HOUSE RESEARCH ORGANIZATION	bill digest 5/23/2017	SB 1090 Lucio (S. Davis, et al.) (CSSB 1090 by Price)
SUBJECT:	Removing and replacing the offense of unlawful restraint of a dog	
COMMITTEE:	Public Health — committee substitute recommended	
VOTE:	8 ayes — Price, Sheffield, Arévalo, Burkett, Guerra, Klick, Oliverson, Zedler	
	0 nays	
	3 absent — Coleman, Collier, Cortez	
SENATE VOTE:	On final passage, April 10 — 28-3 (Birdwell	l, Buckingham, Hancock)
WITNESSES:	<i>On companion bill, HB 1156:</i> For — Alexandra Johnston, Denton County Bellows, Society for Animal Rescue and Ad SPCA of Texas; Jamey Cantrell, Texas Anir Shelby Bobosky, Texas Humane Legislation City Police Department; Linda Halpern; (<i>Re</i> , Donna Warndof, Harris County; Katie Jarl, t United States; Laura Donahue, Karen Rober Humane Legislation Network; Shanna Igo, T Elizabeth Choate, Texas Veterinary Medical individuals) Against — None	option (SARA); Art Munoz, mal Control Association; n Network; Jeff Honea, Wolfe gistered, but did not testify: the Humane Society of the ts, and Skip Trimble; Texas Fexas Municipal League;
BACKGROUND:	 Health and Safety Code, ch. 821, subch. D d offense for the unlawful restraint of a dog. A or animal control officer believes is in violat written warning and 24 hours to comply. The commit a class C misdemeanor (maximum f offenses are a class B misdemeanor (up to 18 maximum fine of \$2,000). Some have raised questions about whether the second sec	A person whom a peace officer tion of the law must receive a ose who fail to comply Tine of \$500). Subsequent 80 days in jail and/or a

SB 1090 House Research Organization page 2

current statute prohibiting the tethering of dogs in response to concerns, including concerns about the requirement that owners be given 24 hours notice before a citation is issued.

DIGEST: CSSB 1090 would repeal Health and Safety Code, ch. 821, subch. D and create a new subchapter defining and establishing an offense for the unlawful restraint of a dog.

The bill would prohibit an owner from leaving a dog unattended and restrained outside unless the owner provided the dog with water, along with adequate shelter and shade from direct sunlight in an area where the dog could avoid standing water.

An owner could not restrain a dog unattended outside with a restraint that:

- was a chain;
- had weights attached;
- was shorter than the greater of five times the dog's length or 10 feet;
- was not attached to a properly fitted collar or harness; or
- caused injury to the dog.

The bill would not apply to a restraint attached to a pulley or trolley system that allowed the dog to move along a running line equal to or longer than the restraint length requirement described above.

The bill would not apply to a dog restrained while:

- in a public camping or recreation area in compliance with that area's policies;
- the owner and dog were engaged in an activity associated with the dogs and related to a valid state license;
- shepherding or herding cattle or livestock;
- engaged in an activity related to cultivating agricultural products;
- left in an open-air truck bed for no longer than necessary while the

SB 1090 House Research Organization page 3

owner completed a temporary task;

- taken by its owner, or another person with the owner's permission, from the owner's residence and restrained for the owner or person to engage in an activity that required the dog to be temporarily restrained; or
- engaged in or training for hunting or field trials.

The bill also would not prohibit a person from walking a dog with a handheld leash.

A violation of the bill would have to be committed knowingly and would be a class C misdemeanor. Each dog restrained in violation of the bill would be a separate offense.

The bill would not preempt a local regulation related to the restraint of a dog and would not prevent a municipality or county from further regulating the care of a dog, under certain conditions. The local regulations would have to be compatible with and equal to or more stringent than the requirements in the bill or relate to an issue not specifically addressed by the bill.

The bill would take effect September 1, 2017.

NOTES: CSSB 1090 made several changes to the Senate-passed version, including adding to the exceptions for the offense and eliminating a higher penalty for repeat offenses.

The companion bill, HB 1156 by S. Davis, et al., was placed on the April 26 General State Calendar and returned to the Public Health Committee on May 1.