



MINUTES

Animal Control Hearing

Thursday, February 2, 2017
The Intracoastal Room at Palm Coast City Hall
Community Wing Entrance
160 Lake Avenue, Palm Coast, Florida 32164

A. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance.

The meeting was called to order at 9:16 A.M. by Nicole R. Turcotte, Esquire, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Swearing-in of Staff and Respondents.

City Staff: Barbara Grossman, Eva Rodriguez, Heather Priestap, William Doonan
Respondents: Elen Puerta, Heather Karbowsky, James Eppes, Richard Doteau, Katie Coleman, Amy Carotenuto, Katie Share, Keith L. Neal, Jimmy Quintero, Maria Santos, Joaquim Carvalho, Lia Carvalho
Complainants: Joseph Demartin, Atty.

C. December 6, 2016 Minutes Approved.

D. Case Heard

CASE NO. 2016121048

Acct. # 663249

City of Palm Coast vs. Elen Puerta

5 Botany Lane "Muneco"

Palm Coast Code Section 8-40 Appeal of Dangerous Dog Classification

SYNOPSIS:

Jennifer Nix, City Attorney, spoke on behalf of the City. She stated the reason for this hearing is that the owners of Muneco, the dog, have requested an appeal of the City's initial determination classifying Muneco as a dangerous dog. The City's initial determination provided sufficient evidence to identify Muneco as a dangerous dog. This was made after the City's investigation. The City did not find or order the dog be euthanized but that the owners comply with the restrictions of Florida Statute 767. The City is providing evidence to this hearing and requesting the determination of dangerous dog be upheld by this procedure. Ms. Nix entered into evidence additional Exhibits (A & B) to the Hearing Officer (copies to opposing counsel).

Ms. Nix stated that Florida Statute Chapter 767.11 defines a dangerous dog as follows:

”Dangerous dog means any dog that according to the records of the appropriate authority:

(a) Has aggressively bitten, attacked, or endangered or has inflicted **severe injury** on a human being on public or private property;

(3) “**Severe injury**” means any physical injury that results in broken bones, multiple bites, or disfiguring lacerations requiring sutures or reconstructive surgery.

Ms. Nix advised that Chapter 767 was amended July 1, 2016. City Code is currently undergoing revisions in regard to the Animal Control chapter of the Code of Ordinances. The City is presently operating under the current Florida Statute regarding Animal Control. The State Statute gives discretion as to whether or not to destroy a dangerous dog.

Nicole Turcotte, Hearing Officer, inquired whether the current code conflicts with Florida Statute.

Ms. Nix stated she feels it is just stricter in that it mandates destruction of the dog and that is not what the City wishes in this case. The City was revising the Code prior to this incident and was following Florida Statute.

Nicole Turcotte inquired if the only thing new in Exhibit B was the Flagler County Sheriff’s Office report.

Ms. Nix advised that Page 2 is a narrative as to circumstances provided by the officer. The prior narrative was between dispatch and the officer.

Ms. Nix stated she wanted to note that testimony might be heard regarding the temperament of the dog, since the particular bite incident. She stated this hearing is more narrow than the temperament of the dog. Chapter 767 provides a definition of dangerous dog and states what she previously mentioned. At the end of the day, the application of the Statute is pretty clear as to what factors need to be met to classify this dog as a dangerous dog. The City asks that you uphold your initial determination and the Florida Statutes as well.

Joseph Demartin, attorney on behalf of Elen Puerta gave his opening statement. He provided a packet of affidavits and photos of the animal Muneco, depicting his general behavior and playfulness. He would like these to be placed as Exhibit C. He had no objections for Exhibit A and B to be entered into evidence.

Ms. Nix had no objections to the affidavits or Exhibit C. She would like an exact copy of the Exhibit C. She called her first witness for the City of Palm Coast, witness Eva Rodriguez.

