flip onto their backs in a display of passive submission (Schenkel 1967). But others with a more "reactive" coping strategy may display a defensive attack. This posture differs from an offensive aggressive display in that the defensive dog's posture is pulled back, with ears back and tail tucked; while he might bark, bare teeth, and lunge forward, ultimately the dog is retreating, attempting to escape or decrease proximity."

We also add, "Importantly, research finds that there are no universal characterizations of "aggressive" or "not- aggressive" dogs. Instead, a UK survey found that many factors influence the presence or absence of aggressive displays, and a dog who shows aggression in one context might not do so in another (Casey *et al.* 2014)."

The chapter reference is the following:

Hecht, J., Horowitz, A. (2015). Introduction to dog behavior. In E. Weiss, H. Mohan-Gibbons, & S. Zawitowski (Eds.), *Animal behavior for shelter veterinarians and staff* (pp. 5-30). Wiley-Blackwell.

I have not studied your second question. I'd say this is the easier thing to tell, since people can also express their fear.

I hope this is helpful!

Alexandra

On Wed, Feb 28, 2018 at 6:50 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Hi Alexandra,

Enjoyed meeting you out here in East Bay following your talk in Berkeley, now over a year ago. I was the one working on dog mgt rules in our national park here, the Golden Gate

National Recreation Area. The rule was tossed by this administration; so, we are now focusing on outreach and education; improved signage; focused enforcement: and a monitoring program.

Toward educating folks, and also observing when dog behavior is crossing a line in a national park experience, would you be able to direct me to a list or study on:

1. observable physical signs of dog aggression toward humans and other dogs.(I seem to remember you referring to *escalating signs* of a dog exhibiting signs of aggression ie. growling, baring teeth etc.)

2. observable signs/human responses to feeling threatened or being un-accepting of dog approaching.

Any advice or referral toward that end would be very helpful, especially if we are able to obtain any study supporting these observable signs, but simple list would be helpful as well; just trying to correlate those signs with any research where possible.

Hope you are staying warm back there in NYC. Look forward to meeting you again whenever you are out.

Thanks,

Mike Savidge
GGNRA
[\(415\)561-4725](tel:(415)561-4725)

On Fri, Sep 30, 2016 at 8:31 PM, Michael Savidge <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:
Thanks. Do expect to come on 11th! Mike

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 30, 2016, at 8:24 PM, Alexandra Horowitz <ahorowit@barnard.edu> wrote:

Hi Michael -

As we discussed, I concur with the ASPCA description of growl as being defensive -- or, more aptly, a warning. If it must be included, something that indicates that the bark/snarl is already in progress, like "growl-bark" or "open-mouthed growl", might fit the bill.

I don't know of any cases of howling being used as a threat, no.

I look forward to perhaps meeting you October 11!

all best - Alexandra

On Fri, Sep 30, 2016 at 5:21 PM, Savidge, Michael

From: [Alexandra Horowitz](#)
To: [Savidge, Michael](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] query about review
Date: Wednesday, August 1, 2018 2:14:25 PM

Hi Mike -

Your request re the lit review and survey make good sense; will do.

Your third "ask" is a good one, and challenging: I have to think about whether I have the time for that. By when do you require this product?

cheers - Alexandra

On Tue, Jul 31, 2018 at 4:45 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:
Alexandra,

[Sorry, just getting this after 4-day weekend].

Thank you. Yes, the form is more appropriate for the former product.

For the lit review, it would be appropriate to identify completeness and any peer-reviewed lit that addresses operationalizing observable, dog and guardian behaviors and findings regarding dog-human, or dog-dog conflicts, particularly in public spaces if available, as that would help in defining, monitoring and mitigating impacts in the park.

For survey, it would be instructive to review questions and comment on reliability and validity of such an instrument, the methodology and what might be changed to address the question's intent. Did I send you the methodology? If not, it is attached below.

