

hands, was likely accidentally bitten. Still terrible, but more context. And even though Grula described the Pit Bull as having the side of the other dog's "head and throat in its jaws," this dog's injuries were fortunately "relatively minor." Grula's friend was bitten however, and he ended up in the emergency room.

All of this was written in a clear effort to demonize all Pit Bulls, yet it all could have been avoided if that dog's reckless owner was not allowing his dog to freely roam the streets!

Grula then also mentions the Colton boy, claiming that he was killed by "family pets." A total lie and misrepresentation. He was actually killed by 1, or up to 7, of the tethered yard dogs that were all residing in the backyard of the home that this unsupervised 2-year-old boy found himself in. He follows that up with exploiting the death of the lady who was attacked while out jogging in Littlerock, which again, was done by up to 4 roaming at large dogs described as "Pit Bull mixes" by the media. I say "up to" because witnesses saw 4 dogs running in a pack and 1 that was actively attacking when the police showed up. They all ran off and then were supposedly tracked back to a home where their owner was charged with murder. This owner's specific dogs had numerous prior violations and routinely ran loose.

Mr. Grula then predictably quotes hate group DogsBite.org, the completely unscientific and irrational website whose blatant goal is to exterminate all dogs deemed by them to be Pit Bulls by any means necessary. He regurgitates unverifiable statistics promoted by this website, and then calls millions of dogs "aggressive" and "violent." Grula then alleges that he is a geneticist, and claims that Pit Bulls have "a predisposition for aggression and viciousness in their DNA." This can absolutely not be proved, at all, and other geneticists would refute out of hand this ridiculous assertion. Grula's claim also pays no mind to the utter fact that there is little to no scientific basis for even identifying the dogs as "Pit Bulls" in the first place. Animal control workers can't even properly visually identify their own impounded dogs. Numerous studies (Victoria Voith, Kristopher Irizarry, Kimberly Olson, Julie Levy) illustrate this quite clearly.

He wraps up his pathetic rant by applauding Councilman Madison for calling for an "outright ban" on Pit Bulls and then suggests changing state law to achieve it. This comes after cheering L.A. County for having a mandatory spay and neuter law for all pets, although he clearly has no idea that this law now goes unenforced.

I find this type of reactionary profiling embarrassing, and quite shocking, coming from any civilized human being. Discrimination concerns aside, look at the identification process, or lack thereof, and look at the due process from a property rights standpoint, or lack thereof. You want to talk about public safety? How about we talk about the actual enforcement of already existing laws? Enforcing the leash laws, and the already existing breed-neutral "dangerous dog" law. Create an anti-chaining law. Mandate a sterilization policy for any dog caught running loose. These are all concepts that are based around responsibility. Human fatalities are preceded by an utter lack thereof. Educate, reach out to the communities, make them a part of the process and show your genuine care and concern by explaining the need to be more responsible. Shun breed discrimination. Shun grandstanding on the opportunity to provide a false sense of security. Shun exploitation, fear-mongering and hate.

Truth is that dogs are incredibly safe. Truth is that there are 72+ million of them in this country alone. Truth is that there is well over 300 million people in this same country. Think about how many daily interactions that creates. No, seriously. Take a moment. Dogs are incredibly safe. Pit Bulls are dogs. There are millions and millions of Pit Bulls in this country. Throw whatever cherry-picked, unverified, media-reported statistic out at me that you want... 99.999999999999% of all dogs, of all Pit Bulls, and no matter the breakdown—by breed or type or city or county or state—have never done anything to anyone. That is a stat that no one can refute.

Fortunately the truth will always shine through, and further, the truth will repeatedly lay waste to those aiming to criminalize millions of completely innocent dogs, or groups of anything else, who have been generically and unfairly deemed to universally fit some negative connotation as a whole. That is fundamentally wrong on every

level. People are individuals, and so are dogs. If you treat them in the opposite ways then you not only discriminate wildly but also resoundingly fail to even attempt to address the problems associated with the individual incidents or “attacks” that have jump-started these debates in the first place.

