

Buchanan, Rita

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

From: Robert Taylor [mailto:mail@changemail.org]

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

To: Morales, Margo

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

Dear Margaret McAustin,

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

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 From January 2012 – May 2013, more than three times as many American jurisdictions have either repealed existing BSL, or declined to enact BSL, as have put BSL into effect.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

Sincerely,
Robert Taylor Santa Ana, California

Iraheta, Alba

From: Barbara Telesmanic <mail@changemail.org>
Sent: Friday, January 03, 2014 9:39 AM
To: Sullivan, Noreen
Subject: I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

Dear Gene Masuda,

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,
Barbara Telesmanic San Clemente, California

There are now 4 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=72d27126ccf1>



Jomsky, Mark

From: Ted Torres <teddytorres@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 5:25 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 Council of Pasadena,

It was recently brought to my attention you will be having a vote regarding breed specific legislation on January 27, 2013. I encourage to you to educate yourselves on the issues surrounding whatever has caused this consideration. Look at communities where these laws have been passed. Instead of reducing dog attack incidences, they have remained essentially the same. Those communities have killed countless innocent loving family members and pets. Those communities have incurred the additional cost of enforcing these laws.

Please consider the history of American Pit Bull Terrier. Once called the "Nanny Dog," the American Pit Bull Terrier was once left to protect children while their parents were out on the farm. The mascot from *The Little Rascals*, Petey, was an American Pit Bull Terrier. Sir Thomas was the American Pit Bull Terrier that belonged to Helen Keller. The mascot for the United States Marine Corps is an American Pit Bull Terrier. Although there may be some debate about the breed of Sgt. Stubby, he was a bully breed. Sgt. Stubby was the most decorated dog during World War I, who even captured a German soldier. More recently, Hercules became famous on the show, *Pit Boss*. I met Hercules many years ago, before television, and he is one of the best dogs I have ever met. When did the beloved American Pit Bull Terrier become public enemy #1?

I understand the fear some people have towards bully breeds. They are often depicted as vicious fighting dogs. It should be important to note that a dog fighting "pitbull" poses no threat to humans whatsoever. Dog handlers must be able to grab a dog while in the heat of battle without any threat of being bitten themselves. For this reason, dog fighters kill any dogs displaying human aggression. I do not condone dog fighting in anyway, but their dogs are not human aggressive.

I am sure you consider this to be a local issue, but it really is not. Like many others, I travel with my girls, Bailey and Winnie the Runt. They are mutts, but are bully breeds. If you enact this law, you would prevent me from ever visiting Pasadena. That would be unfortunate.

I urge you, the City Council of Pasadena, to come down on the right side of history and vote against any sort of breed specific legislation. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ted

Ted Torres
841 Alabaster Court
Atwater, CA 95301
(209) 631-4812
TeddyTorres@Hotmail.com

Jomsky, Mark

From: Ted Torres <teddytorres@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 2:02 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

Dear Councilman Madison,

I am sure your office is being flooded with countless e-mails and appreciate your speedy reply, even if it was nothing more than a form letter response. Since you quoted California SB 841 as support for your breed specific legislation, I too would like to quote California SB 841.

"Jurisdictions that implement programs described in subdivision (a) shall measure the effect of those programs by compiling statistical information on dog bites. The information shall, at a minimum, identify dog bites by severity, the breed of the dog involved, whether the dog was altered, and whether the breed of dog was subject to a program established pursuant to subdivision (a). These statistics shall be submitted quarterly to the State Public Health Veterinarian."

What are the local statistics regarding dog bites causing the City of Pasadena to pass such a law?

It is my understanding the statistics being used come from the website, DogsBite.org. It is my hope that this is not true. This website compiles their statistics from news articles, which often misidentify dogs as pitbulls in an attempt to spark interest and sell papers. This is hardly accurate and should not be taken seriously when considering laws such as these.

Passing laws specific to any breed of dog is the equivalent of human racism. Just as you would not support the sterilization of a human based on the color of their skin, you should not support spay and neuter laws specific to a specific breed. Instead, support a complete spay and neuter law encompassing all dogs or do not support a law at all. Keep in mind, passing a law that cannot or will not be enforced is a complete waste of taxpayer money. Instead, partner with your local animal control department and local rescue organizations to create a comprehensive low-cost spay and neuter program along with spay and neuter education. Only then can you really begin to make a difference.

Have you ever met an American Pit Bull Terrier or any dog from the bully breeds? I have often been told by family and friends that they lived in fear of these types of dogs until they met my girls. The real issue to public safety has to do more with the human element than the canine element. Any dog, even the little chihuahua, can kill. Responsible ownership is what is needed.

Mr. Madison, you have been charged with being a leader in your community. Be a leader and do the research. Educate yourself. Look to communities who have enacted similar laws. Are those communities any safer? Or do those communities continue to have the same problems? If you look, you might be surprised what you actually find.

Sincerely,

Ted

Ted Torres

841 Alabaster Court
Atwater, CA 95301
(209) 631-4812
TeddyTorres@Hotmail.com

From: smadison@cityofpasadena.net
To: teddytorres@hotmail.com
Subject: Spay/Neuter Ordinance for Pit Bull and Pit Bull Cross-Breed Dogs
Date: Wed, 15 Jan 2014 20:35:35 +0000

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

Iraheta, Alba

Subject: FW: 5 new petition signatures: Jeanette Sanchez, georgia gaskell...

