

PA 11-111

HB6303

House	3086-3101	16
Planning & Development	695, 697-701, 718-750, 760- 762, 903-924	64
<u>Senate</u>	<u>6551, 6573-6578</u>	<u>7</u>
		<b>87</b>

**H – 1100**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2011**

**VOL.54  
PART 9  
2762 – 3112**

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

64  
May 17, 2011

House Bill 6350.

Total Number Voting	140
Necessary for Passage	71
Those voting Yea	129
Those voting Nay	11
Those absent and not voting	11

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The Bill passes.

Would the Clerk please call Calendar 154. 154.

THE CLERK:

On Page 45, Calendar 154, Substitute for House  
Bill Number 6303 AN ACT CONCERNING THE TREATMENT OF  
ILL AND INJURED ANIMALS IN MUNICIPAL ANIMAL SHELTERS.  
Favorable Report of the Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Grogins, you have the floor,  
madam.

REP. GROGINS (129th):

Mr. Speaker, I move for the acceptance of the  
Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the  
Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The question before the Chamber is acceptance and passage of the Bill. Will you remark further?

Representative Grogins.

REP. GROGINS (129th):

Yes. The purpose of this Bill is to forge voluntary public/private partnerships between animal control officers and nonprofit rescue organizations so that the nonprofit rescue organizations and the ACOs, which stands for animal control officers, can assist the ACOs with the treatment of sick or injured animals.

And so it's been brought to our attention, this originated in the Planning and Development Committee, of which I am the Vice-Chair, that in some municipal and regional animal shelters the ACOs are overwhelmed or can't afford to treat all the animals in the shelter, and this would allow and set forth guidelines in which animal rescue groups, legitimate animal rescue groups, can come in and pay for the treatment of those animals in assisting the ACOs to make sure that animals do not suffer needlessly.

So I do have an Amendment. It's a strike-all Amendment, and I'd ask the Court, I'd ask the Clerk to

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

66  
May 17, 2011

please call the Amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

And that's LCO 6159.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Would the Clerk please LCO 6159, which shall be designated House Amendment Schedule "A".

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 6159, House "A" offered by  
Representatives Grogins, Urban and Chapin.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The Representative for the Park City has asked leave of the Chamber to summarize. Without objection? Seeing none, please proceed, madam.

REP. GROGINS (129th):

Yes, again, this is a strike-all Amendment, so this is the actual Bill, which is just what I've summarized for you. It passed favorably through Planning and Development, Environment Committee, and through Judiciary, and I'd move for adoption of this Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House "A". Would you remark on House "A"? House "A"?

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

67  
May 17, 2011

Representative Chapin, do you care to remark on House  
"A"?

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House "A" before us. I'd also like to take the opportunity to thank the proponent for gathering all the stakeholders together and bringing some light onto this issue that seems to be a problem in Connecticut.

For the purposes of legislative intent, I do have a question to the proponent. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I heard the Vice-Chair of the Planning and Development Committee reference entering into agreements between the municipal or regional dog pound facility as well as a public or private nonprofit rescue organization.

I just wanted to make sure that the entity involved in entering into the agreement from the dog pound facility is actually supposed to be the animal

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

68  
May 17, 2011

control officer and not some other employee at the  
facility.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Grogins.

REP. GROGINS (129th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Yes, that's  
absolutely true. In fact, it indicates that the  
animal control officer or the municipality  
representative would be the person entering into that  
agreement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Vice-  
Chair for her answer.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I think the Amendment  
before us addresses a problem within the State of  
Connecticut. It sets up a system in a very credible  
way in which rescue organizations who are out there,  
who may want to make sure that there isn't a diseased  
or injured animal at this facility, allows them the  
opportunity to enter into the agreement to provide the  
necessary veterinary care.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

69  
May 17, 2011

I think that all provisions in the Amendment before us have addressed all the concerns that have been raised during the process and I encourage my colleagues to support the Amendment as well as the underlying Bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you very much, Representative Chapin. Further on House "A"? Representative Hetherington, do you wish to comment on House "A", sir?

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am supportive of the Amendment, which would then become the underlying Bill.

I would like, however, to ask a question or two to the proponent if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that this Amendment eliminates most of the prospective costs to towns other than such cost as might be incurred in posting information about the animals. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Grogins.

REP. GROGINS (129th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that's correct. In fact, it even eliminates the cost to the towns potentially, of posting the animal who's potentially up for adoption because it indicates in the Bill that if the ACO of a municipality does not have the money to post the animal for adoption, then they can call on one of the rescue groups to post it in a nationally recognized organization.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Thank you. And through you, Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of legislative intent, I would just like to clarify that the primary intent of this Bill is to address domestic animals as well as cats. Cats are, I'm told, are not technically domestic animals, but anyway, this is domestic animals and cats.

And I seek this clarification so that if for example an animal control officer should take a raccoon into custody, the animal control officer would

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

71  
May 17, 2011

not then be responsible for seeking adoption for the raccoon.

And I say that not to be facetious, but I think we should have that intent established.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Grogins.

REP. GROGINS (129th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, yes, as a matter of fact, this strike-all Amendment, 6159, actually indicates that one of the exceptions to the posting of the animal is that the animal, if the ACO does not have to post the animal if it is feral and not adoptable. So that would take away any need to post for a raccoon.

Plus, it's also my understanding that ACOs are not allowed to bring in rabid animals as well.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Thank you. That's a good clarification. I appreciate the proponent's remarks and I urge the adoption of the Amendment, and of the passage of the underlying Bill.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

72  
May 17, 2011

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Hetherington. Further on House "A"? Representative Grogins. Representative Grogins.

REP. GROGINS (129th):

I just wanted to thank, this was a bipartisan effort and I just wanted to thank Representative Chapin, Representative Aman and my fellow Democrats. There were many co-sponsors in this Bill, for working together and coming to an agreement for the best Bill possible to help for the treatment of sick and injured animals. So thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Grogins. Further on House "A"? Further on House "A"? If not, I'll try, Representative Aman of the 14th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill as has been discussed, does take care of a problem that was brought to our attention.

Yet it's also one of the times that I can honestly say that the Committee system did work,

because the first items that were brought forth, the way they were presented, was something that I could not support and many other Members could not support.

But as it went through the Committee system and was changed, and we ultimately had this Amendment, it is definitely something that I feel does address a problem in a way that the towns can afford.

A couple of main key things in it, is that while there was a lot of discussion prior to this about what can and cannot be done, the first word in the Bill talks about the fact that a town and a municipal dog pound facility may enter into this contract.

If it isn't something that they feel is to the town's benefit, there is no requirement to go forward with the rest of the Bill as such. As a result, there should be very little or no cost to the member towns.

One of the problems in some of the earlier presentations was, who had the final authority and it was being taken away from the animal control officer. This Amendment definitely makes it clear that the responsibility is still and the judgment is still in the hands of the animal control officer.

I do have one question, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the Bill.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

74  
May 17, 2011

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker, part of the Bill talks about a person who observes or reasonably believes that a municipal or regional animal control officer has failed to provide properly for an animal, they may file a complaint with the Department of Agriculture and the Agricultural Department would have to investigate and take appropriate actions.

And my question, through you, Mr. Speaker, would be, what is the current law or procedure for someone who observes or feels the animal control shelter is not properly taking care of an animal?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Grogins.

REP. GROGINS (129th):

Yes, thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker. The current law is that, you know, this tracks the Animal Cruelty Law. If someone feels, has reasonable belief that someone is treating an animal cruel, and it says right in the Animal Cruelty Law that includes the impoundment of the animal, not providing it with the

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

75  
May 17, 2011

proper treatment, someone can, under the Animal Cruelty Law make a complaint and the Department of Agriculture would have to investigate this complaint.

The reason for this particular section is, it clarifies a process, an appeal process under this particular law, in which a person who either observes or has reasonable belief that an animal is not being properly treated who needs to be treated.

It talks about how the proper procedure on how that person must contact the Department of Agriculture and must, they must investigate, although I'm sure they do now, within 24 hours or the next business day, which is ever sooner, they must investigate this complaint and make sure that the animal is not being treated cruelly and the person, the ACO is not in violation of the Animal Cruelty Law.

This is a very important provision, because it has been brought to our attention in the media that there have been some shelters who have failed to treat very sick or injured animals, so this is a very important process that's clarified in this section.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTABELLO:

Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Yes, just a follow up, through you, Mr. Speaker. If the Department of Agriculture decides that a particular town's animal control officer or animal shelter is not properly handling an animal, what action can they take against the officer or the municipality?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Grogins.

REP. GROGINS (129th):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, the Department of Agriculture can contact directly that animal control officer or facility and investigate and make sure that the animal is properly treated if it's determined that the officer is not treating that animal.

They can also pursue animal cruelty charges against that ACO if, in fact, that ACO fails to take that action that's requested.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN (14th):

I thank the proponent for the answers.

The other part of this Bill that I think is well thought out is that the fact that technology is changing rapidly and it tries to address the real way people are adopting animals today, of not looking at the want ads in the newspaper, but going on line through many of the rescue organizations, or directly to the various towns and municipalities to see what animals are up for adoption.

And if they see a picture and a description, I think there's a much better chance of an animal being adopted.

So I encourage my fellow Representatives to support this Bill, and I thank all of those who worked on it to take a concept that had many problems and turned it into a Bill that I think will address the problems, and hopefully we will not be revisiting this sort of thing in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTABELLO:

Thank you, Representative Aman. Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of this Amendment, and I would also like to

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

78  
May 17, 2011

thank Representative Grogins for bringing together,  
and Representative Chapin, for bringing together the  
Department of Agriculture, CVA, and the ACOs so that  
this Bill was worked out to the benefit of the animals  
in the State of Connecticut, and I urge my colleagues  
to support it.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you. Further on House "A"? Further on  
House "A"? If not, I'll try your minds.

All those in favor please signify by saying Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Opposed? The Ayes have it. The Amendment is  
adopted. Further on the Bill as amended? Further on  
the Bill as amended?

If not, staff and guests please retire to the  
Well of the House. Members take your seats. The  
machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by Roll  
Call. Members to the Chamber.

The House is voting by Roll Call. Members to the Chamber, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Have all Members voted? Have all Members voted?  
Have all Members from Orange voted? Have all Members  
from Orange voted?

If all Members have voted, the machine will be  
locked. Will the Clerk please take a tally.

Will the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 6303 as amended by House "A".

Total Number Voting	141
Necessary for Passage	71
Those voting Yea	141
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	10

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The Bill as amended passes.

Would the Clerk please call Calendar 31, three  
one.

THE CLERK:

On Page 40, Calendar 31, House Bill Number 5437  
AN ACT CONCERNING SECURITY DEPOSITS. Favorable Report .  
of the Committee on Housing.

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**PLANNING AND  
DEVELOPMENT  
PART 3  
628 – 964**

**2011**

point in the process or to the STC or all of the other state agencies.

And they're spending a lot of resources. So again, we're dealing with projects that have been approved that -- at least at one point, and we're just asking for a three-year extension for those -- for that initial approval to allow the economy to come back.

REP. REED: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. GENTILE: Are there any other questions from Committee members? Thank you, Bill.

BILL ETHIER: Thank you very much for your indulgence.

REP. GENTILE: Eric Brown? John Filchak? Martin Mador? John?

JOHN FILCHAK: I'm sorry.

Good morning. I'm John Filchak. I'm the executive director of the Northeastern Connecticut Council of Governments, which is one of the 15 regional planning organizations in the state, and I represent 12 towns within that group.

I'm here today to talk briefly about House Bill 5780, An Act Concerning Interlocal Agreements, and House Bill 6294, An Act Concerning Shared Services.

HB 6303

And in support of both, both of these are intended to foster regionalism and intertown cooperation, and there are towns -- our 12 towns are strong supporters of -- of regionalism, and we have put that into practice over the years. And as you can see

Section 148 can be, as Senator Kissel and the others from West Hartford outlined, it can be pretty cumbersome. We had to use that because the -- the legislation required it for the re-valuation, and it took us several months more than I ever anticipated it would going through each town meeting and all that and dealing with 12 different town attorneys. It was a long process to -- to get that through.

