

Iraheta, Alba

Subject: FW: Pit Bull Restricting

From: Trish Lastra [<mailto:smileysoul916@hotmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 9:02 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 Restricting

This message is to inform you on how ridiculous it is to Breed Restrict. You always want to come after Pit Bulls like they are a problem.

People are the problem not the animals. Any Breed of animal from domestic to wild can bite. I'm a Pit Bull Companion owner and have never encountered so much love and help that my dog gives to me from any other breed. This information I'm about to post is taken from the American Humane Society and is as follows: Any breed of dog can bite, and research suggests BSL does little to protect the community from dog-bite incidents.

In fact, BSL can often have unintended consequences -- such as black-market interest and in-discriminant breeding practices -- resulting in subsequent breed overpopulation that leads to increases in the number of homeless, stray and euthanized dogs. Enforcement of BSL has been shown to be very costly and extremely difficult to enforce. One county in Maryland spent more than \$560,000 maintaining pit bulls (not including payroll, cross-agency costs and utilities), while fees generated only \$35,000.5 Responsible breeding and ownership, public education and enforcement of existing laws are the most effective ways of reducing dog bites.

American Humane supports local legislation to protect communities from dangerous animals, but does not advocate laws that target specific breeds of dogs. Get it together people and STOP this madness you are creating.

Iraheta, Alba

Subject: FW: Pit bull bans

From: Kendra Lewis [mailto:kendralewis311@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 7:51 PM

To: De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry

Subject: Pit bull bans

To whom it may concern,

It has recently been brought to my attention that the city of Pasadena is considering enacting a law restricting Pit Bulls. As a new California resident I am saddened and disappointed that one loosely labeled breed get punished for just being a certain type of dog.

It seems every decade a new breed takes the blame, simply because it is popular, misused and abused to fight, or presented biaslyby the media. Rottweilers, german shepards, and dobermans have all faced similar discrimination over the years and now it is the pit bull.

Many breeds or mixture of breeds present similar characteristics to "pit bulls". So now we are simply going to go after a family pet, service dog, or child's best friend because it appears to look like what the media or government thinks is a pit bull and be punished for absolutely no crime? Where does the cruelty end? How do you govern such a witch hunt? That leaves much to interpretation.

You are punishing families who provide dogs with a loving home and are responsible owners. They care for their dogs properly, pay pet insurance, etc. Why not instead punish the puppy mills and novice breeders or the dog fighters who are destroying our beloved dogs. Instead you want to take the easy way out and destroy families thinking you are fixing the problem. This only leads to more illegal breeding, fighting etc.

If you want to regulate something put that money towards shelters that offer low cost spaying or neutering, cheaper rabies shots, dog behavior classes etc. This money can go to much better things then tearing apart families based on the appearance of a dog.

You are truly creating a slippery slope as to how far you can invade some ones privacy and life without any wrong doing. One breed cannot take the blame and become a scape goat for ultimately a bigger problem when it comes to animal care and cruelty.

Please consider what you are doing to innocent people who abide by all laws and how you are letting the people actually breaking the law off easy by putting all attention on the families who do nothing but love their dog too much.

I'm sure you will receive lots of opinions on either side but remember the small picture as well as the bigger picture here. What problem are you really solving and who are you really hurting? Yes, my suggestions require more effort but ultimately they lead to a more positive outcome.

thank you,

--

Kendra L.

Buchanan, Rita

Subject: FW: The targeting of Pit Bulls is wrong

From: Josh Liddy [<mailto:claritysix@gmail.com>]

Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:12 PM

To: Bogaard, Bill; district1@cityofpasadena.net; district2@cityofpasadena.net; Morales, Margo; district3@cityofpasadena.net; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; district4@cityofpasadena.net; Sullivan, Noreen; district5@cityofpasadena.net; De La Cuba, Vannia; district6@cityofpasadena.net; Madison, Steve; district7@cityofpasadena.net; Tornek, Terry

Subject: The targeting of Pit Bulls is wrong

We all want safe communities for everyone--those that we love, those that we know, those that we don't know. Safety is of the utmost importance to anyone that has a genuine care for people and for animals alike. With that being said, Pasadena City Councilman Steve Madison wants to ban my dogs. He'd likely be just as happy if they were dead, and all based around the way that they look. California state law prohibits this, but the Pasadena City Council, knowing Madison's crystal clear intent for these dogs, still voted with him to craft a future breed-discriminatory law that would mandate that all dogs they deem to be Pit Bulls be spayed and neutered. Councilwoman Jacque Robinson was the only dissenting vote. This came a month after they tabled a proposal for the same law in relation to all dogs.