^This (or any reduced version of it) was denied publication in the Pasadena Weekly as a response to the above noted op-eds. I made sure to both email and call the Pasadena Weekly directly in order to submit it in the proper manner and to the proper personnel. They did nothing with it.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Josh Liddy

Stewart, Jana

From: Josh Liddy <claritysix@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 10:03 AM
To: Bogaard, Bill; Robinson, Jacque; McAustin, Margaret; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Tornek, Terry; Beck, Michael; Gutierrez, Julie; Mermell, Steve; Bagneris, Michele; cityclerk; Foster, Siobhan; Walsh, Eric
Subject: Documentation regarding my public comment on BSL and Pit Bulls from last night
Attachments: 2013 breed discrimination year in review.pdf; 2013 dog-related human fatalities.pdf; JoshLiddyPasadenaPitBullAgenda.pdf; ProfessionalOrganizationsAgainstBSL.pdf

Hello Council members,

I just wanted to attach the documentation that I personally was speaking about last night during public comment so that you can further examine it, as well as an op-ed that I've been trying to get the Pasadena newspapers to print, but none have shown any interest thus far.

Also, the stats and website that Mr. Madison consistently references is run by a woman that's made it her life mission to see that all Pit Bulls are banned and killed. Her name is Colleen Lynn and she is basically a demagogue who uses fear and images of horror to fearmonger politicians into passing the draconian legislation that she and her followers desire.

In (I believe it was) 2007 Ms. Lynn was out jogging in Seattle and ran up behind a woman and her leashed dog that was identified by the owner as being a Pit Bull mix. Instead of passing them on the left, Ms. Lynn opted to pass them on the right, between the dog and a concrete wall they were walking besides, creating a pretty tight squeeze. This is all from the police report, mind you... It's unclear whether Ms. Lynn outright fell, spooked the dog and the dog knocked her down, or something else, but she had her arm broken by the fall and the dog reacted out at her while she was on the ground, biting the same arm. Since this time Ms. Lynn has made it her life's work to attempt to ban all Pit Bulls, mixes, and anything that at any level possibly has any visual similarities to anything that she deems to be a Pit Bull. She pays no mind (much like Madison didn't last night) to the many reckless circumstances that so often surround any dog-related human fatality. Instead, he totally ignored my point and went right to her website, which is the first site that always pops up whenever anyone types in "dog bites" into Google. She has paid all the advertising fees to have her search placement be extremely prominent. This website calls everything that's not a little hairy dog a Pit Bull, and all her statistics are based around erroneous media mentions and patently no scientific evidence.

Ms. Lynn is quite literally one of the only faux voices that exists who continue promoting and desiring breed-specific legislation, thus why she is so often cited by those trying to pass it. No professional animal-related organization in this country backs the idea of criminalizing dogs by the way that they look. I've also attached a list of just a few of those organizations, and if you desire, please search any of the listed organizations for their stance on BSL and you can read further into why they do not support it.

If you spend just a moment on Ms. Lynn's website both herself and her followers are reminiscent of some of the most vile online creatures that you'd ever come across. For example, her website has an online dictionary called "maul talk" meant to degrade and ostracize all Pit Bull owners and anyone else not agreeing with her banning/killing agenda. In the dog world, this website represents the hub of profiling and death. Much like the KKK viewed/views African Americans as sub-humans, aggressive, dangerous, unintelligent, and on, and on, and on... This is the mentality behind her website towards Pit Bull-type dogs. And I'm not trying to compare dogs to humans, but simply trying to highlight the mentality and philosophy behind hate groups. Her website is

quite effectively a Pit Bull hate group. Don't take my word for it, feel free to research her name and I'm fairly confident you will come to the same conclusion. And if and when you do, you will see that for someone like Steve Madison to use her as any type of "source" is the biggest mistake that anyone contemplating this issue could possibly make.

Again, thank you for your time. It is my hope that you do not swallow Madison's claims without effectively researching this disgusting character that he so gleefully cites. Also, if any of you would ever want to meet me at the Pasadena Humane Society I'd love to show the true nature of these dogs, and we can take some out into the play yard and you could meet them yourselves. I find that the dogs are better teachers than any person could ever be.

Josh Liddy
Pasadena resident
937-524-1859

Stewart, Jana

From: skylohr2 <skylohr2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 9:55 PM
Subject: Pit Bull ban

As a dog owner (never a pit bull as of yet), I find breed specific bans the lowest common denominator.

Do your research! I do not understand this movement. I get that somehow these cases get big press but that does NOT make the position of many complainers valid - even if they are the 'squeaky wheels' of society.

If you are going to ban Pit Bulls, which ones? We call many breeds 'pit bull.'

Why not many other breeds whose **real stats** are similar?