But mainly I'm here to say it works, and we're thankful that you're trying to encourage it.

And I just want to quickly mention House Bill 6303, the municipal animal shelters, which I mentioned we run. We're in favor of that. That really mirrors what we do do.

We've been operating a program since 2004, and we work with the nonprofit sector, and we have not had to put a dog or cat down due to lack of space, and that's 2200 animals, so we've adopted them all out.

So the system you're proposing works, because we do it. We've been doing it for the last six years, so thank you.

REP. GENTILE: We appreciate your testimony. We're hoping that the system will continue to work and work even better for more municipalities.

Any questions? Representative Grogins.

REP. GROGINS: Yes, thank you for your testimony.

On the animal shelter bill, do you find that there are a lot of rescue groups that are -- you're saying you work with rescue groups to

pay for the treatment of injured or sick animals,

Do you find there are a lot of rescue groups that are willing to do that?

JOHN FILCHAK: There's -- there's a good amount of groups. The problem is -- especially with cats -- that they're just stressed out. More often than not, they're full. We could have at our place anywhere from 20 to 40 to even 50 cats.

Dogs is much less a problem, but the cats, we will give people a list of 12 to 15 different animal -- cat rescue groups, and we've even worked with a group out on Long Island that took I think 32 of our cats.

So we've got a pretty good network. But cats, there's just a lot of them. We probably have a box of cats -- a box of cats, probably not a good thing to say, but a box of cats a week at our place that just get dropped off. And there's people that hoard and there's colonies of feral cats. It is a problem.

REP. GROGINS: I guess you're saying spaying and neutering is important.

JOHN FILCHAK: You know, if we could -- if I had the funds to spay and neuter every animal that went out the door, we -- we selectively try to do that with the help from one nonprofit.

And certain breeds that we try to do that with, some of the pit bulls and that type of dog; but, you know, one of the -- right now, when we adopt a dog out at \$50, we keep five, and 45 goes to the spay and neuter program.

REP. GROGINS: Right.

JOHN FILCHAK: But based on our records, probably 30 percent of those people are actually taking advantage of the -- of the voucher. So, I mean, that's 30 percent more than we had, but...

REP. GROGINS: Do you have any recommendations on how to improve that percentage?

JOHN FILCHAK: Well, I mean, I'd have to run numbers, but I -- if I could keep that money and try to spay as many as I could, we -- we would just spay and neuter every one of them, work out as best a deal with our veterinarian as we could.

It's still -- \$50 doesn't come close to covering the full costs of it; but, you know, there's a huge problem out there.

REP. GROGINS: Well, thank you. I appreciate your honesty. Thank you.

REP. GENTILE: Any other questions from Committee members? Representative Reed.

REP. REED: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Also dealing with 6303, I'm just looking at an email from Laura Burban, who runs our animal shelter, and it's really, as yours is, a model for the state. And she's telling me that they're very much favor this bill, but she is also reminding me that it's pretty labor-intensive to do it well.

You have to really create a brand. You have to have the confidence of the nonprofits that

you're doing that kind of job, and you have to make these marriages between veterinarians willing to give free care and to identify the -- the animals that need to be rescued who are injured or sick.

How labor-intensive do you find that to be?

JOHN FILCHAK: Well, we have -- if we did not have a solid group of volunteers working with our pay staff, we probably couldn't accomplish it. In all honesty, we don't have that kind of resources, so we're very volunteer-dependent to make it happen right.

But the way we've integrated the animal control in our overall system with the Council of Governments, we're able to make the -- the contact really through our office staff. They do the front-line work dealing with the referrals.

So the way our system works, we intercept all the calls that come in with those inquiries before they ever get to our ACLs in order to free them up.

So it's been working fine; but, like I say, we've not had to put any animal down; but, you know, not -- not all the towns are similar to what we're doing.

REP. REED: I'm wondering if as part of this legislation we could have some sort of a training program involving the success with municipalities who are doing this just to show people how to get it done in municipalities that have not attempted this yet.

JOHN FILCHAK: I think that would be good, because,

you know, oftentimes animal control goes way down on the ladder of things. And more often than not, it's part time. And, you know, when it -- compared to plowing roads, et cetera, the investment's not there more often than not locally, and that's been one of the advantages of what we've done, because we've taken all part-time programs and now given them full-time -- full-time coverage.

So, you know, looking at things, doing it regionally, there needs to be a better model, because we're not getting the job done under the current -- current system.

REP. REED: Thank you so much for your testimony and for all the good work you do.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

JOHN FILCHAK: You're welcome.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you. Any other questions?  
Thank you, John.

JOHN FILCHAK: Thanks.

REP. GENTILE: Martin.

MARTIN MADOR: I guess I can say good afternoon, members of the Committee. I'm Martin Mador. I'm the Sierra Club volunteer, legislative chair. I'm going to talking about 5780, the interlocal agreements.

The Sierra Club recognizes that itemization of Connecticut governments into 169 independent children of the state, while useful in giving people a strong sense of home and place, causes a torrent of significant environmental and economic

ERIC BROWN: Thank you.

REP. GENTILE: Moving on, Susan Linker.

Susan, I think you have several people that will be joining you, correct?

SUSAN LINKER: Yes.

My name is Susan Linker. I am with a group of people that represent constituents of many members on this Committee, as well as animal welfare professionals who work with municipal animal control officers, and we're here in support of Raised Bill 6303.

Before my colleagues testify, I wanted, first of all, to thank you for giving us the opportunity to be here, and I wanted first to let you know that today if you give these folks a chance to testify, they're going to -- you're going to hear a lot of stories that might even sound unbelievable to you, stories that are quite compelling and very disheartening involving the type of treatment that happens in our municipal shelters.

So I wanted to provide my testimony to give you some context so you can get a feel for kind of why this is happening and contextualize it all.

First, I want to be very clear to say that there are a lot of animal control officers and municipal shelters that aren't run very, very well.

There are great animal control officers throughout the state, despite the fact that they get paid very little, despite the fact that it's a very emotional job to do, and

despite the fact that there is very little training and none required, and despite the fact that in many cases, the animal protection laws are very inadequate.

Even still, there are people in this field, and they really see it as a labor of love. There's a whole spectrum of animal control officers everywhere from those dedicated individuals to perhaps those individuals who are just here to get a job done.

Perhaps it's the nephew of the police chief and he's burned all the bridges in town so they give him the animal control officer position. Believe it or not, that happens in some of our towns.

Now that you have the context of people in the field, I wanted to just give you the context of the laws surrounding impounded animals.

Basically in Connecticut animals are considered property, so when there's a stray dog running around, the law says they have to go to the pound to be held for seven days so that if there is an owner out there, they can claim their property.

Now, if nobody comes forward -- should I continue? Okay. If nobody comes forward, the law says they could either be disposed of by being euthanized or adopted.

So you could imagine if there were more apathetic animal control officers who perhaps aren't particularly compassionate or motivated, after seven days, the disposition would be to euthanize the animals.

So I think in some of these cases of untreated illness, what it really comes down to, if there's an animal that, let's say, is going to be euthanized on Friday that came in with a broken pelvis on Monday, what would be that person's motivation to bring it to the vet to provide it with pain medication, you know?

In the same respect, there are rescue workers that are committed to helping a lot of these animals, but many of them don't have access to these shelters.

So this bill will not cost the towns any money; will allow animal control officers the requirement to let humane rescue workers in to help these animals, and I do hope the Committee will support this bill.

And I guess I'll just finish by saying if your dog ended up in one of the high-kill shelters, would you want this law to be in effect?

So thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you, Susan. There's several members of your group behind you, if they could just be brief, that would be great.

SUSAN LINKER: Sure, thank you.

REP. GENTILE: Or if you all have similar stories, if you want to pick one spokesperson, that would be helpful.

SUSAN LINKER: Sure. Yes, we have Kathy Sullivan is here and Karen Massey and Chris Oleski, and they have representatives on this Committee,

so they're here in support of it. But I did want to bring to your attention Jessica Corsaletti.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you. Just state your name for the record, please.

JESSICA CORSALETTI: Good day. My name is Jessica Corsaletti, and I'm a founding member of Friends of New Britain Animal Control.

What we are is a volunteer-based group, and we started in the municipal shelter in New Britain. And we go in, and our original mission was to help find homes for the dogs that are in the shelter -- they have limited time -- so that they can be placed, and we can increase adoptions and reduce euthanasia.

I'd like to inform you that in -- from 2009 to 2010 since we've been in the shelter, we were successful in reducing the euthanasia rate from 55 percent to 14 percent, thus generating revenue for the City of New Britain.

Unfortunately in our time there we've seen several cases of neglect, animals that have either been brought in healthy and have suffered at the pound from contracting diseases or have been brought into the pound unhealthy but have been allowed to remain in the pound without medical treatment.

I want to bring to your attention the fact that the City of New Britain is allotted a budget; and contrary to what many people may think, there aren't that many animals that are brought in that often that need medical care. So when they are brought in, I do expect them to have the medical care they

need.

Oftentimes the medical care that they need is very simple. It's pain medications, antibiotics. If it is more advanced, such as surgeries, that can cost anywhere from a thousand dollars and higher, we do have rescue organizations that are more than willing to take that animal into custody and to provide the treatment that it needs.

With -- to inform you of some of the cases that I've witnessed there, I'd like to show you this picture, okay?

This is a dog named Montana. He was brought into animal control facility with several puncture wounds all over his body and gashes on his head. There was also flesh ripped off of his ear, because he was living in a home where other dogs were attacking him.

The animal control officer did bring him to the pound, and he was there two days before I went to the pound to volunteer and noticed him there.

He was in severe pain, and he didn't receive any medical treatment, okay? I had gone there and flushed his wounds with antiseptic and advised the animal control officer to bring him to a veterinarian as soon as possible to put him on pain medications and simple antibiotics.

It was 90 degrees at the shelter that day, and flies were swarming around this dog's head, and I won't go into detail, but that can definitely increase -- it can bring maggots onto the wound, and it will definitely be a lot worse and more expensive

to treat.

Unfortunately, the animal control officer refused to do so. This dog stayed there for a total of four days before we were able to find a rescue that would take the dog and give it the medical care it needed.

Although I used to be a veterinary technician, I obviously don't have all the supplies needed to give the animal the care that it needed. So again, I tried to do the best that I can with what I was given.

This dog's name is Francis. He was brought into animal control at 17 pounds. He should have been 60 pounds. He was denied urgent veterinary care and in my opinion should not have gone for even hours without seeing a veterinarian.

When I found him there, he had already been there for two days, and animal control said he would be euthanized the following Monday, which would bring him -- he would be there for four to five days at that time. He needs to be brought to a vet immediately.

Unfortunately, he had a very contagious skin condition. He was bleeding from his inner thighs, and I found him curled up in the corner of a kennel.

As volunteers, we took Francis immediately to a veterinarian, and we paid for the euthanasia.

I think that the Raised Bill 6303 is very, very, very important. I do feel that it is common sense to bring an animal to the veterinarian when you have the budget and you

also have volunteers who are willing to help you with transportation or even in more extensive cases bring them into -- find a rescue that will treat them.

Unfortunately, that's not happening in all municipal shelters, which is why we need this -- which is why I strongly support this bill.

You have the power to make a difference by supporting this bill, and I hope that you will.

And I would like to leave you with is quote from Albert Schweitzer, which is, "Think occasionally of the suffering of what you spare yourself the sight."

I often find people don't want to see what these animals are going through. But we're there on the front lines witnessing it, and I know that they're in severe pain lots of times and they do need this help, and I hope that you will support this so they can get the help that they need.

Thank you so much.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you, Jessica. Just state your name for the record, please.

BARBARA RODNIK: My name is Barbara Rodnik, and I'm also a volunteer with New Britain Animal Shelter. I worked also several years with the Berlin Animal Shelter. I'm going to be brief, and I thank you for allowing us to testify today.

