

# **CORRESPONDENCE**

**Buchanan, Rita**

---

**Subject:** FW: I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

**From:** Ashley Adams [mailto:mail@changemail.org]

**Sent:** Friday, January 03, 2014 1:51 PM

**To:** Morales, Margo

**Subject:** I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

Dear Margaret McAustin,

I just signed SoCal Pitbull TEAM's petition "[Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena](#)" on Change.org.

As a resident of Southern California, I urge you to reconsider the proposed ordinance mandating spaying and neutering of pit bull type dogs in Pasadena. The State of California prohibits outright breed bans, as do 16 other states. Massachusetts, Connecticut, Nevada, and Rhode Island have gone even further by prohibiting their towns and counties from regulating based on breed. This is called Breed Discriminatory (or Breed-Specific) Legislation (BSL), and what Councilmember Steve Madison has proposed is a clear-cut example that is not in the best interest for the City of Pasadena. In August 2013, for example, the White House released a statement titled, "BSL is a Bad Idea", stating that the Obama Administration does not support breed-specific legislation. In December 2013, The Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association (JAVMA) published a comprehensive multifactorial study that showed that one kind of dog was NOT more likely to injure a human being than another kind of dog. Councilmember Madison's proposed ordinance is a mis-guided attempt to eliminate pit bull type dogs in Pasadena, not to advocate for spay/neuter of ALL pets to solve the issues with homeless pets and overpopulation in local shelters. From January 2012 – May 2013, more than three times as many American jurisdictions have either repealed existing BSL, or declined to enact BSL, as have put BSL into effect. Pasadena's proposed ordinance is unacceptable, and a step in the wrong direction. The ordinance unfairly targets pit bull type dogs instead of solving the real problems surrounding dog safety and responsible pet ownership. Responsible pet owners already spay and neuter their dogs – this is a public education problem not a pit bull problem. Abandoning this mandatory spay/neuter ordinance that singles out pit bull type dogs is simply the right thing to do. It is also the recommendation of professional groups such as the American Bar Association (See ABA Resolution 108B). The National Canine Research Council (NCRC) reports that the trend in prevention of dog bites continues to shift in favor of multifactorial approaches focusing on improved ownership and husbandry practices, better understanding of dog behavior, education of parents and children regarding safety around dogs, and consistent enforcement of dangerous dog/reckless owner ordinances in communities. Please join reputable organizations including the American Veterinary Medical Association, the National Animal Control Association, the Humane Society of the United States, and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in saying "NO" to the proposed ordinance. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Ashley Adams Fullerton, California

## **Iraheta, Alba**

---

**Subject:** FW: Breed Specific Law Opposition

**From:** Tamara Adkins [mailto:tjadk23@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 07, 2014 3:54 PM

**To:** De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry

**Subject:** Breed Specific Law Opposition

As a concerned taxpayer, I am opposed to any law targeting a specific breed.

Regulations that target specific breeds force animal control officers to become breed identification experts (which they are not) in order to identify whether or not a dog is one of the targeted breeds, and draws their attention away from true animal control matters. Breed specific policies will fill our shelters with family pets than cannot legally be kept or adopted out because their breed has been "blacklisted". Our limited tax dollars will have to be used to care for or euthanize dogs that would otherwise never have ended up in a shelter.

Instead of arbitrarily targeting specific breeds, lawmakers should focus their attention on dangerous dog policies that hold ALL dog owners accountable for their pets. This would prove far more cost-effective, enforceable and humane.

You should also know that I am an owner of a pitbull mix who provides friendship and confidence to my legally blind seven year old son. I also feel very safe when I go to sleep at night knowing that I have one of the sweetest, loyal pitbulls roaming my property, so much so, that I don't feel the need to own a gun (which, by the way, are also very dangerous when put into the wrong hands). I know that you will make the right decision for the community. Thank you for your time. On another note, I would like to say thank you to Jacque Robinson for being the ONLY council member to oppose this ban, and to the rest of you, adopt a pitbull and see for yourself how amazing these dogs are.

--

**Stay Healthy,**

**Tamara Adkins**

Herbalife~Independent Distributor

**(714) 323-4934 cell/text**

[Click here to shop my online catalog](#)

**Helping people reach their nutritional goals**

**Buchanan, Rita**

---

**Subject:** FW: I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

**From:** caren alexander [mailto:mail@changemail.org]

**Sent:** Friday, January 03, 2014 11:26 AM

**To:** Morales, Margo

**Subject:** I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

Dear Margaret McAustin,

I just signed SoCal Pitbull TEAM's petition "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena" on Change.org.

As a resident of Southern California, I urge you to reconsider the proposed ordinance mandating spaying and neutering of pit bull type dogs in Pasadena. The State of California prohibits outright breed bans, as do 16 other states. Massachusetts, Connecticut, Nevada, and Rhode Island have gone even further by prohibiting their towns and counties from regulating based on breed. This is called Breed Discriminatory (or Breed-Specific) Legislation (BSL), and what Councilmember Steve Madison has proposed is a clear-cut example that is not in the best interest for the City of Pasadena. In August 2013, for example, the White House released a statement titled, "BSL is a Bad Idea", stating that the Obama Administration does not support breed-specific legislation. In December 2013, The Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association (JAVMA) published a comprehensive multifactorial study that showed that one kind of dog was NOT more likely to injure a human being than another kind of dog. Councilmember Madison's proposed ordinance is a mis-guided attempt to eliminate pit bull type dogs in Pasadena, not to advocate for spay/neuter of ALL pets to solve the issues with homeless pets and overpopulation in local shelters. From January 2012 – May 2013, more than three times as many American jurisdictions have either repealed existing BSL, or declined to enact BSL, as have put BSL into effect. Pasadena's proposed ordinance is unacceptable, and a step in the wrong direction. The ordinance unfairly targets pit bull type dogs instead of solving the real problems surrounding dog safety and responsible pet ownership. Responsible pet owners already spay and neuter their dogs – this is a public education problem not a pit bull problem. Abandoning this mandatory spay/neuter ordinance that singles out pit bull type dogs is simply the right thing to do. It is also the recommendation of professional groups such as the American Bar Association (See ABA Resolution 108B). The National Canine Research Council (NCRC) reports that the trend in prevention of dog bites continues to shift in favor of multifactorial approaches focusing on improved ownership and husbandry practices, better understanding of dog behavior, education of parents and children regarding safety around dogs, and consistent enforcement of dangerous dog/reckless owner ordinances in communities. Please join reputable organizations including the American Veterinary Medical Association, the National Animal Control Association, the Humane Society of the United States, and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in saying "NO" to the proposed ordinance. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
caren alexander Fullerton, California