Finally, with your review of our indicators, I was wondering if we could add your assistance(3rd product for additional 1K) in the development of reliable indicators and protocols thru the operationalizing of 2 park rules as noted here below:

1. "Unmanaged Dogs" means- dogs that annoy, harass, or attack people, wildlife, livestock or other dogs, are presumed to be not under control."
2. "Voice Control" means-dogs are within earshot and eyesight of the owner/handler and respond immediately to commands to return to a leash when called."

We would be looking for both how best to operationalize each of these "rules" for inter-observer reliability in observation, and some detail on protocol and type of training for monitoring technicians that would be required for this third product. If you have suggestions on how these "rules" might be re-defined to address similar situations, such that they would be clearer, that would also be very helpful.

Appreciate all your help! If you have any questions, please feel free to call me.

Mike Savidge
GGNRA
(415)561-4725

On Fri, Jul 27, 2018 at 1:37 PM, Alexandra Horowitz <ahorowit@barnard.edu> wrote:
Hi Michael -

I have submitted my review of the first work product to Bret. In looking at the additional products -- the literature review and Appendix B (survey) -- I wonder if the review form provided is suited to review of them. The questions make more sense for the first product, the Visitor Use Monitoring Program proposal.

Also, it's hard for me to gauge the purpose of these products. Would you like me to consider how complete the literature review is; whether its summary of the reviewed literature is apt; and whether the survey is suitable? Or some other points?

Thanks - Alexandra

--

Alexandra Horowitz
Barnard College | New York, NY

• • • • •

research: [Dog Cognition Lab](#)
writing: alexandrahorowitz.net

--

Alexandra Horowitz
Barnard College | New York, NY

• • • • •

research: [Dog Cognition Lab](#)
writing: alexandrahorowitz.net

From: [Alexandra Horowitz](#)
To: [Savidge, Michael](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] query about review
Date: Wednesday, August 8, 2018 9:04:14 AM

Hi Mike,

I'd be pleased to give some consideration to how to operationalize those rules. That said, I can only commit to producing an informal product: I don't have the bandwidth to do a formal review. Though I'll be consulting some colleagues, and the recommendations will be based in whatever science I can bring to bear on the questions, it wouldn't be a formal analysis (of the sort you've asked me to review, say).

I'd say early September. And I don't really need payment for this, unless it's protocol; I'm happy to help.

cheers - Alexandra

On Wed, Aug 1, 2018 at 6:32 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:
Thanks, Alexandra!

Appreciate your consideration of defining and operationalizing those 2 "rules" as where the rubber meets the road so to speak. Let me know what time you need for that. It would really help us to clarify those definitions for both public and our staff!

thanks,

Mike

On Wed, Aug 1, 2018 at 2:13 PM, Alexandra Horowitz <ahorowit@barnard.edu> wrote:
Hi Mike -

Your request re the lit review and survey make good sense; will do.

Your third "ask" is a good one, and challenging: I have to think about whether I have the time for that. By when do you require this product?

cheers - Alexandra

On Tue, Jul 31, 2018 at 4:45 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Alexandra,

[Sorry, just getting this after 4-day weekend].

Thank you. Yes, the form is more appropriate for the former product.

For the lit review, it would be appropriate to identify completeness and any peer-reviewed lit that addresses operationalizing observable, dog and guardian behaviors and

findings regarding dog-human, or dog-dog conflicts, particularly in public spaces if available, as that would help in defining, monitoring and mitigating impacts in the park.

For survey, it would be instructive to review questions and comment on reliability and validity of such an instrument, the methodology and what might be changed to address the question's intent. Did I send you the methodology? If not, it is attached below.

Finally, with your review of our indicators, I was wondering if we could add your assistance (3rd product for additional 1K) in the development of reliable indicators and protocols thru the operationalizing of 2 park rules as noted here below:

1. "Unmanaged Dogs" means- dogs that annoy, harass, or attack people, wildlife, livestock or other dogs, are presumed to be not under control."
2. "Voice Control" means-dogs are within earshot and eyesight of the owner/handler and respond immediately to commands to return to a leash when called."