Jessica has pretty much covered everything that I was going to say also. I'm just here

to give another example. Unfortunately, during the summer we had a parvo outbreak. I'm not sure if anyone is familiar with the disease, but it's an awful, awful horrendous disease.

Dogs who do contract it unfortunately die a horrible death in which they basically waste from the inside out. It's diarrhea, it's vomiting, bloody stools, and which they just drink and drink and drink and try and replenish what they're losing through all of that, and it's a terrible, terrible death, and it's also highly communicable.

During the summer, we had -- this is Tidbit. Tidbit was brought into the shelter. And as of Wednesday one of the vowel volunteers did see Tidbit and suggested to our animal control officer that he possibly get Tidbit tested because Tidbit was showing signs of Parvo.

He did not get the animal tested, and when we returned on Saturday, Tidbit was almost dead. So instead of bringing Tidbit to have Tidbit tested, possibly treated, the animal just suffered from Wednesday. We don't know how long Tidbid had had the virus, but he suffered from at least Wednesday to Saturday and ended up being euthanized.

Quarantine is very, very, very important with this virus. Procedures were not followed, and unfortunately we lost several other dogs due to this virus.

So, as Jessica said, we are so in favor of this bill. It is so important. On a daily basis we see animals that are brought into the shelter that are suffering and not given

care.

We have our own volunteer organization in which we receive donations, and we have fundraisers. And in many, many cases, we're assisting to pay for the treatment of these animals in hopes that we can find them loving homes. But it becomes very, very difficult to do. And for them not to be brought to a veterinary that is already contracted by the city when they're brought in and they know that they already have injuries or that they are sick, such as Francis.

Francis was brought in in just terrible, terrible condition. Why he was not immediately brought to the vet, we just don't understand. But these are the things that we're seeing on a regular basis, so we are -- we hope that you will support it. Thank you.

REP. GENTILE: Any further questions? Any questions? Yes, Representative Grogins.

REP. GROGINS: This question is for any of the -- for you, Barbara, or any of the ladies.

Do you think this bill is necessary, because -- and I'm not putting words in your mouth, I'm just asking you, that even though there's rescue groups, I'm assuming, that are willing to pay for animals' treatment, some animal control officers just won't contact --

BARBARA RODNIK: Oh, absolutely.

REP. GROGINS: -- anyway?

BARBARA RODNIK: And in many cases, I can tell you that there have been several that we have taken in that I am quite sure that before we

were there as volunteers would have simply just automatically been euthanized because the city would not pay for care.

REP. GROGINS: And these are adoptable animals you're talking about?

BARBARA RODNIK: Absolutely. I can give you another example.

We had one, it was a little seven-pound terrier that we named Angelica. At first we thought she was hit by a car. She was a tiny little thing that had a broken front leg and a broken, dislocated back leg.

We suspected when we found out after x-rays were taken, and then we saw that the back leg was an old break and dislocation, that it could have possibly, unfortunately, been abuse.

We brought Angelica -- we worked with a -- with a rescue organization. We pulled her immediately from the veterinary clinic that is contracted by the pound, and we brought her in conjunction with the rescue group to another vet who treated this dog for a lot less than it would have been treated at the contracted vet, which obviously wouldn't have done the work without us paying for it, and she now is in a loving home.

She had pins and screws and everything, but she's now in a loving home doing really, really well. And we have numerous examples such as that.

REP. GROGINS: Thank you for all the wonderful work you do.

BARBARA RODNIK: Thank you. Appreciate it.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you. Before we move to other questions, I do have one for anyone in the group here.

You mentioned medications, pain and antibiotics, and you mentioned veterinarian services.

Who pays for the meds and who pays for the services of the veterinarian?

BARBARA RODNIK: In many cases, we pay it. In many cases, we have our own funding. But we're a very, very small group, and our funding is obviously limited.

So what we try to do is in -- we will contact a rescue organization that is a bigger group and probably has more funding, and we will work in conjunction with them. And what we'll do is put out via the Internet that we have this dog that probably is going to need \$3,000 worth of work, can anybody help us?

People will then donate, and we will -- we will give so much money towards that, but then the rescue group will sometimes pick up the rest of it in conjunction with donations that we receive.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you. Appreciate your answer.

Yes?

JESSICA CORSALETTI: With regards to that question, pain medication, antibiotics is very inexpensive, and what I had said is if animal shelters increase their adoptions, they are generating revenue rather than spending the

money on euthanizing an animal.

So they will be taking in revenue. And antibiotics and pain meds are very inexpensive, and that is a service that even if you didn't want to reach out to shelter -- to rescue organizations for something as simple as that, municipalities do have a -- a budget.

And I understand that it is small, but those are also very small fees, and they're basic care for an animal that wouldn't cost a lot.

And, again, by increasing adoptions and decreasing euthanasias, you're also taking in some more money to perhaps be allotted to that budget as well.

So it is something that the city can contribute to.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you. Don't go away.

Senator Fasano, then followed by Representative Reed, and then we have a couple over here.

SENATOR FASANO: Thank you. Thank you all for coming to testify. It's always important to come in front of the Committee to express your views, and that's the best way we can get educated.

Let me ask you some questions. Before I do, let me preface this by saying I have the two best dogs in the world, so I am an animal lover.

A VOICE: [Inaudible].

SENATOR FASANO: Yes. So now the debate's on.

So here's the -- you know, I understand where you're coming from, and my heart is there, but I've got to take this apart a little bit just so I understand where I think the rub's going to come so we can all understand this better.

The way this -- the first part of this talks about the fact that a town must maintain a current list of nonprofit organizations that are willing to arrange or fund the treatment of licensed veterinarians for any impounded animal ill or injured. Fine, no problem. I don't think so. I think we can do that. Not a big deal there.

However, whenever we impound an animal that is considered by the municipal animal control officer to be adoptable, requires treatment by a licensed veterinarian, now, you guys seem to have some issue with the animal control officer making some decisions on treatments and other things. And what this language does is still leave it with that animal control officer.

Is that -- is that something you'd like us to take a further look at or are you okay with that?

A VOICE: [Inaudible].

CATHY DEMARCO: Hi. My name is Cathy DeMarco. I worked as an animal control officer in the '90s for two towns in Connecticut, the Town of Berlin and the Town of South Windsor, and this is exactly what I wanted to speak briefly to you about.

The confusion results from many municipal

ACOs -- a number of things, either not being trained correctly to even know that a dog is seriously ill, so a lot of the time, not -- I'm all about facts and not emotion. A lot of the times they're honestly good people. They're, you know, hardworking, decent citizens, but they don't realize that the lethargic dog may be suffering from parvovirus and this is the beginning stages of the disease, and dehydration has certain signs.

So they don't have open wound or open source, but they're very, very ill. And parvo is a huge concern because it's highly transmissible to other dogs, and municipal pounds have to be quarantined.

So there's a basic lack, as Susan mentioned at the beginning, of training, proper credentials and oversight. The Department of Agriculture is supposed to be in charge of municipal pounds. Quite frankly, I believe at least in the '90s, there was one state ACO per county in the State of Connecticut, which is impossible to keep track of what's going on in all of the municipal shelters and pet shops.

The other issue going on here is the problem with a lot of this situations is when they have a group of volunteers, many of the volunteers have experienced -- they're former vet techs or current vet tech -- veterinary technicians. Sometimes the ACO or the police department or the mayor won't allow them access to the dogs, won't allow them to assist with transport to veterinary clinics.

Then again, there's no additional fees incurred by the city. So there's a lot of

confusion here, because it's not always that the ACO is an evil person. They either don't recognize that the dog is seriously ill, and a lot of the time if they're out on other calls, because since rabies reentered the state, it's no longer canine control, it's animal control, is they go on a raccoon call, an opossum call or a feral cat bit somebody.

They're so busy that they're not really monitoring the dogs in the pound regularly.

Just recently, I provided a couple of things -- examples from the '90s in my testimony, but just recently I was at the New Britain pound, Wednesday evening. And this is not urgent medical care, but a dog had very long nails. No one knew how to clip nails. I was there, so I did it.

But the nails being so long affected the way the dog was walking, and he very well could have become lame. At least the front paws were very long.

Also, there's a boxer there right now that has ocular discharge. Now, not a big deal right this minute, but the discharge coming from the eyes could lead to kennel cough, which could be widespread throughout the pound. Thank you.

SENATOR FASANO: I guess the import of my question is the way the language is written, I'm not sure what I heard is what you're looking for, the way this language is, is the animal control officer is going to make a determination, number one, if the animal is adoptable.

CATHY DEMARCO: Well, that's part of the problem,

too. These animal control officers -- there's a lot of conflict between animal control officers even within a pound who has two or three ACOs and volunteers who feel a dog is adoptable.

Again, huge problem is when you put a dog in a kennel, they deteriorate quickly. They become very aggressive or they develop bad behaviors that make them appear to be unadoptable. The problem is, they're confined.

Like in New Britain, we can't walk the dogs except twice a week, Wednesdays from 3:00 to 6:00 p.m. and Saturday from 10:00 a.m. to noon. Those dogs have no exercise all week, so they're crazy, and they start to exhibit very bad behaviors that most of us if we went to adopt a dog would never want. All of my animals at home would be killed.

SENATOR FASANO: Let me go through this language just a little bit here with you.

So, in other words, what this bill says, the way it's drafted, so if you want us to tinker with the language, read the language carefully -- because the way I read it is that when an animal is impounded and the animal control officer believes that animal is adoptable, okay, and then believes that animal needs veterinarian care, and then believes there's not sufficient money in the town funds to pay for that care --

CATHY DEMARCO: Understood.

SENATOR FASANO: -- then one of the organizations will be contacted.

So, one, if you have an animal that he says -- I forgot the black dog's name that was -- was put down, but whatever that black dog was, is very sick, he's going to say that's not adoptable, and I'm relieved of any obligation of calling you guys for care, because he's not adoptable, so the rest of the sentence disappears.

CATHY DEMARCO: I hear what you're saying. I don't know if that's the scope --

SENATOR FASANO: So --

CATHY DEMARCO: -- of this bill, but that's an issue, too.

SENATOR FASANO: I'm saying that is the bill in front of us.

CATHY DEMARCO: Okay.

SENATOR FASANO: And the reason why I'm raising this is if you had suggested language, you need to read that language and make sure that the suggested language that we as a committee look at is what you're trying to get to.

So this one is -- you know, we draft things -- we draft things thinking we know, you know, what we're trying to get to, and sometimes the target changes. So on this -- because what I'm hearing is two things.

I'm hearing some animal control officers may not have the right education. Some animal control officers may be tone deaf to certain illnesses. Some animal control officers, with all due respect, may not care because the way we set up these systems.

And I'm suggesting all three of those cases,  
this bill doesn't help you.

SUSAN LINKER: May I comment on that?

SENATOR FASANO: Sure.

SUSAN LINKER: I was chomping at the bit back there.

SENATOR FASANO: And I saw you.

SUSAN LINKER: I believe that whether an animal is  
deemed adoptable by anyone -- and very, you  
know, not objective, they're subjective or  
not, if an animal is suffering, that should  
be [inaudible] -- that should be the  
threshold in which they should call the  
rescue organization.

SENATOR FASANO: Okay. Now, so -- and I agree. I  
think that's what you're saying.

SUSAN LINKER: Yes, so we --

SENATOR FASANO: So we have to play with that  
language.

SUSAN LINKER: -- [inaudible] language a little bit.

SENATOR FASANO: And who in your view makes that --  
because I've got to get to the salient point  
in a second, but who in your view makes that  
determination?

SUSAN LINKER: If the dog is an adoptable dog or is  
ill?

SENATOR FASANO: If the dog is either adoptable or  
the dog is ill such that it needs the care.

SUSAN LINKER: Well, if we take out the adoptable

language --

SENATOR FASANO: Okay.

SUSAN LINKER: -- really what it says is the dog is impounded and showing signs of illness or injury, okay?

I believe that that should be the call of the animal control officer, and animal control officers also have bosses. They have chief of police and they have municipal animal control officers.

