

May 6, 2025

Good Afternoon,

My name is Diane Drazek from Sherman. I have been dealing with a barking issue from a neighboring kennel for almost 5 years and have contacted all the proper authorities trying to resolve the matter. Since this Bill is in regard to kennels, it is relevant to me.

I am speaking **Neither For Nor Against this Bill LD 1771.**

I am **NOT AGAINST** this Bill for at least the following 4 reasons.

- 1.) I have participated remotely in the AWAC monthly meetings for the past 4 years. It has been an informative experience and I appreciate the work they do. This Bill is at least an attempt to address some concerns that Residents have had with kennels for at least the past 8 years.
- 2.) I applaud any act to strengthen the oversight of kennels as the title states.
- 3.) It finally raises the license application fees for some of these For-Profit businesses who often sell their dogs for thousands of dollars each.
- 4.) Section 15 mentions non-renewal or revocation of the license for non-compliance or violation of the Animal Welfare Laws and provides consequences.

I am **NOT FOR** this Bill for basically the following 2 reasons.

Firstly, the language is still fraught with loopholes which has been a problem from the very beginning of my situation. This kennel owner has a State issued license and has circumvented many of the requirements. They are still operating here with questionable practices while living out of state using a Maine license.

Secondly, it does not address the issue of unreasonable barking. It seems a kennel, pre-existing or not, could possibly change their status from breeding kennel to kenneling hunting dogs,

show dogs, training, sledding, etc. which are apparently exempt and allowed to bark incessantly without any restriction, consequences for the owner or consideration of neighbor.

Finally, I am frustrated that the resolution of the very real barking issue does not appear to be that significant. From what I understand, LD 1655 was voted OTP and includes this sentence...."A person raising chickens on private residential land **shall** prevent chickens from creating a nuisance or disturbing adjacent property and property owners with noise or odor.". Well, that sounds rather vague, short on specifics and very unclear not to mention means of enforcement. Why can't the word "dogs" be substituted for "chickens" in that very same sentence? It would certainly bring much needed relief to many residents enduring unfair noise. A proposal, LD 133, with 110 items of oral and written testimony about barking dogs was made light of, joked about and summarily dismissed without very much discussion to actually come up with a solution in the brief work session recently held.

In closing, my hope is that this Bill can be worked on, amended or modified somehow to finally provide recourse to Residents to find help because we literally can not plead higher than this Committee. And, of course, to secure the health and welfare of the dogs.

Thank you.