We would be looking for both how best to operationalize each of these "rules" for inter-observer reliability in observation, and some detail on protocol and type of training for monitoring technicians that would be required for this third product. If you have suggestions on how these "rules" might be re-defined to address similar situations, such that they would be clearer, that would also be very helpful.

Appreciate all your help! If you have any questions, please feel free to call me.

Mike Savidge
GGNRA
(415)561-4725

On Fri, Jul 27, 2018 at 1:37 PM, Alexandra Horowitz <ahorowit@barnard.edu> wrote:
Hi Michael -

I have submitted my review of the first work product to Bret. In looking at the additional products -- the literature review and Appendix B (survey) -- I wonder if the review form provided is suited to review of them. The questions make more sense for the first product, the Visitor Use Monitoring Program proposal.

Also, it's hard for me to gauge the purpose of these products. Would you like me to consider how complete the literature review is; whether its summary of the reviewed literature is apt; and whether the survey is suitable? Or some other points?

Thanks - Alexandra

--

Alexandra Horowitz
Barnard College | New York, NY

• • • • •

research: [Dog Cognition Lab](#)

From: [Alexandra Horowitz](#)
To: [Savidge, Michael](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] query about review
Date: Thursday, August 16, 2018 9:13:04 AM

Hi Mike -

To be perfectly clear: you would like me to review both surveys Appendices A and B?

On the training and personal space questions: typical training for observational work would involve familiarization (to the point of near-memorization) of the ethogram, and then paired (two-person) observations with review until the observers agree on the measurements taken. Ideally, the observations would involve more or most of the ethogram item. I don't have the ethogram to specify more.

Personal space: Clearly this is something that might vary by environment, so it likely makes sense to have a few rough measurements, such as contact; within arm's length; within body length; etc. If the scale and type of the environment is coded, data collected can be interpreted in light of that (as you say, a beach environment might include personal "zones" that include blankets & possessions; but a crowded beach might require different personal-zone expectations / a hiking path would have different expected personal zones than a towpath). I hope that is helpful.

Alexandra

On Wed, Aug 15, 2018 at 3:36 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:
Alexandra,

Yes. The OMB application describes the methodology as required by OMB for approval. The attached Appendix A is a non-paired, general survey of visitors on their experience at a particular site to provide overall feedback to park. The previous survey sent, Appendix B, is a paired survey conducted only with visitors who are observed in a particular area under study who have interacted, within given timeframe, with a dog or dogs prior to being administered that survey.

A few days more is fine. Appreciate you asking for clarification.

Thanks.

Mike

PS. Regarding your comments on training in your previous review, can you describe what type and amount of training would be most appropriate in your view for Monitoring Technicians (data collectors) to observe the range of indicators noted? Any other thoughts about dogs entering personal space of another visitor? Should that be relegated to actual physical contact rather than the 5 ft you note is problematic? think they were trying to capture broad range to include dogs running onto other's beach blankets, etc.

On Wed, Aug 15, 2018 at 11:17 AM, Alexandra Horowitz <ahorowit@barnard.edu> wrote:
Hi Mike -
I've read the Literature Review and Appendix B (survey) and am compiling my

comments. Along the way, though, I saw the the methodology that you sent in this email (below). It is useful to understand the project. It also includes another Appendix A (different from the one with the Visitor Use Monitoring program), which looks like it would go with the survey. Is that so? Can you clarify its function? Is it additionally meant for review? If so I will consider it but confess it will take a few more days.

Please let me know.

Alexandra

On Tue, Jul 31, 2018 at 4:45 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:

Alexandra,

[Sorry, just getting this after 4-day weekend].

Thank you. Yes, the form is more appropriate for the former product.

For the lit review, it would be appropriate to identify completeness and any peer-reviewed lit that addresses operationalizing observable, dog and guardian behaviors and findings regarding dog-human, or dog-dog conflicts, particularly in public spaces if available, as that would help in defining, monitoring and mitigating impacts in the park.

