

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
CITY OF SACRAMENTO

Nov 3 9 06 AM '87

LONG VERSION OF MINUTES OF
LAW AND LEGISLATION COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, August 27, 1987

City Council Chambers
915 I Street, Second Floor
Sacramento, California

The meeting was called to order at the hour of 2:36 p.m. by Chairman Terry Kastanis.

PRESENT: Committee Members Kastanis, Bradley, Pope;
Councilman Serna.

ABSENT: Committee Member Shore.*

*Committee member Shore arrived at 2:45 p.m.

1. Resolution to support the "Dimes Against Crimes" initiative.

RECOMMENDATION OF STAFF:

RECOMMEND SUPPORT.

REPORTS BACK:

NONE.

COMMITTEE ACTION:

SUPPORTED.

VOTING RECORD:

MOVED: BRADLEY; SECONDED: POPE
AYES: KASTANIS, BRADLEY, POPE
ABSENT: SHORE

MINUTES:

Lt. Jim White of the Sacramento Police Department, Inspections and Standards, was present to discuss this matter. He stated that this resolution would mean 2 million dollars to the Police Department from a small tax on liquor, and that statistics show that alcohol is involved in a high number of crimes in the City.

Committee Member Bradley moved, Pope seconded, and it was unanimously agreed to forward the resolution supporting the "Dimes Against Crimes" initiative to the full Council.

LONG VERSION

2. Resolution relating to Police Department Fee and Charges for fingerprinting and processing.

RECOMMENDATION OF STAFF: RECOMMEND SUPPORT AND FORWARD TO COUNCIL.

REPORTS BACK: NONE.

COMMITTEE ACTION: SUPPORTED AND FORWARDED TO FULL COUNCIL.

VOTING RECORD: MOVED: POPE; SECONDED: BRADLEY
AYES: KASTANIS, POPE, BRADLEY
ABSENT: SHORE

MINUTES:

Diane Balter, Deputy City Attorney, was present to discuss this matter. She explained that this resolution would reduce the charge for fingerprinting from \$12.50 to \$10.00.

Committee Member Pope moved, Committee Member Bradley seconded, and it was unanimously agreed to support the resolution relating to Police Department Fee and Charges for fingerprinting and processing. This will now go before the full Council.

3. An ordinance adding Article X, Chapter 6 of the Sacramento City Code, relating to pit bull dogs.

RECOMMENDATION OF STAFF: RECOMMEND SUPPORT AND FORWARD TO FULL COUNCIL.

REPORTS BACK: NONE.

COMMITTEE ACTION: NO RECOMMENDATION. FORWARDED TO FULL COUNCIL.

VOTING RECORD: MOVED: BRADLEY;
SECONDED: KASTANIS
AYES: KASTANIS, BRADLEY.
NOES: POPE, SHORE

MINUTES:

Chairman Kastanis explained at the onset of discussion of this item that in order for the meeting to end at 5:00 p.m., he would ask for thirty minutes to hear the staff report, thirty minutes

ITEM CONTINUED TO NEXT PAGE

LONG VERSION

3. CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

for testimony from persons in attendance who are in favor of the proposed ordinance, and thirty minutes to hear from opponents. After hearing everyone, he would allow 15 minutes for rebuttals, then close the discussion at 4:30 to give the Committee 1/2 hour to review and decide. For this reason, he requested each speaker to limit discussion to three minutes or the meeting would have to be continued and no decision made today. Mr. Kastanis also requested that each person give their name and address when they come to the podium to speak.

Diane Balter, Deputy City Attorney, was present to discuss this proposed ordinance. Also present was Ruben Mora, Chief Animal Control Officer. Attorney Balter explained that the City has a vicious dog ordinance, but there is a special problem with pit bulls in our city and the general vicious dog ordinance cannot address this problem.

*Dave Shore arrived at 2:45 p.m.