One of the things that happens often is that rescue aren't able to come in at all. They're -- really the essence of this bill is to address access to these animals. A lot of times when animal control officers see rescue workers coming in, they shut the doors and lock them because they don't want to be bothered. So this will legally require them to work with rescues.

SENATOR FASANO: Okay. And that was where I was trying to get to. Really what we -- God bless you.

Really what we're talking about is having the municipalities allow access to those nonprofit organizations that are willing to help these animals.

SUSAN LINKER: That's correct. Particularly if they're -- specifically if they're injured or ill.

SENATOR FASANO: And where the rub's going to come, I believe, in real life, is who's going to control who?

Are the nonprofit organizations really going to become the boss of animal control officers or animal control officers going to control their own territory? That's -- that's the clash that we're getting to, and it's the -- it's the big elephant in the room we've got to talk about if we're going to do anything here.

And I don't blame animal control officers for not showing up at this hearing and, you know, trying to, you know, play the sympathy game with animals, and I get that. But I assure you if this bill gets out, they'll be around this chamber someplace.

SUSAN LINKER: So you're suggesting that if this bill passes, animal control officers will not want to be legally required to provide -- to get free access to veterinary care?

SENATOR FASANO: No, I'm suggesting that animal control officers may argue that they lose control.

You guys come in and say, you know, that dog gets care. I think that dog --

SUSAN LINKER: I understand.

SENATOR FASANO: I don't think that dog -- I think he's okay. No, I think he gets care. I don't know who trumps who in this case. I don't know how we work that either. I'm just suggesting when we pass this bill, we're going to have to think about that relationship a little bit more.

You guys should have access and you're willing to give up the care, and it's no cost to the town, you know, other municipal

officers -- I think ACOs will say I don't understand the language. The town does not have sufficient funds to pay.

How is that determined? Do you look at my bank account? Do you look at my line item? Do you look at my reserve? What are you looking at to determine they don't have sufficient costs?

So what is -- I understand what you guys want to do, and I'm with you. I'm just trying to figure out how we can construct the language that doesn't conflict on the scene, because that's not going to get the treatment and still achieve the end.

SUSAN LINKER: Yes.

SENATOR FASANO: And I'm open to suggestions. Not necessarily today, give it some thought --

SUSAN LINKER: Sure.

SENATOR FASANO: -- and get back to us, but I -- but this is the problem I think in real life how it happens.

SUSAN LINKER: And I agree with it completely, and we'll look at redrafting it and look forward to presenting something to you.

SENATOR FASANO: And I think the sentiment on this Committee, I would assume, is we want to help out and see what we can do.

SUSAN LINKER: Yes.

SENATOR FASANO: And get you to help them without being too disrespectful to animal control officers. They are trying to do their job,

maybe some better than others, but we need to help out animals who are sick, and I agree. Thank you.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you, Senator Fasano.  
Representative Reed.

REP. REED: Thank you, Madam Chair.

You know, the discussion -- I mean, it's so interesting that training, training, training keeps bubbling to the top. I mean, this legislation sounds like just one step in a whole process that really needs to be embraced to -- to really deal with this problem in real terms.

In our town -- and we're very, very lucky in Branford to have Laura Burban --

SUSAN LINKER: Yes, you are.

REP. REED: -- but we switch from the model of a pound to an animal shelter.

SUSAN LINKER: Yes.

REP. REED: And we change the whole idea of how you want to approach this, that the end -- the end result should be adopting out and to euthanize only in the most extreme cases.

And it feels -- I mean, Laura has told me incredible stories where, you know, volunteers suddenly are called out to rescue a dog that's being abused and is confronted by a very large angry dog, as one might expect, and doesn't really have the training to deal with that, so she's had to actually train all of the people with her and to send the appropriate people out on the appropriate

call. So it's a big, big job.

So I'm -- I'm just wondering if there's a way to kind of deal with this, the language of this particular first step, but also try to move the whole idea forward of how to approach it.

SUSAN LINKER: The issue of animal control officer training is not a new one to the legislature. In fact, I believe I saw a bill percolating around on that very topic. It is something very important, and a couple of years ago we proposed a bill that would require that, and fiscally, it seemed not sound for some reason or another.

But, you know, these animal control officers go out into dangerous dog situations with no training. They look like police officers and they have no training. So it is a big issue.

I think one of the ways to deal with this particular bill -- and, by the way, the issue with municipalities -- and you can see in Branford what goes on there, and then if you look at situations -- not to pick on New Britain, but New Britain -- it's night and Day.

And so it does show that these are things that can be resolved, because this is the will of the people and there are rescue organizes and wonderful citizens who want to have their animals treated humanely.

But the crux of the matter is the state law says all you have to do is hold them for seven days and then kill them. You can adopt them if you want, but you don't have to. And I think at some point, perhaps not this

session, but getting to the basis of requiring a little bit more than the bare minimum is really what we need to be focusing on, with all of these other issues that are underneath as well.

And as far as the issue of who determines who is a sick animal, who is a healthy animal, I think we can talk about perhaps some language about getting a licensed vet's opinion on -- on the matter.

REP. REED: Thank you, yes. It feels like a new model and a new mindset really should be the goal, ultimately.

SUSAN LINKER: Absolutely.

REP. REED: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you.  
Representative Grogins.

REP. GROGINS: Yes. Thank you, again, Susan, for coming in and testifying and bringing your group.

Do you think -- you know, we -- I think that Representative Reed is right, that this is a first step, but do you think that, you know, with some tweaking of this language, this could really help the situation, this kind of a bill?

SUSAN LINKER: Absolutely.

REP. GROGINS: Okay. Because I just want to make sure that this -- obviously it doesn't address all animal cruelty or all animal control training issues and things like that, but, I mean, do you think that -- you do

think that the bill could make a -- a dent in addressing this?

SUSAN LINKER: Absolutely. And I think, you know, for some of these closed shelters who animals come in and nobody sees them ever and they don't even get promoted for adoption, this will at least provide a bit of transparency about what's going on by having some rescue workers coming in and seeing the conditions if they're required to treat injured and ill animals.

Not -- a lot of them are injured or ill, but when they come into the shelter, they're often hit by a car, attacked by other animals. We're talking serious, serious illness. So it would give the rescues an access to come to the shelters and hopefully try to partner with some of the municipalities.

REP. GROGINS: Would you be able to get me some suggestive language that this Committee could look at?

SUSAN LINKER: I'd be happy to.

REP. GROGINS: Fabulous, thank you.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you. Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER: Thank you, Madam Chair. And I just want to recognize and thank everyone for being here today, particularly a constituent of mine, Kathleen Sullivan, who has come here.

But I also want to -- thinking back on Senator Fasano's comments beyond the -- no matter how we write this bill and what

language comes out, ultimately it sounds like you're still going to have to have a relationship between the good work you do and that ACO within the town.

And so let's not forget no matter what we pass, that's going to be important. There's going to be an education, the local official, of what language is there, but also don't forget about those relationships.

I just -- take Hartford, Kathleen. If our ACO ever locked the facility on you, trying to give free, on-your-own volunteer time and treat a sick animal, no law needs to legislate common decency and humanity. And there is pressure that can be applied both locally and internally with city council and mayors.

So I hope we don't forget that vehicle as well. Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. GENTILE: Any other questions from our Committee members? Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN: Yes. As far -- picking up on some of the other questions, I do think we need some work on definitions within this, what an adoptable animal is, who -- who actually pays for the care and changes, et cetera. But I think those are -- are language things that we can work on.

I was very surprised when you said that the access to yourselves, to the shelters, was so limited, because that also means that the general public is not allowed into them.

SUSAN LINKER: Right.

REP. AMAN: And I think that is also a problem. I think if the general public was allowed -- though I don't foresee a whole lot of people wanting to visit an animal shelter, I don't see why that is closed off anymore than any other public facility is done.

So if there are towns that have formal processes as to their closing the general public off to the animal shelters and/or pounds, I would like hear from them as to what their logic is and why they're going ahead with it.

So the access part I think we could address fairly easily.

My other question is reading the bill as a whole, is there anything today that stops an animal shelter from doing exactly what you're saying?

If they wanted to do it, could they do everything that's in this bill?

SUSAN LINKER: Nothing stops them from doing it.

REP. AMAN: So -- and the reason I ask that is a very -- within this Committee, the difference between enabling legislation and mandatory legislation is -- is a very huge issues on this Committee, and that's why I wanted to be sure that enabling legislation was not required, that this would fall in the mandate way of looking at it. Again, I think all of us are very sympathetic to the problem.

In -- it's my understanding, at least feel free to correct me if I'm wrong, within most of the suburban communities, most dogs are claimed by their owners within a day or two

of being picked up and often within hours of being picked up. However, within the larger metropolitan areas, a tremendous number of dogs are picked up and are never claimed.

Is that perception correct or have I been misled over the years?

SUSAN LINKER: The Department of Agriculture has statistics on this to give you great detail what animals were returned to owner, dead on arrival, adopted and euthanized.

I can tell you that in suburban areas, many more animals are returned to owner, but not most. And certainly in the large urban areas, because you're dealing with larger populations of animals and people, that a lot of times the return rate is quite low.

REP. AMAN: Okay. I thought I had heard at one point that one of the large cities took in between six and eight hundred dogs a year, and out of that six or eight hundred, only a couple of hundred were either picked up or adopted.

Would that be a reasonable thing to have someone tell me?

SUSAN LINKER: I think it depends on -- on the downtown, and it depends on the kind of support that goes in on it.

For example, New Britain was euthanizing over half the dogs that came in before volunteers were allowed in. Now they're euthanizing about 15 percent.

So I think the towns that don't have public adoption hours, don't post their animals on

any public forum that show that they're at the pound, and that euthanize animals on the seventh day even though there's cage space available -- and all these things do happen in many towns still -- then that is definitely the case, that they take in most of the animals and most of them are euthanized.

REP. AMAN: Do you have an idea, just, again, so we get the size of the problem, how many animals New Britain takes in in a year?

Again, roughly. I'm not looking for an exact number. Just some sort of estimate.

JESSICA CORSALETTI: It's approximately 200.

REP. AMAN: So out of the 200 dogs, about 30 are -- are put down in some form, and the rest are either picked up by their owners or adopted out?

JESSICA CORSALETTI: Well, there is dead upon arrival being included in that number as well. Prior to us going in there, it was approximately 55 percent. So what we do is we take the impounded dogs, we subtract the dead upon arrival, and we subtract the dogs that are reclaimed from their owners.

And then we take -- and then we divide the two numbers, and that's how we come up with the amount of dogs that are euthanized that could have otherwise been adopted out.

REP. AMAN: Okay.

So, again, we are's talking New Britain.

JESSICA CORSALETTI: Yes.

REP. AMAN: I'm just trying to get an idea of the size of the problem.

If your ideal regulations were put into effect, how many more dogs would have been adopted out and not put down?

JESSICA CORSALETTI: I feel pretty confident in saying had we had this go forward and we have -- and we're allowed to go into the pounds more and help with this, the -- and we have some of these restrictions, I can confidently say that as opposed to reducing euthanasia to fifteen percent, it would be close to five percent.

REP. AMAN: Okay.

JESSICA CORSALETTI: Thank you.

REP. AMAN: I thank you very much, and we're going to definitely -- the Committee will be working on the language and trying to figure out some way to -- to make the whole system better for the animal. I don't think any of us want to discourage volunteers from helping out the cities and municipalities in any way possible.

JESSICA CORSALETTI: Thank you.

REP. AMAN: As an aside, if you are turned down, as Representative Ritter had said, in Hartford and run into a problem, a call to the mayor's office might do wonders for you.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you. It appears as if we have a definite work in progress in here. I urge you to continue working on that language, and I thank you for your commitment and your

work.

Tim Calnen.

MARK GREENBERG: Excuse me, I was on the list as number two.

REP. GENTILE: Sorry for the confusion.

MARK GREENBERG: That's okay. I think numbers one, three, four, five, six and seven went.

Thank you very much. And thank you for hearing me. My name is Mark Greenberg. By way of introduction, I'm the founder and director of the Simon Foundation. Simon Foundation is a 501(c)(3) charitable organization that was set up a number of years ago.