For survey, it would be instructive to review questions and comment on reliability and validity of such an instrument, the methodology and what might be changed to address the question's intent. Did I send you the methodology? If not, it is attached below.

Finally, with your review of our indicators, I was wondering if we could add your assistance(3rd product for additional 1K) in the development of reliable indicators and protocols thru the operationalizing of 2 park rules as noted here below:

1. "Unmanaged Dogs" means- dogs that annoy, harass, or attack people, wildlife, livestock or other dogs, are presumed to be not under control."
2. "Voice Control" means-dogs are within earshot and eyesight of the owner/handler and respond immediately to commands to return to a leash when called."

We would be looking for both how best to operationalize each of these "rules" for inter-observer reliability in observation, and some detail on protocol and type of training for monitoring technicians that would be required for this third product. If you have suggestions on how these "rules" might be re-defined to address similar situations, such that they would be clearer, that would also be very helpful.

Appreciate all your help! If you have any questions, please feel free to call me.

Mike Savidge
GGNRA
(415)561-4725

On Fri, Jul 27, 2018 at 1:37 PM, Alexandra Horowitz <ahorowit@barnard.edu> wrote:
Hi Michael -

I have submitted my review of the first work product to Bret. In looking at the additional products -- the literature review and Appendix B (survey) -- I wonder if the review form provided is suited to review of them. The questions make more sense for the first product, the Visitor Use Monitoring Program proposal.

Also, it's hard for me to gauge the purpose of these products. Would you like me to consider how complete the literature review is; whether its summary of the reviewed literature is apt; and whether the survey is suitable? Or some other points?

Thanks - Alexandra

--

Alexandra Horowitz
Barnard College | New York, NY

• • • • •

research: [Dog Cognition Lab](#)
writing: alexandrorowitz.net

--

Alexandra Horowitz
Barnard College | New York, NY

• • • • •

research: [Dog Cognition Lab](#)
writing: alexandrorowitz.net

--

Alexandra Horowitz
Barnard College | New York, NY

• • • • •

research: [Dog Cognition Lab](#)
writing: alexandrorowitz.net

From: [Alexandra Horowitz](#)
To: [Savidge, Michael](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] operationalizing Parks rules/definitions
Date: Sunday, September 16, 2018 12:19:16 PM

Hi Michael -

As promised, I herewith include some thoughts on the two rules you sent last month. This is by no means a formal document, but I hope it is useful to get you started. Please feel free to use or distribute it as desired. As it is not a formal product, again, I am not interested in payment for it. Instead, my aim is to be able to offer a perspective to your project.

1. "Unmanaged Dogs" means- dogs that annoy, harass, or attack people, wildlife, livestock or other dogs, are presumed to be not under control."

I find this definition very hard to operationalize with its current wording. In addition, it's unclear to me whether "unmanaged" is what is meant here. Extrapolating from the wording, I have attempted to determine what the original intent was. My guess is that the rule using this phrasing is meant to describe dogs who are not cooperative with what is being asked of them, and especially those who are harassing other people (by estimation of the person harassed) or animals (by estimation of the owner of the animal, in owned animal contexts).

If I'm correct, then I think the definition should be pared down to eliminate the "presumed to be not under control" element and stick with the former -- as determined by a Parks employee. As "unmanaged" implies that "managed" dogs would never annoy another person (not necessarily true), I wonder if something like "Dogs that create a nuisance" makes more sense.

Then the determination does rely on your definition of these terms. I propose the following as an opening gambit. The terms used and explicated are extrapolated from the ethological literature. Typically, while doing reconnaissance observations (training), the definitions change somewhat, based on what the observers have seen. I would expect them to in this case, too.

Proposed definition: **Dog creating a nuisance: A dog who annoys, harasses, or attacks a person, dog, or other animal**

Explication of terms:

annoy or harass: to subject to repeated and unwelcome approaches within three feet* of a person or animal, including physical contact. Can include directed and sustained aggressive barking or growling at said person or animal, except when the dog has not been the one approached.

