

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB 19	PA 211	1980
House - 4726-4746		21
Senate - 1158-1159, 1280		3
Environment - 183-186, 202-207, 544-561, 590-596, 601-603, 612-628, 632-634, 647-653, 719		66
<b>LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY</b>		(90P)

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2013

H-265

CONNECTICUT

GEN.

ASSEMBLY

HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS

1980

VOL. 23

PART 16

4612-4824

There is a roll call vote in progress in the Hall of the House. Would the members return to the Chamber immediately.

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If so, the machine will be locked. The Clerk will take a tally.

Would the Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 636, as amended by Senate Amendment

Schedule "A":

Total number voting	137
Necessary for passage	69
Those voting yea	137
Those voting nay	0
Those absent and not voting	14

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The bill as amended, passes.

CLERK:

Calendar page 7, bottom of the page, 474. File 198.

Substitute for Senate Bill No. 19. AN ACT CONCERNING THE PROVISION OF FACILITIES FOR THE DETENTION AND CARE OF DOGS.

Favorable Report of the Committee on Environment. (barking noises)

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Would the House please come to order.

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Ahearn.

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Remember a dog act is always tough to follow. (laughter) Mr. Speaker, we have a little bill here that's really not much of anything at all. But I was asked to bring it out, so I shall.

First of all, I'd like to move for the acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate. Will you remark, sir?

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Yes, I will, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Ahearn.

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Thank you, sir. What this bill does is help out those small towns, particularly those who have trouble having dog pounds.

They can't afford them for one reason or another and they don't put them in or what have you. What it would basically do, is to allow a town to combine with other towns to use the facilities of a licensed veterinarian, a veterinary hospital or commercial kennel or a dog pound maintained by another town.

At the present time, we have 24 towns in the state that have no pounds and the state is withholding their fees. A total of something like \$64,000. This bill would help those small towns to work out the problem, I'm told. However, the bill can be improved and I'd like the Clerk to call LCO 3658.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Clerk has an amendment LCO 3658, designated House Amendment Schedule "A". Would the Clerk please call and read.

CLERK:

LCO 3658, offered by Rep. Ahearn of the 55th.

In line 4, after the word "town" and before the word "other" insert the following: HAVING A POPULATION OF LESS THAN TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND,"

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Yes, what this would do is --

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The amendment is in your possession, sir, would you move adoption?

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Yes, I move for adoption, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on House "A"?

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

What it does, it is restricted to those towns under 25,000 and it would help those towns who really have a problem. Those towns over 25,000 ought to have their own dog pound and meet one of the biggest problems we have in the state. The most complaints that any town gets, is from people complaining about dogs. So those towns ought to, over 25,000, should be able to solve their own problems.

I move for adoption, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House "A".

REP. MORDASKY: (52nd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. John Mordasky.

REP. MORDASKY: (52nd)

Thank you, sir. As much as I hate to pick on little Al, I've got to ask him a question. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Please frame your first question, sir.

REP. MORDASKY: (52nd)

Rep. Ahearn, could you tell me how many of these towns that don't have pounds are over 25,000?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Ahearn, will you respond?

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

There are -- I can't answer the question specifically, Rep. Mordasky. There are 24 towns that have no pounds and 47 towns that are having their money withheld. The towns of over 25,000, I can't tell you, although I can tell you that Hartford is one of them.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Mordasky, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MORDASKY: (52nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I don't see why this amendment would have to be put on, when we have the language in there for an alternative to these towns to have facilities that are acceptable to take care of these dogs, and are probably much cheaper and easier to use. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on House "A"?

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Raymond Joyce.

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

A question through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the amendment, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Please frame your question.

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

Is this a bill that appeared in the Environment Committee, Rep. Ahearn, that was proposed by DEP? Is this the substance of that proposed bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Ahearn, will you respond?

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Rep. Joyce, the answer is no. This was proposed by one of the State Senators and it was opposed, I might point out by the Canine Control Officer in the DEP. Or the Agricultural Commissioner or what have you.

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Joyce.

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

Another question to Rep. Ahearn. A city of over 25,000 people, Rep. Ahearn, would have to have its own dog pound within the limits of the city. Is that the thrust of this amendment?

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Ahearn, will you respond?

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is the thrust of the amendment and to clarify my last statement, Rep. Joyce, the Canine Control Officer and the Department of Agriculture is very much in support of the amendment. They would rather not have the bill at all, I might point out, but this is a step forward in restricting it to towns under 25,000 and I can tell you that I firmly believe that any town over 25,000, for the good of its citizens, for the good of its animals, ought to have a dog pound.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Joyce you have the floor.

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that in the case of New Britain, we don't have our own dog pound. Our dog pound, although owned by the City of New Britain, is located in the Town of Berlin.

Maybe a 100 yards from the City of New Britain. This would force us, in our city, to build a new dog pound. To spend a great deal of money to build a new dog pound, when it really is not necessary. It would be very foolish to do that. I think many other cities are in the same position. Possibly Hartford and I would certainly, very highly recommend, the defeat of this amendment.

Actually, in the Environment Committee, a bill proposing pretty much the same thing, was defeated, in Committee. And I would ask the body here tonight, to defeat this amendment, please.

REP. GLASSMAN: (14th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on House "A"?

REP. GLASSMAN: (14th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Glassman.

REP. GLASSMAN: (14th)

I must agree with the two previous speakers. I think this amendment is nonsense. As long as there's a viable alternative why must we force increased cost on any community. It shouldn't make any difference whether the town has 25,000 or even 5,000. I would urge defeat of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on House "A"?

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

MR. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Ahearn.

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

I would suggest to you that this amendment is not nonsense. It's a serious amendment and it's something that ought to be passed. I did not submit it frivolously as somebody might think. The Governor of this state, who happens to live in the City of Hartford, had a problem getting a dog taken care of on Sunday, because the City of Hartford does not have a dog pound. And it is not a very expensive proposition.

If you ask people in any town, in the state, what is their biggest problem. They might say inflation, they might say taxes, but they'll always come up with roaming dogs, not being able to get a dog warden, etc., etc., etc., referring to dog problems. I urgently suggest to you, that any town over 25,000 that can't afford a few thousand dollars for a dog pound, is not doing any service to its citizens. I suggest and hope that you support this amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Would the House please come to order. Would the House please come to order.

Would the House please come to order. Would the members please take their seats. Would the House please come to order. Would the members please take their seats.

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Joyce.

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would remind the body that the Environment Committee discussed this, studies this situation, had a public hearing on it and voted it down. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Dorothy Goodwin.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. A question to Mr. Ahearn.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Please frame your question, madam.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Mr. Ahearn, do I understand correctly that the New Britain arrangement does not fall within the scope of this bill? Would not solve the problem for New Britain in this bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Ahearn, will you respond?

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Rep. Goodwin, if -- I'm not familiar with the situation in New Britain, but if they do not have their own dog pound and if they are over 25,000 population, as I suspect they are, than they would have to somewhere along the line in the future, get their own dog pound. Yes, ma'me?

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Goodwin.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

A question to Rep. Joyce. As I understood your remarks, Rep. Joyce, you said that New Britain owned a dog pound in Berlin?

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Joyce.

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is correct. It is not -- we own the dog pound, but it is not located physically inside the City of New Britain. It is about 100 yards over the line in Berlin.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, another question to Mr. Ahearn.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

State your question.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Does that or does that not meet the requirements of the bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Ahearn, will you respond?

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It does not fulfill the requirements technically. No, it does not.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Why not?

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Ahearn, will you respond?

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Because, the law at the present time, Rep. Goodwin, says that every town must have its own dog pound. Now, what this bill that we're putting in, says that there will be some exceptions. If it concurred with the -- by the Commissioner of Agriculture and to allow a veterinarian, a kennel or regional dog pound to fulfill the function.

What the amendment does, is to say this is for towns only under 25,000, because those are the towns that can least afford to have their own dog pound. And each town over that, believe me, I think, can well afford to have its own dog pound, including New Britain.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Goodwin.

REP. GOODWIN: (54th)

Mr. Speaker, I simply do not understand why ownership of a dog pound while located a 100 yards from the border of the town will not satisfy the needs of the area. I believe we have a number of instances where one town owns property in another. We have towns that own reservoirs in other towns. Hartford owns part of the Elizabeth Park in West Hartford and Hartford owns part of Keeney Park in Windsor. Not Windsor, Bloomfield, I guess it is, but anyway, it's over the line, and it seems to me that this kind of regional arrangement is perfectly acceptable thing for a town of any size.

I don't see any reason for the restriction, of the facility being located within the town. I certainly would agree that every town should have access to something that serves as a dog pound, but I see no reason why a perfectly acceptable dog pound in Berlin, owned by New Britain, cannot serve New Britain. Thank you.

REP. GIORDANO: (99th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on House "A".

REP. GIORDANO: (99th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Giordano.

REP. GIORDANO: (99th)

I really hate to do this, but (laughter) our town just had its specs brought before the town council for its dog pound and it caused quite a turmoil and the dog pound is going to cost \$120,000 and that excludes home box and cable TV. (laughter) But it's very expensive it seems, when you get into it, because the regulations call for a certain amount of concrete and drainage and it really is costing our town a great deal of money and I don't think they would really be pursuing it, but I believe they secured some type of federal grant that's going to aid them in the cost sharing process. Thank you.

REP. FARRICIELLI: (102nd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Joseph Farricielli.

REP. FARRICIELLI: (102nd)

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the amendment is well-intended. Unfortunately, I also believe that the amendment might preclude some of those towns that have so far supported this. In the six years I've been up here, I never seen anything bring my First Selectman up here, but this bill did and I still don't understand that, but we're in a situation, not only by cost, we are using regional, we're presently using a dog pound in conjunction with the Town of Guilford that's adjacent to us and our town population presently is estimated at about 23 to 24,000 people, but it would be my estimate that when we complete the census, we'll have probably 26 or 27,000 people.

The other thing is that, the reason we started doing this with Guilford, which was acceptable to them, was that the facility in our town nor longer would handle our dogs, our stray dogs, and the town could not find an acceptable location and since Guilford was willing to cooperate with us, we did it and we're one of those towns that have been doing this for some time until we found out that we were not legally doing this. And so, I think that's -- while I support the bill very strongly, I think and I support the concept that the amendment is trying to capture, I think that the amendment may hurt some of those towns that actually supported this and then we'd have the question of would 30 or 40,000 people.

I think if we just permit it, and than try governing it, without the amendment, would be the best course of action at this time and I would ask that it we can take this vote on the amendment by roll call.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The question is on a roll call vote. All those in favor, please signify by saying, aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

In the opinion of the Chair, the requisite 20% has been met and a roll call will be ordered at the appropriate time.

Will you remark further on House "A".

REP. ALLYN: (43rd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Rufus Allyn.

REP. ALLYN: (43rd)

Mr. Speaker, this seems ridiculous. It's all right to have regional schools, but it's not all right to have regional dog pounds. (laughter) That's about the most assinine thing I've heard of. Come on, this amendment guts the bill. Those people who don't like the bill are trying to gut it with this amendment.

Let's vote down the amendment and then vote on the bill.  
Up or down.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark futher on House "A". Will you remark further.

If not, would the staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Would the members please be seated. The machine will be opened.

The House of Representatives is now voting by roll. Would the members please return to the Chamber. There is a roll call vote in progress in the Hall of the House. Would the members return to the Chamber immediately.

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If so the machine will be locked. The Clerk will please take a tally.

Would the Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A" to Senate Bill No. 19:

Total number voting	134
Necessary for adoption	68
Those voting yea	10
Those voting nay	124
Those absent and not voting	17

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The amendment fails.

Will you remark futher on this bill.

REP. BELAGA: (136th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Belaga.

REP. BELAGA: (136th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly do pick good ones, don't I. (laughter) The Clerk has an amendment 3389. Would he please read and may I have permission to summarize? Would he please call.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The Clerk has in his possession an amendment, LCO 3389, designated House Amendment Schedule "B". In view of its brevity would the Clerk please call and read.

CLERK:

LCO 3389, offered by Rep. Belaga of the 136th.

In line 15, after the period, insert the following:

Any such facility for the care and detention of impounded dogs shall be open to the public on Saturdays between the hours of one o'clock and five o'clock P.M.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The amendment is in your possession, madam. What is your pleasure?

REP. BELAGA: (136th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you move adoption?

REP. BELAGA: (136th)

I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark further?  
Would the House please come to order. Would the House please  
come to order.

Rep. Belaga you have the floor, madam.

REP. BELAGA: (136th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The debate in the Committee and  
the public hearing convinced me that this bill has a tremendous  
amount of validity. But one of the things that concerned a number  
of people who came to testify and who called me and indeed, expressed  
concern, was the fact that there was no provision where the town  
or a municipality is contracting with a veterinarian or with  
some -- or a veterinary hospital, that there would be provision  
for the public to have access to the dogs on the weekends, when  
indeed, that's when people go to retrieve a dog that's been picked  
up or that's when people go to purchase stray dogs for their  
homes.

I thought that the point was well-taken and put in the amendment, but given the tremendous affection of this body for an amendment to this bill, I think what we will do is call upon the Department to make sure that in their regulations they do indeed require that any veterinarian so contacted, will guarantee that that facility will be available to the public and so I will withdraw the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

House "B" is withdrawn.

Will you remark further on this bill.

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Rep. Aloysius Ahearn.

REP. AHEARN: (55th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're now speaking on the bill itself and the bill, I'm sure you'll all support wholeheartedly because what it does is allow, instead of every town having its own dog pound and doing what should be done, it allows you to have your local veterinarian, who's really concerned about these sick dogs you're going to be getting, and is going to then, or your kennel owner will also be terribly concerned.

However, the bill is here and I move for its passage, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

Will you remark further on this bill. Will you remark further.

If not, would the staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Would the members please take their seats. The machine will be opened.

The House of Representatives is now voting by roll. Would the members please return to the Chamber. Their is a roll call vote in progress in the Hall of the House. Would the members return to the Chamber immediately.

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted and is your vote properly cast? If so, the machine will be locked. The Clerk will take a tally.

Would the Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 19.

Total number voting	136
Necessary for passage	69
Those voting yea	134
Those voting nay	2
Those absent and not voting	15

DEPUTY SPEAKER FRANKEL:

The bill passes.

S-160

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1980

VOL. 23  
PART 4  
979-1281

April 15, 1980

39  
jgt

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks? Matter's been requested to be placed on the consent calendar. Any objections? Hearing no objection, the matter shall be placed on the consent calendar.

Mr. Clerk, will you proceed?

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 159, File No. 198, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 19. An Act Concerning The Provision Of Facilities For The Detention And Care Of Dogs with a Favorable Report of the Committee on the Environment.

SENATOR RUGGIERO:

Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Ruggiero.

SENATOR RUGGIERO:

Mr. President, move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question's on acceptance and passage of the bill. Will you remark, Senator?

SENATOR RUGGIERO:

Mr. President, this bill, in addition to, this bill will allow towns to receive funds from the state dog fund that the Agricultural Department keeps as long as they have a dog pound that the town owns, participate in a regional facility and we expand that to allow them to contract with licensed veterinarians,

April 15, 1980

40  
Jgt

veterinary hospitals, commercial kennels, a dog pound maintained by another town or any suitable facility approved by the Department of Agriculture. If there is no objection, I would move it to the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Matter has been requested to be placed on the consent calendar. Will you remark further? Senator Skowronski.