## **Buchanan, Rita**

---

**Subject:** FW: Pit bull regulations

**From:** Eve Alexander [mailto:[eve@tropicali.com](mailto:eve@tropicali.com)]

**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 12:54 PM

**To:** De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry

**Subject:** Pit bull regulations

Dear Pasadena City Council,

As a former California resident and a US citizen concerned about dangerous pit bulls, I want to you to know that I support breed specific legislation to resolve the problems with pit bulls.

- 1) They are the most overpopulated dog breed. Nearly one million are killed annually in animal shelters because they are unwanted and overbred. I support mandatory spay / neuter of pet pit bulls with breeders being tightly regulated and monitored.
- 2) Pit bulls are among the most difficult dogs to contain. Pit bull owners must be held to a higher standard of containment to protect the innocent public. They should absolutely be required to register and vaccinate their dogs in accordance with existing laws, and must be required to microchip so loose pit bulls can be matched to their irresponsible owners.
- 3) Pit bulls are one of the most dangerous dogs in the world, and their easy availability and draw for unsavory people, increases their potential danger. Last year 30 some people, mostly children and the elderly, were brutally killed by pit bulls in bloody maulings. Hundreds of people survived maulings with scars and missing appendages, and thousands of pets, livestock and wildlife were killed and injured by pit bulls.

You have a chance to lead the way for the rest of California, and the nation, to progressive animal control / public safety regulations. I hope you will.

Thank you for considering breed specific legislation.

Eve Alexander  
5968 Taneytown St.  
North Port, FL 34291

(941) 240-0108

**Buchanan, Rita**

---

**Subject:** FW: I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

**From:** NIKKI-RAE ALKEMA [<mailto:mail@changemail.org>]

**Sent:** Friday, January 03, 2014 12:45 PM

**To:** Morales, Margo

**Subject:** I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

Dear Margaret McAustin,

I just signed SoCal Pitbull TEAM's petition "[Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena](#)" on Change.org.

As a resident of Southern California, I urge you to reconsider the proposed ordinance mandating spaying and neutering of pit bull type dogs in Pasadena. The State of California prohibits outright breed bans, as do 16 other states. Massachusetts, Connecticut, Nevada, and Rhode Island have gone even further by prohibiting their towns and counties from regulating based on breed. This is called Breed Discriminatory (or Breed-Specific) Legislation (BSL), and what Councilmember Steve Madison has proposed is a clear-cut example that is not in the best interest for the City of Pasadena. In August 2013, for example, the White House released a statement titled, "BSL is a Bad Idea", stating that the Obama Administration does not support breed-specific legislation. In December 2013, The Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association (JAVMA) published a comprehensive multifactorial study that showed that one kind of dog was NOT more likely to injure a human being than another kind of dog. Councilmember Madison's proposed ordinance is a mis-guided attempt to eliminate pit bull type dogs in Pasadena, not to advocate for spay/neuter of ALL pets to solve the issues with homeless pets and overpopulation in local shelters. From January 2012 – May 2013, more than three times as many American jurisdictions have either repealed existing BSL, or declined to enact BSL, as have put BSL into effect. Pasadena's proposed ordinance is unacceptable, and a step in the wrong direction. The ordinance unfairly targets pit bull type dogs instead of solving the real problems surrounding dog safety and responsible pet ownership. Responsible pet owners already spay and neuter their dogs – this is a public education problem not a pit bull problem. Abandoning this mandatory spay/neuter ordinance that singles out pit bull type dogs is simply the right thing to do. It is also the recommendation of professional groups such as the American Bar Association (See ABA Resolution 108B). The National Canine Research Council (NCRC) reports that the trend in prevention of dog bites continues to shift in favor of multifactorial approaches focusing on improved ownership and husbandry practices, better understanding of dog behavior, education of parents and children regarding safety around dogs, and consistent enforcement of dangerous dog/reckless owner ordinances in communities. Please join reputable organizations including the American Veterinary Medical Association, the National Animal Control Association, the Humane Society of the United States, and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in saying "NO" to the proposed ordinance. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
NIKKI-RAE ALKEMA Huntington Beach, California

**Buchanan, Rita**

---

**Subject:** FW: I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

**From:** Judy Allen [<mailto:mail@changemail.org>]

**Sent:** Friday, January 03, 2014 12:39 PM

**To:** Morales, Margo

**Subject:** I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

Dear Margaret McAustin,

I just signed SoCal Pitbull TEAM's petition "[Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena](#)" on Change.org.