We just constructed and finished nine months ago a 35,000-square-foot facility in Bloomfield, Connecticut, which includes 129 kennel runs, 75 cat condos, an agility area, exercise pens, and we have 3,000 square feet in that facility which is reserved for our low-cost spay/neuter clinic.

I'm here to speak in favor of 6303 or any other change of language and permutation to it. And I'd also like to -- to mention that the City of Hartford has already moved its facility -- its impounding facility to my facility in Bloomfield just two weeks ago.

Now, let me describe what that means. That means that the City of Hartford dogs are having access to a full-time trainer, have access to the facilities of adoption that the Simon Foundation have, and the Simon Foundation has access to take over ownership

of these animals and then adopt them out to loving homes.

So what this bill thinks about in advance is putting it -- is being put into effect right now by the City of Hartford and by the Simon Foundation, this wonderful facility. Also, the Town of Bloomfield has their animal facility located in the Simon Foundation facilities.

Furthermore, the facility has been or Simon Foundation has been approached by four other towns in the area in order to make the animal control facility available for those four towns line in my facility at the Simon Foundation in Bloomfield.

Now, what that will do, again, is that that will give us the capability of taking over ownership of these adoptable dogs and taking over the veterinary care of these sick animals and ensuring exactly what you're intending to do in 6303.

So I'm in favor of 6303. I'm in favor of amendments to the language, as Senator Fasano has -- has suggested to make it more accurate in terms of our mission, and I applaud this Committee for taking the steps necessary to reduce the euthanasia rate in the state.

These animals don't have voices. They can't talk. They're like children. They're innocent. They need to be -- to be protected, and there are volunteers and organizations, such as mine and such as the ladies' behind me, who are willing to make the effort to ensure that these animals find loving homes.

We are all dedicated to reducing the euthanasia rate or the kill rate, as I say, because euthanasia in Greek means "killing well." And in my opinion, it's not killing well. It's just killing.

We want to reduce it to the lowest possible number practical. We want the animals that come in sick to be treated, and I think that facilities such as the Simon Foundation, or other ones which might become regional facilities, do exactly that.

Thank you for your time.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you, Mark. We appreciate your testimony. Any questions?  
Thank you.

MARK GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

REP. GENTILE: Tim Calnen.

TIM CALNEN: Representative Gentile, Honorable Members of the Planning and Development Committee, my name is Tim Calnen. I'm vice president of government affairs for the Connecticut Association of Realtors.

Side reference, I want to say that our association philosophically supports most of the direction of the bills previously testified by the Home Builders Association to reduce the permit process, streamline the permit process, in particular 491 to eliminate duplicate public hearings

So one thing that, Billy, you didn't mention was the housing matters for the jobs connection in the state. Not just new construction but the turnover of an existing

HB5413

inspector's general license.

REP. AMAN: Okay. I thank you very much for coming forward.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you.  
Any further questions? Okay.

I did skip over one individual, and I apologize. Clara Nolan, if I could just go back to her for a second. And I apologize for the oversight, Clara.

CLARA NOLAN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the Committee.

I'm Clara Nolan from Stratford. I'm here to speak in support of Bill 6303. A lot of what I'm going to say has already been said, but I think I'm going to go ahead with it anyway.

As a taxpayer, and I'm a welfare advocate, I believe that in the best interest of the animals under the care of our municipal shelters, that collaboration and cooperation with area rescue groups is extremely important. This bill is the start of that.

If an animal comes into a shelter in need of medical attention and that particular shelter is unable to provide care due to financial hardship or understaffing, then area rescue groups need to be made aware and given the opportunity to aid that animal.

As we've heard today, the stories are many of how cats and dogs have been left to suffer because a shelter did not have the financial needs to care for an animal. This does not have to be.

As a citizen, it was always my belief that if an animal was taken to a shelter when no other alternative was available, it would be in the best interest of that animal. Many times that's not the case.

Passing this bill can change that. There are many examples of successful collaborations taking place all across this country, with one of the best being Major's Alliance for New York City Animals. One of their initiatives is that -- the Cost of Veterinary Fund which pays for lifesaving medical treatments for sick and injured animals taken in by animal care and control in New York City.

We can learn a lot from this alliance and others like it. Positive alliances are taking place right here in Connecticut. In my hometown, we have STARS, Stratford Animal Rescue Society, that works in collaboration with Stratford Animal Control, with excellent results.

This is just one of the many examples that are already in place, but we can do more, and hopefully this bill is going to allow us to do just that.

The opportunities to help animals in our care are endless if we can all just work together and reach out when help is needed. It is important to put all differences aside for the good of these beings that are completely reliant on us. With animal control agencies, rescue groups and veterinary associations all working together, we can assure that no sick or injured animals suffer needlessly.

Times are hard for many right now. And

especially for the most vulnerable, this has never been truer. Standing alone, the obstacles we face can seem overwhelming, but together any challenge can be overcome.

On behalf of the animals, I'm asking you to pass Bill 6303 so that our municipal shelters can be a safe haven for the homeless animals of Connecticut and provide the care they need until they have the opportunity to find their forever home. Thank you.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you, Clara. Again, I apologize for that oversight. Now we'll go back to Jed Walker.

JED WALKER: Madam Chairman, distinguished members of the Committee, you have my transcript here. I am here representing the Coastal Connecticut and the Southern New England chapters of the American Society of Home Inspectors, and we have a majority membership of licensed home inspectors in the state.

HB 5473

And it is true that septic systems are very costly to repair or replace, but in perspective, the repairs necessary on a house at the time of the sale can easily equal or exceed that.

So if you're going to mandate septic inspections, you should also mandate home inspections.

Now, as home inspectors, that sounds very lucrative, but we don't think that it's really the state's position, or should be, to mandate any inspections at all. The state has licensed home inspectors. And fortunately, we have a set of standards and a code of ethics, but evaluation of septic

speaker 9  
page 5  
line 162**Testimony Concerning Raised Bill 6303****Cathy DeMarco  
Coalition for Change**

Senator Cassano, Representative Gentile, members of the committee, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of Raised Bill 6303, An Act Concerning Municipal Animal Shelters.

I am the founder and spokesperson for the Coalition for Change, the group responsible for the recent reform efforts at the CT Humane Society. I have worked as a municipal ACO during the 1990's (for Berlin and South Windsor) and very recently have been extremely involved with New Britain's animal control facility, currently run by the NB Police Department.

While working as an assistant ACO for the Town of Berlin (1993-1995), there were many serious and upsetting examples of impounded animals not receiving the medical care they so desperately needed.

**The first example involves a cat that I picked up on a side road in East Berlin.**

The cat was near death. Seriously injured with her abdomen split open. She could not stand or walk, she could barely lift her head. Due to recent changes in the department of agriculture's animal control policies (because of the rabies virus re-entering the state), municipalities were now expected to pick up cats (and other rabies vector species). Unfortunately, the town's head ACO continued to ignore sick/injured cats. We had many conflicts over all of this. I was not allowed to take the cat directly to one of the town's veterinarians to be euthanized. I was forced to take the cat to the pound and wait for the head ACO to arrive to 'examine' her (to make sure my claims were legitimate). He did not come to the pound until the next day. Even then it was a struggle to get him to allow me to bring her to be put down. My job was threatened repeatedly for this and many other incidents.

**Another example involves a beautiful black Labrador, found sitting in a pile of leaves by the side of the road.** She could barely stand or walk. I took her to the pound where once again, it took days before I was allowed to bring her to the vet. She was a lovely, young, highly adoptable dog. The town wanted her euthanized immediately. Myself and another assistant ACO refused to have that done. Instead we had her x-rayed. She had a fractured pelvis and other injuries. At that moment we began the Injured and Homeless Animal Fund. I took her home. We named her 'Autumn' and made sure she received all of the medical care that the town and the head ACO denied her. Thanks to the local newspapers running her story, donations poured in. She stayed with me until fully recovered and was finally placed in a loving home.

I am happy to say that much has changed in Berlin since then and animals picked up by the town's current ACO all receive medical attention immediately if needed. However, there are still many cities and towns in CT that simply do not provide the necessary medical care to the animals in their municipal shelter. New Britain is one of those.....

**I have been extremely involved with the on-going conflict at the NB dog pound. I was approached this past summer when the small group of volunteers (FONBAC=Friends of NB Animal Control) reached out to the Coalition for advice and support. After many discussions with volunteers, as well as personally visiting the NB pound on numerous occasions, it was obvious that there were many problems at this facility. The most upsetting of all is the fact that dogs frequently go without appropriate medical care for days at a time. The volunteers have documented numerous cases (including photos). I have witnessed a number of these myself. The city's excuse is money even though the volunteers have a fund in which people donate specifically for this reason. Volunteers also pay out of pocket frequently. They also provide transport to and from a number of vets. The city only has to allow them to do it. All we are asking is to obtain permission to get the dog the care it needs.**

It is hard to imagine that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we are still at odds over such basic humane issues. There is no excuse for any city or town, any ACO/Mayor/ or Chief of Police to deny any animal in their shelter necessary medical care. This includes humane euthanasia. It is shocking that good ACO's are regularly threatened with termination for trying to get the animal to a vet. It is truly appalling that dedicated volunteers are no longer allowed to assist with the dogs at the pound, simply because they brought these concerns to light. Something needs to be done immediately. I hope that passing this law will be the beginning of REAL CHANGE for our state's injured/sick/ and homeless animals.

Thank you for allowing me to submit this testimony.

Cathy DeMarco, [cathyde1962@comcast.net](mailto:cathyde1962@comcast.net); cell: 860-810-8478  
224 Wooster Street, New Britain, CT 06052-1028

Testimony in favor of Revised Bill 6303:

Hello, I am Mark Greenberg, founder and director of The Simon Foundation

We are a 501©(3) charitable organization located at 120 Rescue Lane in Bloomfield, Ct. The Simon Foundation facility consists of 33,500 square feet consisting of 128 kennel runs, 75 cat condos, adoption simulation rooms, training and fitness circuit, and 3,000 square feet reserved for a low cost spay-neuter clinic.

I am here testifying in favor of Bill 6303. In fact, The Simon Foundation is the very model under Section 1 (a)(2) which would provide day to day kennel care under this section and under Section 1 (b) which would provide veterinary care to adoptable animals.

Moreover, this is exactly what is happening at The Simon Foundation as we speak. We are under agreement with both the Town of Bloomfield and The City of Hartford under which The Simon Foundation takes ownership of some of the dogs once their statutory hold time has lapsed and then vets and trains these dogs for eventual adoption in loving homes. In addition, the Foundation offers training sessions to adopters to make sure that any issues with the dogs can be resolved through professional training. Of course, all animals are spayed and neutered for the animals' well-being and to protect against population increase.

The following is a brief summary of benefits-

- 1) The outside facility is up and running with animal care infrastructure intact thus saving the municipality the cost of building and staffing their own facility;
- 2) A charitable organization such as The Simon Foundation is equipped to adopt these animals in a more efficient manner to homes which are pre-qualified for successful adoptions;
- 3) The animals will enjoy a better life in the facility due to the established regimens of regular walking and exercise;
- 4) The euthanasia rate of the animals will decrease due to the extra capacity of both the facilities and the charitable organizations that agree to take the animals after the statutory period

In summary, it is my opinion that this is a win-win bill for the municipalities and the animals whose voices are heard effectively with the passage of this legislation. If you would like to know more about our facility in Bloomfield please go to [www.thesimonfoundation.org](http://www.thesimonfoundation.org).

Thank you.

**Testimony Concerning Raised Bill 6303****Jessica Corsaletti****Friends of New Britain Animal Control**

Senator Cassano, Representative Gentile, members of the committee, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of Raised Bill 6303, An Act Concerning Municipal Animal Shelters.