You may think, what's wrong with spay and neuter? I'd say nothing. My own dogs are all sterilized. The problem is that this Councilman is on a crusade to vilify Pit Bulls and eliminate them from his city. He has admitted as much, and on numerous different occasions. Any breed-specific law that is put forth is done so in conjunction with the mass demonization of whatever type of dog they are targeting. Pit Bulls take the brunt of this from around the country. The unjust stereotypes perpetuated by this action surely results in their further abandonment and mistreatment, and the sheer existence of such ideas imply that they are different from other dogs. This couldn't be further from the truth. Millions of them exist in the United States, 99.9% of which have never harmed anyone.

Mandatory serialization of Pit Bulls, or of any dog, does not reduce attacks on people or pets. What does is the enforcement of actual laws (many times already existing but rarely enforced) that focus on the individual behavior of both the animal itself, and more importantly, its owner. Enforcing leash laws, the anti-chaining law, and the "dangerous dog" law would go a long way in addressing issues that could possibly manifest into something more severe. Mandating the sterilization of any dog caught running loose would also be a worthy idea. These are all concepts that are based around responsibility. Human fatalities by dog are always preceded by an utter lack thereof.

Roaming dogs, chained and tethered yard dogs, and the non-supervision of children are consistently the common denominators in almost every single dog-related fatality that you can pull up from any random calendar year. These are dynamics that allow any individual dog, with whatever level of bad temperament, to act freely and without any level of supervision. To dismiss focus on this is to do a massive disservice to both your community and all of the law-abiding dog owners (of all breeds and types) in Pasadena, and further, across

the country. I'd argue that from a "public safety" standpoint the covering up of that information, the ignoring of it (both the information and the reckless owners themselves), is the biggest crime of all.

The desire 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 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.

I will also be attending any and every meeting that I can going forward, in an effort to give public comment on different factions of this issue. I'd also love to meet with any of you on an individual basis, or however it is done, to further discuss the shortcomings of this type of legislation. Please feel free to reach out to me at anytime. I want to help in any way that you think that I can. Thank you for your time and considerations.

Josh Liddy

Pasadena resident

Iraheta, Alba

From: cityclerk
Subject: FW: 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

2013 breed discrimination year in review

New state laws prohibiting breed-discriminatory legislation:

Connecticut, Nevada, Rhode Island

Municipalities repealing existing breed-discriminatory legislation:

Amesbury, Massachusetts
Boston, Massachusetts
Canton, Massachusetts
Everett, Massachusetts
Haverhill, Massachusetts
Lynn, Massachusetts
Medway, Massachusetts
Rockland, Massachusetts
Whitman, Massachusetts
Winthrop, Massachusetts
Basehor, Kansas
Osawatomie, Kansas
Riverside, Missouri
Annapolis, Missouri
Waunakee, Wisconsin
Darlington, Wisconsin
Bessemer, Pennsylvania
Wooster, Ohio
Orrville, Ohio
Welsh, Louisiana
Newark, Ohio
Bloomer, Wisconsin
Dodge City, Kansas

Municipalities rejecting attempted breed-discriminatory legislation:

Waterloo, Iowa
Camanche, Iowa
Ringstead, Iowa
Baker City, Oregon
Breckenridge, Colorado
Greybull, Wyoming
Watertown, Wisconsin
Rockaway Beach, Missouri
Westwego, Louisiana
Columbus, Nebraska
Great Bend, Kansas
Flint, Michigan
Lansing, Michigan
Royal Oak, Michigan
Broward County, Florida
Bronwood, Georgia

States rejecting attempted breed-discriminatory legislation:

North Carolina, Tennessee, Rhode Island, Oklahoma, Massachusetts

There were at least 39 municipalities that have decided to repeal or reject breed-discriminatory legislation. This number is actually much higher than what is listed here. The reason for this is that there are quite a few places that had a proposal or recommendation that was breed-discriminatory that has not been officially rejected, but rather “tabled indefinitely.” Only places that officially rejected a proposal or recommendation were counted. It is also important to note that there have been hundreds of places (at the very least) that amended their dangerous dog laws in 2013. Only a very small minority ever even consider targeting certain breeds or types of dogs.