Attorney Balter explained that pit bulls are approximately 5% of the dog population, but that from 1984-1987 pit bull dogs were responsible for seven out of nine serious dog attack incidents. She stated that the Chief Animal Control Officer for the City of Sacramento says pit bulls kill more other animals than any other animal in the City. Attorney Balter explained that the City was proposing a "breed specific" ordinance rather than a generalized vicious dog ordinance because with a vicious dog ordinance you can't respond until after an attack, and then it's already too late to protect the public safety. She explained that the Rhode Island vicious dog ordinance states that no city or town shall license a dog that is vicious, and requires vicious dogs to be tattooed. There was some discussion as to who says a dog is vicious, and what happens if the City issues a license to a dog that turns out to be vicious. The question was raised as to how they enforce such an ordinance prior to trouble. Attorney Balter explained that there is a \$250.00 fine for killing a dog, \$500.00 for killing a person, and \$1,000 if a dog kills a person again.

Councilman Serna stated that he understands the County regulates other animals besides dogs. Attorney Balter and Ruben Mora both agreed that it does. Councilman Serna stated that the criticism to this proposed ordinance is that the dog is not at fault for being vicious; the owner is responsible. Attorney Balter agreed, but said that the owner must maintain their dog under certain conditions. Serna asked, "Are we regulating the owner?" Attorney Balter said, "Yes."

ITEM CONTINUED TO NEXT PAGE

LONG VERSION

3. CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

Councilman Kastanis stated that the Committee members need to hear specifically what this ordinance will do. Attorney Balter stated that the ordinance requires that the dog be registered within 60 days of enactment of the ordinance, and that proof be given that the owner has \$50,000.00 liability insurance, proof that the owner has a building or enclosure, with a cover, to keep the dog from escaping, and a sign must be posted on the property stating that there is a pit bull on the premises. When the dog is out, it must be on a leash and have a muzzle.

Councilman Serna asked whether current owners will have to give up their dogs. Attorney Balter said no, but the ordinance would provide for no new sale of dogs to City residents.

Councilman Shore asked whether statistics for attacks by pit bulls have changed over the past few years. Attorney Balter stated that they have been rather constant within the past three years or so, but that she wasn't sure about studies before then. Ruben Mora stated that there has been no period where there have been more bites from other breeds than there have been from pit bulls. Councilman Shore asked what the disposition of the dog bite incidents known to the City have been. Attorney Balter said there were some cases where the dogs were destroyed. Councilman Shore asked what would happen if a dog attacked but didn't hurt someone. Attorney Balter said the vicious dog ordinance could be used if a complaint is made; then the dog could be destroyed or the owner cited.

Councilman Shore asked why the City doesn't apply this ordinance to any breed of dog considered vicious. Attorney Balter asked what standard would be used to determine a vicious dog. Councilman Shore then asked whether an owner of a dog considered vicious could be banned from dog ownership of any kind for some period of time, to avoid their acquiring another vicious dog. Attorney Balter stated that there was some merit to this suggestion, but that she doesn't think such a ban would have stopped any of the incidents cited.

Councilman Bradley stated that U.S. News and World Report has written that the most dangerous dogs in the United States are pit bulls. He also said that letter carriers feel that pit bull dogs are the most dangerous and support this ordinance.

Councilman Pope asked whether ownership of pit bull dogs has increased over the past few years. Ruben Mora stated that ownership in the last three years has been pretty stable. Councilman Pope asked for some clarification of the number of pit bull dog

ITEM CONTINUED TO NEXT PAGE

LONG VERSION

3. CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

attacks compared to attacks from other animals over the years. Ruben Mora stated that out of nine of the most serious cases, seven involved pit bulls. He also said that out of 66 somewhat less serious dog attacks, pit bulls were responsible for 62%, although pit bulls comprise only 5% of the total dog population. He pointed out that there are approximately 1000 reported dog bite incidents in the City each year. There was some discussion as to the meaning of "serious" attacks; i.e., requiring medical treatment. Mr. Mora said his department investigates every dog bite report. He said that they consider it a vicious attack if it was done without provocation and the injuries are serious. Councilman Pope asked how many dogs are removed from their owners each year. Mr. Mora said his department removes 12-15 dogs a year, of which 56% are pit bull dogs. Attorney Balter pointed out that the City does not usually act to declare a dog vicious if it bites a member of its owner's own family.