As a resident of Southern California, I urge you to reconsider the proposed ordinance mandating spaying and neutering of pit bull type dogs in Pasadena. The State of California prohibits outright breed bans, as do 16 other states. Massachusetts, Connecticut, Nevada, and Rhode Island have gone even further by prohibiting their towns and counties from regulating based on breed. This is called Breed Discriminatory (or Breed-Specific) Legislation (BSL), and what Councilmember Steve Madison has proposed is a clear-cut example that is not in the best interest for the City of Pasadena. In August 2013, for example, the White House released a statement titled, "BSL is a Bad Idea", stating that the Obama Administration does not support breed-specific legislation. In December 2013, The Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association (JAVMA) published a comprehensive multifactorial study that showed that one kind of dog was NOT more likely to injure a human being than another kind of dog. Councilmember Madison's proposed ordinance is a mis-guided attempt to eliminate pit bull type dogs in Pasadena, not to advocate for spay/neuter of ALL pets to solve the issues with homeless pets and overpopulation in local shelters. From January 2012 – May 2013, more than three times as many American jurisdictions have either repealed existing BSL, or declined to enact BSL, as have put BSL into effect. Pasadena's proposed ordinance is unacceptable, and a step in the wrong direction. The ordinance unfairly targets pit bull type dogs instead of solving the real problems surrounding dog safety and responsible pet ownership. Responsible pet owners already spay and neuter their dogs – this is a public education problem not a pit bull problem. Abandoning this mandatory spay/neuter ordinance that singles out pit bull type dogs is simply the right thing to do. It is also the recommendation of professional groups such as the American Bar Association (See ABA Resolution 108B). The National Canine Research Council (NCRC) reports that the trend in prevention of dog bites continues to shift in favor of multifactorial approaches focusing on improved ownership and husbandry practices, better understanding of dog behavior, education of parents and children regarding safety around dogs, and consistent enforcement of dangerous dog/reckless owner ordinances in communities. Please join reputable organizations including the American Veterinary Medical Association, the National Animal Control Association, the Humane Society of the United States, and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in saying "NO" to the proposed ordinance. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Judy Allen Fullerton, California

**Buchanan, Rita**

---

**Subject:** FW: I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

**From:** Nancy Antoniak [<mailto:mail@changemail.org>]

**Sent:** Friday, January 03, 2014 2:45 PM

**To:** Morales, Margo

**Subject:** I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

Dear Margaret McAustin,

I just signed SoCal Pitbull TEAM's petition "[Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena](#)" on Change.org.

As a resident of Southern California, I urge you to reconsider the proposed ordinance mandating spaying and neutering of pit bull type dogs in Pasadena. The State of California prohibits outright breed bans, as do 16 other states. Massachusetts, Connecticut, Nevada, and Rhode Island have gone even further by prohibiting their towns and counties from regulating based on breed. This is called Breed Discriminatory (or Breed-Specific) Legislation (BSL), and what Councilmember Steve Madison has proposed is a clear-cut example that is not in the best interest for the City of Pasadena. In August 2013, for example, the White House released a statement titled, "BSL is a Bad Idea", stating that the Obama Administration does not support breed-specific legislation. In December 2013, The Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association (JAVMA) published a comprehensive multifactorial study that showed that one kind of dog was NOT more likely to injure a human being than another kind of dog. Councilmember Madison's proposed ordinance is a mis-guided attempt to eliminate pit bull type dogs in Pasadena, not to advocate for spay/neuter of ALL pets to solve the issues with homeless pets and overpopulation in local shelters. From January 2012 – May 2013, more than three times as many American jurisdictions have either repealed existing BSL, or declined to enact BSL, as have put BSL into effect. Pasadena's proposed ordinance is unacceptable, and a step in the wrong direction. The ordinance unfairly targets pit bull type dogs instead of solving the real problems surrounding dog safety and responsible pet ownership. Responsible pet owners already spay and neuter their dogs – this is a public education problem not a pit bull problem. Abandoning this mandatory spay/neuter ordinance that singles out pit bull type dogs is simply the right thing to do. It is also the recommendation of professional groups such as the American Bar Association (See ABA Resolution 108B). The National Canine Research Council (NCRC) reports that the trend in prevention of dog bites continues to shift in favor of multifactorial approaches focusing on improved ownership and husbandry practices, better understanding of dog behavior, education of parents and children regarding safety around dogs, and consistent enforcement of dangerous dog/reckless owner ordinances in communities. Please join reputable organizations including the American Veterinary Medical Association, the National Animal Control Association, the Humane Society of the United States, and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in saying "NO" to the proposed ordinance. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Nancy Antoniak Wittenberg, Wisconsin



## Buchanan, Rita

---

**Subject:** FW: Consideration of breed-specific legislation

Dear Councilmember McAustin:

I understand that there has been discussion of breed-specific mandatory spay/neuter in your town. I respect your desire to ensure that Pasadena is a safe community. However, breed-specific legislation (BSL) is based on the incorrect idea that any dog can be considered apart from its owner or that breed restrictions of any kind will produce the intended result – which they do not.

I am pleased to send you just some of the overwhelming evidence that BSL does not work. The attached papers elaborate on these key points:

1. There is no evidence from the controlled study of dog bites that one kind of dog is more likely to bite a human being than another kind of dog. (Attachment 1,2)
2. Regulating dogs on the basis of breed or physical description does not reduce dog bites. An evidence-based analysis published in the *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association (JAVMA)* offers one perspective on why this has been the case. (Attachment 3)
3. Visually identifying which dogs are subject to BSL is difficult. In fact, many scientific studies show that attempts to visually identify breed in dogs of unknown origin is usually inaccurate. (Attachment 4-9) If this is the case, we can expect no reliability on reports that attempt to correlate a dog bite incident with a breed descriptor of the dog.

Additionally, with respect to recent comments made by councilmembers regarding dog bite-related fatalities (DBRFs), I thought that you should know about a paper just published in *JAVMA* on the topic (Attachment 10). The study is the most comprehensive multifactorial study of DBRFs to ever be completed. It is based on investigative techniques not previously employed in DBRF studies and identified a significant co-occurrence of multiple potentially preventable factors. Breed was not one of those factors. The authors conclude that the potentially preventable factors co-occurring in more than 80% of the DBRF's in their 10 year case file are best addressed by multifactorial public and private strategies, as opposed to single-factor strategies such as BSL.

The trend in communities across the country is to move away from BSL. From January 2012 – May 2013, more than three times as many U.S. jurisdictions repealed existing BSL, or declined to enact BSL, as have put BSL into effect. The American Bar Association has urged for repeal of BSL nationwide and the White House recently released a statement saying, "research shows that bans on certain types of dogs are largely ineffective and often a waste of public resources" (Attachment 11,12). None of the experts advocate regulating dogs on the basis of breed, including the American Veterinary Medical Association, the Centers for Disease Control, the Humane Society of the United States, and the National Animal Control Association.