SENATOR SKOWRONSKI:

No objection, Mr. President, I rise only to associate myself with the remarks of Senator Ruggiero, the sponsor of the bill. As Chairman of the Environment Committee, I'd like to commend him and tell the Senate that it enjoyed the substantial support of the committee. It addresses some of the concerns raised by the animal welfare community, namely that the Commissioner of Agriculture would have the ability to establish regulations as to what types of facilities and how the facilities where these dogs would be kept would have. It also gives the Commissioner of Agriculture the right to inspect the private facilities where the dogs would be kept. I think it's a good bill and I urge its passage by the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Any objection to this matter being placed on the consent calendar? Hearing none, it is so ordered. Mr. Clerk, will you proceed?

THE CLERK:

Moving to page 6 of the calendar, Calendar No. 162, File No.

April 15, 1980

163

~~HJ 43, SR 24, SR 25, SB 95, SB 3, SB 636, SB 125, HB 5330, HB 5005,  
SB 19, SB 546, SB 107, SB 187, SB 371, SB 580, SB 479, SB 164, SB 585,  
SB 364, SB 327, SB 408, HB 5183, HB 5251, HB 5252, HB 5277, HB 5293, HB 5295,  
115. Page 5, Calendar 131, 146, 159. Page 6, Calendar 166,~~

jgt

168. Page 7, 170, 171, 172, 177, 179. Page 8, 181. Page 9,  
196, 197. Page 10, 202. Page 11, 213. Page 12, 231, 244,  
245, 252. Page 13, 253, 254, 256. Page 14, 264, 267. Page  
15, 269, 270, 271, 273. Page 16, 274, 275, 276, 278, 279.  
Page 17, Calendar No. 284, 285. Page 18, Calendar 287, 288,  
289, 290, 291. Page 19, 294, 296, 297. Page 20, 298, 301,  
302, 303. Page 21, Calendar No. 305. That concludes today's  
consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

~~HB 5607, SB 548, SB 267, SB 598, SB 599, SB 372, SB 346,  
SB 347, SB 351, SB 541, SB 567, SB 63, SB 583, SB 584,  
SB 592, SB 614, SB 670, SB 671, SB 672, SB 707, SB 464,  
SB 491, SB 493, SB 506, SB 508, SB 509, SB 521~~

Machine is open. ~~Announce a roll call, Don.~~

THE CLERK:

Roll call is in progress in the Senate. Roll call in  
progress in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Machine is closed. The Clerk will take a tally. The  
vote is 34 yeas, 0 nay. The consent calendar is passed.  
Senator Lieberman.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN:

Mr. President, move for suspension of the rules to allow  
for immediate transmittal to the House those items that should  
go to the House.

THE CHAIR:

You've heard the motion. Is there objection? Hearing  
none. It is so ordered.

JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS

ENVIRONMENT  
PART 1  
1-362

1980

INDEX

20  
kjo

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Any other questions. If you'd leave those comments, we'd appreciate it. The next speaker is Eugene O'Meara, the First Selectman of the Town of Kent. Okay, Mr. O'Meara.

MR. EUGENE O'MEARA: Senator. Members of the committee. I appreciate your hearing me today as I did come in to testify on bill 19 even though it isn't on your agenda. This act would enable towns to make arrangements other than having their own dog pounds for the detention of stray dogs. The Commissioner of Agriculture is presently withholding the dog funds from the Town of Kent because we don't have our own pound. We don't have our own pound because we choose to use the services of a veterinary hospital.

And the facilities are maintained there at a higher level than most pounds, in fact, they're hospital conditions. It is a loss operation for us but we choose to cover the loss rather than operate our own pound. The commissioner also says to us that we can operate a pound on our share of the dog license money when in the next breath he won't let us into a regional one because he can't run one of those on 100% of the dog license money. So we would like to have the option of continuing to do what we are doing.

It is a high class operation. It is a loss operation. It exceeds normal pound standards and we feel unduly put upon to have our funds withheld.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Thank you. Are there any questions. Rep. Anderson.

REP. ANDERSON: Presently where are you keeping the dogs.

MR. O'MEARA: We use Dr. Breeland's Veterinary Hospital. He is a licensed V.M.D. He has a resident staff nurse, full time care. Hospital conditions which means the cages themselves are sterilized and maintained in a much higher level than in ordinary kennel or pound.

REP. ANDERSON: Does he allow the department to come in and inspect that?

21  
kjo

ENVIRONMENT

February 26, 1980

MR. O'MEARA: I don't know whether he allows it or not but the Regional Canine Control Officer tells me he can't go in there. He has to automatically approve that or he has no authority to go in there.

REP. ANDERSON: He can't go in there by what the Doctor's --

MR. O'MEARA: No, his own -- he has no authority to go in there and inspect that as our pound.

REP. ANDERSON: Did Lou Golet go? Do you know if the doctor would allow him to go in.

MR. O'MEARA: I've never discussed it with him. I don't know why he wouldn't unless for some reason he took umbrage at it. He, of course, feels that and in fact he's explained why his cough syrups so high in public meetings in our town. That they are hospital conditions. Superior to ordinary kennels and pounds.

REP. ANDERSON: Well, one of the problems I think the department has is that they are not allowed to go in and inspect these places and that they are the specifications are not up to what a pound would be. In other words, there are not runs, there are not a lot of restrictions that may be in a doctor's cage but not a run that would be accepted in a pound.

MR. O'MEARA: That's right. This is a small town operation. Small number of cages. There are not runs. They're not individual runs but the dogs get periodic runs in the common run. But they do get a daily run.

REP. ANDERSON: Who would do that?

MR. O'MEARA: The doctor's assistants. He has a staff nurse and he has two other assistants who -- I don't know what their qualifications are but they're kennel maids or assistants.

REP. ANDERSON: Well do you have an itinerary of what the doctor does with those everyday. Do they get a run twice a day.

22  
kjo

## ENVIRONMENT

February 26, 1980

MR. O'MEARA: They get a run at least once.

REP. ANDERSON: How long.

MR. O'MEARA: I don't know exactly how long.

REP. ANDERSON: I think one of the problems is that a lot of dogs are put in cages for weeks. And that's what we're trying to overcome.

MR. O'MEARA: Well, I think that's overcomeable. But I think it's unrealistic to restrict us to build a pound or else not receive our dog license money when we are using a high quality care system.

REP. ANDERSON: Well you're saying it's high quality but we don't know about the runs, we don't know about what itinerary they do have.

MR. O'MEARA: In discussing this with Mr. Russell of Costs today he asked if the bill couldn't be amended or broadened to allow the canine control people to do in or not. But that sounded quite acceptable to me. I don't know what the vets --

REP. ANDERSON: They can't go in now.

MR. O'MEARA: They have no authority to go in.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Okay, thank you.

REP. JOYCE: I'm just confused about what bill this is. Is this Sen. Ruggiero's bill.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Yes, No. 19.

REP. JOYCE: And you're speaking --

MR. O'MEARA: Yes. Right now the commissioner is withholding our funds and saying build a pound or you don't get the funds. And we just don't see how in a town our size we could build and operate a pound -- it would be a very small pound -- it would be a four or six cage and run pound part time operation and those are always a problem.

23  
kjo

## ENVIRONMENT

February 26, 1980

- SEN. SKOWRONSKI: One question, First Selectman. You said that you thought the problem of the runs is overcomeable. What would be your solution to that assuming you could keep your present arrangement. How would you answer the concern that they don't get the exercise.
- MR. O'MEARA: We would have to have an itinerary -- have provision for the assuring that the itinerary, the daily itinerary allowed for sufficient run. I believe that the dogs do get sufficient exercise regularly at Dr. Breeland's. When my wife and I go away we leave ours there voluntarily.
- SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Do you know how many cages they have there?
- MR. O'MEARA: About a dozen.
- SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Do you know how many dogs they normally have everyday?
- MR. O'MEARA: Eight or ten. His practice is primarily large animals, it's a rural area, mostly horses, cows. He probably has some more smaller cat cages. But I would say about a dozen devoted to dogs.
- REP. ANDERSON: Thank you.
- SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Are there any questions? We've been joined on my far right by Rep. Ahearn who is another member of the committee. The next speaker is Muriel Sonnichsen from the Connecticut Dog Federation.
- MS. MURIEL SONNICHSEN: I'd like to speak about bill 5315 please. And I would like to speak against it. And for these reasons. Dogs in this state are not supposed to be sold before eight weeks of age. Two months. So that this big concern is with a four month span. The most important thing at the time the dog is sold, if it's sold at eight weeks is that it have it's shots and veterinary care. And I would hesitate to add another chord such as licensing. Number two, you cannot spay a bitch until she is at least five months of age. And you cannot neuter a male dog until he is almost a year. So they cannot take advantage of these lower license fees.

MR. O'BRIEN: (Continued)

look at it. But the clamour to them goes more on clear air and that sort of thing and they have to put their resources that way. There is many thousands of dollars that is paid in by the sportman, recreation person that goes into Washington and is funnelled back to the states. Supposedly for sporting purposes, but it gets dumped into the General Fund and never comes out.

I think in some day, there should be a bill put through here that any money that comes in from there will be used for the purpose of the Federal Department sends it in here and not dump it into General Funds.

I think if we had that and a separate department of natural resources, that things could be taken care of and we could leave the DPA alone to do the things that they are really set up for. Primarily they were set up on an air and water. Air was the first thing that they hollered about. Set up a DPA for air and this was what was it.

This other stuff was dumped on top of it and their so, so belabored that they don't really have time to do anything. I thank you.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Are there any questions? Our next speaker is Mr. John Sliney from Branford.

JOHN SLINEY: <sup>SB 19</sup> Yes sir, the commission. I'm John B. Sliney, First Selectman of the Town of Branford and I'm here to speak for that part of the new bill that has to do with kennels for the dogs, that would allow a town to work out a program for a neighboring town for regional dog pound. Now, I don't say this and expect some sort of a experiment to come out of it. I've been -- I worked out so few years ago a regional program for a neighboring dog pound where they had built their up-to-date and modern, had all state requirements in their dog pound and found I had doubled the capacity they needed.

I heard of it and I went over and talked to the Selectman and as a result of that, we rent the other half of this dog pound and it works. There's no reason why it shouldn't work. Our warden brings the dogs over there. He takes care of that part of the kennel and everything is worked out as it should be.

40  
kpm

ENVIRONMENT

February 26, 1980

MR. SLINEY: (Continued)

Now at a time when they're saying to you, keep your taxes down. Keep your budgets down, this is the thing that I think towns should be allowed to do. I'll just mention, I won't mention the town, but another adjoining town to the west of us, went along with building their own dog pound. They just got their bids in and they're going to bond for \$214 to supply that town with a dog kennel and to me, if we allow our high school pupils to be regionalized from one town to the other, then why can't we regionalize the dogs? What harm?

So I am definitely for that part of this bill that allows the other towns to do, if they chose, what we have been doing and been doing successfully for the last four or five years. Thank you.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Thank you. First Selectman, who do you have your regional pound with?

MR. SLINEY: Town of Guilford.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Guilford. Okay. Is there any questions?

REP. AHEARN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Sliney, you've headed the Branford goes in with the Town of Guilford?

MR. SLINEY: Yes sir.

REP. AHEARN: You say, how long have you had that system?

MR. SLINEY: Huh?

REP. AHEARN: How long have -- Representative Ahearn over here. Sorry about that, John.

MR. SLINEY: Okay. I would say three or four years.

REP. AHEARN: Three or four years?

MR. SLINEY: I think so.

REP. AHEARN: You've got separate dog wardens in each town, I presume. Right? And you have one dog pound for both town.

41  
kjn

ENVIRONMENT

February 26, 1980

SB 19

MR. SLINEY: Yeah, but it is separated. They built that dog pound in two sections. In the center is the offices and the heating unit so really it's the same building but it's separated.

REP. AHEARN: But it's in the Town of Guilford?

MR. SLINEY: Yes, sir.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, now you, I presume, pay a fee to the Town of Guilford for the use of the pound?

MR. SLINEY: Right.

REP. AHEARN: When I say you, I mean the Town of Branford.

MR. SLINEY: Yes.

REP. AHEARN: How much do you pay?

MR. SLINEY: We started out with \$100 and they thought it ought to go a bit higher like all the rentals and we give them now \$115 a month which I think means \$1,800 a year.

REP. AHEARN: Oh, \$1,800 a year. And you found that it works out satisfactory in this case.

MR. SLINEY: It works beautiful. No problem.

REP. AHEARN: Is that illegal at the present time? What you're doing?

MR. SLINEY: Yes, sir. We are told -- I have letters from the State Dog Warden that we will have to have our own and I don't see any need of it and it would save many other towns a great deal of money.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, can I ask you, John, how many dogs can you take care of there?

MR. SLINEY: Oh, I could say they could take care of 150 dogs or more.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, now, can you give me the size of the Town of Branford and Guilford?

42  
kjn

ENVIRONMENT

February 26, 1980

MR. SLINEY: Population wise?

REP. AHEARN: Population wise.

MR. SLINEY: We're at 22,000; Guilford is about 15,000 or 16,000.

REP. AHEARN: And you've had no problems with overcrowding, no conflict between the towns?

MR. SLINEY: No.

REP. AHEARN: Everybody is happy?

MR. SLINEY: Everybody is happy.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, thank you, John.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Thank you very much, First Selectman, it sounds as though you've got a good operation down there. The next speaker is Dan Cosgrove from Branford.

MR. COSGROVE: I think Mr. Sliney has covered just about everything and I would like to associate myself with all of his remarks and I'd be happy to answer any questions that anybody might think of.

REP. AHEARN: Just one question that I've forgot to ask John. How many towns in the state do you know of that have a mutually satisfactory regional system like this. Any idea, Dan?

MR. COSGROVE: No I don't. I do know that I think that time goes so quickly that we may have had this arrangement a little longer than four years. Its worked out very well. I've been over to the dog kennel myself when people want to get dogs. We go over there and look at them and it is a well-kept place and everybody seems to get along fine.

So I don't know what other towns do this but I do know that its worked out very well for both Brankford and Guildford.

REP. AHEARN: Can you tell me, Dan, when the Guilford dog pound was built?

SB 19

- MR. COSGROVE: Well, I would say it has been built within the last eight years; when the state first mandated this, Mr. Sliney says, that's when they built it.
- REP. AHEARN: Okay, thank you, Dan.
- MR. COSGROVE: We are, therefore, support Senator Ruggiero's amendment to this law.
- REP. BERTINUSON: Could I ask you a question. I'm sorry I didn't hear the first part of the testimony, but one of the questions that was brought up, I think, by the department as far as these informal regional arrangements was that it's a long distance for people to travel if they have to go to pick up their dog, if the dog is picked up?
- MR. COSGROVE: Well, we, I don't know where the 57th district is, but it is probably from the center of Branford to the dog pound on the turnpike, about eight minutes. I would say to get from Stony Creek, which is one part of Branford to the northwesterly section would take you 25. So that it all -- Guilford would take you longer to go from one end of Guilford to the other. There about 38 square miles so it's in -- both of them are in the center very conveniently located from the, right on the superhighway running right through.
- REP. BERTINUSON: And you haven't had a lot of complaints from people that they had to go too far to?
- MR. COSGROVE: Everybody seems to be happy with it except the State of Connecticut.
- REP. AHEARN: Either Dan or John, one more question if I could and when you say you're in favor, Dan, of Ruggiero's bill, are you talking about all phases of that particular bill because it just doesn't include regional type thing, it includes going to kennels or verterinarians as well and there may be a hitch there.
- MR. COSGROVE: I don't know how it applies with some other towns, but I am in favor of that part of Senator Ruggiero's bill which says we could join together with another community which I would consider regional. Regionalization.

MR. COSGROVE: (continued)

I would again repeat that they do have regionalization of trade schools, highschoools, school districts and everything else.

REP. AHEARN: So what you're doing, Dan, is limiting us from your own experience of the regional aspect of one town with a certified dog pound and another town getting together.

MR. COSGROVE: Being able to use it, right.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Thank you very much. We hope maybe the state won't interfere with your good operation down there. We appreciate you coming up, First Selectman. The next speaker is Walter Czja. Walter, I wrote down your name because I remember you but what organization are you representing, if any. None?

MR. CZJA: I'm a member of several clubs but I'm speaking for myself. You didn't give a chance to organize my thoughts because I just got.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: If you want, you're our last speaker but we could take other people if you want.

MR. CZJA: I think it basically is, what the basic reasons are for having separation of environmental quality from a country preservation from the rest of DEP. I'd like to quote a couple of comments. Maybe for the information of the people present here and other members of this committee.

The Council of Environmental Quality in its annual report in 1978, as I pointed out to you last year Senator, there were two drafts to that report. The first draft recommended a separation of these two agencies. That draft, once it got over to DEP, was seen by the Commissioner and so on and so forth, never appeared in the final draft. If you want a copy of that original draft, I will so get you that copy of that original draft because it is part of the public record over in the DEP's records in the Council on Environmental Quality and that's how come I got that report.

But that report at that time, with any doubts, testified that these two agencies could be better served the state without a doubt. Now the final report, the printed version which was all handed out to all the legislators, did not have

JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS

ENVIRONMENT  
PART 2  
363-736

1980

SEN. RUGGIERO: (continued)

District and I'm very fortunate in my district to have the largest natural lake in Connecticut, Bantam Lake, and the second largest natural lake, Lake Waramaug.

There are two federal grants in existence for Lake Waramaug. We're hoping that we would be able to have \$30,000 from the state of Connecticut to go along with those grants to complete the work in making the water at Lake Waramaug quality for all the people in the state of Connecticut.

May I only suggest to the Environment Committee that as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I honestly don't know if there's going to be money available to fund this kind of work but I would hope that the Environment Committee would make a decision as to whether they believe Lake Waramaug is a project that should be funded, that should be worked on and that money should be made available to them for that purpose and forward the bill with a joint favorable to the Appropriations Committee and allow the Appropriations Committee to determine how much funding can be done. There will be, I'm sure, a number of people speaking on Lake Waramaug and I certainly don't want to take up any more of the Committee's time.

I think most of you know that I don't normally appear before Committees to discuss bills because I think we have the opportunity to speak as legislators one on one about various issues. I am here, today, to speak to a bill for a specific purpose, by the way -- Senate Bill No. 19, An Act Concerning the Provision of Facilities for the Detention and Care of Dogs and, basically, as a response to a letter I received from the Friends of Animals Spay Program dated March 4, 1980 from Margaret Wade which, in part, reads that she is positive that I am not aware of the ramifications of allowing dog wardens to board out impounded animals. Many of these animals are lost pets where children are involved. The enclosed article illustrates what can happen, making it impossible to trace a lost animal, etc., and so forth.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm sure many of you received the same material from the Friends of Animals and I personally am very disturbed over it. I happen to have animals, and if my animal -- if I -- if I choose, if I choose to break the law and allow my animal to wander, then I should have to go to an impoundment facility or some other place to pick up the dog. They send out -- Friends of Animals

SEN. RUGGIERO: (continued)

sends out an article regarding a kennel that was breaking the law. Nobody says all kennels are good and nobody says all kennels are bad. But to use one particular instance to attempt to stop a program or a bill from passing the General Assembly that would be a benefit to 169 towns and communities and a direct benefit to at least 47 communities I think is irresponsible as lobbyists, and I, personally, am very disturbed over it.

Now, they raise three questions, the Friends of Animals. The first one, the procedure, is the most expensive way to handle stray and abandoned animals. I represent 15 communities, 13 of which are very small communities. They don't have a number of stray dogs that they pick up. To warrant them to build their own impoundment facilities -- the town of Litchfield rents space from the town of Torrington. The dogs are brought from Litchfield to Torrington. If the taxpayers of the town of Litchfield don't care for, or don't find it objectionable to have to pay transportation costs plus a fee to the town of Torrington, why should we legislate that the town of Litchfield has to have an impoundment facility?

As to the town of Torrington, they're receiving an additional income which is helping them maintain their impoundment facilities. So as far as the first argument of its being expensive, I think that's a decision that the local taxpayers in the towns have to make, and if the -- if a town wishes to use the New Haven facility and it costs them \$200 a dog to board it, if the taxpayers want to allow local selectmen or local mayors to do that, that should be their prerogative.

The second argument is the inspection of facilities and proper check on the obedience of our dog laws are difficulty in a private facility. I think our canine control section of the Agricultural Department has the right to inspect and control all the various facilities named in Senate Bill 19. However, we will grant the Department of Agriculture the fact that we certainly don't want to reduce the standards of municipal impoundment facilities so, if the bill were changed to require that any facility that was not owned by a town must have at least the minimum requirements of a city owned impoundment facility, I think that would definitely be acceptable, because we don't wish to reduce the standards. The argument that is raised by the Agricultural Department in regards to the veterinarians --

SEN. RUGGIERO: (continued)

they do not have the right to inspect veterinary clinics and the veterinarians, which is true -- you'll notice that the bill says there must be a written contract. If, in the wisdom of the Environment Committee you would prefer to see language that says and that written contract must allow for inspection by the Department of Agriculture or Canine Control, I think that certainly would be acceptable.

Mr. Chairman, just to reiterate for one second the small communities of this state have a problem in having to build their own facilities. I would hope that this Committee would look favorably upon a town like Sharon who wishes to use a veterinary service or a veterinary clinic -- if that veterinary clinic does not meet the minimum standards of a municipally owned impoundment facility, then the town only has two choices. Number one, they don't use that facility, or number two, they ask the taxpayers to allow them to spend X number of dollars to improve the veterinary facilities for purposes of keeping their dogs. I think that in language, the bill I think is a good bill, and I think it ought to pass.

If anyone has any questions, I will...

REP. ANDERSON: Are there any questions? Rep. Osiecki.

REP. OSIECKI: Joe, do you want to answer questions about Lake Waramaug or would you prefer that I held them.

SEN. RUGGIERO: I would prefer to defer that until you have some experts that specifically know about it.

REP. ANDERSON: Are there any other questions?

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: One other quick question, Joe. You talked about being willing to accept an amendment that would require that the non-town owned facility measure up to the standards of the town owned facility.

SEN. RUGGIERO: But the Agriculture Department doesn't think it's in there strong enough...

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Okay. If their objections that that might not be strong enough or provide the proper safeguards, could you work up some language that would guarantee that this would be the case, and get it to us fairly quickly. Our deadline's Thursday.

SEN. RUGGIERO: I will have it tomorrow.

REP. ANDERSON: Thank you.

SEN. RUGGIERO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, a question?

REP. AHEARN: Another question. Rep. Ahearn, 55th District.

Senator, I have a couple of questions concerning, first of all, are you familiar with the situation in Hartford where there's an absolute appalling problem where they don't control their dogs at all, apparently, because they don't have a local dog pound and they are not willing or able to spend the money to purchase one. Would you -- would this bill meet this problem at all, do you think?

SEN. RUGGIERO: I think it would allow -- first of all, I'm not sure that the problem in Hartford about not controlling their dogs is the result of their not having a dog pound. You can have half a dozen dog pounds but if you're not willing to have the people to enforce the law, the dog pounds are not going to change that, Representative.

But, as far as the bill goes, I think it gives a number of different options to a town like Hartford and any other community in the state, that it allows them to have some contracts with a number of different facilities -- or types of facilities -- from kennels to veterinary hospitals and so forth -- and I think that, at least hopefully, a town like Hartford would find a facility that they would be able to rent or use in order to enforce dog laws. But the first thing the city of Hartford certainly has to do is to make a decision to enforce the laws. If they're not going to enforce the law, no matter what we tell them they can do with the dogs, then it's not going to do it.

REP. AHEARN: If they have a contract with another town, as they presumably do, and they can't find somebody to pick up a dog on a Sunday, and the dog pound in the next town is limited as to where they can go, where they can't go, that really puts a restriction on the second largest in the state, I would expect, and when you say that these people can, in effect, have a regional dog pound, you know, my question basically is the second largest city in the state ought to be able to have its own dog pound and we should have some concern about that. That's not your basic consideration, I presume.

SB 19

SEN. RUGGIERO: Well, I think when you start talking large communities, it would certainly seem much more economical to the communities to have their own facility, ahh, but if the taxpayers of the city of Hartford don't object to it, I'm not sure that the legislature in its wisdom should start mandating to the city of Hartford that you have to have your own impoundment facilities. As far as who's going to pick up their dogs on a Sunday, regardless of what, the city of Hartford has to have a dog catcher or whatever you want to call him -- a canine control officer available on a Sunday in order to have the dogs picked up. It's not the fact that a kennel -- you know, my concern is that we seem to say that a kennel is not going to be as good a place for impounded dogs as a municipal impoundment facility. When I go on vacation, I don't call up the municipalities and say can I board my dog at your impoundment facility? I call a kennel. And I say can I bring my dog over and pay you \$4.00 or \$5.00 a day, or whatever the price is now?

I think that we seem to indicate or we seem to believe that the fact that we're going to have a municipally owned dog facility is going to be advantageous to the people or to the dog population, when I'm not sure that's the case. I think Hartford has its own problems, the least of which, I'm sure, is impoundment facilities.

REP. AHEARN: Okay. Let's pursue that for a minute, if we might. You talked about a kennel. You said that there are some kennels that are good kennels and some kennels that are bad kennels -- there are some dog pounds that are good and some that are bad, but you have control over them by the local town over the dog pound. When you have a contract with a local kennel there are certain restrictions. The kennel is in business to take care of dogs, not impounded dogs, presumably. He wants healthy dogs because he's got his regular customers such as you, who bring your dog to him on the weekend or when you go on vacation. You don't want your dog mixed in with sick dogs, ill dogs, unhealthy dogs, dogs that may have something wrong with them, isn't that correct?

SEN. RUGGIERO: Absolutely.

REP. AHEARN: Therefore, the local kennel owner is going to start putting restrictions on the use of those dogs, the location of the dogs when and where he will take in those dogs. He may say I won't take them on the weekend. I won't take them after 5:00 o'clock. He would be setting down the rules...

SEN. RUGGIERO: Yes, Representative. But then they would not be meeting the minimum requirements of the bill. In other words, the facility has to have at least the minimum requirements required for impoundment facilities owned by municipalities, and if a kennel doesn't wish to meet the minimum requirements, then they're certainly not going to be able to have a contract to prove...

REP. AHEARN: When you say minimum requirements, Joe, you mean the so-called contract worked out between a municipality and the kennel, or the veterinarian? That contract? Is that your basic agreement that you're talking about?

SEN. RUGGIERO: Yes. Yes.

REP. AHEARN: They must agree on something.

SEN. RUGGIERO: Yes. And what they must agree on must be the minimum requirements as if the municipality owned their own impoundment facility.

REP. AHEARN: Can you tell me, Senator, how many towns have dog pounds at the present time?

SEN. RUGGIERO: I would presume that there are approximately 40 to 50 in the state, and I'll just tell you how I am getting that figure.

REP. AHEARN: That have dog pounds?

SEN. RUGGIERO: There are 46 that do not, or 47 that do not, and funding is being denied to them. There are some regional dog pound facilities and I would presume that the balance of them have some type of their own impoundment facilities for better or for worse.

REP. AHEARN: I would agree with you, Joe, that the idea of a regional pound system could be worked out because you would have the Commissioner and you would have the local people definitely in control. When you are getting into a kennel or something else, that's another question, or the veterinarian. Would you explain to me what you mean in line 31 by improper conditions? As he deems necessary to correct any improper conditions.

SEN. RUGGIERO: That's existing language in the statute, Representative.

REP. AHEARN: Yes, but that's part of the bill that you're talking about.

SEN. RUGGIERO: It's existing language in the statute and that's the statement that gives the Commissioner of Agriculture, the Canine Control Division of the Agriculture Department the right to go in and inspect and make a determination as to whether he thinks that facility is being properly run or improperly run. It's an extremely loose worded statute which gives overriding tremendous powers to the Department of Agriculture which was the intent of the original dog bill to start with.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, does that mean according to your interpretation that he could go into a local veterinarian or kennel, and say that he must be open on weekends to take dogs that are picked up off the street on Saturday or Sunday?

SEN. RUGGIERO: In my interpretation?

REP. AHEARN: Yes.

SEN. RUGGIERO: Yes, sir.

REP. AHEARN: Do you know if that's a fact though?

SEN. RUGGIERO: Pardon? Do I know -- right now they're not allowed to do it. Right now there is no funding coming back from the state of Connecticut if there's a contract with a veterinarian for a town so, therefore, the state of Connecticut gives no money and has absolutely no right to go in there whatsoever.

REP. AHEARN: So your basic argument, Joe, is that the present situation is intolerable and the idea of each town having its own dog pound or a regional dog pound will not work out, so we must go to the kennel or veterinarian route, as you see it?

SEN. RUGGIERO: Yes, sir.

REP. AHEARN: Thank you.

REP. ANDERSON: Any other questions? Thank you very much. The next speaker is Rep. Otto Neumann, followed by Lou Golet and Deputy Commissioner Dennis DeCarli and John Baker.

REP. NEUMANN: Members of the Committee, Rep. Otto Neumann. I believe I'm here to speak on Senate Bill 19, the dog pound

REP. NEUMANN: (continued)

bill, too. I think it was rather lengthily discussed by Senator Ruggiero. I cannot add too much, other than to point out that there are two problems covered by this.

In my district there are six towns covered by the need for this bill because of the reinterpretation that came up last summer. One obviously is the veterinarian contract situation. I must say as First Selectman I was the one that entered into the contract eight years ago to do it, and I thought that that was the best care we could provide impounded dogs and the best arrangement we could make, under the circumstances, and I still feel that way about the town's arrangement. Obviously, without this bill, however, it cannot continue as the funding has been cut off.

We also have, in another three of my towns, a cooperative arrangement. It is a municipally owned, at least semi-municipally owned -- the communities have put up the money although it is in the name of the dog warden. It serves three towns. Objections have arisen on that count because various owners would have to travel out of town to reach the facility. I would point out that the three towns' total population is less than 8,000 people so it doesn't make much sense to split this into three units when one is working. There's a provision of the statute, 7-1 on town meetings that will allow 20 people in any of those towns to request a town meeting to have their own independent dog pound if they feel that it's too obnoxious to travel to the other towns. There has been no such request over the years of this thing and I see no reason to make the requirement of the change right now. I would certainly urge passage of 19, with whatever technical wording changes were discussed when Senator Ruggiero was here.

REP. ANDERSON: Are there any questions? Yes, Rep. Ahearn.

REP. AHEARN: Otto, on the -- I'm not quite sure what kind of a system you have over there. I presume what you're saying is that the present bill would make what you're doing now which is illegal, legal. Is that correct?

REP. NEUMANN: Ahhh, basically, yes. Yes, Representative. We thought what we were doing was legal under the law until it was reinterpreted. We have -- it's been declared

REP. NEUMANN: (continued)

illegally and the funding has been taken away on the dog pounds and our dog license fees. With that in mind, we are looking at this bill as a way to get that situation corrected.

REP. AHEARN: For my information, would you tell me what other towns -- are you talking about a regional system that some of your towns have. What towns?

REP. NEUMANN: We have three towns, Hartland, Barkhamsted and New Hartford, who have a cooperative system. It is not a regional system as defined under the law.

REP. AHEARN: Hartland, Barkhamsted -- what's the third one?

New Hartford.

REP. AHEARN: Okay. And they have what?

REP. NEUMANN: A cooperative system.

REP. AHEARN: What's that?

REP. NEUMANN: They all have the same dog warden and use the same building.

REP. AHEARN: Where's it located?

REP. NEUMANN: It's located in West Hartland.

REP. AHEARN: Do the -- now, who provides the funds?

REP. NEUMANN: Each town pays in. They've hired this one person as dog warden. The dog warden works on a fee basis.

REP. AHEARN: What's the amount of population of those three towns?

REP. NEUMANN: Ahh, about 8,000 in total.

REP. AHEARN: Now, the other situation you mentioned.

REP. NEUMANN: Yeah, the other situation is the town of Granby, my town. The contract's with a veterinarian.

REP. AHEARN: How long have you been doing that?

REP. NEUMANN: Ahh, about ten years.

REP. AHEARN: What do you pay him?

REP. NEUMANN: Quite honestly -- when we entered the contract we were paying a couple of dollars a night. I don't know what it is now.

REP. AHEARN: Can you take your dogs to him on a weekend or at night, or after hours or what have you?

REP. NEUMANN: Whenever, ahh...

REP. AHEARN: He'll accept them at any time?

REP. NEUMANN: He'll accept them at any time. They have on duty a veterinarian around the clock. There's four people in the office.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, thank you Otto.

REP. ANDERSON: Any other questions? None. Thank you very much.

REP. NEUMANN: Thank you.

REP. ANDERSON: The next speaker is Lou Golet from the Department of Agriculture, followed by Dennis DeCarli and John Baker.

MR. LOUIS GOLET: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. My name is Louis Golet, chief of the Canine Control Division of the Department of Agriculture.

I'm here to speak and register in opposition to Committee Bill 19, An Act Concerning the Provision of Facilities for the Detention and Care of Dogs. I would also, at this time, like to ask your permission if I could represent Commissioner Krogh who happens to be in Washington and cannot be in attendance at this hearing.

The law governing pounds in municipalities has been in existence for over 43 years with, perhaps, very little change in the language during that time. However, the intent and purpose has remained the same. It is basically a good law and should be allowed to remain. Approximately 120 Connecticut municipalities have complied under this law in the regulations adopted thereunder. Thirty-three years ago records show that approximately 15,000 stray animals were impounded by local dog wardens throughout

MR. GOLET: (continued)

the state whereas the fiscal year ending June 30, 1979 the number of animals impounded reached nearly 37,000. Quite a remarkable increase.

The demand for pets by the public has not by any means decreased. In reality, it has and it will continue to increase, along with the growth in the human populus. The current widespread concern for animal care and control in many years, particularly in a number of towns and cities demands a revaluation of the function of the animal control programs in that society. It calls for the reassessment of the kinds of resources and support that the animal control agencies need to respond more adequately to the demands society makes upon them.

While each person has a somewhat different impression of the nature of the animal control function based primarily upon his personal experiences and contacts with animal control officers, there is a widespread popular conception, however, of animal control officers supported by some news and entertainment media. Through these sources of communication, animal control officers have come to be viewed as a body of people continually engaged in harassing activities concerned only with the removal and destruction of family pets. Emphasis upon this aspect of animal control has lead to a tendency on the part of both the public, the appointing authorities and even the animal control officers to underestimate the full range and complexity of the total animal care and control tasks. Town authorities who believe their problems will be solved through the utilization of other facilities such as private kennels, veterinarian hospitals or other town pounds should not overlook the realistic factors involving the expense and continued increases applied by private facilities. These costs will be significant as the increase in the dog population continues. Private facilities are not accessible to the public as has just been mentioned. Many boarding kennels refuse to take in stray animals as a matter of protection for their own clientele. That has been stressed.

A veterinarian hospital is just what the term implies. It's a place where sick, injured or diseased animals are cared for. Veterinarians, like many kennel owners, also refuse to board stray dogs and in regard to fees, there's no such thing as a \$2.00 fee for a dog overnight anywhere. Town dog wardens who are using facilities in other towns are

MR. GOLET: (continued)

inconvenienced through the necessity of traveling time and, of course, the major factor -- the use of energy, which must be considered as an additional cost. This same inconvenience must also be absorbed by the public.

Improper identification of their dogs could mean additional trips to a facility out of town. For an example, the owner of an unlicensed dog must obtain a license for his or her dog before it can be released from the dog pound, but this is not known until proper identification has been made. Then, upon that identification of the said owner's pet, that person must now purchase a license in their respective town. That means a trip back to town. We're not talking just a couple of miles. This could mean 10, 20 or even a 30 mile round trip. We have towns now that are commuting dogs that's a 30 mile round trip.

The importance and availability of a dog pound in a municipality should not have been more evident than at the time of the tragic and unfortunate disaster which occurred in the towns of Windsor and Windsor Locks last fall. Personnel from the State Canine Control Office, accompanied by local wardens from the two affected towns under the direction of Civil Defense authorities, utilized the two pounds as a holding area for pets which had become disoriented and injured, were taken to a vet for treatment if required, returned to their shelters and picked up and united with their owners. Needless to say, they were saddened by the losses of their properties but joyful to learn that their pets had been provided for. I guess one should say thanks to those authorities who had maintained the foresight and interest years ago to see that their towns were adequately provided for.

Many of the towns presently without dog pounds were appraised of the need for pounds in their respective municipalities by State Canine Control officers covering their areas. In some instances, town administrators were advised of such needs as long as 15, even 20, years ago. However, they apparently did not choose to act.

Dog pound plans and other technical assistance was also offered and made available to such towns. Other resources available and suggested by the towns was to pursue the employment of technical school students in the construction of pounds. Several towns did take advantage of the latter

MR. GOLET: (continued)

opportunity and were more than pleased with the results. This bill, if acted upon favorably as presented, would most certainly act as a deterrent in the furtherance of a good canine control program in those municipalities not maintaining their own facilities.

Connecticut has been cited by many other states in the animal welfare groups both local and national as having dog control laws and programs. Wardens who have their own facilities to work with function more efficiently and maintain a better control over the dog population and the fees collected under the law. Wardens are charged by law with the observance and care of the animals they impound until claimed by their owners or disposed of otherwise. This becomes very difficult, if not impossible, to achieve when wardens are required to perform without facilities of their own.

The most conducive aspect of a successful educational dog control program in any municipality is the combination of a good qualified and conscientious dog warden having the availability of a proper dog pound facility and the support of his superiors. Thank you.

REP. ANDERSON: Thank you. Are there any questions?

REP. AHEARN: A couple, John.

REP. ANDERSON: Yes, Representative Ahearn.

REP. AHEARN: Yeah, Louis, I wish you had addressed specifically some of the -- some of the comments you made I thought were extremely interesting, about the number of dogs that we have today compared, impounded, that is -- compared to a number of years ago, the fact that the law has been in existence for 43 years, and that 120 towns have complied. When you -- I'd like you to be a little bit more specific on Senator Ruggiero's bill, if you would. When he talks -- he says that if the local community or the local taxpayer doesn't care, why should the state care? Would you respond to that? And is that a good argument?

MR. GOLET: Well, I -- I -- in the first place, most of the funding in this case is not the average taxpayer, Rep. Ahearn, but the person who requests the dog licenses. This is where the tax revenues come in. It's these people who support most

MR. GOLET: (continued)

of these municipalities it's quite -- Granted that probably in some of the municipalities it's quite -- there probably just isn't enough funds from dog license revenues to support it totally, but nevertheless, under the present framework and structure of the rebate system or the pro rata monies, this is the purpose that these monies are to go back to -- for the purpose of construction and maintenance of dog pounds.

REP. AHEARN: Well, if you have 120 towns complying, Lou, and some towns in violation, is there serious problem now with the system as it is?

MR. GOLET: Yes. For example, somebody cited -- a previous speaker -- a question was cited to a previous speaker about the city of Hartford -- and I don't particularly care to speak against the capital city which is right under my nose here everyday -- but their situation here, for example, we've been withholding fees from the city of Hartford which have accumulated to the sum of \$30,000 or almost \$30,000 for reasons of failing to comply. They use a facility outside city limits which is not conducive for transporting the dogs nor conducive to the public. And the biggest problem is the fact that people refuse to go out of town to redeem their dogs.

And the same thing will show in the statistics as applicable to those towns that Mr. Ruggiero represents which are here in front of me. The statistics go back for ten years and it's very evident that many of these towns have no programs whatsoever.

REP. AHEARN: Would you name some of those towns?

MR. GOLET: Well, I can go right down the list -- Barkhamsted...

SEN. RUGGIERO: (Inaudible) I don't represent Barkhamsted.

MR. GOLET: Pardon me. I was just going to say that.

REP. ANDERSON: Senator, you had your say...

MR. GOLET: I was just going to say that. I don't know -- I don't feel that -- I'm not sure of what towns Mr. Ruggiero has, but I'm not acquainted with the area that he represents.

REP. AHEARN: I'd appreciate your responding to that sometime, Lou, so we could get that factually straight. If you'd get that information -- you said that some towns aren't complying at all. I'd appreciate...

MR. GOLET: I've got a list of towns here that represents the whole northeast corner, not just by areas.

REP. AHEARN: If you could get that I'd appreciate it. One last question, Lou -- and I'll ask you the same question I asked of the Senator, about improper conditions in line 31. When you have a veterinarian or a kennel -- at the present time, and it's contracted by a local town, for instance -- let's take the town of Bolton which contracts with a local kennel, can the Commissioner or a dog warden inspect that kennel or that veterinarian at the present time?

MR. GOLET: Some vets have been willing to allow us in...but only, only...

REP. AHEARN: Does the state or the dog warden have the right to do that?

MR. GOLET: Not actually. It's not written in the law that we have the right...

REP. AHEARN: So if a kennel operator says no, then you can't go in?

MR. GOLET: We don't have that ironclad in there to allow us to trespass, so to speak, on private properties. Those are private premises, now. When you speak of boarding kennels and vet hospitals, you're talking of private premises. This bill shows nothing in there to allow us to egress to get onto a private premise...

REP. AHEARN: Well, the argument is if you have a written agreement that that could be brought up in the written agreement, and then you could make inspection.

MR. GOLET: Yes. It probably could be worked out...

REP. AHEARN: Could possibly...okay, thank you, Lou.

REP. ANDERSON: Are there -- Rep. Osiecki has a question.

REP. OSIECKI: Lou, Senate Bill 19 allows you to go into any facility where impounded dogs are kept, so you'd have no problem with trespass there.

MR. GOLET: Is it stated as such?

REP. OSIECKI: The law says it. I mean this proposal -- accomodates you. It says it on line 30½ -- or other facility where impounded dogs are kept. I would take that to mean whether it's a kennel or anywhere else. I mean, the wording of the language in the bill, the beginning of line 24, seems to me to answer some of the things you brought up. It would allow you to go into any facility wherever an impounded dog is kept, whether it's a hospital, commercial kennel, another city of town, or other suitable facility approved by the Commissioner or -- and you can inspect where impounded dogs are kept, any facility, so that would answer some of your problems, if this bill were to come out of Committee and pass.

But I want to ask you something else. In the towns that today board their dogs if, what your department would like to become law, what would be the start up cost for towns and how many employees would be necessary and what sort of regulations would your Department like that would require -- and I'm not discussing the city of Hartford because I'm not familiar with the situation -- what kind of costs are we talking about to these municipalities?

MR. GOLET: On municipal pounds?

REP. OSIECKI: Right.

MR. GOLET: You mean if an individual town (inaudible)... that would depend a lot, Rep. Osiecki, on the size of the facility and in what manner it is constructed, whether it's with local talent that they may have on the town crew -- some towns do have this talent -- or whether they go out to contract. I'm not a builder. I couldn't -- I could not estimate to you just...

REP. OSIECKI: I know, but you're talking about a position that would certainly mandate costs, new costs...

MR. GOLET: Some cost, yes.

REP. OSIECKI: All right. Because it also says that the Commissioner has the regulations concerning the construction and the maintenance, so he dictates the size based on people population or animal population,

REP. OSIECKI: (continued)

apparently, on the requirements of new facilities.  
Is that right?

MR. GOLET: We don't -- there is no specifications that --  
you're speaking now, strictly on this bill here.

REP. OSIECKI: But that's old language. Line 28 -- the  
Commissioner may make regulations concerning the  
construction and maintenance of dog pounds and the  
care, handling and transportation of dogs by wardens  
which means that under today's law, if...

MR. GOLET: Right. We have regulations governing this, yes...

REP. OSIECKI: Okay, so the towns that do not have pounds  
today, if we were to pass a law that said they must,  
as your department would like, they then would be  
subject to the Commissioner's regulations for the  
construction of a facility. So we're talking, potentially,  
considerable funds...

MR. GOLET: Not necessarily. It depends on the situation  
there. There are or some smaller  
towns that probably could get by with about a six  
pound, and those costs would vary extremely, depending  
as I said before, on who builds them and how they go  
about it.

But if you have the call today for a six pound,  
and six stalls and six outside kennels, could probably  
run in the vicinity of \$20,000. I'm just using that as  
a figure -- it could be less. It could be a little bit  
more...but it would be in that vicinity.

Now, you're talking about size of towns. Of course,  
some towns maintain that we don't have a location.  
You have a town of 55 square miles -- they have no  
location. On the other hand, we have towns with 5.3  
square miles that have found a location for a pound.  
You have the town of Barstow I may cite, for one  
example -- a little bit of a town which found a suitable  
place adjacent to the town to build a four or five  
run -- a beautiful little shelter -- at very little  
cost.

REP. OSIECKI: Can you tell me how many of the towns that do not today have pounds that are on that list, how many of them have a local ordinance prohibiting the free roaming of dogs.

MR. GOLET: I'm not aware of more than possibly one or two towns that have an ordinance, but to supercede the statute you might say. In other words an ordinance that a...

REP. OSIECKI: When dogs are picked up and impounded ten miles from the home of the owner outside the borders of the town, I think the implication in your statement is that we should be concerned about a public that allows the dog to roam, having to drive 10 miles to pick up the dog, because I heard you say it's not conducive to the public.

MR. GOLET: Well the dog doesn't have to be picked up 10 miles from town, Rep. Osiecki, it could be picked up two doors from your door and then carted 10 miles away to you know.

REP. OSIECKI: That's what I'm saying though, in your testimony you said that the present situation in our state is not conducive to the public. But it's the public who's letting the dog roam that is inconvenienced by driving 10 miles, isn't that...

MR. GOLET: Granted.

REP. OSIECKI: So what you would prefer...

MR. GOLET: But they also have a penalty incurred already on them once they go to redeem that dog and there's also an infraction set up which is in force, so I mean this is an additional penalty you're talking about.

REP. OSIECKI: So you're actually saying they're being penalized too much for allowing their dogs to roam.

MR. GOLET: Right

REP. ANDERSON: Other questions? Thank you very much, Lou. You aren't testifying on any other bill.

MR. GOLET: Oh, pardon me, yes, I still have. I did have a little notation here and I'm glad you reminded me, thank you. I'll be very brief. There is two bills very briefly I want to just register in favor of. I would like to speak

SB333

MR. SHALEK: (continued)

The Department of Environmental Protection on a request from Friends of Animals who has a list of people who have been threatened by the poachers has stepped up their investigation and arrest record, and they've been doing an excellent job, too. The fines as they stand now on the books, \$25.00, \$50.00 fines -- the courts may confiscate a \$50.00 rifle, are completely ineffective. And because they're not afraid of the penalties, they continue to pursue this ...

REP. AHEARN: Okay, one last question, David, any idea how many deer are shot legally each year in the state of Connecticut?

MR. SHALEK: Yes, about a thousand.

REP. AHEARN: About how many?

MR. SHALEK: About a thousand, approximately.

REP. AHEARN: One thousand?

MR. SHALEK: Ummhmm.

REP. AHEARN: And 5,000 are shot illegally?

MR. SHALEK: Yes, sir.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, thank you.

REP. ANDERSON: Any other questions. Thank you very much. The next speaker is Pricilla Farrell, is she here?

: Forgive me, Pricilla Farrell couldn't stay and she had to leave.

REP. ANDERSON: The next speaker is Margaret Wade followed by Patricia Checko.

MS. MARGARET WADE: Hi, I'm Margaret Wade. I conduct a spay-neuter program here in the state of Connecticut for Friends of Animals. I am also on the advisory board for the state administered low cost Spa-Neuter Clinic. I work very closely with many of our dog wardens in our municipal pounds. Therefore, I believe I understand canine control problems.

SB 19  
just gotten additional help to get the garage, and the lovely little shelter there with, believe, the about 12 runs

MS. WADE: (continued)

I'm the Margaret Wade that wrote the letter to Senator Ruggiero, the contents of which he did not like very much. I wanted to make comment that I don't like the contents of that letter either, and I was awful sorry to have to write it. But I'm here today to point out again the ramifications of allowing bill -- Senate Bill No. 19 to pass this Committee.

I am opposing this bill very vehemently. First, I will make a list of the reasons why. I'm sorry I'm speaking to a practically empty house. But our animals always seem to come last.

First, this procedure is the most expensive and most undesirable way to handle stray and abandoned animals and is a waste of taxpayers money.

Second, this procedure and this is the most important point, leads the way open for many irregularities as was pointed out here in Hartford during the recent scandal in regard to the handling of strays in this fashion. They had a terrific scandal here where they were selling dogs left and right. They were not advertising them. They were not obeying any of our dog laws.

Third, the inspection of facilities and proper check on the advance of dog laws are difficult on a private facility as Louie has pointed out to this Committee. The required advertising of each dog impounded and the required holding period of seven days would be jeopardized as this article proves was jeopardized. Here in Hartford, the capital of our beautiful state of Connecticut. They have no municipal pound. And all of these irregularities are going on.

I am sure you are aware of the trauma experienced by a pet owner and especially children when a beloved pet has been lost. Their first call is always the municipal pound. To allow dogs to be boarded out with a possible indicated irregularity makes the tracing of a lost pet almost impossible. We in Monroe, I come from a small community, and all our neighboring towns and cities have provided a shelter for our stray animals, and we believe all other communities should also. They don't have to spend a million dollars. In Monroe, we're a very small town. We just put an addition on to our town garage. We have a lovely little shelter there with, I believe, they have about 12 runs.

MS. WADE: (continued)

We have one part time kennel man. He comes in in the morning, beautifully takes care of that kennel, paint, does everything for us, and then, of course, we have the dog warden that is mostly on the road. And he's got a beautiful office right in our police station.

Now every little community can do this. And they will not do it if they're not forced to do it. We did it because we wanted to treat our animals and our pet owners right. That is why they're buying these licenses. They want some service for their \$3.50 or their \$7.50 or whatever it is. And this is one of the important services. Until such time when we have a strict leash law, I'm for that leash law, compulsory spaying which is again very important. Compulsory licensing of breeders. They're breeding animals left and right and don't need a license. A house to house check for unlicensed dogs. Immediate licensing of puppies. I'm very distressed to hear this Committee killed that bill on the immediate licensing of puppies. And this hereby is another great big problem.

They take these little puppies. They don't need a license. They keep them when they're no longer puppies and it comes time to buy a license, they just abandon the animal and get another little puppy that doesn't need a license. The problem of stray and abandoned animals will be with us, and it is the responsibility of every community to provide a proper shelter for these animals as our law now reads where inspections by our district dog wardens would be possible at all times.

Now we pay this may, Louis , a lot of money a year and he has appeared before this Committee, and he's telling you what he thinks is necessary. I think it behooves this Committee to listen to our state canine control officer. Now he's tell you the only proper way is to have every community have their municipal pound. They don't need to spend a million dollars. No way.

I consider, and I believe I speak for many who are concerned with the welfare of animals, I listed to Senator Ruggiero and as far as I can see, he couldn't care less, and he doesn't know the ramifications like Louie does, and I know and Betty Long knows and Mr. Helberg from the Connecticut Humane Society. We know what the real problems are. Not Senator Ruggiero. And I beg this Committee to listen to our state canine control officer.

MS. WADE: (continued)

SB 19

And he says that we should have municipal pounds in every community. I urge -- yes, yes -- we have started a very nice progressive path here in Connecticut. We have banned the controversial decompression chamber. We have opened our first low-cost spay-neuter clinic. We have made it compulsory that you license a dog before you take him out of our pounds. Why must we take a step backward now. I think it's up to this Committee to go ahead and continue on this progressive path that we have started.

And I hope we never go back to the good old days like I think Senator Ruggiero called them dog catchers. This is what they were, dog catchers, in those days. I hope we never go back to the good old days when we had dog catchers that used to keep impounded animals in the garages under anything but humane conditions. I beg this Committee to uphold our present law on municipal pounds. Thank you.

REP. ANDERSON: Are there any questions?

REP. AHEARN: Just a couple of questions, Margaret. Now we all heard Senator Ruggiero, and we heard you and there seems to be a difference of opinion on the basic idea here. Are there any animal welfare people that you know of who are in favor of Senator Ruggiero's bill.

MS. WADE: I don't know of any. We're fighting every day to get better laws in the state of Connecticut for our animals. The animal problem is getting completely out of hand. Now if you're not going to insist on municipal pounds, how are we going to handle this problem?

REP. AHEARN: Well his -- you know, he says and the law says basically that there will be a written agreement between the town or the local kennel or the veterinarian or what have you. And that if you do that, then this would give more control to the local people, and if they want to raise their taxes, then who cares as long as they do it.

MS. WADE: We had such a -- all you need is to study this article. I sent it to everybody on the Environment Committee. This points out to you the ramifications. This is what can happen. And what else do you need but an example like this. Here's a dog warden that was sold one dog three times. He finally sold it to a current reporter for \$40.00 when that dog was supposed to be sold for \$5.00 to the general public. They were making all this money on the side.

MS. WADE: (continued)

Then they checked and they found out this was a private kennel, mind you, a decent, respectable kennel. They found out that they were not advertising. Our law says you must advertise every dog you pick up. You must hold that dog for seven days. That might be the beloved pet of some pet owner or some child's pet. And they're not doing this.

REP. AHEARN: But Margaret you're talking about violations of the law that ...

MS. WADE: Exactly.

REP. AHEARN: And what you're saying if I understand you correctly is that if you had better control by dog wardens or more local control, that there would be fewer violations, is that correct?

MS. WADE: Al, I'm saying that when you allow them to manipulate like that, get their own -- there's all room for all kinds of hanky panky. Where you have a municipal pound, any taxpayer can come in there anytime and check their records. Now they're not going to run around trying to find which kennel this dog warden is in fact boarding these dogs. Those records are there. I can go in anytime in our municipal pound, look at those records and check and see that he is advertising every dog. Now this will not be possible as Louie has pointed out to this Committee, you're going to make his job a whole lot harder, and you're going to leave the way open for all these ramifications that they had right here in Hartford. What more proof do you have that this is a, if you'll excuse my expression, a lousy law. We've got a good law on the books, let's keep it there. And if we can obey the law, a little town like Monroe, new town where John comes from, they have a municipal pound. They're a small community, and they're not going to do it unless they're forced to do it. And it didn't cost us any \$100,000.

REP. AHEARN: What you're saying, Margaret, correct me, is that you want -- first of all you don't like the bill period. But you think that every town should have its own individual pound with its dog wardens and the local control over it primarily.

MS. WADE: Absolutely.

REP. AHEARN: What -- then I understand, if I'm correct, that you're not in favor of a regional dog pound where you have two towns get together, is that correct?

MS. WADE: Well now I'm willing to compromise on that. When you have two little bitty towns and if they're not too far apart where a pet owner would have to travel too far, I would compromise on that.

REP. AHEARN: I'm thinking of the towns of Branford and what's the other one -- Guilford, right.

MS. WADE: All right, let them -- if they're not too far apart, I'm not familiar with that area. If they have one dog pound and they're not too far away from each other, I would compromise. I would not object to that. But to take and allow dog wardens to make deals with private kennel owners or private veterinarians leaves the room open for an awful lot of hanky panky. And I'm not for that.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, so occasionally you might go for under certain circumstances but the kennel and veterinarian you're strongly against.

MS. WADE: Out, absolutely out.

REP. AHEARN: Okay. Thank you, Margaret.

MS. WADE: All right, thank you.

REP. ANDERSON: Any other questions? Thank you, Margaret. The next speaker is Patricia Checko, followed by Representative Rybak.

MS. PATRICIA CHECKO: Members of the committee, my name is Patricia Checko, I'm an Epidemiology Consultant in Infectious Diseases in the Department of State Health Services, and I would like to speak in support of Committee Bill 333, an act prohibiting the breeding and sale of certain animals. I will be handing in my testimony, but I would like to briefly review it at this time.

Although there are certainly a number of reasons, public health concerns, related to the breeding and sale of wild animals, I will restrict my comments to the potential for rabies that is associated with these animals.

Rabies is one of the oldest known and most dreaded diseases. A deep-seated fear of rabies is almost instinctive in man despite the actual rarity of the disease. Perhaps this reflects the primordial knowledge of the virtual certainty of death once the disease is overt. Despite the fact that we now have vaccines available for post exposure treatment, only two persons are known to have survived the disease in recent times, so it remains virtually 100 percent fatal.

Dogs continue to be the principal source of rabies in Africa, Latin America, Mexico and Asia; but wild animals have presently become the main reservoirs of rabies in Canada, the United States and parts of Europe. In the United States in 1977, over 3,000 rabies cases were reported to the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta. Of these, 86 percent occurred in wild animals - skunks, bats, raccoons and foxes, with skunks accounting for over 50 percent of all wildlife cases. Rabid skunks were reported from 28 states and raccoons from 18.

Rabies is increasingly being reported in wild animals that are being kept as pets. Dr. William Winkler of the CDC has noted that wild pet rabies reports are coming in at the rate

REP. AHEARN: (Continued)

out, we do have a serious problem with the skunks, although there's no rabies in the state of Connecticut since 1964 what have you, at least in skunks.

MS. CHECKO: Right.

REP. AHEARN: So the problem is not an imminent problem, but I agree with you, it's a serious and could be a serious problem, and I would agree that we ought to do something about banning the sale of skunks period. They serve no useful purpose, they're let go in the woods and they've been de -- de -- ah -- whatever they call it, so they can't control or protect themselves in the woods, and so they are at the mercy of other wild animals, and it's really a silly kind of a thing that we allow. We ought to do something about exotic animals, but I think this bill, as John points out, may be a little bit too extreme. Thank you.

REP. ANDERSON: Are there any other questions? Thank you very much. The next speaker is Representative Rybak, followed by Peter Young.

REP. RYBAK: Thank you Mr. Chairman. My name is Michael Rybak and I'm a State Representative from the 66th District, which includes the towns of Litchfield, Harwinton, Thomaston and Morris, and I'm here testifying on behalf of Senate Bill 19. I do so as one who has raised Irish Wolfhounds, as one who has sponsored a bill to ban the sale of dogs by municipalities for medical research, and as a Selectman who understands the conditions in the dog pounds that we have and the cost of maintaining these pounds. I feel that if a municipality can make a contractual arrangement with a kennel or a veterinarian running a kennel and that that kennel is open to state inspection and meets all of the state's standards, then I see no reason why that municipality should not be free to make that arrangement, and I say so feeling that, I think, in the long run not only will the interest of the municipality be served, but the interest of the animals themselves.

I would much rather have my dog under the care of a veterinarian or licensed kennel operator, where the dog can receive the necessary treatment if the dog is injured, hungry or has a vitamin deficiency because it's been roaming, then to put the dog in the municipal pound, under the care of a canine control officer, who although having training and has the interest of the animals at heart, simply is neither equipped nor adequately trained to take care of the animals and must ultimately take

REP. RYBAK: (Continued)

them to a veterinarian anyway, if there is a problem with the animal.

I also would like to raise the concept that came up in a bill that I proposed, House Bill 5421. Under the present law, the fines which the Judicial Department collects for unlicensed dogs, that's ten bucks, and roaming dogs, that's \$25, go into the general fund. They do not go where they should go, namely into the state dog fund account. We put the license moneys in there, but we don't put the infraction moneys in there, and we've been watching this state dog fund account from the towns' end for a long time, and the share to the towns -- those towns, and my town does have a dog pound, keeps creeping down and it is not really adequate to maintain our pounds and canine control officers, so we have to make supplemental appropriations.

The state is also, I understand from Mr. [redacted], in a rather difficult financial position on the regional state dog pounds. They need additional funds, so I would suggest that you consider perhaps amending Senate Bill 19, or using a number and raising a separate bill, take these moneys that go into the general fund -- they're dog offenses, and put them into the canine control fund so we can beef up our reimbursement for canine control and ultimately have better canine control in the state. And if there are any questions, I'll be happy to answer.

REP. ANDERSON: Are there any question from the committee?

REP. AHEARN: Just one, John. Mike, one question that -- you really have a great deal of faith in the local veterinarian that when you bring in an impounded dog he's going to really take care of it, don't you.

REP. RYBAK: If he's subject to -- I do have that, if he's subject to state inspection, and I'm speaking from the small towns. I really don't understand the problem in Hartford. I don't understand why the City of Hartford doesn't have a dog pound I guess, but speaking from the standpoint of a Colebrook, 1,400 people, or a Morris, 2,500 people, I really feel that a small cinder block building with a gas heater in it trying to keep those animals clean on a part time basis, the local canine control officer really can't do the job that a kennel operator can, and if the kennel operator's not doing a good job, the state won't honor the contract, the dogs cannot be housed there and it will be subject to state inspection.

REP. RYBAK: (Continued)

It's just putting the dogs in a different place. That's the way I see the bill. All of the horrors that were identified by the other speakers would be true if there were no state supervision, but there should be strict state supervision. Any other questions?

REP. ANDERSON: Any other questions? Thank you very much.

REP. RYBAK: Thank you very much.

REP. ANDERSON: The next speaker is Peter Young, followed by Helen -- Raffuse.

REP. ANDERSON: Thank you. Helen Raffuse.

MR. PETER YOUNG: Good afternoon. My name is Peter Young, I'm Executive Director of Area Cooperative Educational Services, one of Connecticut's six educational service centers located in the New Haven area. I'm here this afternoon speaking in favor of Bill 5824, an act concerning the sale of certain lands by the New Haven Water Company.

The specific land in question under this bill is a piece of property located at 205 Street in Hamden, Connecticut, approximately 4.3 acres of land on which there currently exists two buildings comprising a total of 42,500 square feet.

ACES, as I said, is a regional educational service center whose mission is to provide services for the 21 boards of education that make up its membership. We have leased, and are presently leasing, this property of the New Haven Water Company, in order to operate a program for secondary school age handicapped students. The setting is particularly applicable for these children for the following reasons:  
1. The geographic location is excellent for the greater New Haven area; 2. the highway transportation system is good since the location is near both Route 15 and Route 91; 3. it's near public transportation, and since many of these students are reaching the point that they can utilize public transportation, its location between Dixwell Avenue and Whitney Avenue in the Town of Hamden is ideal; 4. it's a very sound building, it's a building that is in its architecture and its layout ideally suited as a vocational training facility. The type of student that we're talking about in this facility is the more severe student.

March 11, 1980

REP. MC CLUSKEY: (Continued)

is just the kind of proposal that was -- was hoped could be reached. The -- my understanding is that the water company used it for their highway garage, which is certainly more of a threat to the -- the water quality than the use that you have, so...

REP. ANDERSON: Okay, I'd like to interrupt. We have this room until quarter of and it is now ten of. We're going to have to recess and commence the hearing in the Hawaiian Room at five minutes after two, which is up on the fifth floor. So if you'd come back, Peter, go upstairs -- unless you have no...

REP. MC CLUSKEY: I -- I have no...

REP. ANDERSON: Are there any other questions? There are no others. I guess you're finished then, Peter. Thank you.

(After short recess, hearing reconvened in Hawaiian Room)

REP. ANDERSON: The next speaker is Helen Raffuse. I bet you I haven't said that right yet, right?

MS. HELEN RAFFUSE: You have. Sometimes it's pronounced a lot differently than that, Raffuse.

REP. ANDERSON: Raffuse. Okay, I got Helen right anyway.

MS. RAFFUSE: No problem. SB 19 I am Helen Raffuse from Chester, Dog Warden. I better tell you that I was sort of conned into this, being a speaker, I was -- I thought I was signing a guest list, which doesn't say much for a police officer I don't...

REP. ANDERSON: That's how I enlisted in the Navy for four years.

MS. RAFFUSE: I'm here to ask you to not support Bill 19. I am one from a town that does not have a pound, having to use a veterinarian's facility; and believe me, it's a very, very difficult situation. And I would first be very concerned that the same thing might not happen as has just recently happened in our town, whereby our town was told, written -- had a letter written to them by the Department of Agriculture, stating that they could not use the Chester Veterinary Clinic after December 31, because it is in violation of the state standards as to requirements for a dog pound, 22336, 1 through 12, which

MS. RAFFUSE: (Continued)

says, dimensions of runs, whatever. This does not have runs, the dogs are in a little four by four cage all the time, and many other things, so I just wonder if we supported Bill 19, would we have the same sort of thing going on if it was something that was convenient within the town but didn't meet the standards, since since December 31, now the Department of Agriculture has said, you may use it on -- ah -- an extended term until your town comes to some other provisions. Which, thanks to Mr. Ruggerio, I might have had a pound in the works by now, but since this was sort of let out before, our -- my selectmen are sort of sitting on the sidelines hoping that this will pass so that they won't have to build a pound.

I did start some action last fall -- last spring, and did get some plans, went out among people in my town, contractors, and did get bids -- ah -- that were not up to \$20,000 yet -- met -- volunteer help, everything -- ah -- School for a little bit of funds for experience and -- ah -- the funds were there, but I -- I don't have any action on a pound yet because of this sort of thing.

Working in the Chester Veterinary Clinic, as it would be with any other veterinary facility, is difficult because, one, they do not have 24 hour services, and what do you do? Our dog warden's job is not any set period of time. We're called any hour of the day or night to impound a dog, holidays, weekends or whatever. You wait -- certainly, you can call them, but you have to wait a long time. I've had to wait a long time for a vet to come and let me in. There's no free access. The dogs do not have as good an opportunity to be placed into a new home because of being kept there, because a board goes up, so after the seven days, they're rather in jeopardy. And I have made myself a reputation by having dogs that I have kept for at least three months, and have found the owners of these dogs that had been lost through accident or had been stolen. These were very rewarding experiences to be able to have these dogs go back to their owners. So they would not have that opportunity in -- in a veterinary clinic or even a kennel.

We do have a very nice, well known kennel in our town also who refused, as of six and a half years ago when our local pound was closed, and the veterinary services were offered to the town on a temporary basis, this kennel proprietor was asked if he would be willing to take the stray dogs, and he

MS. RAFFUSE: (Continued)

said he would definitely not have them, because he could not jeopardize the dogs that he is having there that are being boarded and supposedly being very sanitary conditions, and so forth, having stray dogs brought in that might be carrying some diseases, and I'm finding that 99 percent of the stray dogs that I pick up are infested with parasites, worms, which can be transferred to other dogs. My situation, I cannot see the dog: once I take it in there, it is taken from me into the facility. When I want to show it, I have to make an appointment. I cannot go and see where that dog is being kept. I have had many people talk to me when I have been there during hours, and said, I do not like the fact that you have your stray dogs possibly out here in the back right next to my dog that is a healthy dog, but is just here because it needed worming. It isn't good for the veterinarian, nor is it good for the dog warden.

I've had the employees let the dogs out by paying the board fee at the veterinary clinic without my being able to collect a redemption fee. So you have different employees -- there's quite a turnover of employees in this situation, plus the veterinarians, plus the -- the receptionists and the workers there. There are so many other -- ah -- things that I could go on and on and tell you that it is not feasible -- is not a workable thing for a dog warden to have to go to a veterinary clinic or a kennel or whatever. If we were to go to this kennel that I'm talking about, I'm sure we would have many more problems in our town than I'm already having, because these dogs are very noisy, and they have tw -- 30 to 40 dogs there. If I were to go in there at 11 o'clock at night and impound a dog, can't you imagine all the racket that would be and the neighbors would really be up. I know -- I can't know where there is a veterinary clinic or a boarding kennel that's out in the boondocks away from anyone who is within hearing distance of the animals when they would be disturbed and bark.

In relation to regional pounds, the Town of Essex and the Town of Deep River, which are adjoining towns of mine, do not have a pound either, and we did talk, the three towns, and -- ah -- tried to do something about a regional pound. Essex and Westbrook are sharing the same pound, which is in Westbrook, and there is problems all the time between the dog wardens -- one doesn't clean when the other one does, and the one has someone coming in to show the dogs and the other one -- the

MS. RAFFUSE: (Continued)

other side is dirty. This is things that you have that you -- is -- you can't -- you're not working with each other, you're not doing the same things at the same time.

If you have a pound, then it is the dog warden's job to take care of it, unless the town wants to provide a part time worker to take care of them. Believe me, I'd be more than happy to take care of my dogs if I only had a pound.

I -- I see where it would be very expensive for a regional pound, or I find it expensive for our town to be boarding the dogs at the veterinary clinic, because of the board fee -- the cost is much more than it would cost for the -- a dog being kept in the dog pound.

The -- for instance, if I had my own pound and it happened to be a time when I didn't have a dog, I could turn the heat down to a reasonable -- ah -- number. The cost of food wouldn't be as much. The cleaning -- the -- ah -- I just mentioned about the cleaning of the pound. It's -- you are not supposed to double them up. How do we know, if they want a little bit more money and they don't have the room, that they might put one of my dogs in with one of my other ones?

Any questions?

REP. ANDERSON: Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

REP. AHEARN: Yes, a question or two, John. Representative Ahearn.

REP. ANDERSON: Representative Ahearn.

REP. AHEARN: I'm sorry, would you give me your name, please.

MS. RAFFUSE: I'm Helen Raffuse, the Chester Dog Warden.

REP. AHEARN: Matthews?

MS. RAFFUSE: Raffuse, R-a-f-f-u-s-e.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, the Chester, okay. How long have you been dog warden?

MS. RAFFUSE: Seven years.

102  
kjz

## ENVIRONMENT

March 11, 1980

SB 19

- REP. AHEARN: Do you feel that it would be a political football, in effect, if the dog warden were to be split, or would be in a particular town and have to have some kind of a liaison with a veterinarian or a kennel and the two or three towns involved would -- would be passing it around like a -- like a football? Do you feel that you would be losing control over the situation?
- MS. RAFFUSE: I do.
- REP. AHEARN: Basically, is what it amounts to.
- MS. RAFFUSE: Unhuh.
- REP. AHEARN: On the idea of the regional pound however, do you have reservations about that completely?
- MS. RAFFUSE: Yes I do, because there have been some that I've -- know have closed because they were not workable, and there are others -- I think maybe two or three others in the state that are really having problems.
- REP. AHEARN: We have heard that there a couple of them that seem to be doing pretty well, like in Branford and Guilford.
- MS. RAFFUSE: I wasn't aware that Branford and Guilford had a combination, because...
- REP. AHEARN: Yeah.
- MS. RAFFUSE: We -- our Valley Shore and Home Welfare League are helping them place some of their dogs. I wasn't aware that there was one facility.
- REP. AHEARN: Well, one town pays \$1,800 to the other town for the use of its facility is what it amounts to.
- MS. RAFFUSE: Unhuh.
- REP. AHEARN: I think your comments are good though, however. Thank you.
- REP. ANDERSON: Are there any other questions? Thank you very much. The next speaker is Gus Heilberg followed by Helen Reid.

MR. GUS HEILBERG: Mr. Chairman, members of the Environment Committee, I'm August Heilberg, General Manager, Connecticut Humane Society. I'm also speaking today as the chairman of the steering committee for the Connecticut Federation of Humane Societies. We'd like to register in opposition to Senate Bill 19, an act concerning provisions of facilities for detention and care of dogs.

I think it's important at this point to emphasize to you, which has not been brought out, that redemption of animals, those pets that are straying, usually occurs within 24 to 48 hours. Any period thereafter, it starts to dwindle down, making it any difficult -- or any more difficult for pet owners, who are lazy people in many instances, to retain their pets, indirectly is going to cost the town more money. You know that they have to be held for seven days and advertised in the paper. You move them from one town to another, these people, for whatever excuse, just don't move out of the town. They don't go looking for them.

The average cost right now for processing dogs runs between 35 and 40 dollars, and it's going to keep going. Towns who presently have pounds and those comparable towns who don't have pounds, redeem approximately 50 percent less of the stray animals, and their budget for animal control is about 50 percent more. So in effect these towns are penny wise and pound foolish. That's what it boils down to.

We'd also like to go on record to indicate that we are in favor of Senate Bill 333, an act prohibiting the sale of certain animals. Our agency in numerous occasions receives these so-called exotic pets, and in -- in which we're talking about is a tremendous reservoir for rabies. Connecticut does not have a mandatory rabies vaccination relative to dogs, and this potential hazard just keeps coming down the tube.

As far as Senate Bill 385 concerning leashing of dogs, I will just speak on behalf of the Connecticut Humane Society's position, because there is some concern back and forth in animal groups. The Connecticut Humane Society would register an opposed to mandatory leashing of dogs.

I think you have to understand that making it mandatory to leash a dog is not going to improve the statute any. What is needed is implementation of existing statutes. Putting bandaids on statutes isn't going to solve your problem.

MR. HEILBERG: (Continued)

We would also like to speak on Senate Bill 540, an act concerning the killing of deer. We would like to register in favor of said bill, although we are not in favor of hunting per se as a humane organization, we do see the need for stringent -- ah -- penalties relative to this statute.

Thank you.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Thank you very much, Gus. Are there any questions? Al.

SB 19

REP. AHEARN: Just one brief question. What are those figures again, Gus? I didn't get them when you -- when you made your pun about dog pounds and pound wise and penny foolish. The processing of impounding dogs by local community was 25 to 40 dollars I think you said. Would you repeat that.

MR. HEILBERG: Well, it was around 20 or so dollars, but now it's running closer to \$40.

REP. AHEARN: And you said that the town that has its own pound as compared to the town that -- ah -- goes in with the regional or other type of facility...

MR. HEILBERG: The community that doesn't have its own pound, and Mr. Gillette can bear these facts out, their budget for an animal control program is approximately 50 percent more than the town that has the pound. He's got it in black and white. And it is -- and it backs it up relative to the return for the stray dogs. In other words, the town with the pound will return to owners 50 percent more animals and cost them 50 percent less in their animal control program, because now they're getting the money back from the offending party and more often than not these animals are not truly stray animals, they are pet that are straying. They are usually found maybe two or three streets away from their original home, and if left alone, they'd go right back there. However, they are usually, in many cases, picked up by the animal control officer and now the town has to pick up the tab. You take them out of their immediate location, making it difficult for people to redeem their animal, all you're doing is costing money for the town. And in the end result, the animal probably is not going to be relocated with its owner and you have a dead animal. That's what it boils down to.

105  
kjz

## ENVIRONMENT

March 11, 1980

REP. AHEARN: Do most towns who have to euthanize dogs take them to veterinarians or to your place?

MR. HEILBERG: It's either one or the other. Of course, since the passage of the legislation last year, we have cut back considerably on the towns that we service. At our peak, we handled over 80 towns throughout the state of Connecticut.

REP. AHEARN: Are there 80 towns now that you handle?

MR. HEILBERG: No.

REP. AHEARN: What do you -- what do you handle now?

MR. HEILBERG: I think we're down around 25 to 30, and we're hoping to cut that back further.

REP. AHEARN: What are you charging the towns?

MR. HEILBERG: We're charging them...

REP. AHEARN: Is it a contract basis or for each dog or cat that's brought in?

MR. HEILBERG: For each animal that we euthanize for a town, it costs \$10. And that's a bargain in the field as far as -- unless you're getting it free from a veterinarian in your community, that's a pretty cheap going rate. It averages...

REP. AHEARN: Dog or cat?

MR. HEILBERG: Dog or cat, yeah.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, thank you.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Are there any further questions?

REP. JOYCE: Gene, can I ask...

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Yes, Ray -- Representative Joyce.

REP. JOYCE: Those figures again, Gus, where are they from? Those figures you quoted that were...

MR. HEILBERG: State Canine Control Office -- ah -- I -- I've looked at their records and discussed it with Mr. Gillette

MR. HEILBERG: (Continued)

SB 619

and those -- those -- those figures relative to costs on processing an animal as well as the cost per budget per town.

REP. JOYCE: Well, these are just -- ah -- what was it again, 100 -- 50 percent more it costs the town?

MR. HEILBERG: It averages about 50 percent more for those towns that do not have their own pound. I would -- I went...

REP. JOYCE: That's not the total figure, that's just per animal probably.

MR. HEILBERG: Well, their budget per year.

REP. JOYCE: Well, that's -- that's deceptive I think, isn't it?

MR. HEILBERG: What's that?

REP. JOYCE: That's a little deceptive, isn't it? That's a -- if the town has 15 animals a year that they have a -- they would be required to go out and put up a building and -- ah...

MR. HEILBERG: Well, I think there's exceptions. You know, there's no question that there are some towns that don't necessarily need it, but I think rather than pass a statute and weaken the statute as it is, -- ah -- they'd be better to work this out in regulation, however, within the department. There's no necessity to undermine those 120-odd towns who've gone ahead and complied with this statute.

REP. JOYCE: Let me get back to that figure again. You say that you're quoting whom, first of all, Gus?

MR. HEILBERG: The Chief Canine Control Officer.

REP. JOYCE: Who is?

MR. HEILBERG: Mr. Gilette.

REP. JOYCE: Who was here this morning.

MR. HEILBERG: He was here this morning, right. He has those figures.

REP. JOYCE: His figure says it's 50 -- 50 percent more per animal?

MR. HEILBERG: There's an average. 50 percent of the operating budget for an animal control program in a town. In other words, if you're spending \$1,000 because you don't have a pound, the other town's only -- in a comparable size -- you're -- the other town's only spending approximately \$500.

REP. JOYCE: Well, that's per animal, but what about the...

MR. HEILBERG: No, that's a yearly budget.

REP. JOYCE: What about the amortization of the building costs and the expense of -- that includes all that too?

MR. HEILBERG: No, I think that's just the -- the...

REP. JOYCE: Per animal.

MR. HEILBERG: Well, okay, if you want to put it per animal, right.

REP. JOYCE: This is -- you know, we have an awful responsibility here imposing on towns, mandating towns that they put up a building.

MR. HEILBERG: I understand.

REP. JOYCE: In a small town that's a -- that's a serious...

MR. HEILBERG: No, I understand. I think that -- again, the way to go with that is to work it out in regulations as opposed to setting forth a statute, that regulations can be worked out easier than passing a statute.

REP. JOYCE: What would the regulations be, Gus? Do you mean they would be required to do something essentially...

MR. HEILBERG: In essence what's happening now, the only penalty that state's imposing on these towns is holding back moneys. They're doing what they want to do now. They're getting together in -- in a total of 40-odd towns in community pounds. Maybe two or three towns are getting together, and they're just flaunting whatever the statute says. The only penalty to them is that they're not getting their license fees back, and it's being held in escrow until such time as they comply with the statute. And the state -- as far as Hartford is concerned, it's run up to \$30,000, and if they added another \$30,000, they could have a very nice little pound -- ah -- and do the job that's necessary for that city.

MR. HEILBERG: (Continued)

Some of these other towns it's down, you know, down to five of \$1,000 that's being held, it's not really effecting them to any great extent.

REP. JOYCE: Now you say by regu -- they could do this by regulation. What would the regulation be that the Commissioner could inspect?

MR. HEILBERG: No, I think the regulation should stip -- stipulate relative to certain conditions -- ah -- that he could waive the mandate that they would have to construct said pound, if under his guidance or under his officers' inspection, that they were meeting a standard that was acceptable, it could be worked out.

MR. HEILBERG: (Continued) SB 19

If under his guidance or under his officer's inspection, if they were meeting a standard, it was acceptable. It could be worked out.

REP. JOYCE: That would do very much what this bill would do, really, wouldn't it?

MR. HEILBERG: Well, I don't like statutes.

REP. JOYCE: Thank you. Are there any other questions? Thank you very much, Gus.

MR. HEILBERG: Thank you.

REP. JOYCE: The next speaker is Helen Reid from Newtown, followed by--to be followed by Officer Frank Strona of New Haven.

MS. HELEN REID: I'm Helen Reid from Newtown, Connecticut. I have been in dogs for about thirty years. I have been the Dog Warden of Newtown. I have been the Dog Warden for almost four years. I own and maintain my own kennel which is separate from the Dog Warden--from the dog pound. One of the reasons is because I don't want my dogs subject to the dogs that I do pick up, because they do pick up not only parasites, but usually they are loaded with fleas and ticks, which also transmit disease amongst the animals.

Newtown, at one time, before--this is a few years back, I forget just what year, the Dog Warden at that time had the dogs--kept the dogs at his own place which was considered the dog pound, and it can be verified by the State Canine Control Officer, had to close the pound. The veterinarian in town, went up there, and there were thirty dogs they had to order, all but six destroyed, because the conditions were just atrocious. This person was paid to keep these animals, but it didn't work out. They eventually, even had to put the six that they tried to save, euthanized, too. They went to another kennel to another woman's home in another part of town, tried to maintain the dog pound that way, and that condition did not work out also. In a lot of that the problem there was these people would not euthanize the animals. They also--if people wanted to come in, the hours were such even--nothing was mentioned here before, but many times, a lot of these animals are up for adoption if they are not claimed, and when you put them into a veterinarian or a prior--a commercial kennel, they are not up for adoption--you know, people want to come in and see the animals, and the people that maintain these places

MS. REID: (Continued)

can't be bothered to show these animals for adoption, so many of them are euthanized that didn't have to be. Near me is the New Milford--near Newtown's border, Brookfield, New Milford has a regional pound that covers four towns; New Milford, Bridgewater, Brookfield, Sherman and New Fairfield. They have two wardens that do work very well together that cover this area. I have had to call them, being on my town line many times. Sometimes our dogs get over to their area, or I have picked up dogs from their area, and have had many contacts with them that way and was able to get these dogs back to their owners. But a lot of all this, I am opposed to the bill because to me it's not--it's changing the law instead of towns abiding my a law that was set into motion for the towns to work with very well. If you change this law, what happens to the towns that have been abiding by the law? Can they turn around and slough off and not take care of the pounds as well. You talk about inspections, they do have inspections, but why should a few towns, because they don't want to feel they can have the funds to put up a pound, they turn around, and want to change it to their benefit, you know, make it beneficial to them. I was going to say something, but forgot. Oh, I know what it was. Veterinarians--as far as putting dogs into veterinarians, also--our veterinarian, we have two in town now, but even then, veterinarians charge a lot more than your other towns, because they don't want to be bringing these dogs into their facilities, as they feel, you know, it cramps their situation.

They have operations, you know, to take care of these sick dogs. They don't want to be taking dogs in. They even told--my veterinarian told me he doesn't even like to board dogs of people who are just going away, so that is why he charges excessive amounts to discourage people from bringing their dogs to him to board, and he feels they should take them to a boarding kennel. I have---well, that's just about it.

REP. JOYCE: Okay, are there any questions from the members of the committee?

REP. AHEARN: Just one question. Someone who has been in this as long as you, Helen, and is familiar with this, I have great respect for your opinion and I, going back to my basic question, I can see how you feel very strongly about the veterinarian and the kennel owner. They don't want the lousy stray dogs, and I can't see why they don't want them, and they make it difficult for the town, but getting

REP. AHEARN: (Continued)

back to the regional system, are there any systems that you know of that seem to be working effectively, like Branford and Gilford, for instance, where two towns can share a pound. Do you really object to that?

MS. REID: No, no, that's what I said, I can see, you know, if they have a regional pound, right.

REP. AHEARN: And you feel that two dog wardens, one town and another, can work together cooperatively in a system like that?

MS. REID: I think if they set up certain rules and regulations right from the beginning, it's like anything else. If you say this is the way it's going to be, and stick to it. It's just like this law, really, you said this is the way it's going to be, and it should stick to it.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, thank you, dear.

SEN. SHOWRONSKI: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Officer Frank Strona from New Haven, to be followed by Officer Richard Wiese of Cheshire, and the next speaker is a D. or G. Aspinwall from North Haven. The next speaker is Ed Risko from Monroe, to be followed by Michael Parizo of the Law Revision Commission.

MR. EDWARD RISKO: I am Edward Risko from the Monroe town. I am the warden there. I have been there since October of 1978. We have got a shelter and I am in opposition to Committee Bill 19. Basically, for two reasons. The time the kennel would be available for us to bring in a dog, and also the cost of boarding the dog there for a period of seven to eight days. Right now, the standard boarding fees for most kennels and veterinary officers are approximately five dollars, three-fifty to five dollars per dog, per day. This would run us, using my own figures from last year, 1978 to 1979, fiscal year, it would cost us approximately \$4,680 to have kept dogs in there as long as we did that year. Whereas it cost me, actually, to operate my own shelter \$1,525 for that period. It's basically, the only thing.

SEN. SHOWRONSKI: Thank you. Are there any questions?  
Representative Joyce.

REP. JOYCE: Let's see, now. Your shelter in Monroe, it cost you \$1,120 was it sir?

MR. RISK0: About \$1,525.

REP. JOYCE: And if you figured out--if you did not have your own facility there, it would have cost \$4,680, was it?

MR. RISK0: Yes.

REP. JOYCE: Okay, now, this \$1,525, what does---that's just the animal itself, that doesn't include any--they other type of overhead such as....

MR. RISK0: No, that's the operation of the building, the amount of food. That's the operation of the building and the amount of food that I use for those animals during that period.

REP. JOYCE: How about the payroll for attendants and so forth?

MR. RISK0: As far as an attendant goes, you can be paying your full time warden, and he would take over that responsibility.

REP. JOYCE: Don't you think that should be included in there, also, then? In the \$1,525?

MR. RISK0: No, I do not because already you are paying a full time warden. The warden is working on fees.

REP. JOYCE: How much is it---what does it cost for the warden to Monroe?

MR. RISK0: That varies quite a bit, because it works on a contract type basis. Presently, I am being paid approximately \$10,000 a year.

REP. JOYCE: Is this paid by the city of Monroe or the town of Monroe, or by through the fees?

MR. RISK0: This is being paid through the dog fund.

REP. JOYCE: Through the dog fund, from the state then?

MR. RISK0: No, from the town of Monroe. Each municipality has its own dog fund.

REP. JOYCE: Okay, Fifty percent of which, goes to the state, right?

MR. RISK0: I believe so.

REP. JOYCE: Now, this \$4,680, how is that---is that just for the dog, or is there anything there for the...

SB 19

MR. RISKO: All I figured that on was the amount of money that it would cost in order to board any dogs that I had picked up during that period in one of our kennels that is in the town.

REP. JOYCE: How about the cost of the building that you have in Monroe?

MR. RISKO: The cost to maintain it?

REP. JOYCE: Yes. Heat and electricity and so forth, don't you think that should be included in there also?

MR. RISKO: I included it in my base price of \$1,500. It cost me last year to heat the building, \$774, and then for maintenance of the building, that would include the electrical and the phone, there would be another \$750.

REP. JOYCE: How about food?

MR. RISKO: The food runs...

REP. JOYCE: I mean you are up to \$1,400.

MR. RISKO: The food runs \$758.

REP. JOYCE: How much?

MR. RISKO: \$758.

REP. JOYCE: That's \$2,100 and something, isn't it? You have three seven hundreds, yet you only have \$1,525.

MR. RISKO: Because I didn't include the food in that \$1,500 cost.

REP. JOYCE: How about insurance, did you include insurance in there, too?

MR. RISKO: That would be covered under the town.

REP. JOYCE: Well, still, I mean, the town should apportion something for that building, the cost for operating this dog facility. How about the depreciation of the building, is that figured in there, too?

MR. RISKO: What do you mean by depreciation of the building?

REP. JOYCE: The building isn't going to last forever that you keep your dogs in, is it? It has to be repaired and has to be replaced some day.

MR. RISKO: That would be under the shelter maintenance.

REP. JOYCE: Still, it is a cost to the town that you haven't figured in here, anyway.

MR. RISKO: Well, I did figure in the shelter maintenance, which includes all my expenses, except for the food.

REP. JOYCE: Except insurance, depreciation and food?

MR. RISKO: Because the insurances never come out of my fund.

REP. JOYCE: Thank you very much.

MR. RISKO: The depreciation, I wouldn't know about.

REP. AHEARN: Representative, just a quick question, Ed, how big is the town of Monroe? Population wise?

MR. RISKO: We have a population of approximately 14,000 people.

REP. AHEARN: And how many dogs--when you talk about that figure, that \$4,680 that are boarded out, how many dogs do you impound in a year, the year that you based this on?

MR. RISKO: That year, that period was 204 dogs impounded.

REP. AHEARN: 204?

MR. RISKO: That's correct.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, thank you.

SEN. SHOWRONSKI: Are there any other questions? Yes, you could come forward to the microphone, Helen, I think--no, yes, you are Helen also.

MS. HELEN RAFFUSE: The gentleman that was here from New Haven, that had to leave, told me that in New Haven they have 31 or 32 runs in their pound. Sometimes he has sixty-some dogs in there, I'll wager he must double them up, but nevertheless, he told me the cost per dog and he has about 2,000 dogs a year, is \$2.65 per dog and that includes maintenance of the building, the warden's salary and taking care of the dogs, so I don't know if that will help you, but I thought I would add that.

SEN. SHOWRONSKI: Okay, thank you, Helen. The next speaker is Michael Parizo from the Law Revision Commission, to be followed by Edward Hooker from Hartford.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: The other question was, Any idea of how much this would cost, the fiscal impact of this bill?

MR. ANDERSON: I believe none. This we asked in a meeting with Commissioner Crow and the head of the Dairy and Live Stock Divisions at the State Department of Agriculture and they said they foresaw no fiscal impact for now.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: For now. Okay. Thank you. Any other questions?

The next speaker is Betty Long to be following by Gail Ewen.

SB 19  
BETTY LONG: Ladies and Gentlemen of the Environmental Committee, for the last twenty-five years I have devoted my life to the welfare of animals. I have worked with very, very many dog wardens, dog pounds etc. It sounds very, very good to board a dog with a veterernarian. If it is your own dog, and a sick dog, fine. But we find and I have found it in three different veterernarians who have boarded dogs that these poor dogs are treated like second class citizens. We have taken dogs from one particular veterernarian down in our area where they have kept them trully, three and four weeks which is fine but they have come out looking absolutely like skeletons and they just don't pay any attention to the poor animal. No animal is really a stray animal, it's usually a lost animal. There are no dogs in our part of Connecticut, certainly they've all been owned by somebody. I really feel we shouldn't license dogs we should license the owner. The man who cuts your hair has to have a license, the woman that washes my hair has to have a license, to drive a car you have to have a license, you have to prove you know what you are doing. Why not license when you get a dog to prove you know how to take care of it. That's where our whole system is wrong. Don't license the poor dog, license the owner. If the owner doesn't behave himself like a little town in Ohio, put the owner in the pound, not the dog, it's not his fault.

Too many irresponsible dog owners and this goes right back to our education. I talk to kids at school all the time, we all do. But, the school themselves teach nothing in the world about the domestic animals we are supposed to live with. Now, that's now your department but it certainly is necessary. People should be taught about animals in school. It would save all kinds of taxpayer's money. We have people on our spading, and we do run a low cost spading clinic, oh I would have had this animal spade, I thought it had to be a year old, here it

MS. LONG: (continued)

had puppies when it was eight or nine months old. Where did they ever teach that in school. The same for kittens. Five months old a little kitten can become impregnated. Oh, gosh we would have had it spade but we didn't realize this could happen so soon. Well, this is education.

Years ago I sat on a committee, it was one of the last things Governor Ribicoff happened to organize here in the state, it was called the Governor's Committee. We sat for a solid year revising the dog laws as they are pretty much today and I wish to goodness that Section 2366 will stay the way it is. When we have a fine Control Officer like Louie G who is one of the most dedicated people I know. He works with all these things, he knows what he's talking about. There is one thing when you get into nitty gritty with your sleeves rolled up and see what is happening around pounds, these are the people I think you ought to listen to. They really know what's happening.

One person a few minutes ago spoke about boarding dogs. He mentioned something like two or three dollars a day. I'd love to know where that is. I have 15 dogs of my own that I have to board when I have to go away. I can't find anybody to do anything under five to eight dollars a day, depending on the size of the dog. Now those are good boarding kennels or veterinarians. It's not inexpensive to board a dog in any place and kennels do not like them. In Westport we boarded our dogs in a kennel, miserable. Then we went to a veterinarian. The veterinarian is good but he doesn't have the facilities. They only have cages and veterinarians very seldom see they dogs they are boarding. They have kennel kids that come and go and they don't look at them very much, maybe if the dog gets sick they might but otherwise they don't bother with the so called, even their own borders. I don't even like to board a dog with a veterinarian. He's too busy helping sick dogs. A boarding kennel would be better, but I've been in some pretty miserable boarding kennels where they will not let you in to see how they take care of those animals. Those are the ones to be aware of.

I really beg all of you to think very, very well before you destroy what we tried to do so long ago. We really have some of the best dog laws of anywhere right here in Connecticut.

120  
kms

## ENVIRONMENT

March 11, 1980

MS. LONG (continued)

and somebody asked about euthanasia, that committee we had that started in about 1960-61, that was the committee out of which came the thing that all unclaimed dogs had to be euthanized by veterinarians. There are very few towns that had not complied with that law. There were a couple who were right in my neighborhood who did not. At that time they had the Connecticut Human Society do it and we all knew we didn't like the euthanair machine, which has been outlawed in so many states and is finally outlawed in Connecticut. But by and large nearly all towns did abide by that particular law.

I have been doing this work for 25 years. In the beginning it was very, very discouraging. It still is but more and more and more people are really becoming extremely animal conscious. If you look at old Fitz and you see Mr. or Mrs. So and So died, where are all their children. Yes, this one's in Salt Lake City, another one's in Los Angeles, another one is in Hawaii, poor mom and dad stuck all by themselves, so what do they do, they take an animal. The animal becomes their family. I have no family except my animals. They mean more to me than anything. Gosh if any of mine ever got into a bad pound, I'd sue that pound for everything if they didn't take good care of my animal. My animals happen to be kept in great big fenced in yards. I don't have other things that other people have, but I do have good protection, I hope, for my animals. I wish there was a law that with animal, every dog, had to have a paged fenced in yard. It's a roaming dog that causes all the trouble. The dog at home or the dog that's kept under control is not. Leash laws are fine if people abide by them, but who's going to enforce it. It's the irresponsible dog warden. If they had to prove they knew how to take care of an animal 385 before they were issued a license we'd have an awful lot of dog woes that wouldn't happen. Thank you all very much and please don't disturb 22336.

#10  
SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Thank you very much.

REP. AHEARN: Just one question. SB 385 You did mention the leash law, Betty and I understand that you feel this law is not a good law, is that correct? The bill I mean.

MS. LONG: I think in a real urban area you've got to have a leash law, but I think in your rural community that it really

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Thank you. Are there any questions?

REP. AHEARN: Yes, just one question. I didn't understand you. Are you for or against 542?

MR. LYNCH: 542 -- I am against 542 as far as the pass is concerned. I don't think it will generate the monies that are contemplated. I think will go at a cheaper rate more often than they would if they had to pay, for instance they had to pay a \$5 pass. If they could go to the park facilities at the present time at a dollar parking fee, I think they would go more often.

REP. AHEARN: So you're against 542?

MR. LYNCH: (Speaker inaudible)

REP. AHEARN: Additionally, you said you were for 536 and 542, it's my understanding. Now, I understand that you're against, really, the 542 concept. It's too high.

MR. LYNCH: I'm not for -- I don't want the pass proposition.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, thank you.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Are there any other questions? Thank you. The next speaker is Philip Woodrow, Connecticut Lung Association. John Inman from the Hartford Humane Society of the United States. John. He was clean shaven when he signed up. Isn't that true?

SB 19

MR. JOHN INMAN: I'm really asleep on my duff. You know, I'll never run for public office. I don't envy you people this experience at all. If this is -- where are my notes. I'll go through my testimony quickly and then I want to make some comments.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Environment Committee, I'm John Inman. Thank you for the opportunity to speak here today. I'm the New England Regional Director for the Humane Society of the United States. My office is located in West Hartford. My residence is located in Hartford.

In behalf of our 2200 members who live in Connecticut, I wish to speak concerning three of the bills you are considering today.

MR. INMAN: (continued)

I urge you to veto proposed Senate Bill No. 19 concerning facilities for the impoundment of dogs. The existing laws governing dog pounds are adequate and flexible enough to meet the individual needs of the varying communities throughout the state. That is proved by the fact that approximately two-thirds of the towns in the state do now comply with the law. There is no reason why the other third of the towns cannot comply.

In order for an animal control department to function effectively and successfully, it must be convenient. And I underscore that word "convenient" for the taxpayers to use the facility. The facility must be easy to find; it should be well marked by street signs; it should be an attractive, clean, comfortable place for the animals, employees and the public. The facility must be open for business when it is convenient for the taxpayers to get there -- in the evening after work and on weekends.

It must also conform to the minimum standards of construction, operation and animal care procedures recommended by the Humane Society of the United States.

At this point, I'd like to digress for just a moment and refer to something that Billy Gillette said in his statement this morning. He indicated that he feels it is time to reassess the problem of animal control in the State of Connecticut and that is time to get realistic about the financial aspect of animal control.

I'm sorry that Representative Joyce had to leave the room. He, in his questioning of some of the dog wardens, raised questions about the cost of building animal shelters, and he was concerned about imposing the cost of the construction of an animal shelter on a town's Board of Selectmen. I would like to urge you to consider the fact that what we're talking about in terms of animal control is a matter of public health and public safety.

We do not hesitate to urge Town Selectmen to spend money for police and fire and other forms of health and public safety and animal control is a matter of public health and public safety. Unfortunately, it is on the bottom of the rung in terms of the priorities of the cities.

MR. INMAN: (continued)

In Seattle, Washington, for example, 85 percent of the Dog Pound budget is derived from dog's license sales. Merikopa County, Arkansas, derives 78 percent of its budget and Salt Lake City, Utah, derives 60 percent of its budget from dog license sales. Therefore, the point is that dog pound construction and operational costs can be largely self-sustaining.

My feeling is, based on some of the comments that Senator Ruggiero made this morning. He was concerned about small communities having a problem building their own facility. I said to Mr. Gilette last fall, building plans which our society has developed -- we have a variety of building plans available and based on a construction figure of \$35 a square foot, which the architect felt was sort of an average construction figure, we have a small animal shelter with six runs in it which can be built at a cost of approximately -- I think it was \$19,000 for that small facility. That just for the construction cost. That doesn't include the equipment that would need to go into it, or, you know, heat and the insurance and so forth and so on.

But my point is that there is a lot of material available. We talked about the small towns versus the large towns in Connecticut and the Committee is faced with the problem of writing a law which will apply equally to all towns. The City of Hartford has been a problem for years. I've only been in the New England office for three years. I understand from Mr. Gilette and Mr. Helberg that they have been dealing with the City of Hartford for about ten years concerning its dog pound problem.

With all due respect to the government of the City of Hartford, animal control is a joke. Margaret was the only member of the City Council who ever took the problem seriously. She begged the Humane Society of the United States to sue the City of Hartford for abuse to animals in the dog pound. We did not feel that that was an appropriate way to try to correct the problem. The point is that it is an ongoing problem in Hartford and other communities, and we feel that now, as Louis said, is the time to really reassess this. Let's take a serious look at it. I've just today given to Mr. Furbish some information from the State of New York where they have begun to take a whole new look at the problem of dog identification and control in that state.

136  
kjr

## ENVIRONMENT

March 11, 1980

MR. INMAN: (continued)

The point is that the Humane Society of the United States has been trying to offer information from other places around the nation to various communities in Connecticut for a long time and there are workable solutions to these problems. And I think that Senator Ruggiero and also Representative Rybak were indicating, you know, that they wanted to try to find a reasonable solution and I simply say let's get on with the job of finding that solution. It is possible to do so and I think our existing law is flexible enough, given the regional dog pound situation or proposal, or aspect of that, with the local dog pound aspect of it.

Concerning 333, I was very impressed with the testimony given by the staff member from the State Board of Public Health -- wild animals should not be kept as pets, ever, by anybody. They simply do not make pets and I would urge you to vote favorably on Committee Bill No. 333.

Concerning Committee Bill No. 385, the leash law, I would urge you to vote favorably and, concerning Raised Committee Bill No. 540, concerning the penalty for killing deer, we would support this effort to regulate hunting activity and, hopefully, through better regulation the activity there would be a decrease in animal suffering which results from the deer poaching and jacklighting activities that are currently going on. I have met with Mr. DeCarli on this subject and we hope to help him find solutions to this problem. Thank you.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Any questions? SB 19

REP. AHEARN: Just one question. Are you familiar with the laws in the State of Connecticut?

MR. INMAN: Am I familiar with what laws?

REP. AHEARN: The laws. You said it was about \$35 a square foot, it cost \$19,000. One of the complaints I've had and I happen to live in a town that does not have a dog pound. We've been told to meet the state requirements it would cost us maybe something like \$40,000 to \$60,000 for it to build a dog pound. Now, if we could -- and that's not the primary reason we're not building it, by the way, it's because we're looking for a building site and other internal problems we have.

137  
kjr

## ENVIRONMENT

March 11, 1980

REP. AHEARN: (continued)

But are you saying a \$19,000 six-run site -- that you could build a six-run site for about \$19,000 legally and meet the laws in the State of Connecticut requiring -- concerning the dog pounds?

MR. INMAN: I cannot answer that but I would assume that the answer would be "yes". The architect came up with that figure and I have the plans in my office. He came up with that figure based on \$35 a square foot being an average construction figure, nationwide, and I'm sure that the plans do comply with all building codes and regulations, nationwide. We wouldn't be distributing it from our Washington headquarters.

REP. TIFFANY: The one big difference there is that that does not include any site preparation. That's just the building.

MR. INMAN: Absolutely, you're correct.

REP. TIFFANY: ...you've got to dig the well, okay, and put the road into the facility. This is assuming you've got city water and you're assuming that you're building it right on the road.

MR. INMAN: That was one of the problems with the -- do you remember the \$300,000 bond issue that they tried to get through -- the City of Hartford -- for the construction of the dog pound. I was never able to get a breakdown on how that \$300,000 was to be spent but I think the bulk of it was for septic fields out there in the North Meadow. It wasn't for the building that the animals were going to kept in. So there are -- my point is, that I felt that the public was deceived on that particular matter, and as Representative Tiffany pointed out, there are many factors which have to be considered but it can come about reasonably.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Are there any other questions?

MR. INMAN: Thank you.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Thank you very much, John. Barbara Biewer.

MS. BARBARA BIEWER: I'm Barbara Biewer from East Granby, Connecticut. I'm talking against the changes in the dog leash law, No. 385. I'm a dog owner who spends considerable time training my pets for obedience trials and field trials.

MS. BIEWER: (continued)

Obedience training is not only a sport which many dog owners in Connecticut participate in, but also is important in promoting better citizenship for dogs and their owners.

We agree that no dog should be allowed to roam at large, out of control, and be a nuisance to neighbors and a danger to motorists and farmers. We believe that the present law prohibits this now when it is enforced. However, a law which would require dogs to be on leash at all times off the owner's land would hamper obedience training and be unfair to those of us who train our dogs to be under our control at all times.

Also, it is unfair that only hunting dogs would be allowed to be off leash and there are many other sports with dogs which require that the dogs be off leash.

We would support any law which would stop roaming dogs or prohibit walking of dogs on private land without the owners's permission. However, we are concerned that requiring leashing of dogs will hamper obedience training throughout Connecticut.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Thank you very much. Any questions?

REP. AHEARN: Yes. I don't like to prolong it but who do you represent, again, please? I didn't get it when you introduced yourself.

MS. BIEWER: Just myself -- dog owner.

REP. AHEARN: Okay, thank you.

SEN. SKOWRONSKI: Okay. Thank you very much. Is Paul Gutlief here? Dorothy Kane? Dorthy McCaffrey? Are there any other people who wish to speak?

MR. EDWARD ROBINSON: Edward Robinson. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, I would like to speak against Bill No. 19. I am deeply opposing this bill. I feel that this bill will give the dog warden, or act to dog wardens a joint ownership in the towns. Many times you might say how this happens is a town road has to be worked on; there's joint ownership between two towns and it's the dog town -- or this other town does not have a dog pound, and this joint town wants to work on this road, and they'll say "Okay, I'll go along with expenses on this road and I'll share it with you

MR. ROBINSON: (continued)

if we can use your facilities." And the First Selectman might say, "Oh, that's fine. That's no problem with me. You can use my facilities," not realizing the vast problems he has created for the dog warden and the problems of the taxpayers of this town, as far as disease, as far as responsibility to the dog warden is concerned.

Under the state statutes, a dog warden is responsible for the care and treatment of all dogs in his care. Now, if I have to bring in other dog town's dogs in my pound, am I going to be responsible for them? Am I going to be responsible if they get diseased in my town? Am I going to be sued for it? Is my town going to be sued for it?

If a person comes into visit and looked for a pet for their animal -- for their family -- and they're bitten by a dog from another town that is in my pound because of this. Am I going to be sued for it? Is my town going to be sued for it? Or is the adjoining town going to be sued for it? Who is going to pay these bills? This is what your opening yourself up to the towns to on this joint venture.

I don't like being a football. I don't want the responsibility. It isn't fair. All towns pay for their -- most of the towns pay for their own municipal pounds now. There's a small percentage that don't have pounds. I feel sorry for them but laws are made for the benefit of the majority, not the minority and you're going to hurt the majority and benefit the minority with this bill.

SB 385

On the Leash Law Bill, I'd like to speak in favor of that one, also. The problem with people today is they're getting more lax and lax. There are certain laws governing roaming dogs now but, here again, there are loopholes in that law which you have eliminated when this Leash Law was developed. One of the biggest problems under the Roaming Law right now is the one single wording in the Roaming Statutes: "the unauthorized presence", unauthorized. It doesn't make much sense "unauthorized". Who authorizes a dog to be there in Joe Blow's yard if he doesn't live there. You'd be surprised.

If I get called down the street, according to the general statutes, the state laws, the Governor and the judges -- if I get called down the street by a complaintant about black and white dog, I go to that residence and by the time I get

64  
kjc

ENVIRONMENT

March 12, 1980

BELT

#10

MS. LUCAS: (continued)

communicate a lot more than we used to think. The gap between animals and human beings is closing. I want to particularly document what scientists have told me about pets, our pet dogs in laboratories. They say it's particularly hard on them. They cannot adjust to the laboratory. They're very say there and very upset. Animals for labs, in labs, seem to adjust a lot better to the laboratory, but pet dogs have a very difficult time existing there. Specifically our bill would prohibit the sale, giving or transfer of unclaimed impounded dogs to research facilities or to U.S.D.A. licensed dealers. It's a loss of a mere \$2,800 out of the \$1¼ million K-nine control budget, made up as you know of license money and fees, not one penny of taxpayer money.

In towns like Danbury where your Rep. Cloris Asechi comes from, 95 dogs out of 96 are placed by the Danbury Animal Welfare Society. There are no dogs to put down. When animal groups are allowed to work with the pound, they generally are able to place a good number of them and they always spade and neuter so they don't recycle.

I might remark, incidentally, that Governor Grass has promised in a communication to Helen Jones, President of the Society for Animal Rights, that she will sign such a bill, if you vote it favorably now and get it through the House and Senate. Since I wasn't able to be here yesterday, I'd just like to mention that I am against bill #19 to allow towns to share pounds, etc. I am very much for #95, the literal leash law.

I'm also, in case I don't get here to testify about SB385 steel jaw trap bill, I would like to say that I'm very much in favor of banding the steel jaw trap once and for all from Connecticut. I'll answer any questions from the committee. SB279

REP. ANDERSON: Are there any questions from the committee?

REP. JOYCE: (speaker inaudible)

MS. LUCAS: You're paying it out of your other pocket, the federal pocketbook, the research lab pays that much, spends that much, to condition each dog. SB 579

REP. JOYCE: (Speaker inaudible)