New municipalities passing breed-discriminatory legislation:

Riverside County, California (mandatory spay/neuter)

Riverside City, California (mandatory spay/neuter)

Dover, Arkansas (ban)

Garland County, Arkansas (confinement)

Murfreesboro, Arkansas (ban)

Livingston County, Kentucky (restrictions)

Clay, Alabama (ban, in litigation)

Bluefield, West Virginia (ban)

Hornbeak, Tennessee (restrictions)

Schuyler, Nebraska (restrictions)

*These 10 passages affect a total of 14 breeds, and their mixes, as well as Wolf hybrids: American Pit Bull Terriers, American Staffordshire Terriers, Staffordshire Terriers, Bull Terriers, Dobermans, Rottweilers, German Shepherds, Akitas, Chows, American Bulldogs, Dogo Argentino, Presa Canario, Cane Corso, American Bandogge.

www.stopbsl.org

The Genuine Known Circumstances Behind The 2013 Dog-Related Human Fatalities

Victim Age?	Roaming, Loose Dog?	Chained, Resident, Yard Dog?	Unsupervised Children?	Picture of Dog?
65 YR.	NO	NO	NO	YES
4 YR.	NO	YES	YES	NO
91 YR.*	NO	NO	NO	NO
2 YR.	NO	YES	YES	NO
7 YR.	NO	YES	YES	NO
1 YR.	NO	N/A	YES	YES
2 YR.	NO	NO	YES	NO
7 YR.	YES	N/A	N/A	YES
38 YR.	NO	YES	NO	YES
4 YR.	NO	YES	YES	NO
2 YR.	NO	NO	YES	YES
35 YR.	NO	YES	NO	NO
63 YR.	YES	NO	NO	YES
80 YR.	YES	NO	NO	YES
5 YR.	NO	NO	YES	NO
6 YR.	NO	YES	YES	YES
5 YR.	NO	YES	YES	YES
63 YR.	NO	NO	NO	NO
96 YR.*	YES	NO	NO	NO
5 YR.	YES	NO	YES	NO
2 YR.	NO	NO	N/A	YES
2 YR.	NO	YES	YES	YES
5 YR.	NO	NO	YES	NO
56 YR.	NO	NO	NO	YES
25 YR.*	NO	YES	NO	YES
65 YR.*	YES	NO	NO	NO
4 YR.	NO	YES	YES	NO
75 YR.	YES	NO	NO	YES
2 YR.*	NO	NO	YES	NO
2 MO.	NO	NO	YES	NO
41 YR.	NO	YES	NO	NO
64 YR.	NO	NO	NO	YES

32 Total Incidents	7	12	16	15 YES, 17 NO
--------------------	---	----	----	---------------

26 of the 32 fatalities involve at least 1 of the 3 reckless circumstances, and many of the fatalities involved more than 1 in tandem.

Roaming, loose dogs killed 7 people this year.

Chained, resident dogs killed 12 people this year.

The non-supervision of children led to 16 deaths this year, victims who were all under the age of 7.

*5 of the 32 fatalities were potentially due to natural causes or foul play, maybe in full or maybe in partial, it's ultimately unknown.

17 of the 32 incidents included no photo of the alleged offending dog or dogs.

In conclusion...

81.25% (red) of all dog-related fatalities for 2013 involved either roaming dogs, chained/resident dogs, and/or the non-supervision of children. 18.75% (yellow) of all dog-related fatalities for 2013 (or 6) involved no reported element of recklessness. Over 50% of the dog-related fatalities for 2013 had zero public evidence of what the offending dog or dogs actually looked like, only breed claims coming in the form of a media mention.

We all want safe communities for everyone--those that we love, those that we know, those that we don't know. Safety is of the utmost importance to anyone that has a genuine care for people and for animals alike. With that being said, Pasadena City Councilman Steve Madison wants to ban my dogs. He'd likely be just as happy if they were dead, and all based around the way that they look. California state law prohibits this, but the Pasadena City Council, knowing Madison's crystal clear intent for these dogs, still voted with him to craft a future breed-discriminatory law that would mandate that all dogs they deem to be Pit Bulls be spayed and neutered. Councilwoman Jacque Robinson was the only dissenting vote. This came a month after they tabled a proposal for the same law in relation to all dogs.

You may think, what's wrong with spay and neuter? I'd say nothing. My own dogs are all sterilized. The problem is that this Councilman is on a crusade to vilify Pit Bulls and eliminate them from his city. He has admitted as much, and on numerous different occasions. Any breed-specific law that is put forth is done so in conjunction with the mass demonization of whatever type of dog they are targeting. Pit Bulls take the brunt of this from around the country. The unjust stereotypes perpetuated by this action surely results in their further abandonment and mistreatment, and the sheer existence of such ideas imply that they are different from other dogs. This couldn't be further from the truth. Millions of them exist in the United States, 99.9% of which have never harmed anyone.