I have worked as a Veterinary technician in the past and recently started a volunteer based group called "Friends of New Britain Animal Control." Our original mission was to work *with* local Animal Control to assist in placing the dogs at the New Britain pound, which would in turn, reduce the euthanasia rate. However, after volunteering there on a weekly basis for over 2 years, we have seen numerous cases of dogs that have been neglected. Despite the fact that the City has a budget for veterinary care, its often not used and dogs are left to sit in the pound untreated. I have personally witnessed dogs go without simple and inexpensive antibiotics to others who were literally dying in their kennel rather than being humanely euthanized to spare them the suffering. There is simply no excuse for a living animal to be allowed to suffer or die in pain. Through personal experience in dealing with Animal Control Officers, it is my belief that there are *some* who have become callous to their position in Animal Control. Others simply have no interest in this field and do it to collect a paycheck. These Animal Control Officers need to be held accountable for allowing animals to suffer needlessly and this is the reason I strongly support this Bill.

This past summer, there were two dogs in particular that were denied urgent veterinary care and were left to suffer in pain for days. Our group named one Montana and the other Francis, after St. Francis the patron Saint. Montana was a VERY friendly, adoptable, young dog. Aside from his wounds, he was otherwise healthy. Unfortunately, Montana was attacked by numerous other dogs which inflicted many puncture wounds and torn skin. He was brought to the pound by the ACO but was never brought to a Veterinarian. When the ACO pointed him out to me during a visit there, he informed me that he had already been there a couple of days. The temperature was over 90 degree's and I observed flies landing on his wounds. I explained to the ACO that the dog needed urgent medical care consisting of pain medication and antibiotics. I was told that he would not bring the dog to a Vet. I explained that it is not uncommon for the flies to infect the wound thus creating a more severe infection. I gave Montana an antiseptic rinse and lathered him with triple antibiotic ointment which I had left at the pound. Montana was at the pound for over 4 days without pain medication and treatment. After the 4 days, my group was able to take him and place him with a rescue that would provide the medical treatment he so badly needed.

Francis however, was not so lucky. He was picked up by the ACO and brought to the pound. Instead of going to the pound, he should have been brought directly to a Veterinarian. He was severely emaciated at approximately 17lbs when he should have been over 60lbs. I found him curled up in the corner of his kennel on the cement floor. He was so malnourished and lethargic that he could not even lift his head. In addition, he had a severe skin infection which left him bleeding on his inner thighs. The rest of his skin was scabbed and itchy. Poor Francis could not even lift his leg however, to scratch his scabbed skin. When I noticed Francis at the pound, he had been there slowly dying, for 2 days. Outraged at the amount of suffering this dog had been forced to endure both prior to the pound as well as in it, I immediately put him in my car and brought him to a Vet to be humanely euthanized to end his pain and suffering.

Although I have done my best to describe what the above animals went through, it is important to know that no amount of detailed writing could ever capture the pain and suffering that I witnessed in these helpless animals eyes. Animals that depend on us for help. Often, individuals turn away because they can't hear about these realities which pound dogs face. As a result, I often find myself conveying the following quote from Albert Schweitzer; "Think occasionally of the suffering of which you spare yourself the sight." With this testimony, I ask you to just consider that quote. The suffering these animals endure is real and it happens more often than one would think. I often wonder how many animals suffered without medical care before I started volunteering in New Britain Animal Control. We cannot change the suffering that past animals have gone through, but with this legislation we *can* prevent needless suffering in the future. To spare an animal unnecessary pain and suffering, when you have a budget as well as rescue groups to help, *should be* common sense. For some however, it is not and that is why I strongly urge you to support Bill 6303. YOU have the power to make the difference that will hold negligent ACO's accountable and help animals who depend on people to get the proper medical care they need.

Thank You,

Jessica Corsaletti  
22 Mattabassett St.  
Berlin, CT 06037

speaker 7  
page 5  
line 145

**Testimony Concerning Raised Bill 6303**  
**Susan B. Linker**  
**CEO, Our Companions Domestic Animal Sanctuary**  
**Vice President, CT Votes for Animals**

Senator Cassano, Representative Gentile, members of the committee, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of Raised Bill 6303, An Act Concerning Municipal Animal Shelters.

In my role at Our Companions I have been in countless municipal shelters where I have witnessed first-hand dogs suffering in unimaginable ways from untreated illnesses and injury.

These animals have had everything from gun-shot wounds, their flesh ripped off from being attacked in dog fights, collars embedded in their necks, broken bones, knife wounds and in many cases the dogs and cats are sick with illnesses like Parvo and severe upper respiratory infection.

Sadly in many of our municipal shelters the shelter workers have become callous and apathetic to the plight of animals. So much that the animal's suffering in their own kennels become unimportant to them.

In many cases however, the towns do not provide proper funding for animal control officers to provide urgent veterinary care and the animal control officers take it upon themselves to bring them to the vet and pay out of their own pockets.

It is a disgrace that the animals who are taken into the municipal shelter systems are far too often denied urgent veterinary care. It's a disgrace that some Animal Control Officers do not care about an animal's suffering. It's equally disgraceful that Towns create these cruel conditions by denying animal control officers the necessary funds to operate a humane shelter.

However, the reality is that far too many animals languish in silence in our shelters, exposed to unnecessary pain and suffering. No animal should be treated cruelly and forced to suffer, especially those who have been abandoned and are most vulnerable to exploitation.

Passing this law will give those animals the urgent care they require. On behalf of the nameless, animal victims in our shelters, I urge you to support this piece of legislation.

Thank you for allowing me to submit this testimony.

Susan B. Linker  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
SusanL@OurCompanions.org  
860-372-8915



**TESTIMONY**  
of the  
**CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE OF MUNICIPALITIES**  
to the  
**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

February 18, 2011

The Connecticut Conference of Municipalities (CCM) is Connecticut's statewide association of towns and cities and the voice of local governments - your partners in governing Connecticut. Our members represent over 93% of Connecticut's population. We appreciate the opportunity to testify on the following bill of interest to towns and cities:

**H.B. 6303, "An Act Concerning Municipal Animal Shelters"**

CCM appreciates the intent behind this proposal. However, the H.B. 6303 would require animal control officers to maintain a registry of nonprofits "that are willing to arrange for and fund the treatment by a licensed veterinarian of any impounded animal that is ill or injured." If animal control officer believes an animal is "adoptable", and if the municipality does not have "sufficient funds to pay" for treatment, the officer would be require to contact organizations on the list to provide treatment.

We are not sure of the liability exposure animal control officers may subject themselves to when determining which animals are "adoptable" and, therefore, which ones are deserving of treatment, or through maintaining a registry that is sufficient.

Thank you.

## ## ##

If you have any questions, please contact Ron Thomas at [rthomas@ccm-ct.org](mailto:rthomas@ccm-ct.org) or (203) 498-3000.

**Testimony Concerning Raised Bill 6303**  
**Barbara Rudnick**  
**Friends of New Britain Animal Control Volunteer**

Senator Cassano, Representative Gentile, members of the committee, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of Raised Bill 6303, An Act Concerning Municipal Animal Shelters.

My name is Barbara Rudnick and I am a volunteer with the Friends of New Britain Animal Control, a member of CT Votes for Animals, the CT Underhound Railroad and I also work with feral cats. I have been involved with animal welfare for over 20 years. As a volunteer with the New Britain Animal Shelter I have first-hand knowledge of animals not receiving the urgent veterinary care they require.

During this past summer unfortunately, there was a dog named Tidbit, who began to display signs of Parvo virus. If you are not familiar with the virus, it is highly communicable and very resilient. Dogs that do contract Parvo and remain untreated die a horrible painful death from the inside out. Symptoms include vomiting, runny stool (which can be bloody), excessive drinking to compensate and GI pain. These symptoms get progressively worse until the dog eventually dies. It is extremely important that quarantine procedures be followed when an animal is diagnosed with the virus and that they be tested as soon as symptoms are observed.

Even though Tidbit began displaying obvious signs of Parvo virus, and the volunteers at the shelter pleaded that the dog be taken to a vet, the Animal Control Officer refused to bring the dog to a Vet until days later when Tid Bit was in the final stages of the virus and near death.

For days, this dog suffered unnecessarily from an agonizing virus before he was euthanized. In addition to denying Tidbit urgent care, the Animal Control Officer did not follow correct quarantine procedures. This was the 3<sup>rd</sup> time in less than 6 months, which the facility had been contaminated with the virus.

The lack of both prompt and proper veterinary care along with improper quarantine procedures resulted in the deaths of numerous dogs at this pound. These were all beautiful, young, healthy dogs when they entered the shelter.

It is a disgrace that the dogs who are taken into the municipal shelters are quite often denied veterinary care. I have looked into their eyes and seen their pain and suffering. For the volunteers who care for these dogs I cannot tell you the heartbreak it is to watch these dogs who are all so vulnerable, suffer unnecessarily. Passing this law will give those animals the necessary care they require and hopefully end their suffering.

Thank you for allowing me to submit this testimony.

Barbara Rudnick  
44 Stony Mill Lane, East Berlin, Ct. 06023

Testimony Concerning Raised Bill 6303  
Valerie Friedman, Washington, CT  
Board member, Our Companions Domestic Animal Sanctuary

Senator Cassano, Representative Gentile, members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to share some of what I have learned in visits to municipal animal shelters throughout the state of CT.

Because of their very high (60%!) euthanasia rate, I focused on the Waterbury, CT Pound, where I was able to document many cases of animal abuse and neglect, which I presented to the municipality last year. Just some of the examples:

- On March 12, 2010 and April 1, 2010, two small dogs were rescued by a rescue organization. Both were unrecognizable as to breed, sex, etc. They were so matted and foul, they could hardly walk or move (Pictures enclosed). Both had been hosed over by high pressure hoses when the cages were cleaned because – according to a Waterbury ACO – no one wanted to touch/remove them. They had no vet care when impounded, a violation of 22-336-28 c. Many hours of grooming uncovered a young Schnauzer and senior Bichon, both of whom were eventually placed by the rescue into loving homes.
- Yorkie died from untreated maggots, due to lack of vet care at the Pound, which was captured on video and presented to the municipality.

These are just some of the many examples of animals denied critical veterinary care that I have witnessed first hand. The public would be outraged if they knew how poorly many animals are treated at municipal pounds. Passing this law will give these animals a chance and go a long way to bringing the treatment of impounded animal into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Thank you for allowing me to submit my statement.



Valerie Friedman, 36 West Morris Road, Washington, CT 06794 860-868-1769

CVATestFeb2011

October 10, 2010

To Waterbury Deputy Police Chief Fred Spagnola and William Covell:

My name is Mike Fine and I am property manager in Waterbury, Ct. On September 29, 2010, I found a dog left in one of my apartments, by tenants who just got evicted. The dog was left there for approximately a week without any food or water. In short the dog was left to die.

HB16303

After calling the Waterbury pound I was told there would be a \$50.00 fee if they were to come and pick up the dog for the property. Being that I did not have the money, I was told that I could come and bring the dog down to the pound for no charge.

Upon entering the pound with the dog in a box wrapped in towels, Pat Dionne who works in the pound approached me and before even asking about what was in the box that I was bringing in, he wanted to know about the \$50.00 to drop a dead dog off. I tried to tell him that the dog was still alive and needed help, but he was not concerned in the slightest. I told him I did not have the money and he was not interested and was not willing to take the dog without the money. After not being able to get anywhere with Pat, I asked him if he wanted me to bring the dog back to the apartment where I found and leave it there for him to go deal with and he threatened to have me arrested for animal cruelty.

As a property manager I have dealt with Pat on a few occasions and his primary concerns was always about money and never about the animals. Near one of my other properties I managed, there was a neighborhood dog with no owner that used to come by one of my properties. The dog was a young pitbull, with signs of abuse and neglect. The dog would circle around the property while barking or growling at my tenants and their kids. Since the dog had no owner, I called the pound. It took Pat over 2 weeks to show up to the property. Upon arrival at the property, Pat demanded \$50.00 for the dog and wanted me to sign papers in case an owner showed up. He also made numerous threats, that if I did not pay him the money to get rid of the dog and that if the dog were to bite someone I would be liable and he also made threats of me going to jail.