Councilman Serna stated at this time that the ordinance addresses the matter of the severity of the pit bull attacks in comparison with that of other breeds. He then asked Attorney Balter whether government can declare a species illegal for purchase. Attorney Balter answered yes, pointing out that State law makes it illegal to purchase wolves, ocelots, venomous snakes.

At this time the meeting was opened up to members of the audience who wished to speak in favor of the proposed ordinance.

(a) Mary Gill (Doug Pope's district). She related a personal experience where her dog was on her front porch when two pit bulls came and ripped her dog up. She said the dogs wouldn't let go; that most dogs fight for dominance, not mutilation and death. She suggested that the City draft a pamphlet to dog owners to identify vicious dog behavior. She said that if this ordinance passed, and they [the City] were wrong, some people will be inconvenienced; however, if it isn't passed, someone could be hurt or killed.

(b) Joseph Russell, attorney, and his client, Mr. Isaac Lanier. Mr. Russell explained that in October of last year his client was attacked by two pit bulls, who ate his flesh. He passed around pictures of his client's injuries. He explained that because of this incident, his client's life has been ruined and that he is still suffering.

(c) Mr. Lanier explained the details of his pit bull attack. He said that he was going to the store and wasn't doing anything to

ITEM CONTINUED TO NEXT PAGE

LONG VERSION

3. CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

provoke the dogs. He said he was told by the owners that the reason for the attack was that the female dog was in heat. Mr. Lanier said, "What did I have to do with that?!" He showed his injury scars.

(d) Ruben Ramos. Mr. Ramos explained that he had been bitten by a dog before. He said his neighbors have two pit bull dogs, and that he (Ramos) has two children, a 6½-year-old girl and a 1½-year-old boy. He said that the gate next door is falling apart, but that an Animal Control officer stated they could not force Mr. Ramos' neighbor to do anything about it unless the pit bull dogs did something first. He said that would be a little too late if one of his children happen to be outside when the dogs break through the gate.

(e) Elizabeth Atkins, South Sacramento (Cloverdale Court). She said that the City is not a good environment for these animals. She said that human life is at great risk by having these animals in the City. She stated that last December some neighbors moved in next door who had pit bulls. She said one of the dogs jumped over her six-foot fence and attacked her dogs. At that time, the Animal Control could only warn the neighbors. Three days later the same dog again jumped over the fence and killed her 24" male Sheltie. She said she had two small children in the house who witnessed this killing, and had they been playing outside at the time, they, too, could have been hurt or killed. The owners of the dog did not respond to her calls and did not answer their door. She compared the owning of pit bull dogs, with their unique persistence in biting, to the owning of hand guns. Councilman Shore asked whether the owners were still living next door, and what had happened to the dogs. She said the neighbors have moved, and that the male pit bull dog was put to sleep and the female dog was removed from the owners.

(f) Steve Currington, Pacific Bell employee. He explained that he was bitten by a pit bull dog. He feels the ordinance needs more teeth; that it should require dog owners to carry \$250,000.00 in insurance. He said that no amount of money could compensate for the problems incurred by a vicious dog bite. He also feels the owners should provide a fence 1½ feet in the ground so the dogs can't dig under the fence, and at least 7 feet high. He also stated that since blind people need to have dogs, they shouldn't have to be covered under the law.

(g) Jesse Contreras (Serna's district). He said that a pit bull dog jumped a 6' fence and bit him. He was in his yard picking tomatoes with his three-year-old son, whom he put in a barrel for

ITEM CONTINUED TO NEXT PAGE

LONG VERSION

3. CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

protection. He showed some pictures. He said there were two dogs, and the owners were mad because the dog was put to sleep.

(h) Tim Nevel. Mr. Nevel did not want to give his address, as he has a civil case pending. He said he was attacked last July when he went to someone's home for an appointment. He said he had called prior to coming to the home, but that the dog got loose and attacked, requiring him to have 12 stitches. He said the owners had no insurance. He also stated that he did not provoke the attack.

(i) Robert Cameron, District 7. Mr. Cameron stated that he knows of at least two incidents in his own neighborhood where pit bulls have bitten through wooden fences. He said he can't even enjoy the quiet of his own yard because of those dogs. He said that Animal Control can't do anything right now, because the dogs haven't done anything. He feels Animal Control should deal with the dogs "before the fact". He asked that the Committee members not be swayed by the figures ("only 7"), because the seriousness of those attacks mandate this ordinance.

(j) Karen Brock (Pope's District). Ms. Brock said that she has a 15-month-old son, and her next-door neighbors have two pit bull dogs. She said she is afraid to go in her own yard. She stated that one day one pit bull killed the other, and it took two hours. She said she knows there's not going to be a simple solution, but something must be done.

(k) Bob Anderson, U.S. Postal Service. Mr. Anderson stated that dog attacks hurt their people, and they would like to have that hurting stop. He said the U.S. Postal Service had 93 dog bite incidents last year, and there have been 88 incidents so far this year. He said the U.S. Postal Service is in favor of the proposed ordinance as a step in the proper direction, but would prefer to see an expanded vicious dog ordinance. Councilman Pope asked Mr. Anderson if the U.S. Postal Service had a model vicious dog ordinance, and Mr. Anderson responded no. Mr. Anderson explained about one of the U.S. Postal Service employees who required three constructive surgery operations because of a dog bite. Councilman Shore asked how dog attacks on postal employees occur. Mr. Anderson said that the majority of attacks occur when a dog is surprised (i.e., sleeping, etc.). Councilman Shore asked about whether the dogs were unleashed or unrestrained (half and half). Mr. Anderson stated that the problem here is with the owners' responsibility for their dogs. He then stated that he has not yet seen a breed specific ordinance succeed.

ITEM CONTINUED TO NEXT PAGE

LONG VERSION

ITEM CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

Those members of the audience who wished to speak against the proposed ordinance were then called forward.

(a) Stanley Dicking, Q Street. Mr. Dicking asked: "If I get \$50,000.00 insurance and a kennel, can I have chickens?" He then said that he feels responsible owners are the issue here; that the irresponsible owners don't do anything except teach their dogs to go after other animals. He feels all dogs should be licensed and have their shots. He said he feels rewards and fines are the most important tools in enforcement, and that 77% of the dogs are not licensed, which means that 60,000 dogs in this City are without licenses. He said that if all dogs were licensed, there would be over \$4 Million to pay for pound and kennel enforcement. He concluded by saying again the the problem is not the dog, but the irresponsible owner.

(b) Dr. Ralph Barrett, Carmichael veterinarian representing the Sacramento Valley Veterinary Medical Association as well as himself. Dr. Barrett stated that he could have people come up and give him the same statistics about other breeds of dogs; that there are other dangers in the things we enjoy in life. He said that vets say pit bulls are not inherently vicious; that people need to be cautious around all big dogs. He stated that the California Veterinary Association has come out against breed specific ordinances, but have come out for better vicious dog ordinances. He said the majority of pit bulls are wonderful friends of families, and that he is concerned about the sensationalism of all of this talk about pit bulls. He said he thinks the City needs to think rationally about this. Councilman Serna said that he met with Dr. Barrett and tried to hammer out a compromise, but they decided there was no middle ground. He then asked Dr. Barrett if he (Barrett) would own a pit bull. Dr. Barrett said yes. Serna then asked the history of that breed. Dr. Barrett said he didn't know about the credentials of the authority in the U.S. News and World Report as to pit bulls being the most dangerous of all dogs; however, all dogs do as their owners want them to do. He said dogs can be trained to fight or trained not to fight, and that most pit bulls are trained to be good family members. Councilman Serna asked Dr. Barrett about the severity of pit bull attacks, to which Dr. Barrett replied that St. Bernards have killed people. Councilman Serna then said that someone said today an urban setting for this type of dog is inappropriate. Dr. Barrett replied that any vicious dog is inappropriate. Councilman Serna then asked whether Dr. Barrett feels this particular breed has risen in popularity. Dr. Barrett replied that one must be very careful about statistics; that the media attention is one of