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 90 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,

- 89. Jeanette Sanchez Corona, California
- 88. georgia gaskell Ladera Ranch, California
- 87. Tina Byrd San Clemente, California
- 86. Stephanie Yu San Gabriel, California
- 85. Debra Bushman Carlsbad, California

Buchanan, Rita

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

From: leah urbank [mailto:leah@changemail.org]

Sent: Friday, January 03, 2014 1:30 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,
leah urbank fontana, California

Iraheta, Alba

From: Traci Vandermade <mail@changemail.org>
Sent: Friday, January 03, 2014 9:53 AM
To: Sullivan, Noreen
Subject: I just signed "Pasadena City Council: Abandon Mandatory Spay/Neuter of Pit Bulls Ordinance in Pasadena"

Dear Gene Masuda,

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,
Traci Vandermade Huntington Beach, California

There are now 7 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=72d27126ccf1>



Buchanan, Rita

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

From: Laura Vena [mailto:mail@changemail.org]

Sent: Friday, January 03, 2014 1:55 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,
Laura Vena Long Beach, California

Iraheta, Alba

Subject: FW: Regarding an important matter! Urgent!

From: Ana Vides [mailto:anarvides@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 2:22 PM

To: De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; hsullivan@cityofpasadena.net; Tornek, Terry

Subject: Regarding an important matter! Urgent!

I don't understand how a person can actually be thinking about banning an animal before getting educated about that breed. Yes it is unfortunate that some incidents have happened, but have you ever wondered that it might not be the animals fault. It's the fault of that irresponsible parent that leaves its kid unattended with an animal that it's not owned by them, that irresponsible parent that doesn't know how to tell its kid to stop pulling that dogs ear or tail or pinching the animal, the irresponsible owner that treats its animal like trash and abuses and mistreats its animal to the point that they can't trust no one. All humans and animals have a breaking point imagine someone pinching you, pulling your ear, pulling your hair what would you do "oh yes we can speak and say no, or that hurts" but what about the animal they don't speak so they react. If you will ban a pit-bull because there was an incident then ban all the animals because they are all territorial and try to protect your home its owner, yes you don't hear that people get bit by a Chihuahua because they are to embarrassed to come out in the news and tell their story, but Chihuahua, Maltese, Rottweiler's, German shepherds, all of them bite it is unfair for someone to ban an animal because of a person's irresponsibility. Educate yourself, find out about the animal, did you know that in the 70's it was the Doberman, then they blamed the German Shepard in the 80's, in the 90's it was the Rottweiler and in none of these eras they banned any of these animal, what is this world coming to where you can't have a pit-bull because it bites and the media makes them monsters, what are you Hitler to try an exterminate a breed. You should be focusing on banning humans we are the dangerous ones, ban the kids that bully other kids to the point of death, ban the women that have so many kids that can't take care of them and the kids end up gangsters and killing other people, ban gangs & gangsters that like to tag our communities and kill innocent people.

Take care of those issues, which are killing millions of people, not poor animals that can't defend themselves.

Ana Vides

Buchanan, Rita

Subject: FW: PIT BULL BANS

From: Ali Watters [<mailto:ali@extraextracasting.com>]

Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 1:26 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 BANS

Hello,

This is in response to the pending legislation in your jurisdiction as to regulating vicious/potentially dangerous dogs via breed specific legislation.

All dogs are dangerous under certain circumstances. Only when the owner or custodian of the animal does not properly train and confine his/her animal, does that animal pose a potential risk to human safety. A common ingredient to the dog personality is to guard and protect it's owner and property. ANY dog with that personality can become a problem for the public, if that dog is allowed to run loose and is not responsibly supervised. The key word here is responsibility (per Websters, definition of responsibility: Being legally or ethically accountable for the welfare or care of another.) To say certain breeds of dogs are dangerous is not a complete statement. All dogs can be dangerous if in the hands of an irresponsible owner.

Please retract your breed specific bill/ordinance. Don't punish all of us responsible owners that maintain our dogs as companions and members of our families. We can and do maintain our dogs so they do not pose a threat to anyone, why should we be denied our companions simply because irresponsible owners of the same breed of dog have not "ethically and legally" protected others from injury?

There are several samples of existing non-breed specific legislation (ie., the State of California) that is competent to regulate the irresponsible owners and not punish those that maintain their dogs safely and humanely. I, as a responsible dog owner, ask that you seriously consider the impact of breed specific legislation. The irresponsible owners don't care what breed of dog they lose the right to own....they'll find another dog breed to fit their needs. I deeply care, because it threatens me with the loss of a family member.

Sincerely,

Alison Watters

Alison Watters

Extra Extra Casting/New York

212.327.4685 NY Office

310.552.1888 LA Office

323.304.1212 cell

WBENC Certified

A portion of all casting fees from Extra Extra are donated to Hounds of Hope, 501c3.

Save a life. Adopt.

www.houndsofhope.com

Buchanan, Rita

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

From: Cynthia Weiler [<mailto:mail@changemail.org>]

Sent: Friday, January 03, 2014 3:41 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,
Cynthia Weiler Newport Beach, California

Jomsky, Mark

Subject: FW: Breed Specific Legislation is a Bad Idea

From: marysia wojcik [mailto: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

Buchanan, Rita

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

From: Veronica Zepeda [mailto:mail@changemail.org]

Sent: Friday, January 03, 2014 12:18 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,

Veronica Zepeda Santa Ana, California