Pit Bulls ARE NOT the most common dog bite. Be responsible and really do your homework....**PLEASE.**

Instead of a ban:

Aggressive Low Cost/Free Spay/Neuter programs.
Real Licensing requirements and follow up.
Stricter rules regarding care and abuse.
Rein in illegal dog fights.
Follow up on illegal kennels (>5 dogs where I live).
Real consequences for bad OWNERS.

Thank you for your time.
Jo Lohr
San Diego County

Stewart, Jana

From: Juliewoo23@aol.com
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 4:08 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 Ban
Attachments: get-attachment.aspx.jpeg

Hello,

I'm writing you today because I just read of your consideration of a Pit Bull ban. As an owner of two shelter Pit Bulls I find this news very scary. I do not have children and I cannot have children so my husband and I consider our dogs as our furry, four legged children. You may be rolling your eyes right now at that but thats how we feel about them.

We chose to adopt Pit Bulls because they are crowding our shelters and are often overlooked because they are what they are. We chose to give two lucky dogs a second chance and give them a warm, loving and stable home. And now you are telling me an officer could essentially knock on my door and tell me I have to give them up because they are Pit Bulls. They have done absolutely nothing, but because they are what they are they cannot live. If thats the case why stop the ban there, how about targeting all large breed dogs, German Shepherds, Dobermans, Rottweilers, Mastiffs etc... they all could potentially hurt another person and or animal.

I have owned many dogs in my life and I have to tell you my Chihuahua, Merv, rest his soul was by far the meanest dog I have ever owned. I also understand that a Chihuahua's bite would obviously do much less harm than a large breed dog, such as a Pit Bull. However my dogs have not harmed a soul, they are loving, wonderful dogs and they mean the world to my husband and I.

I'm sure you all have bigger fish to fry such as helping out your homeless population, targeting your gang and drug activity or fixing your street signs and pot holes. Not targeting dogs because they are large and have been portrayed in movies, media and society as aggressive fighters who's only mission in life is to kill anything in their sights. I'm not saying there aren't Pit Bulls out there that are not aggressive, because I know there are, but there are aggressive dogs of all breeds out there. But that does not give you or anyone the right to destroy a breed because they are Pit Bulls. Because if you believe that I suggest you visit your local shelters and take a look at the abandoned Pit Bulls, and I am sure you will find that the majority are harmless and just want someone to love them. Just like all of us.

My family thanks you for reading this letter and especially Jack and Cookie (our furry, four legged Pit Bulls) thank you too.

Sincerely,
Julie Margherone

Stewart, Jana

From: ontargetgolf@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 8:14 PM
To: De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry
Subject: BSL

To Pasadena officials,

- Our Country was not founded on the restriction and punishment of the masses based on the actions of a few.
- Focusing legislation on dogs that are "vicious" distracts attention from the real problem, which is irresponsible owners.
- These very breeds as a whole have proven their stability and good canine citizenry by becoming Search & Rescue dogs, Therapy dogs working inside hospitals, professional Herding dogs and family companions for years.
- Banning the so-called dangerous breed will merely hasten the upswing in popularity of some other breed that will be used for vicious attacks on people and other animals.
- There is no valid reason to deprive animal lovers of their well behaved pets.
- The reports and statistics are flawed. Among other things, a dog bite victim is usually unable to identify the breed of dog that bit him or her. Therefore, victims will name the type of dog that currently is on people's minds as being the dangerous dog.
- There are better and fairer ways to protect the public.
- I feel that banning a breed is like human racial discrimination, hell lets spay and neuter blacks because they play knockout a game where a black kid walks up to a upstanding citizen and punches him as hard as he can in order to knock them out. But lets not stop there, we will do the same to Muslims because they place bombs where crowds gather for no other reason other than to kill people to make a statement. How bout Italians, they all belong to the Mob and they like to kill anyone that disagree with them including their own family members. Irish people like to get drunk and fight with everybody. Politician's, now here is the one breed that we need to spay and neuter, after all they are nothing but professional liars.

BSL is discrimination to all dogs and it is wrong. Do your homework and stop being so narrow minded. The most decorated military dog was a Pit Bull.

