



K-117

JAMES C. KIRKPATRICK  
STATE INFORMATION CENTER  
(573) 751-4936

JASON KANDER  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
STATE OF MISSOURI

ELECTIONS DIVISION  
(573) 751-2301

January 29, 2014

The Honorable Tom Schweich  
State Auditor  
State Capitol Building  
Jefferson City, MO 65101

RECEIVED

JAN 29 2014

STATE AUDITORS OFFICE

RE: Petition approval request from Karen Runk (2014-117)

Dear Auditor Schweich:

Enclosed please find an initiative petition sample filed by Karen Runk on January 29, 2014.

We are referring the enclosed petition sample sheet to you for the purposes of preparing a fiscal note and fiscal note summary as required by section 116.332, RSMo. Section 116.175.2, RSMo requires the state auditor to forward the fiscal note and fiscal note summary to the attorney general within twenty days of receipt of the petition sample sheet.

Thank you for your immediate consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Jason Kander

cc: Hon. Chris Koster  
Sheri Hoffman  
Barbara Wood

14-117

RECEIVED

We, the citizens of Missouri, petition the state to prohibit breed specific legislation in the state of Missouri.

2014 JAN 29 PM 1:51

The following states all have laws that prohibit local governments from enacting breed-specific legislation or have statements saying that BSL may not hold up in court: California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Main, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, and Washington. California's code: Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prevent a city or county from adopting or enforcing its own program for the control of potentially dangerous or vicious dogs that may incorporate all, part, or none of this chapter, or that may punish a violation of this chapter as a misdemeanor or may impose a more restrictive program to control potentially dangerous or vicious dogs, provided that no program shall regulate these dogs in a manner that is specific as to breed.

Breed specific legislation has been proven to be an inefficient way to handle dangerous and/or aggressive dogs. Dogs should be deemed dangerous and/or aggressive/vicious based on their behavior and not their appearance. Also, the term "pit bull" is very vague and can include breeds that have no bully breed in them. These breed bans have caused the stereotype to worsen on the American Pit Bull Terrier and other bully breeds that are deemed "pits." They are prejudice and wrong. Officials should be able to deem dogs dangerous by behavior.

An example of a correct ordinance is in Boone County MO. They define a NUISANCE DOG as a dog of any breed which repeatedly demonstrates threatening behavior by growling, or lunging, or chasing, or baring teeth, towards an individual or individuals, or bicyclists, or motor vehicles, or domesticated animals or livestock off the Owner's property. They define a VICIOUS DOG as Any dog of any breed which without provocation or command demonstrates a pattern of unequivocal viciousness, bites or injures a human being or exhibits a pattern of behavior of biting or attacking or attempting to bite or attack human beings at any location or inappropriately attacks animals off the owner's or possessor's property. No dog shall be defined or considered vicious if the dog is working for a law enforcement agency or any law enforcement officer in the performance of law enforcement work, or is protecting its owner or possessor's person or premises from someone committing a crime. No dog shall be defined or considered vicious solely because of its breed.

Many studies have been done and have all proved the same result: Breed Specific Legislation is inefficient and wrong. There are many ways to still protect the public from dangerous dogs while allowing the innocent dogs to remain in their families. A dog doesn't deserve to be judged by its appearance just like people don't deserve to be judged by the color of their skin.

14-17

[illegible]