ITEM CONTINUED TO NEXT PAGE

LONG VERSION

3. ITEM CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

the problems here, in that the media has greatly blown this thing out of proportion. Councilman Serna asked Dr. Barrett if this was an economic issue for him, to which Dr. Barrett replied that he does treat pit bull dogs, but that he won't go out of business without them. Councilman Pope asked Dr. Barrett if the Veterinary Medical Association has prepared a model ordinance regarding vicious dogs. Dr. Barrett said they did not, but that he would be happy to give any opinions but doesn't think they should draft it.

(c) Kurt Latham, Field Investigator, United States Humane Society. Mr. Latham stated that his background is in animal control and law enforcement. He pointed out that the Humane Society of the United States is opposed to breed specific ordinances, but is not against an ordinance protecting human life. He said he does not think the proposed ordinance would have protected victims who spoke today; that it was irresponsible owners. He feels a general specific dangerous dog ordinance would allow measures to be taken before attack. He stated that animal control has always been a low priority, and that the courts don't take it seriously. He said, "Man's best friend has now become man's killer by being put in the hands of irresponsible owners." He asked the Council not to penalize one kind of dog owner over another. He also feels it is important to have better education, and that schools should educate as to dog behavior. He feels a sign won't do any good to a child who can't read and who doesn't know how to approach a dog. Councilman Pope asked Mr. Latham whether he had a model ordinance. Mr. Latham replied that they had some guidelines, but that one particular model for every community would be hard to do. He continued by stating that by what's been said today, it appears there may be some limitations to the vicious animal ordinance, and that hearings could be requested prior to biting or attacking. He mentioned that San Mateo County has not had the problems anymore, as they just recently strengthened the penalties. He also feels that the best ordinance in the world can't prevent some attacks.

(d) Virginia Isaac, National Association of Pit Bull Owners. Ms. Isaac feels that it is the person contributing to the dog doing these things. She feels the Washington ordinance is the toughest in the country, and that it is very good.

(e) Barbara _____, new resident to the City and representing the Dog Trail Kennel Club. She stated she has owned pit bulls in the past, but does not own any now. She said it is true that if those dogs are not stopped early in life, they may exhibit vicious ways. She explained that in the 1830's pit bulls were fighting dogs -- they were taught to fight, bred to be aggressive.

ITEM CONTINUED TO NEXT PAGE

LONG VERSION

3. CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

She said there is a way to handle that now. She said pit bulls are very popular today because they have status.

(f) Archie C. Williams, Galt. Mr. Williams said he is an ex-professional dog handler and is on the Board of Directors of the Sacramento Kennel Club. He said that in 40 years he has never had an incident involving pit bulls. He said there is a problem, but there are also a lot of other problems that need to be faced in the community. He asked how many people were killed last year by handguns, and did they have a \$50,000.00 bond.

(g) Dr. Karen Pizer, Veterinarian, Elk Grove. She said she had a number of clients with pit bulls, and has never had any trouble with them. She also said she makes house calls and has never had problems with them in a house, either. She asked how pit bull dogs were to be identified; that she has a pit bull (or a "part" pit bull) and that pit bulls include several different categories and mixes. She also stated that she has never had any trouble with her pit bull dog.

(h) Mr. Pizer (Dr. Pizer's husband). Mr. Pizer stated that he works in an emergency room, and on his shift he sees about two dog bites a week. He said he has been working there six months and has yet to see a pit bull dog attack victim; that most of the incidents were from German Shepherds or large labradors. He feels there has been too much press coverage about pit bull dogs. He said he was against the breed specific ordinance but feels the City should adopt a stronger vicious dog ordinance.

(i) Ann Muldanado, Vice President of the Sacramento Dog Training Club, Inc. She stated that they are in support of any legislation to protect the public, but that they are against a breed specific ordinance. She said they have 95 members, consisting of people in all areas of dog-related fields. She said this group would support any carefully drafted and fair legislation.