Mandatory serialization of Pit Bulls, or of any dog, does not reduce attacks on people or pets. What does is the enforcement of actual laws (many times already existing but rarely enforced) that focus on the individual behavior of both the animal itself, and more importantly, its owner. Enforcing leash laws, the anti-chaining law, and the "dangerous dog" law would go a long way in addressing issues that could possibly manifest into something more severe. Mandating the sterilization of any dog caught running loose would also be a worthy idea. These are all concepts that are based around responsibility. Human fatalities by dog are always preceded by an utter lack thereof.

Roaming dogs, chained and tethered yard dogs, and the non-supervision of children are consistently the common denominators in almost every single dog-related fatality that you can pull up from any random calendar year. These are dynamics that allow any individual dog, with whatever level of bad temperament, to act freely and without any level of supervision. To dismiss focus on this is to do a massive disservice to both your community and all of the law-abiding dog owners (of all breeds and types) in Pasadena, and further, across the country. I'd argue that from a "public safety" standpoint the covering up of that information, the ignoring of it (both the information and the reckless owners themselves), is the biggest crime of all.

The desire 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 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.

Josh Liddy, SwayLove.org

Not a single dog or human safety expert organization has come out saying breed-specific legislation is effective.
All mainstream and professional animal welfare groups are totally against breed-specific legislation...

American Animal Hospital Association
American Bar Association
American Canine Foundation
American Dog Breeders Association
American Dog Owners Association
American Humane Association
American Kennel Club (AKC)
American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA)
American Temperament Test Society
American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA)
American Working Dog Federation
Animal Farm Foundation
Animal Legal Defense Fund
Association of Pet Dog Trainers
Best Friends Animal Society
California Veterinary Medical Association
Coalition for Living Safely with Dogs
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)
Humane Society of the United States (HSUS)
International Association of Animal Behavior Consultants
International Association of Canine Professionals
In Defense of Animals
National Animal Control Association
National Animal Interest Alliance
National Association of Dog Obedience Instructors
National Canine Research Council
No Kill Advocacy Center
United Kennel Club (UKC)
United States Department of Justice

Jomsky, Mark

From: skylohr2 <skylohr2@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 3:09 PM
To: Morales, Margo
Subject: Re: Pit Bull ban

I have received many replies to my original email. I thank all that replied.

However, I find it interesting that:

NONE of you have addressed the fact that you are targeting Pit Bulls.

NONE of you have responded with the factual information you are using for this action.

NONE of you have sent me any documentation that the Pit Bull population is any more of a hazard than any other breed.

ALL of you have addressed other areas/municipalities that have taken similar steps. That does not make anything more valid... just because others have done it.

I asked you to do your homework.

If there is to mandatory **anything** for Pit Bulls, you need to make it mandatory for **all dogs**. And if the program is really only regarding spaying/neutering, that program SHOULD apply to all dogs.

On Tue, Jan 7, 2014 at 11:47 AM, Morales, Margo <mlmorales@cityofpasadena.net> wrote:

Thank your e-mail regarding the proposed mandatory spay/neuter ordinance for pit bull and pit bull cross-breed dogs. We understand and respect your views. The Pasadena 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.

The proposed City of Pasadena ordinance, which is still under staff 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.

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

Margo Morales

District 2 Field Representative

(626) 744-4742

(626) 744-3814 fax

To Join Our Mailing list go to www.cityofpasadena.net/district2

From: skylohr2 [mailto: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

Jomsky, Mark

From: tamyra dow <tamee333@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 7:56 PM
To: De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry
Subject: PLEASE NO BAN

To all the parties with the power to stop this consideration of banning pit bulls.

PLEASE DO NOT BANS THESE LOVING, LOYAL DOGS. Pit bulls have been the attack of myths that are not true including locking jaws, vicious personalities, killers and other such harmful judgments. Please research thoroughly before making this judgment about banning a specific breed of dog. Drinking alcohol can be deadly if drank irresponsibly and so can ANY BREED OF DOG become deadly.

I would highly recommend developing bans for irresponsible dog/pit bull owners that train "watch dogs", fighting rings and animals abusers.

Thank you for your time.

Tamee MacDow

Buchanan, Rita

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

From: Susanne Marin [<mailto:mail@changemail.org>]

Sent: Friday, January 03, 2014 5:57 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,
Susanne Marin Levittown, New York

Buchanan, Rita

Subject: FW: 5 new petition signatures: Cathy Marseilles, Heather Bearden...