If we can be of further assistance in helping to find a breed-neutral solution I hope you will feel free to contact me. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Elizabeth Arps  
National Canine Research Council Action Fund  
a 501(c)(4) non-profit corporation  
"Advocating for the Human-Canine Bond"

**Buchanan, Rita**

---

**Subject:** FW: I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

**From:** Krista Aspiras [<mailto:mail@changemail.org>]

**Sent:** Friday, January 03, 2014 5:52 PM

**To:** Morales, Margo

**Subject:** I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

Dear Margaret McAustin,

I just signed SoCal Pitbull TEAM's petition "[Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena](#)" on Change.org.

As a resident of Southern California, I urge you to reconsider the proposed ordinance mandating spaying and neutering of pit bull type dogs in Pasadena. The State of California prohibits outright breed bans, as do 16 other states. Massachusetts, Connecticut, Nevada, and Rhode Island have gone even further by prohibiting their towns and counties from regulating based on breed. This is called Breed Discriminatory (or Breed-Specific) Legislation (BSL), and what Councilmember Steve Madison has proposed is a clear-cut example that is not in the best interest for the City of Pasadena. In August 2013, for example, the White House released a statement titled, "BSL is a Bad Idea", stating that the Obama Administration does not support breed-specific legislation. In December 2013, The Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association (JAVMA) published a comprehensive multifactorial study that showed that one kind of dog was NOT more likely to injure a human being than another kind of dog. Councilmember Madison's proposed ordinance is a mis-guided attempt to eliminate pit bull type dogs in Pasadena, not to advocate for spay/neuter of ALL pets to solve the issues with homeless pets and overpopulation in local shelters. From January 2012 – May 2013, more than three times as many American jurisdictions have either repealed existing BSL, or declined to enact BSL, as have put BSL into effect. Pasadena's proposed ordinance is unacceptable, and a step in the wrong direction. The ordinance unfairly targets pit bull type dogs instead of solving the real problems surrounding dog safety and responsible pet ownership. Responsible pet owners already spay and neuter their dogs – this is a public education problem not a pit bull problem. Abandoning this mandatory spay/neuter ordinance that singles out pit bull type dogs is simply the right thing to do. It is also the recommendation of professional groups such as the American Bar Association (See ABA Resolution 108B). The National Canine Research Council (NCRC) reports that the trend in prevention of dog bites continues to shift in favor of multifactorial approaches focusing on improved ownership and husbandry practices, better understanding of dog behavior, education of parents and children regarding safety around dogs, and consistent enforcement of dangerous dog/reckless owner ordinances in communities. Please join reputable organizations including the American Veterinary Medical Association, the National Animal Control Association, the Humane Society of the United States, and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in saying "NO" to the proposed ordinance. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Krista Aspiras Irvine, California

## **Iraheta, Alba**

---

**From:** cityclerk  
**Subject:** FW: BSL

From: "julie b" <[msg.julie@gmail.com](mailto:msg.julie@gmail.com)>  
Date: Jan 14, 2014 7:07 PM  
Subject: BSL  
To: <[smadison@cityofpasadena.net](mailto:smadison@cityofpasadena.net)>

Can you ask where Steve Madison has obtained his data regarding fatal pit bull attacks? Are they solely based on (often fallible) media reports\* or on actual law enforcement findings and/or medical examiner reports?  
\*In 2012, southern California new outlets were reporting that a postal worker died from a fatal pit bull attack. In reality, the cause of death was determined by the San Diego medical examiner to be a stroke.  
Media reports that name/blame specific breeds are rarely based on conclusive proof of the dog's ancestry or true breed (the vague "pit bull type" dog).

Is the council aware that, according to the CDC, fatal dog attacks occur in less than 0.00001% of the U.S. population? Most of these attacks occur on children in the home and are a result of a lack of supervision.

Something I found while looking at historic data of dog bite fatalities in the U.S. is that the responsible breed seems to trend with what dogs were "popular" as guard and/or attack dogs. For a while it was German Shepherds then Rottweilers then Pit Bulls. There have even been fatalities from Dachshunds and a Pomeranian. Pit Bulls have been in this country hundreds of years and are a deservedly well-loved breed.  
<http://bslnews.org/pit-bull-heroes-hall-of-fame/>

Steve Madison said that he is expecting the Pasadena Humane Society to take on the burden of identifying pit bulls. How will this added responsibility affect their current workload? Is the City of Pasadena going to fund this, and if so, will the costs be passed on to residents? Have preliminary budgetary estimates been made? If no additional funding or staffing is to be allocated, will other services need to be cut? If so, and since the Pasadena Humane Society also serves other cities (Arcadia, Glendale, La Cañada Flintridge, Monrovia, San Marino, Sierra Madre and South Pasadena) will those residents also have a chance to weigh in on this subject?

Is the council familiar with the ASPCA's opinion on pit bulls having the capacity to be "one of the most delightful, intelligent and gentle dogs imaginable"? They also address how the media shamefully continues to warp and misrepresent the breed.  
<http://www.aspca.org/pet-care/virtual-pet-behaviorist/dog-behavior/truth-about-pit-bulls>

## Iraheta, Alba

---

**From:** Zia Bossenmeyer <ziasavesdogs@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 11:38 AM  
**To:** Bogaard, Bill; Robinson, Jacque; McAustin, Margaret; Kennedy, John; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; Beck, Michael; Gutierrez, Julie; Mermell, Steve; Bagneris, Michele; cityclerk; Foster, Siobhan; Walsh, Eric  
**Cc:** Josh Liddy  
**Subject:** Why Mandatory Spay Neuter laws DON'T WORK regardless if your targeting pit bulls or not

Dear City of Pasadena,

It has come to my attention that there is a focus on creating mandatory spay neuter ordinances against pit bulls in Pasadena.

I am a board member of a low cost non-profit spay neuter clinic. One might assume that I would be in support of your ordinance however I am 100% against it. In short, research has shown that the reason MSN fails is because people don't Spay/Neuter their animals is not because they don't want to, but because they can't afford it. Because people can't afford the spay neuter procedure which costs approx \$200-300 at most vets offices, they also can't afford the fines when they get sited, so they frequently relinquish their cherished family pet due to low finances instead of complying with punitive laws. MSN results in higher intake in shelters, higher financial burden on cities and tax payers and does not reduce dog bites or fatalities in communities.