(j) Troy Gardner. Mr. Gardner spoke on behalf of dog owners and professionals. He stated he feels a breed specific ordinance will not work. He said that as responsible dog owners, they will work with the City to work out a good vicious dog ordinance. He feels that licensing and registration is the main concern, since those revenues should be channeled back into animal control. He concluded by stating his feeling that the problem is not with the vicious dogs, but with irresponsible owners. Councilman Kastanis asked Mr. Gardner if he [Kastanis] understood correctly that his group would approve an ordinance prohibiting dogs in front yards.

ITEM CONTINUED TO NEXT PAGE

LONG VERSION

3. CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

Mr. Gardner answered yes. Councilman Serna remarked that the proposed ordinance is the same as many passed throughout the State and has survived a Federal court appeal test. Mr. Gardner said the City could pass an ordinance and spend the money to enforce.

Councilman Pope questioned at this time whether testimony should continue, and requested that Attorney Balter respond to all of this. Chairman Kastanis, on seeing that several more people wished to speak, said to continue with the testimony.

(k) Bessy Ollison, District 5. Ms. Ollison stated that she is disabled, and that she has a pit bull terrier. She said she abides by all the dog rules, that her dog is always on a chain leash, and that the dog is her constant companion. She said she doesn't feel she should have to pay high registration fees because of the inconsiderateness of other owners. She asked how many dog attacks had been reported in her district (Joe Serna's). She then asked how many drug incidents or shootings. She wanted to know why responsible owners should be punished. She said that if this ordinance passes, she could lose her dog since she can't afford the high cost of registration. She was told that her dog would not be taken away from her.

(l) Theo Shiross, South Sacramento. Mr. Shiross explained that he has a pit bull, a cat, two kids and a wife, that the dog sleeps with the children at night, and that the law is very, very discriminatory.

(m) Larry Reed, pit bull breeder for 50 years. Mr. Reed stated he has handled several hundred dogs and only saw one incident of a dog bite. He did say that pit bulls are fighting dogs, game dogs, and that if they are allowed to fight, all dogs will fight. He explained that pit bull dogs were bred as natural protectors.

(n) Susan BelCastro, Rancho Cordova (not in the City). Ms. BelCastro pointed out that if the dog population is 82,000+, and only 23% are licensed, then 77% of the dog population are not licensed. She continued by saying that if these owners won't pay \$10.00 for a license, why would they pay \$200.00. She feels irresponsible owners will not comply with this ordinance, and that the only ones who will comply are the responsible ones with family pets. She feels that a better solution would be to enforce the licensing requirements as they now stand, which would bring in at least \$427,000.00 per year.

ITEM CONTINUED TO NEXT PAGE

LONG VERSION

3. ITEM CONTINUED FROM NEXT PAGE

(o) Donna Roberson, Del Paso Heights. Ms. Roberson is the owner of a pit bull dog. She said that little dogs always try to bite her, that they bother her, and that this is always a problem with small dogs. She said it upsets her that animal control is trying to control her dog, but they don't ever do anything about small dogs when they are a problem.

(p) Kevin BelCastro. Mr. BelCastro stated that these dogs, when registered as a therapy dog, have been found in all situations to help children, the handicapped and the elderly. He stated that he knows of no attacks by registered kennel dogs, and that the dogs who do attack have no breeding record.

(q) Dorris Hercs, Executive Director of the Sacramento SPCA, Florin-Perkins Road. Mr. Hercs stated that the Society does appreciate the City's concern, but they they do not believe a pit bull ban is the way to solve this problem. He said the SPCA would like to be involved in the drafting of an ordinance. He also feels the City is setting a legal precedence by setting apart one type of dog, and the SPCA doesn't want to see this community become a police state.

(r) Karen Bedoe, Scramento County resource leader for the 4-H dog care and training program. She pointed out that, in her opinion, the numbers cited today are wrong. She feels that the number of pit bulls is based on registered breeds, not on the actual number of pit bull dogs in the City. She said the pit bull dog is in vogue with people who do not register their dogs, which makes the actual number a big unknown. She said she does not support a breed specific ordinance, as it is discriminatory and expensive.