* on narrow paths, this amount would be reduced and may be gauged by the point at which a person moves away from the dog

attack: to initiate aggressive physical contact by quick approach of a person or animal, use or attempted use of the mouth on the person or animal, possibly including a bite; or to jump on or knock down and subsequently aggressively restricting movement of the person or animal

Instructions for observers:

With this definition, an approach zone is identified. **Three feet** is about the length of a reach of an adult person (imagine leaning forward with arm outstretched). The zone should be considered variable dependent on the context (e.g. on a narrow path, a dog and person walking in opposite directions would inevitably be within three feet of each other. In that case, the zone radius can be determined by the point at which the person moves away from the dog, if they do.).

Insofar as the tenor of "annoy" and "harass" is that it is **unwelcome**, any approaches or contact which are initiated by the person, or are welcome and reciprocated by friendly gestures from the person, shall not be considered an instance of annoyance or harassment. Similarly, interactions initiated by a second dog shall not, at least initially, be considered an instance of annoyance or harassment by the first. Unwelcome approach may be accompanied by a person or dog's attempt to move away, but this is not required for it to be an annoyance.

A single approach, unless it is an **attack**, is not an annoyance. It is an approach. The nature of annoyance includes **repeated** instances of approach or remaining within the individual's personal zone despite their attempts to move away.

Aggressive barking: sharp staccato barking. Since there are many kinds of nonaggressive barking, it is important that these vocalizations **not** be accompanied by play or bodily relaxation (loosely wagging tail). Note that the barking should be **directed** (in the direction of the person/dog; not in the direction of their owner or other object) and **sustained** (long sequences of barks, sometimes including bursts of barks).

"Except when the dog has not been the one approached": If the dog is barking or growling in response to another dog or person's approach of them, this is defensive behavior, not offensive.

Aggressive physical contact: Physical contact that is not in the context of play. **Play** is identified by use of play signals (such as play bows), and behaviors from other contexts that are moderated in force (as a nonaggressive bite) or exaggerated in form (as a loping chase).

Jumping on or knocking over a person or dog may be accidental, annoying, or aggressive. Accidental contact is meant to be excluded. Annoying behavior is subsumed by the definition of "annoy", above. Aggressive (attacking) contact of this sort may be identified by a dog then **restricting movement** of the person or dog, but standing over them, guarding them against others' approach, or initiating other contact with mouth. Any of those acts easily identify the act as aggressive.

Training on person/dog interactions:

Videotape multiple instances of interactions between people, wherein at least one person has a dog. The instances should include cases of what appear to be friendly and unfriendly interactions.

In each interaction one individual (A) must have a dog; the other (B), whether she has a dog or not, is considered the receiver of the behavior. Because "annoyance" and "attack" are binary measures, in each case the coder marks whether A's dog annoyed or attacked (0 for no; 1 for yes) B. In the case of a dog-dog interaction, again the coder marks whether A's dog annoyed or attacked (0 for no; 1 for yes) B's dog.

Use Cohen's Kappa to measure interobserver agreement.

2. "Voice Control" means-dogs are within earshot and eyesight of the owner/handler and respond immediately to commands to return to a leash when called."

I have spent some time reviewing the procedures and papers available on voice and sight control as well as speaking with some colleagues about it. I have to conclude that "voice control" is not the best description of what can be achieved with an owned-dog and owner population.

"Voice control" is impracticable: it does not reflect contemporary dog owning relationships (which are more about the dog as "family member", as polls indicate 90% of owners consider their charges) than about "control." Further, it does not reflect contemporary dog owning practices, wherein an instant recall

(i.e., dog comes to one's side after being called once) is not taught or needed in most training contexts. (An exception is some working-dog training.)