Regardless of whether your discriminating against pit bulls or not, (which you are) Mandatory Spay Neuter has been PROVEN TO FAIL countless times. As well, the National animal advocacy organizations are AGAINST MSN NOT FOR IT.

Please review this site for direct links to articles and research on why MSN is a horrible idea that will COST THE CITY MONEY and INCREASE SHELTER INTAKES not lower them.

Link to ZiaSavesDogs website <http://www.ziasavesdogs.org/news-special-events/advocacy/msn-mandatory-spay-neuter/> \*If you would like this information as an attachment or mailed. I'm happy to provide that as well.

If you feel you have a problem with DOG bites or DOG fatalities, the issues are with the OWNERS and not an entire breed of dogs. STRICTER punishments of irresponsible dog owners should be the topic of discussion, not how can we work to ban a breed of dogs from our city.

Many cities already have dangerous dog laws and leash laws (to prohibit roaming dogs) why do you think that this un-enforceable law is going to make the difference? You already have two laws to target the real problem you are trying to address. Spay/Neuter has nothing to do with your perceived misconception of "dangerous dog breed".

As an animal advocate I would love to sit down and discuss this issue with you personally before any votes or decision making is finalized. I would be happy to provide you with countless articles and references on why MSN is well-intentioned but HORRIBLE policy making.

I understand that to run a city you can't know everything about every issue, that is why I'm volunteering to provide you with the information you need to avoid making a mistake that costs the city more money and dogs lives.

Thank you for reading this valuable information which also convinced the city of Canyon Lake, CA to HALT their decision to move forward on MSN and Mandatory Microchipping.

Zia Bossenmeyer  
Animal Advocate  
T:310.242.7746  
ZiaSavesDogs@gmail.com

## Iraheta, Alba

---

**From:** cityclerk  
**Subject:** FW: Please read, too important not to "Why "statistics" based on media reports are invalid" and dogsbite.org

**From:** Zia Bossenmeyer [mailto:ziasavesdogs@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, January 18, 2014 9:21 AM

**To:** Bogaard, Bill; Robinson, Jacque; McAustin, Margaret; Kennedy, John; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; Beck, Michael; Gutierrez, Julie; Mermell, Steve; Bagneris, Michele; cityclerk; Foster, Siobhan; Walsh, Eric

**Subject:** Please read, too important not to "Why "statistics" based on media reports are invalid" and dogsbite.org

**Please read this article:**

### **Why "statistics" based on media reports are invalid**

"The research for articles and statistics presented difficulties as **the majority were anti Breed Specific Ordinances**. The few that were in favor of BSOs generally justified their positions with statistical data generated by [dogsbite.org](http://dogsbite.org). Research of this website found the data to be extremely distorted with many myths presented as facts....because no one, including the CDC, maintains statistics of attacks by breed, the party who maintains the website gathers statistics based on a review of newspaper articles for reports of dog attacks. This method would not be embraced by any statistician, as this would lead to **greatly skewed and inaccurate results**."

<http://btoellner.typepad.com/kcdogblog/2014/01/why-statistics-based-on-media-reports-are-invalid.html>

## Iraheta, Alba

---

**From:** cityclerk  
**Subject:** FW: Response to your form letter with REAL STATISTICS AND REAL RESEARCH CITED. PLEASE READ

**From:** Zia Bossenmeyer [mailto:ziasavesdogs@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Monday, January 20, 2014 1:32 PM

**To:** Suzuki, Takako; Bogaard, Bill; Robinson, Jacque; McAustin, Margaret; Kennedy, John; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; Beck, Michael; Gutierrez, Julie; Mermell, Steve; Bagneris, Michele; cityclerk; Foster, Siobhan; Walsh, Eric

**Subject:** Response to your form letter with REAL STATISTICS AND REAL RESEARCH CITED. PLEASE READ

Dear Mr. Madison in response to this ridiculous form letter,

You suggest you are concerned about the safety of the public in your district. If this is in fact true, you will continue to work on educating the public and enforcing your leash and dangerous dog laws. Education on responsible dog ownership is the MAIN thing that will keep the public safe. What really is the top reasons for dog bites and human death in ALL breeds is 1) loose or stray dogs 2) chained or tethered unsocialized dogs and 3) unsupervised children.

Just because other cities weren't educated enough about the HUGE AND COSTLY mistake they are making DOESN'T MEAN that Pasadena needs to make the same mistake. MSN is difficult to enforce, costly to cities and results in HIGHER INTAKE and EUTHANASIA numbers NOT LESS. See below

### Anecdotes of cities who implemented MSN

- A mandatory spay/neuter law enacted in Dallas, Texas, in 2008 resulted in a 22 percent increase in animal control expenditures, as well as an overall decrease in licensing projected to reduce revenue by \$400,000.
- The City of Santa Cruz, California, experienced a 56% cost increase over the first 12 years of implementation.
- The City of Los Angeles' budget ballooned from \$6.7 million to \$18 million following implementation.
- 2005, Kansas City, MO passed a law mandating the spay/neuter of 'pit bulls' in an attempt to reduce the killing of pit bulls at the shelter. During the next 24 months, the city saw a 76% increase in the number of 'pit bulls' killed at the city shelter. And while the number of dogs of all other breeds being killed was dropping, the number of pit bulls killed nearly doubled. Sourced from The KC Dog Blog "Understanding Cause & Effect when it comes to MSN" (Excellent article)
- Little Rock, AR In the first year of having the ordinance, pit bull killings in the Little Rock shelter increased by 44%. Sourced from The KC Dog Blog "Understanding Cause & Effect when it comes to MSN"
- Los Angeles, CA – Has had MSN since 2008. 8 years later the city is still not No Kill. See research and another brilliant article from the KC Dog Blog. Research and statistics sited within article "Los Angeles MSN – year 3 – when can we expect it to start working?"