(s) Alice Woodyard (Pope's District). Ms. Woodyard stated that most people can't tell adequately what a pit bull is. She said the ordinance only selected three show dogs. She asked what dogs should be included, and pointed out how difficult it would be to enforce. She said most pit bulls can be recognized, but the specific breed of pit bull can't be put in words, which causes problems with constitutionality. She said the problem here is with the unregistered "who-knows-what" dogs. She said one of the problems is with loose dogs, and that Mr. Gardner's recommendations should be considered.

(t) Victoria Corrall, Oak Park. Ms. Corrall stated that pit bulls have a reputation for gameness and aggressiveness, which are stereotypes. She then said: "We breed animals, and we must be

ITEM CONTINUED TO NEXT PAGE

LONG VERSION

3. ITEM CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

responsible." She said that there is also an economic issue involved here, as in Oak Park it would make owning certain breeds a luxury.

(u) Kelly McCusker, Carmichael. She stated her feeling that certain laws need to be enforced, and that she has never had to show her dog's license. She said the proposed ordinance would make it financially impossible to get a new pet. She feels owners should have to demonstrate their dog's ability to show good training.

(v) Maryann Canelli. Ms. Canelli stated that she is the owner of a registered pit bull dog. She pointed out the problems in the City with murder, molest, handguns, and that she has had her dog for five years with no trouble.

(w) Kevin Reed. Mr. Reed said his mother had a cocker spaniel and it bit him. He said he now has a pit bull, which he has trained well, and he has had no problems.

(x) Marty Kemper, Sacramento County. He is concerned that if the City passes this ordinance, the County will also do so. He said he is the victim of a dog bite, but that it was not a pit bull. He said he was not addressing the whole problem, but only a small portion of it: that of irresponsible owners.

At this time Councilman Bradley moved that they recommend Council adoption of the proposed ordinance. Chairman Kastanis seconded the motion.

Councilman Serna stated that he feels this is a discriminatory ordinance, but that the philosophy is that we prefer human life to the ownership of a specific breed. He said that when you live in an urban area, you agree to live within the rules of that area; there is a choice of life here. He also said they would be happy to stiffen up the vicious dog ordinance a little. He said he didn't want to see anyone in this City maimed or killed because we didn't do anything. He asked, "Do you have a privilege over that of human life to own a pit bull breed that tends to have a problem? We don't have a constitutional right to have this kind of breed."

Councilman Shore suggested the Committee come back and work on a stronger vicious dog ordinance for non-specific breeds. Councilman Pope said he was not prepared to support this ordinance after listening to everything. He stated that he was not concerned with statistics that say pit bulls are more dangerous than any other breeds. He said: "Perhaps there is an ordinance that could work

ITEM CONTINUED TO NEXT PAGE

LONG VERSION

3. CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

better, and that in compassion to help human life, you want to do it workably, not just in a way that gets a lot of press. so I'm voting 'no'. I would prefer the Committee not take a vote at this time." Councilman Bradley said that the Committee has heard from a lot of people present, and that the City's responsibility is not to the County residents but to the City. He said staff has worked very hard on this, and that it should be sent on to Council. He also pointed out that there could be amendments made to this later but that he urges support now. Chairman Kastanis said he was persuaded to support this ordinance, and that he hopes the ordinance takes effect before a terrible incident happens. He also said the vicious dog ordinance is always too late. He said that all of the people in Council chambers today are responsible owners, or they wouldn't be here, but that there are a lot of irresponsible owners in the City. He said he would support the motion.

Councilman Pope moved to table the ordinance for 30 days. Councilman Shore seconded the motion. Kastanis and Bradley voted against tabling the motion, and the motion failed.

Chairman Kastanis stated for the record that the motion was split 2-2, so the matter will go forward to the City Council with no recommendation.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

* * * * *

Respectfully submitted,

TERRY KASTANIS, Chairman

ATTEST:

JUDY VARVEL, Secretary