Pat McGoldrick
856 905 7155

Stewart, Jana

From: Amanda Mildebrandt <amildebrandt@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 09, 2014 9:20 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill; district1; McAustin, Margaret; Madison, Steve; Sullivan, Noreen; De La Cuba, Vannia; Tornek, Terry
Subject: Discussion Regarding Pit Bull Ban

Dear Councilmen/ Councilwomen,

I am writing concerning some recent news regarding the desire to ban Pit Bulls but as that is illegal in California, Steve Madison is trying to require that Pit Bulls be spayed and neutered. Although I understand some of the concerns that he has brought up in recent meetings the information that he is presenting is incorrect on many occasions and if the owners were held responsible for their animals it would help considerably. To address some of the points Councilmen Madison has made:

“This whole debate started because I just got tired of reading articles where Pit Bulls killed kids. So we should first decide if there is a problem here, and I gotta tell ya, to me it looks like there is. And, I mean, we know the reasons why. Pit Bulls were bred over hundreds of years to be fighting dogs, they have the strongest jaw of all dogs.”

First- It is absolutely horrible any time a child or any person is attacked or killed by an animal. I have a two year old and two pit bulls, my dogs absolutely adore her and wouldn't hurt her. I trust them with her and my life. With that said they are dogs and she is a toddler, I do not leave my child with the dogs unattended. I also have a miniature pincher, in which has attempted to bite my toddler on more than one occasion. Of all fatal dog attacks for toddlers per the American Humane Association, 88% of those children were unsupervised, where were the adults?

Yes, a dog that is unneutered or unsprayed is more likely to bite it isn't only pit bulls that bite, so you specifically requiring pit bulls be spayed and neutered is discrimination.

Second- It has been proven on more than one occasion that a Pit Bulls jaws do not lock and they are not the strongest of all dogs. National Geographic did a test on three breeds the German Shepard, the Rottweiler and the American Pit Bull Terrier. The results the Pit Bull's jaws were the weakest. If you would like to check this it is found <http://dogfacts.wordpress.com/2008/02/03/national-geographics-dr-brady-barrs-bite-pressure-tests/>.

“I had some of my staff do some research as well, and we found some data from 2006-2008. I believe this comes from the American Humane Society. In those 3 calendar years there were 88 fatal dog attacks in the U.S., and that of those 88 Pit Bull-type dogs were responsible for 59 percent of the fatalities, or 52.”

As I cannot find the information he provided anywhere, below is a direct quote from the CDC regarding dog bite fatalities and monitoring them:

“Although, fatal attacks on humans appear to be a breed-specific problem (pit bull-type dogs and Rottweiler's), other breeds may bite and cause fatalities at a higher rate. Because of difficulties inherent in determining a dog's breed with certainty, enforcement of breed-specific ordinances raise's constitutional and practical issues. Fatal attacks represent a small proportion of dog bite injuries to humans therefore, should not be the primary factor public policy concerning dangerous dogs. Many practical alternatives to breed-specific ordinances exist and hold promise for prevention of dog bites.” This can be found <http://www.cdc.gov/homeandrecreationalafety/images/dogbreeds-a.pdf>.

Please take the time to review the information I have provided and review some of the current laws that are not being upheld that would also prevent dog bites on an overall level not just with one breed being targeted. This breed is very loyal and loving when raised the right way with responsible owners.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Amanda Mildebrandt

Stewart, Jana

From: Jessica Carla de Lima-Moran <jessicacarla@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 12:17 AM
Subject: Pit Bull Ban

Hello,

My name is Jessica and I am a business owner, teacher, and animal lover. My self and my husband have four cats, one pit bull, and one chihuahua. They are our family.

I writing to express my complete disagreement with Pasadena's proposed pit bull ban. It is really surprising to me that a forward thinking city like Pasadena would even consider such a piece of legislation. There is so much information, so many studies that show pit bulls are loving, loyal dogs. Even President Obama and the Center for Disease Control oppose to Breed Specific Legislation.

Uneducated, cruel owners are to blame for violent DOGS, not pit bulls but DOGS in general. And these owners would ignore a ban regardless.... these bans are useless...

Pit bulls are family pets, service animals, they have saved lives and they deserve a chance to overcome sensational media stories and fear mongering of certain community members.

Please do not make this terrible mistake !

Thank you for your time.

--

Jessica Carla de Lima-Moran

Stewart, Jana

From: Elaine Godfrey <vegas1vizn@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 8:26 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill; De La Cuba, Vannia; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; christiancrus@cityofpasadena.net; West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; ttornek@cityofpasadena.net
Subject: Save pit bulls ??????????