Your source dog [bites.org](http://bites.org) is a hate site dedicated to spreading lies and misinformation about pit bulls. There is no basis of fact, no true research or case studies to the misinformation sited. Going to [dogsbite.org](http://dogsbite.org) for reliable information is about as logical as going to the Westboro Church and asking them how to be a good, kind person.

THE REAL STATISTICS show that pit bulls account for LESS THAN 38% of the death fatalities. As well that's of a total of 30 people in 2012 and 29 in 2013. MORE PEOPLE DIE FROM EVERYTHING ELSE BESIDES THIS. This is not a real problem. Why are you citing this as a reason to DISCRIMINATE against millions of pit bulls in the US.

**CDC – “Fatal attacks representation a small proportion of injuries to humans, herefore, should not be the primary factor driving public policy concerning dangerous dogs. Many practical alternative to breed specific ordinances exist and hold promise for prevention of dog bites.”**

Pit bulls are the most popular dog breed. Banfield’s State of Pet Health Report 2011, lists Pit Bull among the most popular pets in 46 states. "A 2012 Vetstreet survey showing the American Pit Bull Terrier as the most popular in the country"

There are nearly 75 million owned dogs in this country, 300 million people, and yet, each year, only 30 are involved in incidents that are fatal. And the number of pit bulls involved is less than 38%.

This legislation you're suggesting is NOT LOGICAL. As you suggest  
**The following organizations are against MSN. (Click on the link for position statements)**

- [ASPCA – American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals](#)
- [AVMA – American Veterinary Medical Association](#)
- [AKC – American Kennel Club \(PDF download\)](#)
- [\(ACT\) The American College of Theriogenologists & \(SFT\) Society for Theriogenology](#)
- Allie Cat Allies -
- [No Kill Advocacy Center \(PDF Download\)](#)
- Best Friends
- [Fix Austin](#)

## **(MSN) Mandatory Spay Neuter**

**What is MSN Mandatory Spay Neuter? Why is it good or bad?** (MSN) Mandatory Spay Neuter is when cities or counties require citizens to spay or neuter their dogs before they are licensed with the city. They may make the cost of licensing a non-sterilized pet extremely costly or have expensive fines if caught with an unlicensed and non-sterilized pet. *Due to evidence from the many failures of MSN around the country and the overwhelming evidence that this policy or law has not been effective in lowering shelter intake numbers ZiaSavesDogs is completely 100% against any MSN ordinances.*

**The following organizations are against MSN. (Click on the link for position statements)**



- [ASPCA – American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals](#)
- [AVMA – American Veterinary Medical Association](#)
- [AKC – American Kennel Club \(PDF download\)](#)
- [\(ACT\) The American College of Theriogenologists & \(SFT\) Society for Theriogenology](#)
- Allie Cat Allies -
- [No Kill Advocacy Center \(PDF Download\)](#)
- Best Friends
- [Fix Austin](#)

### Why are they against it?

- The ASPCA is not aware of any credible evidence demonstrating a statistically significant enhancement in the reduction of shelter intake or euthanasia as a result of the implementation of a mandatory spay/neuter law. – ASPCA
- it can be extremely difficult for even a veterinary professional to visually determine if an animal, particularly a female, has been sterilized; it would be virtually impossible for an animal control officer to make those determinations in the field. –ASPCA
- in at least one community that enacted an MSN law, fewer pets were subsequently licensed, likely due to owners' reluctance to pay either the high fee for keeping an unaltered animal or the fee to have the pet altered (Office of Legislative Oversight, 1997) –ASPCA
- One of the main barriers to spaying and neutering of pets is accessibility of services, which is not addressed simply by making spaying and neutering mandatory. Cost is one of the primary barriers to spay/neuter surgery in many communities (Patronek et al., 1997; Ralston Purina, 2000; Frank, 2001). – ASPCA
- The AVMA does not support regulations or legislation mandating spay/neuter of privately owned, non-shelter dogs and cats. Although spaying and neutering helps control dog and cat populations, mandatory approaches may contribute to pet owners avoiding licensing, rabies vaccination and veterinary care for their pets, and may have other unintended consequences. – AVMA
- The ACT and SFT do not believe that mandatory spay/neuter programs will significantly reduce the pet overpopulation problems, **since most animals that are abandoned are relinquished because of** behavior, health, economic and life changing conditions and not due to their reproductive status. In fact, in some European Union countries where gonadectomy is illegal unless deemed medically necessary (such as Norway) **there are no significant problems with pet overpopulation**, indicating that **the pet overpopulation problem that exists in the United States is due to** cultural differences on the importance of pets, the responsibility of pet owners, and the ability of the government and national agencies to properly educate the public. Although both organizations believe that most companion animals should be spayed or neutered, the ACT and SFT also strongly believe that **it is not in the best interest of the animals to produce legislation regarding medical treatments**, Therefore, **both organizations oppose** mandatory spay/neuter programs – The American College of Theriogenologists (ACT) & Society for Theriogenology (SFT)
- Most of America's 50 largest cities do not have high-volume spay/neuter clinics. Smaller communities, whether suburban or rural, are even less likely to have affordable and accessible spay/neuter facilities. – Allie Cat Allies
- Veterinary services in many, if not most, areas of the country are prohibitively expensive for working families – Allie Cat Allies
- The resources a community would have to dedicate to enforcing mandatory spay/neuter laws would be far better spent in making spay/neuter facilities available to residents and educating them about the importance and availability of sterilization. – Allie Cat Allies