Eva Rodriguez, (previously Eva Boivin) Animal Control Officer for the City of Palm Coast., gave testimony regarding her involvement of this incident. On December 28, 2016 at 7:00 p.m., she was contacted by Flagler County Sheriff’s Office dispatch in

reference to an animal incident at 34 Bolling Lane. The Flagler County Sheriff's Office Deputy requested that she respond to the address and remove the dog and take the dog into quarantine due to the severity of injury. Per her affidavit, Composite B-2, Mrs. Rodriguez stated that due to the severity of the injury Muneco should be declared a dangerous dog. Ms. Rodriguez did not see the victim. The victim was already at the hospital. She did meet with dog sitter, Mr. Carvalho and his daughter who translated for him. They gave a brief statement saying Mr. Carvalho was walking the dog on a leash, when the victim approached and asked to pet the dog. When she went to stand up and leave, the dog jumped up and there was an injury. Mrs. Rodriguez stated the dog was taken into her truck and taken into the Flagler Humane Society at 8:30 that night and placed in the shelter. The Flagler County Sheriff's Office asked her to specifically remove the dog from the home and bring it to the shelter. Ms. Rodriguez had never met the animal owners prior to this incident. They were out of town in Columbia and were to arrive back in town on January 10. Mrs. Rodriguez stated she posted her name and phone number to let them know she needed to speak with them about the incident. She met with them on the 11th at the Flagler Humane Society to discuss the determination of declaring the dog dangerous due to severity of injury. Mrs. Rodriguez met the owner, Elen Puerta and advised her the City would be taking action to declare the dog dangerous. She advised Ms. Puerta that if she were to provide a written statement that she would not contest the dangerous dog determination, she could take the dog home that day. Ms. Puerta advised that she made the decision to have the dog euthanized. She did not want this to happen to anyone else. She stated she and her husband had a discussion while on vacation to put the dog down. She was very torn on what decision to make. Mrs. Rodriguez advised her that the City's intent was not to euthanize the dog.. It was a very emotional meeting. Her final decision was to have Muneco put to sleep humanely at the Humane Society. She went in and paid for the euthanization. Mrs. Rodriguez advised the Flagler Humane Society she would be back the following day to pick up records regarding same. That decision changed. The next day, on the 12th of January, Mrs. Rodriguez was advised by Flagler Humane Society staff that the owner had changed her mind and she would be consulting with a lawyer. The dog remains at the Humane Society. Although she did not see the victim's injury, Mrs. Rodriguez stated she has seen photo evidence of the injuries. William Doonan, Animal Control Officer for the City of Palm Coast, provided photos of the injury on December 31, 2016 when he went to pick up the affidavit from victim. The photos Mrs. Rodriguez saw at that time were reviewed again. The determination of dangerous dog was a result in part by the photos provided by the victim.

Ms. Nix stated again, the definition of dangerous dog is "any physical injury that results in broken bones, multiple bites, or disfiguring lacerations requiring sutures or reconstructive surgery." The photographs clearly depict sutures, 44 to be exact, which fall under the dangerous dog classification for severe injury again which adds to the facts as provided by Mr. Carvalho, the pet sitter and the bite victim. Those sworn affidavits are included as B3 and B4 in composite Exhibit B. Also of note, the Flagler County Sheriff's Office report was provided after initial packet was received. The officer stated in his report that Ms. Helmich had received approximately 44 stitches in her left forearm. He also stated that he was told Ms. Helmich had gone up to the dog and asked Mr. Carvalho if the dog was friendly and he had stated "yes". The narrative coincides with the affidavits provided in the packet.

Mr. Demartin asked Mrs. Rodriguez if when she went to the home of the dog, did the animal give her any evidence of trouble when she put him in the truck to take him to the humane society.

Mrs. Rodriguez stated the pet sitter placed the dog into the truck and when she arrived in the Flagler Humane society she placed him on the rabies pole. He did not provide any problems.

Ms. Nix called Heather Priestap, Animal Control Officer for the City of Palm Coast as witness.

Mrs. Priestap identified herself as an Animal Control Officer for the City of Palm Coast. She was shown additional photographs of the victim's injuries. There were seven additional photos. Mrs. Priestap stated these photos were emailed to her by the law offices of attorney for the bite victim. She identified each of the photos shown to her as those emailed to her previously.

Mr. Demartin had no questions for Mrs. Priestap.

Ms. Nix called Mr. William Doonan as final witness.

William Doonan identified himself as Animal Control Officer, City of Palm Coast. He explained he met Mrs. Helmich when picking up her statement and affidavit of complaint.. When he arrived at the house, he was invited into the home by Ms. Helmich. Ms. Helmich proceeded to tell him she hoped her statement didn't hurt the animal at all and stated she didn't want to see the animal put to sleep. She stated she loves animals. She discussed the incident that occurred, stating she was walking up to the dog and he jumped on her. She stated she felt it was an accident and the dog didn't mean to hurt her. She didn't realize she was injured until she was home. She stated she had a long sleeve shirt on and didn't realize she was injured. She stated it happened at 10 in the morning. The call didn't come in until later that day. She didn't want to call. A family member called and she was upset with that person. Mr. Doonan was shown photos he took and identified them as those he took when he met Mrs. Helmich. He saw her to have multiple sutures in her arm.