I love pit bulls ,if you don't let me tell u why .i would like to share with you ,what you are about to do . Have you every love a dog when you are little .i am sure you have , so what Is the differ of that dog and a other dog .The breed because that is all see ,I have 5 pit bulls at my house . None of them have ever hurt a living thing . If you think there are mean . Well they are not just because you heard bad things on the new. Have you ever looked at the good they done . Also do you knew they where the nursing dog before everyone started this crap. They also knew dog act how they are trained too . Also if you do that you would have to take all those dog from there kids and family . Plus how ever can put all those dogs down is cold hearted . So please save the pit bulls

By Abigail Oneill
I am 11years old

Stewart, Jana

From: Lisa Daly-Pshide <lcdpshide@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 6:31 PM
To: De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry
Subject: Pitbull Ban

I know this won't change your minds. Nothing ever changes bigotry, except the experience and wisdom that frees you from it. I'm not even a resident of Pasadena, so why should you care, unless you innately value life?

I never sought out a pitbull. I've had a myriad of breeds throughout my life, but never wanted a pitbull, because I read the papers, they're dangerous, right? I never wanted them killed or banned, because I'm not that kind of person, but clearly, they were not a breed you wanted as a family dog; not with children.

But then one day I went to pick up my kids from my mother's house, after work, and because I had taught them from a very early age to value all life forms, and lend a hand to any and all in need, they knew that if you see a stray, you help, in whatever way you can, and this stray had wandered onto my mother's property, so they petted her, and fed her, and made her feel like she belonged. They made her feel like every living thing should feel -- welcome.

She was scared and hungry and among strangers, but despite that, when I kneeled down to say hi to her, she came to me and she wagged her tail and she licked me, smack dab on the lips. Her warm brown eyes were welcoming and sad and thankful, all in the same moment. "She's a pitbull", I thought, "should I be careful?" But instinct, thank God, took over, and I knew in a moment that it is character, not breed, no matter what your species, that matters.

I brought her home to our three dogs: A Rottweiler (surely not, they're just as dangerous as pitbulls, I've read the articles!), a lab and a St. Bernard. She curtseyed and bowed and let them know she knew she was the new one, she was the visitor. She slept with my 15 year old son, who without hesitation invited her into his bed, where she curled up tightly next to him and slept all night, for several weeks, grateful for the warmth and companionship that life had robbed her from to that point.

She was funny and energetic. She made me laugh. But we had three dogs already, so we tried to find her a home. But she was a pitbull, and who wants a pitbull? They're dangerous and frightening and you can't keep them in a family, around kids. Only this pitbull swam and played with a Rottweiler, was gracefully ignored by an aging lab, and tried to engage a lethargic, aging St. Bernard, with comical grace. She slept with kids, and sat on laps, and radiated a loving energy that was infectious.

We named her Claire -- her rescue name, only until we could find a home. And we did. Our home. And then, as our aging canine members passed on, we actively, purposefully (can you believe it?) went out and got a pitbull puppy, Emma, because how could we not expand our family with the finest, most loyal and loving breed we had ever met?

Bias and bigotry are nothing more than skewed perspective, and unless you listen to others who have crossed beyond the line and done the research and lived beyond the lie, you will never know. I have pitbulls. They are the greatest pet experience I have ever had. They are family. And you don't stand by and watch anyone hurt your family.

If a specific dog is vicious, it needs to be dealt with, just like a human does when he or she is vicious. There are far more atrocities inflicted by humans than dogs every day. If you are not going to ban humans, then it begs the question, why ban pitbulls? They temperament test better than most breeds, and if you asked and were wiling to listen, there are thousands upon thousands of pitbull owners who will happily testify to the abject beauty of having a pitbull as part of your family. There is a reason that pitbull owners are actually rabid when the breed they defend is, in fact, not -- pitbulls are, in a word, amazing.

Punish the act, not the breed. I would like to believe you will sleep better at night and the world will be a better place for doing so. But maybe that's just my inner pitbull talking. After all, my pitbulls are the wisest people I know.

Thank you.

Lisa Daly-Pshide

Stewart, Jana

From: Sandra Russell <friskyseagle@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 6:10 PM
To: De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry
Cc: Sandra Russell
Subject: Opposition to law restricting Pit Bulls...

Do you want your dog banned, confiscated, and killed? The Pasadena city council is considering enacting a law restricting Pit Bulls. City council member Steve Madison and the Mayor may try to change state law to allow Pit Bull bans.