After seeing what goes on by the Waterbury pound and how it is run, I could assure you that many people who have dealt with them in the past will not do so in the future. If it was someone else in my shoes, they would have simply just kept the dog in the box and dumped the box with the dog in it, on the side of the road or in a supermarket parking lot. When being faced with threats of jail, being sued and getting charged to try and do a good deed, many people would just rather not deal with it and leave the animal to die out of fear.

In closing, I wanted to state that I am a pet owner myself and it hurts me to see that the workers at the Waterbury pound have just as little compassion as my tenants did who left the dog in my apartment without and food or water to die.

Sincerely,

Mike Fine, 917-584-1787

August 26, 2010

To Whom it May Concern:

I examined "Matt", a 2 year old male Lhasa Apso mix on August 24, 2010. On presentation, Matt was bright and alert. Physical exam was Unremarkable.

However, coat condition was extremely poor and compromised. Heave, thick mats covered the entire body, wrapping tightly around his legs and covering his eyes.

Grooming was done under general anesthesia and took over an hour to perform. At times, mats were so tight that surgical blades were needed to remove the mats. Luckily, the skin on his body and circulation to his legs were not compromised.

If there are any questions please call me at the above phone number.

Sincerely

Marie Eagan, DVM

Prospect- Wolcott Vet Hospital  
93 Waterbury Road  
Prospect CT 06712  
203-758-6601



**Testimony Concerning Raised Bill 6303****Ronald L. Troia**

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of Raised Bill 6303, An Act Concerning Municipal Animal Shelters.

As well as being the motorcycle activist that you know me as I am also a private citizen with no official ties with any animal protection/welfare organization although I do support the efforts of many of them. That being said I feel it is imperative that we as a society work to protect our animal friends at every opportunity. Those who are charged with caring for those are unfortunate enough to end up in shelters almost always through no fault of their own must always utilize utmost care and compassion for these creatures.

It is a disgrace that the animals who are taken into the municipal shelter systems are far too often denied urgent veterinary care. However, the reality is that far too many animals languish in silence in our shelters, exposed to unnecessary pain and suffering. Passing this law will give these animals the urgent care they require.

I respectfully urge you to support Bill #6303 to help in the protection of innocent animals.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this proposed legislation please feel free to contact me.

Thank you for allowing me to submit this testimony.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ronald L. Troia  
31 Ladas Place  
Shelton, CT 06484  
rltroia@snet.net  
203-924-5654 Home  
203-650-2668 Cell

**Testimony of Kathleen Sullivan  
Member CT Votes for Animals  
Board Member -Our Companions**

**In Support of Raised Bill 6303 – an Act Concerning Municipal Animal Shelters  
February 18, 2011**

Senator Cassano, Representative Gentile, members of the committee, I thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of Raised Bill 6303, An Act Concerning Municipal Animal Shelters.

I am a dog owner and citizen who volunteers my time to further the cause of animal welfare and protection as well as rescue. While working in these areas over the last several years, I have been consistently disappointed to learn just how poorly our society is allowed to treat its' most vulnerable, voiceless members.

It is incomprehensible to me that municipal animal shelters whose purpose is to protect, care for and temporarily house our homeless dogs can routinely deny basic veterinary care to those which are injured and suffering. At the very least, if the animal is otherwise adoptable, they should have a right to be treated by a licensed veterinarian.

I believe it is a disgrace that common decency should have to be legislated, but since it apparently does, I urge you to do the humane thing and please support Raised Bill 6303.

Passing this bill will give the animals the urgent care they require to eliminate needless suffering and to allow them a second chance at a quality life in a loving home.

Thank you for allowing me to submit this testimony.

Kathleen Sullivan  
86 Bloomfield Avenue  
Hartford, Connecticut 06105

Testimony Concerning Raised Bill 6303  
Charlotte Meade, New Preston, CT  
Meade Canine Rescue

Senator Cassano, Representative Gentile, members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to share some of my observations from my rescue visits to municipal animal shelters throughout the state of CT.

Because of their very high (60%!) euthanasia rate and disturbing conditions, I focused on the Waterbury, CT Pound, where I was able to document many cases of animal abuse and neglect, which were presented to the municipality last year. Just some of the examples:

- On September 29, 2010, a resident of Waterbury, Mike Fine, entered the foyer of the Waterbury Municipal Pound with a cardboard box. He told Animal Control Officer Pat Dionne that the dog had been in a vacant apartment in a building he managed for the last week and there was no food or water evident in the apartment. ACO Dionne asked him for a \$50 surrender fee, and when Mr. Fine said he did not have the money, Pat Dionne told him he would not accept the dog and he should take it back to the vacant apartment. He never even looked inside the box to determine the condition of the dog. I happened to be at the Pound at the time, opened the box, and found a very emaciated and sick Yorkie (see pictures). I immediately took the dog to a vet, and nursed him back to health over the next few weeks, until it was placed by me in a loving home in the City of Waterbury. Michael Fine was so incensed by the callous disregard for the welfare of the dog evident by ACO Dionne that he wrote the attached letter to the Waterbury Police Department and Human Resources Department.
- On August 24, 2010, a dog impounded at the Waterbury Municipal Pound was brought out for me by ACO Mark Ring. The dog was in such matted condition that it could barely stand, although it had been left in that condition by the ACOs for 7 days. The condition was so poor that they were unable to determine sex or breed, making it impossible to advertise the animal properly if a concerned owner was trying to find their dog. The dog was immediately transferred by me to Prospect Vet Hospital, and they prepared the attached report.
- On many visits to the Waterbury Pound, I have seen dogs in terrible shape, left untended and untouched by the Animal Control Officers and receiving no vet care, suffering while waiting out their seven days for the inevitable decision by the ACOs to euthanize them.

The public is entitled to expect humane treatment of animals that unfortunately find themselves at municipal pounds throughout the state of CT. This law is long overdue, and will bring the treatment of animals at the municipal shelters out of the dark ages, which, sadly, is the situation at many municipal pounds.

Thank you for allowing me to submit my statement.

Charlotte Meade, 20 Flirtation Avenue, New Preston, CT 06777 860-868-6419

**Testimony Concerning Raised Bill 6303****Cathy DeMarco****Coalition for Change**

Senator Cassano, Representative Gentile, members of the committee, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of Raised Bill 6303, An Act Concerning Municipal Animal Shelters.

I am the founder and spokesperson for the Coalition for Change, the group responsible for the recent reform efforts at the CT Humane Society. I have worked as a municipal ACO during the 1990's (for Berlin and South Windsor) and very recently have been extremely involved with New Britain's animal control facility, currently run by the NB Police Department.

While working as an assistant ACO for the Town of Berlin (1993-1995), there were many serious and upsetting examples of impounded animals not receiving the medical care they so desperately needed.

**The first example involves a cat that I picked up on a side road in East Berlin.**

The cat was near death. Seriously injured with her abdomen split open. She could not stand or walk, she could barely lift her head. Due to recent changes in the department of agriculture's animal control policies (because of the rabies virus re-entering the state), municipalities were now expected to pick up cats (and other rabies vector species). Unfortunately, the town's head ACO continued to ignore sick/injured cats. We had many conflicts over all of this. I was not allowed to take the cat directly to one of the town's veterinarians to be euthanized. I was forced to take the cat to the pound and wait for the head ACO to arrive to 'examine' her (to make sure my claims were legitimate). He did not come to the pound until the next day. Even then it was a struggle to get him to allow me to bring her to be put down. My job was threatened repeatedly for this and many other incidents.

**Another example involves a beautiful black Labrador, found sitting in a pile of leaves by the side of the road.** She could barely stand or walk. I took her to the pound where once again, it took days before I was allowed to bring her to the vet. She was a lovely, young, highly adoptable dog. The town wanted her euthanized immediately. Myself and another assistant ACO refused to have that done. Instead we had her x-rayed. She had a fractured pelvis and other injuries. At that moment we began the Injured and Homeless Animal Fund. I took her home. We named her 'Autumn' and made sure she received all of the medical care that the town and the head ACO denied her. Thanks to the local newspapers running her story, donations poured in. She stayed with me until fully recovered and was finally placed in a loving home.

I am happy to say that much has changed in Berlin since then and animals picked up by the town's current ACO all receive medical attention immediately if needed. However, there are still many cities and towns in CT that simply do not provide the necessary medical care to the animals in their municipal shelter. New Britain is one of those.....

**I have been extremely involved with the on-going conflict at the NB dog pound. I was approached this past summer when the small group of volunteers (FONBAC=Friends of NB Animal Control) reached out to the Coalition for advice and support. After many discussions with volunteers, as well as personally visiting the NB pound on numerous occasions, it was obvious that there were many problems at this facility. The most upsetting of all is the fact that dogs frequently go without appropriate medical care for days at a time. The volunteers have documented numerous cases (including photos). I have witnessed a number of these myself. The city's excuse is money even though the volunteers have a fund in which people donate specifically for this reason. Volunteers also pay out of pocket frequently. They also provide transport to and from a number of vets. The city only has to allow them to do it. All we are asking is to obtain permission to get the dog the care it needs.**

It is hard to imagine that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we are still at odds over such basic humane issues. There is no excuse for any city or town, any ACO/Mayor/ or Chief of Police to deny any animal in their shelter necessary medical care. This includes humane euthanasia. It is shocking that good ACO's are regularly threatened with termination for trying to get the animal to a vet. It is truly appalling that dedicated volunteers are no longer allowed to assist with the dogs at the pound, simply because they brought these concerns to light. Something needs to be done immediately. I hope that passing this law will be the beginning of REAL CHANGE for our state's injured/sick/ and homeless animals.

Thank you for allowing me to submit this testimony.

Cathy DeMarco, [cathyde1962@comcast.net](mailto:cathyde1962@comcast.net); cell: 860-810-8478  
224 Wooster Street, New Britain, CT 06052-1028

**Testimony Concerning Raised Bill 6303**

**Amanda Ewchuk**

**Animal Behaviorist and Trainer**

Senator Cassano, Representative Gentile, members of the committee, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of Raised Bill 6303, An Act Concerning Municipal Animal Shelters.

During the year of 2010, I was an Assistant Animal Control Officer in Connecticut and witnessed several accounts of animal cruelty committed by the Animal Control Department, which was operated under the Police Department.

In one instance, a domestic shorthair feline was impounded after being discovered underneath a parked vehicle. The animal was taken to Mattatuck Veterinary Hospital of Waterbury in which the veterinarians informed the supervising officer that the animal had a dislocated femur and severe abscess that caused the limb to swell to twice its size and constantly drain puss and blood. The supervising officer did not leave the animal with the veterinarian, but instead housed the animal in the pound for the next 5 days. The only medication the animal received was Clavamox, an antibiotic. The veterinarian specified that the animal was most certainly in severe pain, but no pain management was provided. I decided to remove the animal from the facility and Our Companions assisted in financially supporting the feline's medical treatment. Only once Our Companions intervened, did the cat receive a leg amputation that removed the infection and he was given a clean bill of health and a new family. The supervising animal control officer did not provide any medical attention aside from the initial veterinary visit nor did she consider the alternative that the animal was unnecessarily suffering and humane euthanasia should be an option if the budget could not allow treatment.

Another instance of cruelty was in the case of a lhasa apso that came in seriously ill. The animal was in the facility for 7 days, during which the animal barely ate or drank. The canine did not move about in his kennel and had to be hand fed wet food. His eyes and ears appeared to be badly infected and his hair was severely matted. After the seven day holding period, the animal was then brought to the veterinarian. It was then discovered that the animal had two broken hips and double conjunctivitis that was so severe the eyes would have to be removed to get rid of the infection. The animal also had double ear infections and hair that was literally peeling his skin off because it was so tightly matted. Only then was the animal euthanized and the veterinarian said the animal was definitely in significant pain the entire week and that it had possibly, aside but being unkempt, been involved in a car accident. This animal suffered in the pound for a week before it was humanely euthanized. The animal showed clear signs of infection and illness, but only the supervising officer was allowed to take animals to the vet and approve veterinary assistance, so the assistant officers had to sit by and watch the animal suffer.