Ms. Turcotte asked about the fact that she had long sleeves and didn't know she was hurt.

Mr. Doonan stated that is correct and what Mrs. Helmich stated to him.

Ms. Nix asked Mr. Doonan if he had been called out regarding this particular animal previously. Mr. Doonan stated that in October of last year, he was called out to a possible dog bite. Arriving at the scene the dog owner stated that his son was outside on the front lawn playing with the dog on a leash attached to a lead, sitting on the dog playing with him. A neighbor child started to pull the dog's collar, choking the dog, and the dog turned his head, scratching the child on the face. It was a provoked accident at the time and the City took no action regarding the dog. It was not felt those particular

facts rose to the level of a severe injury. Mr. Doonan stated he did see lacerations that were severe on Mrs. Helmich.

Mr. Demartin asked Mr. Doonan about the prior dog bite call and asked whether he considered this a provoked situation. Mr. Doonan stated he did and therefore the City did not take any action.

Mr. Demartin asked Mr. Doonan, in his experience, whether he believed you would know if you were being bitten. Mr. Doonan stated he believes you would, but can't say for sure. Depending on her clothing, she stated she did not know. He did not see the victim's clothing.

Mr. Doonan again stated he saw the sutures in Mrs. Helmich's forearm.

Ms. Nix noted the prior incident involving Muneco was brought up primarily to note that there was a prior incident, not because of a severe injury. In this instance, however, testimony was presented as well as sworn affidavits of the bite victim, as well as Mr. Carvalho as to the facts the day of the bite. The affidavits state Muneco was with the pet sitter. Mr. Carvalho walked Muneco on a 3 foot leash. Mrs. Helmich who is a neighbor, petted the dog for approximately one minute. She had asked if the dog was friendly. When she turned to walk away, the dog jumped up with both paws in her face, and bit her arm. Those are the sworn affidavit statements of those who were personally present during this incident. Mrs. Helmich's affidavit states specifically when Muneco had jumped up and bit her there was blood and tissue and severe pain hanging off her arm. She states she went to the emergency room and had 44 stitches and that she doesn't think that the dog should be put down. The City again is not asking for the dog to be put down. Again, Florida Statute is clear regarding severe injury. It is the City's position that this is a physical injury that clearly results in disfiguring lacerations requiring sutures. There are approximately nine photos of this persons injuries. It is the City's position that that injury is clearly severe as provided by the Florida Statutes. There may be testimony from witnesses and others who know the dog who will testify the dog may be friendly, happy, etc., but at the end of the day, there was a severe injury.

Mr. Demartin called his first witness, Amy Carotenuto, Flagler Humane Society Executive Director. He asked Mrs. Carotenuto about her background working with animals. She stated she has been in this position with the Humane Society for 16 years. Mr. Demartin asked Mrs. Carotenuto whether she has seen any evidence of Muneco being aggressive. Mrs. Carotenuto stated she did not and felt the dog was friendly.

Mr. DeMartin called James Eppes, 175 Westhampton Drive, Palm Coast, FL as his second witness. Mr. Eppes stated he knows Muneco for 2 – 3 years and Muneco plays at the dog park with his dog. He has not seen any aggressive behavior from the dog and stated Muneco interacts with small and large dogs as well as people while off his leash.

Mr. Demartin called Richard Duteau, 50 Riviere, Palm Coast FL as his third witness. Mr. Duteau stated he also knows Muneco from the dog park and has not found Muneco to be aggressive at all. He stated Muneco acts puppyish and very friendly.

Ms. Nix inquired as to Mr. Duteau's occupation. He stated he is retired and was prior medical military and a prison guard.

Mr. Demartin called Heather Karbowsky, 218 Ocean Palm Drive, Flagler Beach, FL as witness. Mr. Karbowsky stated she knows Muneco from the dog park and sees him 3 – 4 times a week. She stated she has never witnessed any aggressive action by Muneco. She feels comfortable having him around her dog and her 9 year old daughter. She states he acts goofy, playful and obedient.

Mr. Demartin called Ellen Puerta, owner of Muneco as witness. She states she wasn't at the home the day of the incident. She feels her dog is a good dog, she trusts her dog, children love her dog. She initially wanted to put him down. Other people told her not to do so. She loves her dog and doesn't feel he would hurt anyone.

Mr. DeMartin stated he feels after hearing testimony, he feels there are contradictory statements made by the Animal Control Officers. The victim was not present to testify. The victim testifies states she felt pain on being bitten. The Animal Control Officers state she said she didn't feel pain until she got home. There seems to be a contradictory situation. Mr. Demartin feels without having the victim here present to clear up the matter, he feels we are unable to make the decision on dangerous dog. He also has statements regarding the dog's behavior.

Ms. Nix asked Kathleen Coleman, Chiumento Sellis Dwyer, paralegal, to be called as a witness.

Mrs. Coleman was sworn in. She stated the victim was not present because she is having infection and joint problems. It is difficult for her to ambulate. Infectious disease physicians are involved in her care.

Both Ms. Nix and Mr. Demartin gave their closing statements.

Ms. Turcotte stated it is clear to her there is severe injury. It is also clear to her that the dog is a dangerous animal as defined under the Code and Florida Statutes.

I believe this is a dangerous dog as defined by Florida Statute. I am specifically finding the dog aggressively attacked a person severely injuring that person. Not having testimony from anyone otherwise, I cannot fathom that biting, jumping and injuring someone severely, cannot be considered aggressive behavior. I agree with the City's observation that this is a dangerous dog. It is clear to me that there is a severe injury to the victim.

ORDER

The animal shall be held for ten (10) business days after the owner is given written notification, and thereafter shall be destroyed in an expeditious and humane manner unless a Notice of Appeal of my Final Order is filed by the owner within ten (10) days of the filing of the Order with the Circuit Court of Flagler County. The

Code also requires a date before which the dog may not be destroyed. That date will be February 24, 2017.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business on the agenda, the next hearing for Animal control Licensing will be held on February 7th, 2017 at 10:00 a.m.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact Wendy Cullen, at 386-986-3718 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or visit Palm Coast City Hall, 160 Lake Avenue, Palm Coast, FL 32164. If any person decides to appeal a decision made by the Animal Control Hearing with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he/she will need a record of the proceedings including all testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. To that end, such person will want to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made. The City of Palm Coast is not responsible for any mechanical failure of recording equipment.

All pagers and cell phones are to remain OFF while the Animal Control Hearing is in session.

property or, while lawfully on the property, was tormenting, abusing, or assaulting the dog or its owner or a family member. No dog may be declared dangerous if the dog was protecting or defending a human being within the immediate vicinity of the dog from an unjustified attack or assault .

After reviewing the documentation and evidence, and the fact that this dog has had two previous incidents regarding aggressive behavior, the City feels there is cause to determine this dog dangerous and ask that the Court abides by the Statutes.

Bill Doonan, Animal Control Officer for the City of Palm Coast gave his statement as follows:

I received a call on 5/6/16 from the Flagler County Sheriff's Office regarding a dog bite at 18 Cherry Tree Court. When I initially made contact, the family members were at the hospital with the victim and the dog was contained. I made contact later in the day, and verified the dog was contained. I advised Mrs. Sorrentino, the dog owner and granddaughter of victim, I would arrive in the morning to quarantine the dog. When I arrived at the scene in the morning on May 7, 2016 I explained the quarantine process to Mrs. Kraese. Approximately 10-15 minutes later Mrs. Sorrentino arrived and the dog was placed into the City vehicle by Mrs. Sorrentino. Mrs. Sorrentino followed me to the Flagler Humane Society. She removed the dog and placed him in the quarantine area. The dog was put on quarantine from 5/7-5/17 then released from quarantine, but was held an additional 9 days while the City investigated the case. From what I understand, the other attack happened in 2014 where the dog attacked protecting his owner during a domestic incident. The City was not aware of this case at that time.

During the incident, from what I was told, there was a verbal argument between Mrs. Kraese and her husband which led to some articles being thrown and an open hand was going to be used against Mrs. Kraese. At that time, the dog nipped the back of Mr. Kraese's leg. When the dog turned to leave, Mr. Kraese kicked the dog in the butt and the dog attacked him. This was told to me by Mr. & Mrs. Kraese and dog owner. I was also told that both the dog and Mrs. Sorrentino had been abused since the dog was a puppy and he believes the dog was protecting his owner. End of statement.

Bill Reischmann submitted a packet of documentation into record.

Nicole Turcotte, Animal Control Attorney, called Mrs. Sorrentino, the dog owner, to testify.

Mrs. Sorrentino reiterated what the officer stated regarding the attack back in 2013 when a physical altercation occurred. She was in an abusive relationship, and in December her ex came home drunk and started beating her. The argument moved into the kitchen where her ex continued to abuse her. She stated she feels the dog saved her life. The man did have to go to the hospital. When she initially got the puppy at 2 months old, she stated she had to hide the dog while she hid to avoid being abused. She stated that is all the dog knew was to defend her throughout all his five years. The night she and her grandmother got into an argument, her grandfather got involved trying to diffuse the situation. They were yelling and her grandmother picked up something to throw it and her grandfather was reaching over the counter to reach whatever her grandmother had in her hand. The dog came around the counter and started barking. He is very protective of her grandmother. She stated she didn't see the initial nip in the back of the leg, but when she got around the counter, she witnessed her grandfather nudging the dog in the butt to get him to go into the other room, and the dog bit her grandfather. Mrs. Sorrentino then took the dog and put him in the garage. She then called 911 and they came and took her grandfather to the hospital. End of statement.

Attorney Turcotte inquired regarding the previous incident in 2013, when the dog bit her ex in the arm, as to the extent of the injuries and whether surgery was required.

Mrs. Sorrentino stated it was a puncture wound, no stitches were necessary.

Attorney Turcotte asked who else Mrs. Sorrentino brought with her to testify.

Mrs. Sorrentino stated she brought her grandparents and her daughter and inquired as to whether her daughter would need to testify. She requested her daughter not testify if not necessary. Mrs. Sorrentino also read the City's documentation about an animal who is protecting its owner.

Attorney Turcotte requested Mr. & Mrs. Kraese give their testimony.

Mrs. Kraese stated that the situation was pretty much what her granddaughter said. She didn't feel it was an angry type of confrontation and was annoyed that her husband was telling her not to talk about it now. It was a minor point. She stated she got angry with her and they exchanged words, and she took a glass, a pencil jar, and slammed it on the floor and broke it on his side of the counter. At that point, something else was said to her she got angrier. She picked up something else to throw it and her husband picked up his hand to stop me, and the dog came in and seemed to scare him. She states she has been the main caretaker of the dog since he came to them, he sleeps by her and she feeds him, he lays his head on her lap. She feels he was protecting her because he loves her. End of statement.

Attorney Turcotte asked about the normal temperament of the dog.

Mrs. Kraese stated the dog has a great temperament and is very vocal. He is definitely vocal. He could sound scary she believes but if you know the dog you know he is not vicious. His tail is usually wagging and she doesn't believe he meant to be really aggressive.

Mr. Kraese gave his testimony. He stated that the event happened pretty much the way it was heard except that when that was happening, and his my wife was about to throw something at him, he put his hand up to stop her, he thinks the dog thought he was going to hit her, and he gave him a warning and bit my shoe. He got mad at that and gave the dog a kick in his hip area. He stated his wife is right, and that the dog loves his wife and he thought he was protecting her. He stated the dog was also his buddy, but likes Mrs. Kraese more than him.

Attorney Turcotte inquired as to his thoughts on the dog's demeanor.

Mr. Kraese stated the dog's way of greeting people is barking. He will greet neighbors he knows for years and barks to greet them.

Attorney Turcotte asked if Mr. Kraese was present to witness the incident in 2013.

Both Mr. & Mrs. Kraese stated they were not present.

Attorney Turcotte inquired as to what happened once at the hospital.

Mr. Kraese stated a special bandage was put on so that the wound would heal from the inside out. It allows it to heal that way, which it is healed now. He also got stitches on his hand from the dog's jaws.

Attorney Turcotte stated that understanding that Mr. Kraese was distracted right after the incident, but inquired as to the dog's demeanor immediately following the incident.

Mr. Kraese stated he was immediately brought into the garage, quiet, calm. He couldn't hear him barking or carrying on.

Attorney Turcotte asked Mr. Kraese if he agreed with his wife's assessment that the dog was protecting her?

Mr. Kraese stated he agreed totally, because he didn't do anything until he put my hands up and he was definitely protecting her.