It's my understanding that the City of Pasadena is looking to ban the Pit Bull breed. I'm writing to urge you not to do that for ANY breed of dog. I have had Pit bulls over 35 years. Now I am 65 years old, and my daughter has 2 pit bulls. I take care of them often. I love the best breed, Pit Bulls!

It is a big problem with Pit Bull owners! It is not a problem with pit bulls.

Thanks so much,

Julia Russell

Stewart, Jana

From: Michael S Shannon <publknme2000@att.net>
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 4:22 PM
To: De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry
Subject: BSL

what gives you people the right to tell people what breeds of Dog one can own?
I don't get a say in what type of child you get to raise. or if you should even be allowed to Bear children depending on ones character...

Punish the deeds not the breeds People. Banning sudaphed didn't get rid of the meth problem in California, just made it easier for kids to make, and get injured.

Thank you for your time.

Michael S Shannon

Stewart, Jana

From: spruill811@aol.com
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 2:32 PM
To: De La Cuba, Vannia
Subject: BSL

It has come to my attention that there is a consideration to unshirk the state law which prevents any breed specific legislation to inevitably enact a ban on pit bulls and pit bull type dogs. I am writing to protest this very cruel and discriminatory act. It has been proven time and time again that this does nothing to protect society but everything to waste taxpayer money while killing innocent family pets and ruining family homes. **How could you be so cruel!**

The solution would be more education and enforcement of laws that are already in place; containment of animals, chaining laws and leash laws. The animals are innocent in all of this. It is the irresponsible owners that are to blame.

I own a pit bull who has never harmed anyone and never will because I train, maintain, socialize and supervise him at all times. I abide by all the laws that are put in place for him not to do so. Why should I be penalized because of some else's irresponsible owner behavior..

Pit bull's are no more dangerous than any other dog species. I hope you can take time to research the studies that prove this and focus your time and attention on enforcing the laws that are already in place.

Thank you for your time,

Nicole Spruill
pitbull owner

Stewart, Jana

From: megusmaximus . <megusmaximus@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 2:36 PM
To: De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry
Subject: Experts Against Breed-Specific Legislation
Attachments: ExpertOrgsAgainstBSL.pdf

I understand that the Pasadena City Council is petitioning the state of California to repeal the state law prohibiting breed-specific legislation (BSL) in an attempt to enact a pit bull ban in Pasadena. As a resident of nearby North Hollywood and the owner of a pit bull (who has achieved his AKC Canine Good Citizen obedience title), I hope you will re-consider this line of thinking.

Numerous expert organizations dedicated to protecting the health and welfare of humans and animals oppose BSL, including the American Bar Association, American Humane Association, American Kennel Club, American Veterinary Association, ASPCA, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Animal Control Association. I have attached a document that lists the many expert organizations who oppose BSL, with excerpts from their position statements. I would suggest that you take the time to read their position statements in full and use their extensive, on-the-ground experience as your guide in creating safer communities.

You will find as you read the opinions of experts that there are many ways to ensure safe communities that do not involve BSL. Techniques that are more cost-effective and data-proven include:

- Ensuring animal control departments have the resources they need to investigate reports of violations of existing animal protection laws (such as those related to abuse, negligence, roaming dogs, chained dogs, and aggressive/dangerous dogs) and also have the resources to follow up on incidents where owners have been cited;

- Implementing spay/neuter programs – with a strong outreach component – that are affordable and site-based; and

- Creating accessible, affordable training programs to reduce the number of dogs returned to shelters for behavior problems and decrease unwanted behavior in dogs in public.

I encourage you to speak to the organizations above, as they have expertise in working with community leaders such as yourself to find effective solutions.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Megan Uebelacker

muebelacker99@post.harvard.edu

muebelacker@alum.wellesley.edu

Flores, Valerie

From: megusmaximus . <megusmaximus@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2014 3:32 PM
To: Madison, Steve
Cc: De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry
Subject: Re: Spay/Neuter Ordinance for Pit Bull and Pit Bull Cross-Breed Dogs
Attachments: Impact of MSN on Los Angeles.pdf; Building Safe Communities.pdf; Experts Opposed to MSN.pdf

Dear Mr. Madison:

Thank you for response. My thoughts follow, and while this is a lengthy email, I do hope that you will take the time to read it. I have put in bold the most relevant and important points that I hope you will consider, should you be pressed for time. (Note: I received similar responses from some of your fellow City Council members, and have cc'ed them or their field representatives as well.)

I read your email carefully, and I must say that it seems that you have not taken the time to consider the expert opinions of organizations dedicated preserving the safety of humans and animals. If you had, you would not continue down this path, because you would know **that every major organization opposes breed-specific legislation in any form, including mandatory spay/neuter laws.** While their focus is on general mandatory spay/neuter laws, the unintended, negative consequences can be applied to breed-specific mandatory spay/neuter legislation.

A summary of the negative impacts of mandatory spay/neuter follows:

A decrease in licensing revenue as owners who cannot afford either the fix or the fine attempt to remain under the radar.

- **Alberta, Calgary**, which does not have mandatory spay/neuter, receives approximately **\$4 million** in licensing fees due to their pro-active, breed-neutral, education-focused approach to animal services.
- **Los Angeles**, on the other hand, has mandatory spay/neuter and only receives approximately **\$2 million** in revenues from licensing (source: Found Animals Foundation).

Increased animal abandonment when owners cannot pay for either the fee or to fix their animal.

- Please see attached document "Impact of MSN on Los Angeles.pdf" to see the negative impacts on shelter intake and euthanasia in Los Angeles after mandatory spay/neuter was implemented.
- It is worth noting that **major improvements were seen, however, when No Kill Los Angeles was established in 2012, which promotes and provides voluntary, affordable, site-specific spay/neuter services.**

No measurable impact on public safety.

- **No study has ever found a decrease in dog bites or attacks due to mandatory spay/neuter.** While sterilization undoubtedly decreases aggression in many dogs, mandatory spay/neuter is not an effective way to achieve increased sterilization rates.

You will hear these sentiments echoed over and over again by expert organizations who have studied this type of legislation and its negative impact on communities. I have attached a **very brief summary of statements by experts who oppose mandatory spay/neuter, such as the ASPCA and American Veterinary Association, with links to their full statements** ("Experts Opposed to MSN.pdf").

I also strongly encourage the Council to read the attached document, "**Building Safe Communities.pdf**", which includes **information about the extremely successful techniques employed by the city of Alberta, Calgary in increasing public safety and decreasing unwanted pets – all of which were breed-neutral, voluntary, education-based strategies.**

Another wonderful resource is Downtown Dog Rescue's web site, where you can find a summary of their tremendous success in reducing the number of unwanted animals in shelters through voluntary, site-based interventions (<http://www.downtowndogrescue.org/2013-shelter-intervention-program-stats/>).

As to the specific arguments made in your response, I must respectfully point out several flaws (again, other City Council members have made similar arguments, and I hope they will read the following as well):

You state: "*Many other cities and 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.*"

Simply because an ordinance has been enacted does not mean that there is a reasonable basis for the legislation. All it means is that there was a successful vote to pass it. A "**reasonable basis**" would be, for example, a study that shows a **statistical corollary between mandatory spay/neuter policies and an increase in public safety and a decrease in unwanted animals.** You have offered no such evidence.

You state: "*Statistics suggest that pit bull breeds are responsible for over half of the fatal dog on human attacks in the United States.*"

There are no credible statistics that suggest this, as breed identification is notoriously unreliable. In many cases, there are often conflicting breed identifications from Animal Control, the owners, neighbors, witnesses, and visual representations of the dogs involved. As to the reliability of statistics, you may wish to consider the words of an advisory council assembled in the town of Bonner Springs, Kansas, whose city council recently repealed its breed-specific legislation:

*"The research for articles and statistics presented difficulties as the majority were anti-BSOs [breed-specific ordinances]. The few that were in favor of BSOs generally justified their positions with use of statistical data generated by DogsBite.org. Research of this website found the data presented 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."* (emphasis mine)

It is also worth noting that in the frequently-cited report "Breeds of dogs involved in fatal human attacks in the United States between 1979 and 1998" (Sacks JJ, Sinclair L, Gilchrist J, Golab GC, Lockwood R., J Am Vet Med Assoc. 2000 Sep 15;217(6):836-40), the authors stated in their conclusion:

*"Because of difficulties inherent in determining a dog's breed with certainty, enforcement of breed-specific ordinances raises constitutional and practical issues. Fatal attacks represent a small proportion of dog bite injuries to humans and, therefore, should not be the primary factor driving public policy concerning dangerous dogs. **Many practical alternatives to breed-specific ordinances exist and hold promise for prevention of dog bites.**"* (emphasis mine)

As you will see in the attached document, "Building Safer Communities.pdf", legislation that addresses focuses on dangerous dogs of all breeds, rather specific parts of the canine population, is far more effective in increasing public safety.

You state: *"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."*

Again, I must reiterate, study after study demonstrates that mandatory spay/neuter DOES NOT decrease the unwanted animal population – it, in fact, increases the population. Spay/neuter programs that are voluntary, site-based, and affordable or free are the only programs that have proven to significantly reduce unwanted animals (in addition to education and outreach to communities with the highest rates of shelter intake).*

To summarize:

The consequences of continuing to pursue mandatory spay/neuter legislation is dangerous, even just for one portion of the canine population, is foolhardy. **Not only will it fail to achieve the intended outcomes (increase public safety, decrease the unwanted animal population), it will in fact exacerbate those problems.** This is not my personal opinion – this has been confirmed in numerous studies.

I am somewhat perplexed as to why you would pursue a course of action that has failed in other municipalities, and why you are not instead proposing actions that are proven to increase public safety and decrease the unwanted pet population, such as those described in the attached document "Building Safer Communities.pdf". We have a number of wonderful organizations in the L.A. area who are leading the charge in these types of programs, such as Best Friends Animal Society, FIX Long Beach, and Downtown Dog Rescue.

I sincerely hope you will consider an alternative course of action, and discontinue your pursuit of an ordinance that will not achieve its intended outcomes, especially when there are viable, cost-effective techniques that will indeed achieve those outcomes.

Thank you for your time,

Megan Uebelacker

muebelacker@alum.wellesley.edu

Resident, North Hollywood

Leadership Team Member, Los Angeles Responsible Pit Bull Owners

Wellesley College (BA, *magna cum laude*), 1995

Harvard University (Cert., Dramaturgy; Teaching Fellow), 1999

University of New Orleans (MA), 2005

Attached:

Impact of MSN on Los Angeles.pdf

Building Safer Communities.pdf

Experts Opposed to MSN.pdf

** Some say that San Francisco's mandatory spay/neuter law for pit bulls has been a success. After extensive research, however, I could not find statistical evidence or case studies to confirm this assertion.*

On Wed, Jan 15, 2014 at 12:35 PM, Madison, Steve <smadison@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

Stewart, Jana

From: marysia wojcik <marysiawojcik@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 17, 2014 11:20 PM
To: marysia wojcik
Subject: Re: Breed Specific Legislation is a Bad Idea

To the City of Pasadena Regarding Proposed Breed Specific Legislation:

This is an outdated and ineffective legislative side step that places the onus on specific breeds of dogs when what needs to be addressed is the human behind the animal.

Based on a statement that the White House put out in August, 2013, it would seem that President Obama agrees. "Breed-Specific Legislation Is a Bad Idea" begins the White House's official response to an online petition, signed by more than 30,000 people, asking for laws that target dogs by breed to be outlawed at a federal level.

Here's the White House's full statement:

We don't support breed-specific legislation -- research shows that bans on certain types of dogs are largely ineffective and often a waste of public resources.

In 2000, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention looked at twenty years of data about dog bites and human fatalities in the United States. They found that fatal attacks represent a very small proportion of dog bite injuries to people and that it's virtually impossible to calculate bite rates for specific breeds.

The CDC also noted that the types of people who look to exploit dogs aren't deterred by breed regulations - when their communities establish a ban, these people just seek out new, unregulated breeds. And the simple fact is that dogs of any breed can become dangerous when they're intentionally or unintentionally raised to be aggressive.

For all those reasons, the CDC officially recommends against breed-specific legislation -- which they call inappropriate.

As an alternative to breed-specific policies, the CDC recommends a community-based approach to prevent dog bites. And ultimately, we think that's a much more promising way to build stronger communities of pets and pet owners.

Lisa LaFontaine, who is president of the Washington Humane Society and a longtime opponent of breed specific legislation, told The Huffington Post she thinks this statement will provide a big boost.

"The White House is such a bully pulpit for important issues," she says, with her daughter's pit bull, Lila, napping nearby. "And certainly for them to come down against this type of discrimination I think will give pause to any communities that are thinking about putting something like this in place, and certainly will fuel the work that's already being done by advocates to overturn legislation that already exists...It's a really happy day."

Thank you for not saddling our community with such an unenlightened piece of outdated legislation.

Sincerely,

Marysia Wojcik

Former Chair

South Pasadena Animal Commission