Another case was that of a domestic shorthair feline that came into the facility the day before I worked. I came into the office at 6 in the morning to begin cleaning and feeding the animals. When I went into the cat room, I thought one of the cats was deceased because he was motionless. Upon opening the cage, I found he was breathing, but it was shallow and his visual reflexes were sluggish (when tapping the side of his eye, his blink reflex was slow). At that early

of an hour, the only veterinary clinic that was open was Cheshire Emergency Vet Clinic. I wrapped the animal in a towel, put him in the car and began driving. The animal started to aspirate, so I pulled the vehicle over and began artificial respiration appropriate in felines. The animal began taking shallow breaths again and his heartbeat was weak, but existent. However, the animal passed before we reached the clinic which was 35 minutes away. Upon returning to the facility, the supervising officer informed me she knew the animal has a severe ascarid (roundworm) infestation the day before, but did not provide the animal with significant medical attention. The animal was not given intravenous fluids which are necessary in a severe infestation. Furthermore, the animal should have been humanely euthanized if the infestation was so advanced, but my supervisor informed me both medical treatment and euthanasias are too expensive given the limited budget. However, when I was working there, she re-painted and tiled the cat room and the main office. The town also replaced the kennel doors and was financing a new drainage system. Money that could have been spent saving the lives of animals and preventing suffering was allotted to the physical appearance of the shelter itself.

Animal control officers are not trained in any form of animal behavior or basic emergency medical care. My supervising officer wanted to euthanize a nursing mother for hissing at people, when it is well known in the field of veterinary medicine and animal behavior that nursing mothers typically exhibit aggression until their litter is weaned. This cat never once swatted at or bit any employees in the facility. My supervising officer stated to me "That cat is not leaving here alive." I made many attempts to explain the cat's behavior was very natural and the other assistant officers agreed they had no trouble handling and feeding her, so she was of no danger to employees, but my supervisor said she just didn't like to cat and she had to be euthanized. She told me "If you want to deal with it, you adopt her." So I personally adopted the nursing mother to prevent her from being executed and she is the most affectionate and loving companion.

It was common practice in the animal control facility that animals were not taken to the veterinarian upon impound despite apparent malnourishment and flea/tick infestations. Animals were routinely not given deworming medication, despite worms in their stool or bloody diarrhea (known symptom of coccidia and giardia infestations). The conditions of the work environment and lack of concern for the animals' well-being led me to quit my position as Assistant Animal Control Officer. Unfortunately, I had no authority to create change in the shelter. The lack of education in the field or required training leads to ignorance and negligence in the field. Helpless animals are paying the price for the lack of legislation governing animal control facilities. Many officers care deeply about animal welfare; however, there are no regulations monitoring the officers that euthanize animals on a whim or fail to provide necessary veterinary care. Animals are suffering in facilities all over the state and it is a disgrace that we treat helpless creatures with such little respect and dignity.

Thank you for allowing me to submit this testimony.

Amanda Ewchuk  
152 Brewster Rd  
West Hartford, CT 06117  
860.965.3699

Testimony of Christine Zaleski  
220 Farm Village Road  
Rocky Hill, CT 06067

In Support of Raised Bill 6303 – an Act Concerning Municipal Animal Shelters  
February 18, 2011

Senator Cassano, Representative Gentile, members of the committee, I thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of Raised Bill 6303, An Act Concerning Municipal Animal Shelters.

I am a concerned citizen who volunteers and financially supports a number of animal welfare organizations. You don't have to be involved in rescue to see the great inadequacies in the care standard of our municipal shelter system,

In my time visiting shelters to donate supplies, funds and to adopt pets, I have been consistently disappointed to learn just how poorly our society is allowed to treat its' most vulnerable, voiceless members.

It is incomprehensible to me that municipal animal shelters whose purpose is to protect, care for and temporarily house our homeless dogs can routinely deny basic veterinary care to those which are injured and suffering. At the very least, if the animal is injured and suffering it should be immediately taken to a licensed veterinarian.

Currently the laws require minimal standard of care and as a taxpayer, citizen and voter, I feel strongly that these standards be raised.

Nonetheless, neglect and animal cruelty in our shelters via the denial of urgent veterinary care should never be tolerated. I believe it is a disgrace that common decency should have to be legislated, but since it apparently does, I urge you to do the humane thing and please support Raised Bill 6303.

Passing this bill will give the animals the urgent care they require to eliminate needless suffering and to allow them a second chance at a quality life in a loving home.

Thank you for allowing me to submit this testimony.

Testimony for Raised bill 6303-  
An Act Concerning Municipal Animal Shelters

Karen Laski  
279 Fern St.  
Manchester, CT 06040  
860-646-4258

I am here today in strong support of Raised bill 6303, An Act concerning Municipal Animal Shelters.

When a dog is lost, has been abandoned or intentionally abused, he or she will often end up in the community animal shelter. Already traumatized the animal is thrown into a strange place and must endure the stress of unfamiliar people and animals. If the dog is sick, injured or wounded, he is at the mercy of whoever is on duty at the Pound. Sometimes that person does not care about the dog's well-being and ignores the suffering.

Imagine a dog, hurt, sick and terrified, lying on a cement floor in a small cubicle without anyone to comfort her. Imagine her shivering, sick to her stomach with injuries covered in excrement.

The Shelter bill would insure that ailing dogs entering pounds receive the attention and veterinary care they need.

Humane is a powerful word. That is what the Shelter bill is all about.

Thank you.



**DAN COSGROVE ANIMAL SHELTER**  
749 East Main Street  
Branford, CT 06405  
(203) 315-4125



February 18, 2011

To Whom It May Concern:

I am the Director of the Branford Animal Shelter and we feel it is imperative not only for the animals but also for the morale of the staff and community to at least attempt to treat ill and injured adoptable animals. We have kept a list for years of non profit groups willing to help pay for surgeries or medications as well as low cost veterinary services available to residents. We are in support of Bill #6303.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Laura Selvaggio Burban'.

Laura Selvaggio Burban  
Director of Animal Shelter  
Town of Branford  
203-315-0698

**S - 632**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2011**

**VOL. 54  
PART 21  
6546-6914**

mhr/cd/gbr  
SENATE

498  
June 7, 2011

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Continuing on calendar page 14, Calendar 522,  
House Bill Number 6303.

Madam President, move to place the item on the  
Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Moving to calendar page 15, Calendar 523, House  
Bill Number 6499.

Madam President, move to place the item on the  
Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Continuing on calendar page 15, Calendar 524,  
House Bill Number 6490.

Madam President, move to place the item on the  
Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

mhr/cd/gbr  
SENATE

520  
June 7, 2011

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call's been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll call's been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CLERK:

Madam President, the items placed...

THE CHAIR:

I would ask the Chamber to be quiet please so we can hear the call of the Calendar for the Consent Calendar.

Thank you.

Please proceed, Mr. Clerk

THE CLERK:

Madam President, the items placed on the first Consent Calendar begin on calendar page 5, Calendar 336, House Bill 5697.

Calendar page 7, Calendar 421, Substitute for House Bill 6126.

Calendar page 8, Calendar 449, Senate Bill 1149.

mhr/cd/gbr  
SENATE

521  
June 7, 2011

Calendar page 10, Calendar 470, Substitute for House Bill 5340. Calendar 474, Substitute for House Bill 6274. Calendar 476, House Bill 6635.

Calendar page 12, Calendar 499, Substitute for House Bill 6638. Calendar 500, House Bill 6614. Calendar 508, House Bill 6222.

Calendar page 13, Calendar 511, House Bill 6356. Calendar 512, Substitute for House Bill 6422. Calendar 514, House Bill 6590. Calendar 515, House Bill 6221. Calendar 516, House Bill 6455.

Calendar page 14, Calendar 517, House Bill 6350. Calendar 519, House Bill 5437. Calendar 522, House Bill 6303.

Calendar page 15, Calendar 523, Substitute for House Bill 6499. Calendar 524, House Bill 6490. Calendar 525, House Bill 5780. Calendar 526, House Bill 6513. Calendar 527, Substitute for House Bill 6532.

Calendar page 16, Calendar 528, House Bill 6561. Calendar 529, Substitute for House Bill 6312. Calendar 530, Substitute for House Bill 5032. Calendar 532, House Bill 6338.

Calendar page 17, Calendar 533, Substitute for House Bill 6325. Calendar 534, House Bill 6352.

mhr/cd/gbr  
SENATE

522  
June 7, 2011

Calendar 536, House Bill 5300. Calendar 537, House  
Bill 5482.

calendar page 18, Calendar 543, House Bill 6508.

Calendar 544, House Bill 6412. Calendar 546,  
Substitute for House Bill 6538. Calendar 547,  
Substitute for House Bill 6440. Calendar 548,  
Substitute for House Bill 6471.

Calendar page 19, Calendar 550, Substitute for  
House Bill 5802. Calendar 551, House Bill 6433.  
Calendar 552, House Bill 6413. Calendar 553,  
Substitute for House Bill 6227.

Calendar page 20, Calendar 554, Substitute for  
House Bill 5415. Calendar 557, Substitute for House  
Bill 6318. Calendar 558, Substitute for House Bill  
6565.

Calendar page 21, Calendar 559, Substitute for  
House Bill 6636.

Calendar page 22, Calendar 563, Substitute for  
House Bill 6600. Calendar 564, Substitute for House  
Bill 6598. Calendar 566, House Bill 5585.

Calendar page 23, Calendar 568, Substitute for  
House Bill 6103. Calendar 570, Substitute for House  
Bill 6336. Calendar 573, Substitute for House Bill  
6434.

mhr/cd/gbr  
SENATE

523  
June 7, 2011

Calendar page 24, Calendar 577, Substitute for  
House Bill 5795.

Calendar page 25, Calendar 581, House Bill  
6354.

Calendar page 26, Calendar 596, Substitute for  
House Bill 6282. Calendar 598, Substitute for House  
Bill 6629.

Calendar page 27, Calendar 600, House Bill  
6314. Calendar 601, Substitute for House Bill 6529.  
Calendar 602, Substitute for House Bill 6438.  
Calendar 604, Substitute for House Bill 6639.

Calendar page 28, Calendar 605, Substitute for  
House Bill 6526. Calendar 608, House Bill 6284.

Calendar page 30, Calendar number 615,  
Substitute for House Bill 6485. Calendar 616,  
Substitute for House Bill 6498.

Calendar page 31, Calendar 619, Substitute for  
House Bill 6634. Calendar 627, Substitute for House  
Bill 6596.

Calendar page 32, Calendar 629, House Bill  
5634. Calendar 630, Substitute for House Bill 6631.  
Calendar 631, Substitute for House Bill 6357.  
Calendar 632, House Bill 6642.

mhr/cd/gbr  
SENATE

524  
June 7, 2011

Calendar page 33, Calendar 634, Substitute for  
House Bill 5431. Calendar 636, Substitute for  
House, correction, House Bill 6100.

Page 34, Calendar 638, Substitute for House  
Bill 6525.

Calendar page 48, Calendar 399, Substitute for  
Senate Bill 1043.

Calendar page 49, Calendar 409, Substitute for  
House Bill 6233. Calendar 412, House Bill 5178.  
Calendar 422, Substitute for House Bill 6448.

Calendar page 52, Calendar 521, Substitute for  
House Bill 6113.

Madam President, that completes the item placed  
on the first Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

We call for another roll call vote. And the  
machine will be open for Consent Calendar number 1.

THE CLERK:

The Senate is now voting by roll on the Consent  
Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the  
Chamber. The Senate is now voting by roll on the  
Consent Calendar, will all Senators please return to  
the Chamber.

mhr/cd/gbr  
SENATE

525  
June 7, 2011

Senator Cassano, would you vote, please, sir.

Thank you.

Well, all members have voted. All members have voted. The machine will be closed, and Mr. Clerk, will you call the tally?

THE CLERK:

Motion is on option Consent Calendar Number 1.

Total Number Voting	36
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar Number 1 has passed.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

We might stand at ease for just a moment as we prepare the next item..

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)