From: Cathy Marseilles [mailto:mail@changemail.org]

Sent: Saturday, January 04, 2014 8:17 PM

To: Morales, Margo

Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Cathy Marseilles, Heather Bearden...

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 75 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,

75. Cathy Marseilles H.B., California

74. Heather Bearden Fountain Valley, California
73. Jody Nolan Tustin, California
72. D'Ambrosio Jason Huntington Beach, California
70. Jana Pruse Talsi, Latvia .

Buchanan, Rita

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

From: Alex Martinez [mailto:mail@changemail.org]

Sent: Friday, January 03, 2014 1:08 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,
Alex Martinez Colton, California

Buchanan, Rita

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

From: Larissa Maslen [mailto:mail@changemail.org]

Sent: Friday, January 03, 2014 9:29 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,
Larissa Maslen Rancho Cucamonga, California

Iraheta, Alba

Subject: FW: Pit Bull Ban?

From: Jacqueline Maas [mailto:jaxmaas@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 4:45 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?

How can you think that a breed has anything to do with behavior? I am aware there are some people that breed these dogs for all the wrong reasons, but I have a mix and she is the most loyal and loving dog you would ever want to meet!!!! Where do we draw the line? Pitbulls for sure are not the only breeds that have been bred to be aggressive! I am quite sure you would not want someone coming into your home and taking your family member away to be killed!

Jacqueline

I hope you have an amazing day



"The tragedy in life doesn't lie in not reaching your goal. The tragedy lies in having no goal to reach."—
Benjamin Mays

"We seem to gain wisdom more readily through our failures than through our successes. We always think of failure as the antithesis of success, but it isn't. Success often lies just the other side of failure." - Leo F. Buscaglia

Get this email app!



Latest post: [Make a change today! jjmaas.govizn.com](http://jjmaas.govizn.com)



Like · Comment · Share

Get this email app!



Please consider your environmental responsibility. Before printing this e-mail message, ask yourself whether you really need a hard copy.

Buchanan, Rita

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

From: Nadene McIntyre [mailto:mail@changemail.org]

Sent: Friday, January 03, 2014 10:11 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,

Nadene McIntyre Los Angeles, California

Jomsky, Mark

Subject: RE: BSL

From: Nina McNaughton [mailto:bluebear38@hotmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 8:44 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: BSL

Soon you will be voting on BSL. I just want to say, we are taught in this country that it is wrong to judge someone based on their race, skin type, religious beliefs, etc. So why would anyone think it is ok to judge a dog based on its looks, breed, etc. We were taught that Hitler's attempt to destroy all Jews was wrong. He took them from their homes, split them up from their families and killed hundred's of thousands all based on his opinion of them. You cannot tell me that by banning a specific breed and taking pit bulls from their homes, from their families, and killing them, all based on your opinion, is not EXACTLY the same as Hitler with Jews. IT IS THE SAME, AND IT IS WRONG. Thank you for your time, I hope you will set a better example for our future generations by teaching them that it is NOT ok to judge a human or an animal based on appearance. I hope that you will put an end to BSL, and put an end to the hatred. I'm sure the council will do the correct thing.

Iraheta, Alba

Subject: FW: Breed Specific Legislation

From: Gabriela Menendez [mailto:gmenendez@drribahc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 11:58 AM
To: Morales, Margo
Subject: Re: Breed Specific Legislation

Thank you for your prompt reply, Ms. Morales.

I agree with your statement on neutering and spaying, but my question and concern is, why just Pitbulls? I don't understand why the target is the breed and not the owners. I would not have any problem neutering/spaying my dog (even if he was not from the pound and even if he was not a Pitbull) since I know I don't have the ideal conditions and knowledge to breed responsibly. If you target Pitbulls only, The "bad people" are still going to breed and sell puppies, just not Pitbulls.

What happens with the people like myself, who has a neutered dog, which I didn't buy from a pet shop, I rescued. Who has a Canine Good Citizen certificate. Who gets at least one refresher class for obedience a year (and that always gets first of class). Who is always under my supervision, and never off leash, we don't even go to dog parks. Do you think I am the type of animal owner that you are targeting with this measure? Do you think my dog is abused in any way (by what I've told you)? My dog is already where you want all dogs to be, in a house where he is safe, loved, trained, cared for. About myself, I am a professional who works with children as part of wonderful non-profit organization. Like I said, I work with children, and collaborate with school districts, therefore my record has to be sparkly clean. We seem like good people/dog. I am doing the right thing and I would do it no matter the breed of my dog.

If we start targeting one breed for neutering/spaying, later you would start targeting the same breed for other things. and then breed specific legislation comes. Would you deny my dog and I access to your city, but welcome a gangster with an unleashed Rottweiler? Nothing against Rottweiler dogs, but due to their strength and intelligence, they will be, most likely, the next breed to be picked for fights and illegal breeding. On the same page, would you be ok with no more Pitbulls being bred, but lots of Maltese, or Pugs, or Labs coming from backyard breeders and puppy mills? I wouldn't. No dog deserves to suffer, and if your motivation is to stop animal cruelty, then apply the laws to ALL BREEDS or none. I would say TARGET THE OWNERS NOT THE BREED. I am 100% responsible for any problem my dog may cause. He is an animal. I chose to have him. Therefore, I should be the one to pay for the mistakes.

Breed specific laws do not work. All breeds, same rules. Target the humans. ENFORCE EXISTING RULES.

I'm right behind you on protecting animals from abuse. But saying that "just Pitbulls" are the problem, is as bad as saying "just Mexican" (I'm Mexican, and constantly fighting the stereotype). In all bites, there has been human error. Dogs will be dogs, and all dogs bite, and all dogs suffer from cruelty.

I really hope you have the time to take my request and revisit this changes on the law. It would mean so much to me. It is not right.

Thank you for your attention, Ms. Morales. Have a wonderful rest of the day.
G. Menendez.

On Tue, Jan 7, 2014 at 11:36 AM, Morales, Margo <mlmorales@cityofpasadena.net> wrote:

Thank your e-mail regarding the proposed mandatory spay/neuter ordinance for pit bull and pit bull cross-breed dogs. We understand and respect your views. The Pasadena 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.

The proposed City of Pasadena ordinance, which is still under staff 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.

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

Margo Morales

District 2 Field Representative

(626) 744-4742

(626) 744-3814 fax

To Join Our Mailing list go to www.cityofpasadena.net/district2

From: Gabriela Menendez [<mailto:gmenendez@drribahc.org>]

Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 3:39 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 Legislation

Dear City Officials,

I recently heard about BSL in the City of Pasadena.

I have a 3 year old Pitbull, rescued at 6 months from the pound. Canine Good Citizen certified. Trained, and always supervised.

I agree 100% with the letter below. Please save the pain to the responsible owners, and don't spend the so much needed money on something that doesn't work.

I'll be happy to provide more information about BSL being the wrong choice if you would like to read it.

Thank you.

"It has come to my attention that there is a consideration to try to usurp 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 waste of time and money. It has been proven over and over that BSL does NOT work and does nothing more than waste taxpayer money while killing innocent family pets and doing nothing to raise safety.

In Denver, a city with one of the longest running pit bull bans, the incidences of hospitalizations for dog bites is HIGHER than in surrounding cities that do not have a pit bull ban.

What works is education and enforcement of laws such as proper containment of animals, anti-tethering (chaining) laws, leash laws and DANGEROUS DOG LAWS that target irresponsible owners and dangerous dogs no matter what breed they may be.

In our area just a few days ago a child was bitten by a dog at a Lowe's store. The offending dog was not a pit bull but the child's injuries were no less real because of it. The owner ran and it was later discovered that his dog had previously bitten other people. He has been charged for his actions, as he should be. As any irresponsible owner should be. How would your proposed ban have protected that child? It would not.

I own a pit bull who has never harmed anyone and will never harm anyone because I train, maintain, socialize and supervise him at all times. Why should I, a law abiding citizen be penalized because of someone else's poor behavior? I should not.

I hope that you will take the time to actually research the studies that prove that pit bulls are no more dangerous than any other dog but that many dog owners are and those are the people you should be directing your time and attention to."

Gabriela Menendez

Phone: 714 222 4755

Confidential Notification: The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may be privileged and/or confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, or person responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, please be advised that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is prohibited. If you have received this in error please contact the sender then delete or destroy the material received. Thank you.

Gabriela Menendez
Program Coordinator
2100 W. Alton Avenue, suite 2
Santa Ana, CA 92704
Office phone: (714) 549 6440 ext 2
Fax: (714) 549 6449
www.drribashealthclub.org

Confidential Notification: The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may be privileged and/or confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, or person responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, please be advised that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is prohibited. If you have received this in error please contact the sender then delete or destroy the material received. Thank you.