Subject: BY-LAWS and INSURANCE
From: John D Roth <jroth4@comcast.net>
Date: Fri, 18 Sep 2009 20:15:15 -0400
To: "Milton L. Chappell" <mlc@nrtw.org>, LAWRENCE BERUL <LBERUL@yahoo.com>, LULUP722@aol.com, John D Roth <jroth4@comcast.net>, Judi Segermark <judiseg@hotmail.com>

But small dogs are specifically permitted by the 9400 By-Laws as are, by implication, I suppose, balconies, automobiles, parking spaces, the swimming pool, etc. This is an important distinction!

If the condominium liability policy sufficiently protects us from a financial crisis resulting from a dog bite, I'll withdraw my financial argument. I'm hoping that the members of the BOD are following all committee correspondence and will have that answer available at tomorrow's (Sept 19) BOD meeting. I'll be attending that meeting and will formally submit the insurance question if necessary.

Additionally, I've been waiting for someone to advance the idea of "grandfathering" all large dogs owned by current owners in the building, defining the term "small dog," and strictly enforcing the small dog limitation immediately. That proposal finally came to us from Committee Member Berul in the last day or two. That's probably the only plan that will pass BOD scrutiny. It puts off the solution, but eliminates the problem over time. I firmly believe there IS a problem. Large dogs make many people uncomfortable. The provisions of the by-laws are in place to keep people comfortable with their neighbors.
For Margot - I've been at 9400 just a couple more years than you have. I would recognize your husband for sure from his participation in discussions at annual meetings. I think I would also recognize you. I would have recognized Midnight. I haven't noticed your two new dogs. I, too, tend to stay in the background unless confronted with an important issue. We all leave footprints here!

JR