

**PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY**

Meeting Date: 6/19/2001**Reference No.:** CB-26-2001**Proposer:** County Executive**Draft No.:** 2**Sponsors:** Bailey, Hendershot**Item Title:** An Act amending the Animal Control Ordinance and
generally relating to animal control

Drafter: Karen T. Zavakos
Law**Resource** Leslie Jackson Jenkins
Personnel: DER

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:**Date Presented:** 4/24/2001**Executive Action:** ___/___/___ US**Committee Referral:** 4/24/2001 THE**Effective Date:** 9/10/2001**Committee Action:** 6/12/2001 FAV(A)**Date Introduced:** 6/19/2001**Public Hearing:** 7/10/2001 1:00 P.M.**Council Action:** 7/10/2001 ENACTED**Council Votes:** RVR:A, DB:A, JE:A, IG:A, TH:A, WM:A, AS:A, PS:A, MW:A**Pass/Fail:** P**Remarks:** _____

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE DATE: 6/12/01

Committee Vote: Favorable as amended, 5-0 (In favor: Council Members Estepp, Shapiro, Bailey, Gourdine and Hendershot)

Committee staff explained the purpose of CB-26-2001 stating that a Work Study Group was convened in August 1998 by the Director of the Department of Environmental Resources (DER) to review the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) Evaluation Report of the Animal Management Division (AMD) and the current Animal Control Ordinance. After discussion and consideration of all of the report's recommendations, CB-26-2001 represents the Work Study Group's recommendations suggested for implementation.

The Legislative Officer finds CB-26-2001 to be in proper legislation form. However, he noted that the proposed revisions have not addressed existing problems of clearly understanding the Animal Control Ordinance.

The Office of Law proposed amendments presented in a draft 2. The proposed amendments included the Health Departments and the Legislative Affairs Office recommendations.

The Office of Audits and Investigations has determined that there will be positive fiscal impact in the amount of approximately \$22,325. The amount results from additional revenue generated from the increases in fines and fees.

Members of the Work Study Group were present and testified in support of CB-26-2001. However, the Work Study Group recommended repeal of the pit bull ban, which was not included in CB-26-2001. The members stated that in order to get CB-26-2001 passed, they would not object to the exclusion of language dealing with the repealing of the pit bull ban.

The County Executive's staff explained that consideration was given to the Work Study Group on repealing the pit bull ban. However, the safety and well being of the citizens far out weigh the consequences of repealing the pit bull legislation.

The dog bite statistics indicate that dog bites have declined subsequent to the pit bull ban. Several proponents of the pit bull ban suggested that the collected data is opened to interpretation. The data takes into account all dog bites and is not categorized by breed or type of bite.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION/FISCAL IMPACT

(Includes reason for proposal, as well as any unique statutory requirements)

This legislation will amend the Animal Control Ordinance generally relating to animal control.

CODE INDEX TOPICS: