

19 January, 2016

Chairwoman Eileen Heaphy
Legislative and Rules Committee
Stamford Board of Representatives
888 Washington Blvd, 4th Floor
Stamford, CT 06904

RE: Proposed Revisions to Chapter 111 – Public Safety and Animal Welfare

Dear Chairwoman Heaphy and Members of the Legislative and Rules Committee:

The following summarizes testimony which I would propose to offer in connection with the above and said public hearing held this day.

Resume:

As a 36 year resident of the City of Stamford, Taxpayer, a local business owner, Licensed Professional (CPA), Canine Owner, Canine Breeder, Holder of one of the few City of Stamford Kennel Licenses, American Kennel Club Exhibitor, American Kennel Club Licensed Judge and American Kennel Club Member Club Delegate, I would offer my comments as regards the proposed legislation.

Specific Comments

The proposed legislation relies heavily on the "City of Stamford, **Animal Control Manager**", and the "City of Stamford **Animal Control Officer(s)**". Nowhere in this legislation is a standard of competency, education or training provided for these City of Stamford employees. The media has recently carried news with regard to the disputes with regard to the actions of the Animal Control Manager, and personal experience has shown that the Animal Control Officers are both untrained, inaccurate and often acting under political influence of members of the Board of Representatives.

The proposed legislation is silent with respect to the establishment of the "Stamford Animal Control and Care Center", making no mention of minimum standard of care for its defined capacity of specific genus and species of Mammals, Reptiles, and other creatures. The legislation does not define staffing requirements or plant, property and equipment assets to be provided to the Animal Control Manager to serve the Citizens of the City of Stamford, and to enforce or otherwise supervise the enacted Chapter 111 ET. Seq. Reports carried by the Stamford Advocate regarding the absence of heat, on severely cold days or non-functional vehicles.

Under Sec. 111-10 there is no mention of euthanasia, and what policy with regards to the destruction of animals under the care of the SACCC is acceptable to the Residents of the City.

Sec. 111-10 provides no guidance for the delivery on a 24-7 basis of urgent life threatening and also routine medical care to animals housed in the SACCC and the recovery of the cost of same from the owners of said animals.

Sec. 111-10 item G allows the expenditure of funds generated by Dog Licenses to be expended on other species.

Sec.111-11 Why are Cat's not required to be microchipped?

Sec. 111-11 item E. provides no due process, allowing for the abuse of this policy by unfriendly parties and others.

Sec. 111-12 in its entirety is unenforceable. How will the City of Stamford identify a dog that has been bred more than once? What is the legal authority under which the City of Stamford is authorized to "Permit" dog breeding? Stamford has a rich history of Canine activities, and this is an insult to the Canine fanciers. This resident would question what influence HSUS, PETA and other such organizations used on the drafter's of this legislation.

Sec. 111-12 (B.)(2) ignores the standards established by APHIS with regard to animal care, and substitutes the term "Adequate" which in and of its self is ambiguous and leaves to definition by parties that may not be adequately trained to make such judgements.

Sec. 111-12(B.)(4) is redundant with regards to other sub sections of Sec. 111 and provides by language for dogs to be microchipped instead of licensed.

Sec. 111-12(B)(5) denies a citizen of their rights without any due process.

Sec. 111-12(B)(6) defines criteria that in abstract deny a citizen of the right of due process, in the use of the word "History" instead of "Conviction".

Sec. 111-12(C)(1) creates authority for the Animal Control Manager or a "designee", an unnamed person who again may not have any training, or credential to enter on to the property, and perhaps the home of a resident without a warrant to conduct an "evaluation" without any defined criteria. Said party may have already been subject to or exempt from an APHIS inspection, an AKC inspection and perhaps the inspection by another agency of another governmental unit.

Funds raised by the aforesaid permit, in addition to any/all fines are not directed to be used for Animal Welfare Education, but rather are directed back to the general budget of the City of Stamford, which may very well create impetus for abuse not unlike vehicle speeding tickets etc.

Sec. 111-4(C)(2) why are the handlers of Stamford Police Dogs exempted from the general cleanup of their dogs?

Sec. 111-5 the wording of this section not only exposes residents to a claim of violation for dead squirrels, raccoons and deer, but further the 12 hour limitation may require disposition on a freezing cold day when owing to holiday/Sunday that a crematory/veterinary offices is either unavailable or charges a premium for accepting the animal's cadaver.

1, Sec. 111-6(C)(2)(b) creates a responsibility for medical practitioners to obtain and report cases of
2, canine bites. It further goes so far as to require Veterinarians and others to report bites that may
3, occur during the course of medical including reproductive activities.

In general terms I am also very concerned about the burdens of additional costs that this legislation gives rise to, that are not currently funded and that may give rise to a further reduction in the quality of care that the City of Stamford Animal Control Center and its aged infrastructure already compromise.

I am also concerned that the proposed changes of Chapter 111 seemingly focus on those who already are attempting to comply with the current statutes, laws and rules while not addressing the greater problem of pet owner noncompliance as can be concluded through information available from the 2010 census.

Lastly, I would offer my support to the correspondence that the American Kennel Club, has written to this committee and the Board of Representatives with regard to tonight's subject.

Respectfully,

Andrew I. Kalmanash
One Windward Lane
Stamford, CT 06903

Items appearing in **BOLD** are those which this writer would speak to as a priority, if the Chair places a time limit on individual comment.

A copy of this document is available to the record should it be desired.