Attorney Reischmann stated that this is a difficult case. The reason is that you have a strong animal, and the dog did attack, and he is clearly a dangerous dog. He is around children. He attacked two adults prior. The City feels that unfortunately the circumstances in this case, because of the history of the life of this dog, this is going to happen again and that's what the statute is for. He is dangerous to its family, its neighbors, and the community and the city asks that you abide by the statute.

Attorney Turcotte addressed Ms. Amy Carotenuto who was sworn in. Ms. Carotenuto is the Director of the Flagler Humane Society and presented an Affidavit.

Ms. Carotenuto gave her testimony, stating she wasn't there during the night of the incident, but during the days the dog was with them, he was very well behaved. She stated he was a little depressed the first few days, but after that, as they have many different kennel staff, and after the quarantine period, he was handled by untrained people, he was around other dogs and cats, and she didn't see anything at all that would lead her to believe he was a dangerous dog. Sometimes kennel can bring out worse in dogs, a dominant dog would jump at fence. Biscuit did none of that, he was well behaved. She stated she has been the Director for 3 years, also for 15 years from 2000-2015.

Attorney Turcotte asked if it was fair to say she is familiar with all types and breeds of dogs and how the Humane Society can affect their demeanor. She also stated she has some affidavits signed by your employees, and asked if she could certify that they are her employees.

Ms. Carotenuto verified the affidavits and stated the other employees agreed with her assessment of the dog's demeanor and behavior.

Attorney Turcotte asked Mrs. Sorrentino how much the dog weighs?

Mrs. Sorrentino stated the dog weighs 56 pounds.

Attorney Turcotte inquired as to the December 2013 attack, she indicated her ex boyfriend punched her in the face and the dog bit him. Did she remember whether the dog was hit by her ex boyfriend at that time.

Mrs. Sorrentino stated that when her ex boyfriend came home, her dog was sleeping in the living room. She and the dog were in the bedroom and she tried to walk back and the dog came into the kitchen barking at us, and my ex did hit the dog. Then the dog bit. Since the dog was a puppy, he has been around kids and other dogs his whole entire life and he has never had any issue with them. He doesn't have an aggressive manner all the time, just if there is arguing or fighting, he will bark. He presently plays with three other dogs that they live with and they get along fine and with the kids.

Attorney Turcotte asked about the issue of her dog having friendly relationships with other dogs. She stated she has an affidavit provided by the City signed by Tracy who lives at 5 Seville Way, who states she was walking past the house in August 2015 on the other side of the street with her dog, a labradoodle, and she stated Biscuit attacked her dog. She states however that the dog did not break skin or injure them.

Mrs. Sorrentino stated she wasn't there but didn't speak to her about it. The first time she heard about it was when this case happened. Her grandmother mentioned it to her.

Attorney Turcotte asked Mrs. Kraese what she knew about the Affidavit.

Mrs. Kraese stated she was inside vacuuming and babysitting. The children knew not to let the dog out but they did. The dog was outside playing with the kids. The neighbor was walking with her dog and her dog did run across the street. She was not aware the dog bit or scratched the neighbor. She believed the dog was looked at and no injuries were found. She did not see the incident. When she got out of the house, after one of the children called her, the dog was back on her property and just barking. The dog was attacked when he was a puppy was attacked by a retriever. Attorney Turcotte stated as pertains to her decision today, the City met all requirements and thanked everyone for coming and testifying. She is familiar with the City Code and the Statutes and in that regard, in defining what a dangerous dog is. After reviewing the City of Palm Coast Ordinances Section 8-28 and Florida Statutes Section 767.12 (2a)(2b), and based on the evidence and testimony received, the determination of the dog being declared a dangerous animal has been overturned. The dog is not considered a dangerous dog. This is the final action regarding this matter. An Order will be sent to the owners in the mail.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

E. None to report.

OLD BUSINESS:

F. None to report

NEW BUSINESS:

G. None to report.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING:

H. Next Animal Control License Hearing – 8/2/2016 @ 1:00 P.M.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 P.M.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact Wendy Cullen, at 386-986-3718 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or visit Palm Coast City Hall, 160 Lake Avenue, Palm Coast, FL 32164. If any person decides to appeal a decision made by the Animal Control Hearing with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he/she will need a record of the proceedings including all testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. To that end, such person will want to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made. The City of Palm Coast is not responsible for any mechanical failure of recording equipment.

All pagers and cell phones are to remain OFF while the Animal Control Hearing is in session.