- When a law governing the ownership or care of animals is enacted 1) without adequate resources for the populace to comply, but which 2) has costly penalties and 3) is widely enforced, it can cause people to relinquish their pets to a shelter or to abandon them elsewhere. When more animals enter shelters, the kill rate goes up. When cats are abandoned outdoors, they add to and compound the feral cat issue.- Allie Cat Allies
- Legislation is often thought of as a quick solution to high rates of shelter killing. “If only we had a law,” the argument goes, “all the bad, irresponsible people would have to take care of their pets properly, and shelters wouldn’t have to kill so many animals.” If this were true, given the proliferation of punitive mandates nationwide, there should be many No Kill communities. That there are not, is because experience has proven that legislation is far from a cure-all. In fact, it often has the opposite effect. Communities that have passed such laws are not only far from No Kill, many are moving in the opposite direction. – No Kill Advocacy Center [The Dark Side of Mandatory Laws \(PDF Download\)](#)
- “Best Friends does not support mandatory spay-neuter legislation as a method of pet population control”
- Every single data-based study of mandatory spay/neuter laws has demonstrated that such laws do not increase spay-neuter compliance rates, nor do they reduce shelter intake, nor are they cost-effective, nor do they save lives. In fact, the opposite is true: in community after community that has passed a mandatory spay/neuter law, shelter killing and intake actually increase because in poor communities, families who cannot afford the money or time to have their pets surgically altered are forced to surrender their pets (or the pets are seized). These pets are quickly replaced in the communities with additional unaltered animals, creating an enhanced cycle of killing. These laws do not work, have never worked in any community, and will not work. – Fix Austin.org [Why we Join the Natl Consensus against MSN \(PDF Download\)](#)
- There is universal opposition to mandatory spay/neuter laws among national animal-welfare organizations who have spent time to empirically study such laws’ effects. Indeed, given the frequent hostility between national animal-welfare organizations, the universal opposition to mandatory spay/neuter laws is telling. – Fix Austin

On Tue, Jan 14, 2014 at 11:11 AM, Suzuki, Takako <[tsuzuki@cityofpasadena.net](mailto:tsuzuki@cityofpasadena.net)> wrote:

Thank you for contacting my office regarding the proposed mandatory spay/neuter ordinance for pit bull and pit bull cross-breed dogs. We understand and respect your views. The City Council is committed to ensuring public safety, while at the same time establishing preventive health measures for pets that can reduce overpopulation and improve their quality of life.

The proposed ordinance is consistent with California Senate Bill 861 which states that “uncontrolled and irresponsible breeding of animals contributes to pet overpopulation, inhumane treatment of animals, mass euthanasia at local shelters and escalating costs for animal care and control; (while) irresponsible breeding also contributes to the production of defective animals that present a public safety risk.”

Many other cities and counties—including Camarillo and Lancaster, plus Riverside and San Bernardino counties—have implemented the same type of breed-specific ordinance such as the one the City of Pasadena is considering. There is clearly a reasonable basis for this local legislation. Statistics suggest that pit bull breeds are responsible for over half of the fatal dog on human attacks in the United States. No doubt you have followed the cases just here in our region over the last couple of years in which toddlers and seniors have been viciously attacked, and some killed, by pit bull breeds.

Meanwhile, animal shelters—including the Pasadena Humane Society—are overcrowded with unwanted pit bull puppies and thousands are put to sleep in California every year. Our proposed ordinance will directly address these issues.

The proposed City of Pasadena ordinance, which is still under review, would help mitigate the effects of pit bull and pit bull cross-breed overpopulation and help ensure that these pets, their owners and the community remain safe and maintain a high quality of life.

I appreciate your comments and thank you for your community involvement.

Steve Madison, Councilmember for District 6

**Buchanan, Rita**

---

**Subject:** FW: 5 new petition signatures: Kevin Brennan, sabrina foraker...

**From:** Kevin Brennan [mailto:mail@changemail.org]

**Sent:** Friday, January 03, 2014 9:02 PM

**To:** Morales, Margo

**Subject:** 5 new petition signatures: Kevin Brennan, sabrina foraker...

5 new people recently signed SoCal Pitbull TEAM's petition "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena" on Change.org.

There are now 60 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to SoCal Pitbull TEAM by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/pasadena-city-council-abandon-mandatory-spay-neuter-of-pit-bulls-ordinance-in-pasadena/responses/new?response=2e7a75dbe3fb>

Dear Margaret McAustin,

As a resident of Southern California, I urge you to reconsider the proposed ordinance mandating spaying and neutering of pit bull type dogs in Pasadena. The State of California prohibits outright breed bans, as do 16 other states. Massachusetts, Connecticut, Nevada, and Rhode Island have gone even further by prohibiting their towns and counties from regulating based on breed. This is called Breed Discriminatory (or Breed-Specific) Legislation (BSL), and what Councilmember Steve Madison has proposed is a clear-cut example that is not in the best interest for the City of Pasadena. In August 2013, for example, the White House released a statement titled, "BSL is a Bad Idea", stating that the Obama Administration does not support breed-specific legislation. In December 2013, The Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association (JAVMA) published a comprehensive multifactorial study that showed that one kind of dog was NOT more likely to injure a human being than another kind of dog. Councilmember Madison's proposed ordinance is a mis-guided attempt to eliminate pit bull type dogs in Pasadena, not to advocate for spay/neuter of ALL pets to solve the issues with homeless pets and overpopulation in local shelters. From January 2012 – May 2013, more than three times as many American jurisdictions have either repealed existing BSL, or declined to enact BSL, as have put BSL into effect. Pasadena's proposed ordinance is unacceptable, and a step in the wrong direction. The ordinance unfairly targets pit bull type dogs instead of solving the real problems surrounding dog safety and responsible pet ownership. Responsible pet owners already spay and neuter their dogs – this is a public education problem not a pit bull problem. Abandoning this mandatory spay/neuter ordinance that singles out pit bull type dogs is simply the right thing to do. It is also the recommendation of professional groups such as the American Bar Association (See ABA Resolution 108B). The National Canine Research Council (NCRC) reports that the trend in prevention of dog bites continues to shift in favor of multifactorial approaches focusing on improved ownership and husbandry practices, better understanding of dog behavior, education of parents and children regarding safety around dogs, and consistent enforcement of dangerous dog/reckless owner ordinances in communities. Please join reputable organizations including the American Veterinary Medical Association, the National Animal Control Association, the Humane Society of the United States, and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in saying "NO" to the proposed ordinance. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

60. Kevin Brennan Santa Ana, California

59. sabrina foraker watsonville, California

- 58. Josh Newell Sherman Oaks, California
- 57. Lisa Salazar Foster City, California
- 56. Laquita Martin pitkin, Louisiana

**Buchanan, Rita**

---

**Subject:** FW: I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

**From:** Courtney Browne [mailto:mail@changemail.org]

**Sent:** Friday, January 03, 2014 11:21 AM

**To:** Morales, Margo

**Subject:** I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

Dear Margaret McAustin,

I just signed SoCal Pitbull TEAM's petition "[Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena](#)" on Change.org.

As a resident of Southern California, I urge you to reconsider the proposed ordinance mandating spaying and neutering of pit bull type dogs in Pasadena. The State of California prohibits outright breed bans, as do 16 other states. Massachusetts, Connecticut, Nevada, and Rhode Island have gone even further by prohibiting their towns and counties from regulating based on breed. This is called Breed Discriminatory (or Breed-Specific) Legislation (BSL), and what Councilmember Steve Madison has proposed is a clear-cut example that is not in the best interest for the City of Pasadena. In August 2013, for example, the White House released a statement titled, "BSL is a Bad Idea", stating that the Obama Administration does not support breed-specific legislation. In December 2013, The Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association (JAVMA) published a comprehensive multifactorial study that showed that one kind of dog was NOT more likely to injure a human being than another kind of dog. Councilmember Madison's proposed ordinance is a mis-guided attempt to eliminate pit bull type dogs in Pasadena, not to advocate for spay/neuter of ALL pets to solve the issues with homeless pets and overpopulation in local shelters. From January 2012 – May 2013, more than three times as many American jurisdictions have either repealed existing BSL, or declined to enact BSL, as have put BSL into effect. Pasadena's proposed ordinance is unacceptable, and a step in the wrong direction. The ordinance unfairly targets pit bull type dogs instead of solving the real problems surrounding dog safety and responsible pet ownership. Responsible pet owners already spay and neuter their dogs – this is a public education problem not a pit bull problem. Abandoning this mandatory spay/neuter ordinance that singles out pit bull type dogs is simply the right thing to do. It is also the recommendation of professional groups such as the American Bar Association (See ABA Resolution 108B). The National Canine Research Council (NCRC) reports that the trend in prevention of dog bites continues to shift in favor of multifactorial approaches focusing on improved ownership and husbandry practices, better understanding of dog behavior, education of parents and children regarding safety around dogs, and consistent enforcement of dangerous dog/reckless owner ordinances in communities. Please join reputable organizations including the American Veterinary Medical Association, the National Animal Control Association, the Humane Society of the United States, and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in saying "NO" to the proposed ordinance. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Courtney Browne Wildomar, California

## Jomsky, Mark

---

**Subject:** FW: City Council Meeting- 1/27/14

**From:** Kim Bubar [mailto:kbubar76@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Friday, January 17, 2014 11:26 AM

**To:** Bogaard, Bill; Robinson, Jacque; McAustin, Margaret; Kennedy, John; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; Beck, Michael; Gutierrez, Julie; Mermell, Steve; Bagneris, Michele; cityclerk; Foster, Siobhan; Walsh, Eric

**Subject:** City Council Meeting- 1/27/14

Hello Representatives of Pasadena-

It has been brought to my attention that the City of Pasadena is trying to pass a ban on Pit Bulls and I am writing to you as a concerned Pit Bull owner. First and foremost, Breed Restrictions DO NOT WORK and are a complete waste of tax payer dollars. Secondly, to pass judgement on a breed as a whole is no different than passing judgment on a person based on their skin color, sex or sexuality. It is ignorant and unacceptable.

I understand that in the hands of an irresponsible or dangerous owner a Pit Bull can become aggressive. But this does not solely apply to just Bully breeds as I have encountered aggressive Golden Retrievers, Boxers, Terriers and even Chihuahuas. Dogs as a whole are the responsibility of their owners to ensure that they are not a threat to their community. As a responsible Pit Bull owner, I can say that my dog is the most loving, giving, gentle dog I have ever encountered. He has been around every type of dog, every type of animal and every type of child with no issue. If you are a dog owner you understand that you love your animals like you love your children and would go great lengths to protect them. It breaks my heart to ever think that he would be banned from a city that I live in. Or that my city does not welcome him as part of my family.

Even our President has spoken out against breed restrictions stating, "bans on certain types of dogs are largely ineffective and often a waste of public resources." It would be far more effective to focus on educating our community on dog ownership rather than attempting to rid our community of whole breed of animal.

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/08/20/obama-breed-specific-legislation\\_n\\_3785911.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/08/20/obama-breed-specific-legislation_n_3785911.html)

To reiterate my point I am attaching a few photos of my dog, Ace. Ace was abused, has cigarette burns on his head, his teeth broken out and he spent months living on the street. Even having faced such hardship, Ace came to us as a loving and eager to please dog. Not a day goes by that we do not feel forever grateful that we have him in our lives. Having 4 young nieces and nephews, I have never been afraid to have him around children as you will also see in the photos.

I ask that you please take the time to reconsider this ban. To refocus your efforts on legislation and initiatives that truly build the community of Pasadena. To understand that you can not judge a breed as a whole and that there are families out there that consider these dogs as an important part of their families.

Thank you kindly,  
Kimberlee Mieiners





**Iraheta, Alba**

---

**Subject:** FW: WHAT IS IT GONNA TAKE?

**From:** Patty Burrier [mailto:Patty.Burrier@utsa.edu]

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 07, 2014 6:18 AM

**To:** De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry

**Subject:** FW: WHAT IS IT GONNA TAKE?

Dear City of Pasadena Council,

While the rest of the country is ending Breed Specific Legislation - please reconsider what a mistake this would be to enforce.

It is a sad day when you can't realize the breed of a dog does not make a dog vicious. Only how that dog is raised and treated can cause behavior, just as in humans.

I hope you can find better things for your community to be concerned with and I wish you the best in your future positive endeavors on behalf of your community.

Sincerely, Patricia Burrier  
Texas