I thus recommend that you operationalize the rule not as stated but changed to reflect what I perceive to be the reasoning behind it: to avoid having a dog annoy or injure another person or dog. I might call it "Prompt dog retrieval." Under a "Prompt dog retrieval" regulation, an owner is required to retrieve their dog, however possible, when they begin or appear to begin annoying, harassing, or attacking another person or dog.

Proposed revision: **"Prompt dog retrieval" regulation: upon awareness of a potentially problematic situation involving another person, dog, or wildlife, an owner must move at once to retrieve the dog and put them on leash or otherwise restrain the dog**

Explication of terms:

Awareness: being within sufficient normal visual or auditory range to become aware of. A person who has tripped and is unconscious may not be **aware** of someone approaching. A person who is walking while listening to music may not actually be able to hear that an approaching person is talking to them, but is within visual range and thus may be declared aware. Persons who choose to ignore a situation that is within their sight or hearing are still **aware**.

Problematic situation: a behavior by their dog which would cause them to be described as a **"dog creating a nuisance"** (above)

At once: upon awareness of the situation

Retrieve the dog: by any means, to move to get the dog within reach and to thereby restrain with leash or with body the dog from continuing to create a nuisance. Note that retrieval may happen by calling the dog or by approaching and physically handling the dog themselves. If a vocal effort to retrieve the dog is unsuccessful -- if calling a dog does not cause the dog to approach -- owner must act to themselves approach and restrain the dog **at once**

Note that this revision of "Voice control" leaves out the "within sight and earshot", which I think are useful. Thus, there might be an additional rule requiring that the owner keep any off leash dog within their line of sight and/or within earshot, is quite reasonable. Further, it would help with the "Prompt dog retrieval" rule, above, in which owners are made aware of their dogs' behavior by seeing it.

I hope the above is useful.

all best -
Alexandra

--

Alexandra Horowitz
Barnard College | New York, NY

• • • • •

From: [Alexandra Horowitz](#)
To: [Savidge, Michael](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] operationalizing Parks rules/definitions
Date: Tuesday, September 25, 2018 3:25:34 PM

Understood. I hope my suggestions are still helpful within the current framework or in prompting what I think would be a well-motivated, and important change. I'll be available should you have any follow-ups.

And I will let you know the next time I'm out your way, thank you!

Alexandra

On Tue, Sep 25, 2018 at 6:01 PM, Savidge, Michael <michael_j_savidge@nps.gov> wrote:
Alexandra,

I apologize for the long delay in recognizing your work in helping us with your thoughts and research on our definitions. I have been deeply engaged in preparing our annual report for the park for the past 2 weeks, and it is due tomorrow. [Our fiscal year ends Sept. 30].

You have certainly provided much food for thought, and excellent input on practical changes for the park to consider. Because our definitions are embedded in rules and regulations (some of which were defined in 1979 by a Citizen's Advisory Group and made regulation by a court until we could complete an environmental and rulemaking process), it is not an easy process to make changes.

Nonetheless, we will certainly be discussing these internally and looking at how we can best incorporate them thru our process. We will probably have some follow-up questions when we do re-engage on these issues later this year; and, we hope to be able to come back to you with any questions that may arise from your thoughtful recommendations.

Thanks again!

Mike
(415)561-4725

PS. Again, if you are ever out this way, please let me know ahead of your visit so we can give you a national park perspective and maybe even get you out to Alcatraz!

On Sun, Sep 16, 2018 at 12:19 PM Alexandra Horowitz <ahorowit@barnard.edu> wrote:
Hi Michael -

As promised, I herewith include some thoughts on the two rules you sent last month. This is by no means a formal document, but I hope it is useful to get you started. Please feel free to use or distribute it as desired. As it is not a formal product, again, I am not interested in payment for it. Instead, my aim is to be able to offer a perspective to your project.

1. "Unmanaged Dogs" means- dogs that annoy, harass, or attack people, wildlife, livestock or other dogs, are presumed to be not under control."

I find this definition very hard to operationalize with its current wording. In addition, it's unclear to me whether "unmanaged" is what is meant here. Extrapolating from the wording, I have attempted to