IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO 2 Civil Action No. 06-cv-01510-WYD-BNB 3 AMERICAN CANINE FOUNDATION and FLORENCE VIANZON, 5 Plaintiffs, 6 VS. 7 CITY OF AURORA, COLORADO, 8 Defendant. 9 10 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT TRIAL TO COURT 11 DAY TWO TESTIMONY OF JAMES CROSBY ONLY 12 13 Proceedings before the HONORABLE WILEY Y. DANIEL, 14 Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Colorado, continued on the 18th day of November, 2008, in 15 Courtroom A1002, United States Courthouse, Denver, Colorado. 16 APPEARANCES 17 For the Plaintiffs CAROLYN CHAN, ESQ. 2485 Notre Dame Boulevard 18 Chico, California 19 For the Defendant DANA R. SPADE, ESQ. TERESA KINNEY, ESQ. 20 Aurora City Attorney's Office 15151 East Alameda Parkway 21 Aurora, Colorado 22 23 THERESE LINDBLOM, Official Reporter 24 901 19th Street, Denver, Colorado 80294 Proceedings Reported by Mechanical Stenography 25 Transcription Produced via Computer

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 THE COURT: Call your next witness. 3 MS. CHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Plaintiff calls Mr. Jim Crosby. 4 (JAMES CROSBY, PLAINTIFFS' WITNESS, SWORN) 5 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Please be seated. 6 7 THE WITNESS: Thank you. COURTROOM DEPUTY: Please state your full name and 8 9 spell your full name for the record. 10 THE WITNESS: My name is James W. Crosby, J-A-M-E-S, 11 C-R-O-S-B-Y. 12 DIRECT EXAMINATION 13 BY MS. CHAN: 14 Q. Good morning, Mr. Crosby. Could you please tell the Court 15 what your current job is. 16 A. I am the director of animal control for Bay County, 17 Florida. 18 And how long have you done that? Q. 19 I've been the director there since February of this year. 20 And did you do something different prior to that? Q. 21 Oh, yes. A . 22 Could you please tell me what that is. 0. 23 Yes, I'll go through it. I was a police officer with the 24 department of the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office, Jacksonville, 25 Florida, for 23 years between 1977 and 1999. During that time

James Crosby - Direct

I served as a patrol officer, a sergeant, and a lieutenant. At the time I retired I was a watch commander in charge of an area of town that had a population of about 160,000. I had four sergeants and four -- I'm sorry, 40 police officers under my direct command.

On the -- on my retirement from the police department,

I went into working as a professional dog trainer. I became

certified as a certified pet dog trainer under the Council for

Certification of Pet Dog Trainers. Went into professional

training, both obedience, field dogs for competitions,

including hunt tests and field trials, show handling on a

limited basis, not very good at it. Also training and working

with behaviorally challenged and difficult animals.

Over time I became much more involved in working with aggressive and dangerous animals.

I've consulted with veterinarians and animal control agencies around the country and in Canada on aggressive and dangerous dog issues. I have given educational seminars and taught regarding aggressive and dangerous dogs and fatal dog attacks in places such as the National Animal Control Association's national conference, the Ban of Urban Animal Strategies conference in Banff, Canada, and many other venues, both for law enforcement, animal control, and civilians.

I have trained a number of dogs, probably over 2,000 animals. I went to New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina and

James Crosby - Direct

worked with approximately 1,200 animals in the shelter which I was assigned, developing a new protocol for the handling and --safe handling and treatment of apparently aggressive and dangerous dogs, some of which were simply stressed by the trauma of having had to literally fight for their lives on the streets of New Orleans post-storm.

I have a bachelor's in science degree from Charter Oak State College with a concentration in psychology. I have attended Jacksonville University, Duke University, and the University of North Florida in preparation for that. I have conducted on-scene investigations in ten different fatal attacks on humans across the United States, more than any other investigator has ever done. Those involved 23 animals that I have handled, that have killed human beings, after the attack and have evaluated those animals behaviorally after the attacks.

THE COURT: Are these all dogs who have attacked?

THE WITNESS: These are all dogs who have attacked and killed human beings.

I've conducted more of those evaluations than any investigator has ever done.

I have a number of memberships and certifications, including a member of the executive board of the National Animal Interest Alliance Trust of Florida, I am a consultant for the National Animal Interest Alliance and their directive

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Direct

for companion animal issues, consultant with the National Canine Research Council, a member of the National Animal Control Association, a member of the Florida Animal Control Association, a member of the American College of Forensic Examiners, a member of the International Institute for Applied Companion Animal Behavior, a member of the International Association of Animal Behavior Consultants, I am a past president of the Curly-Coated Retriever Club of America, I'm a certified animal control officer in Florida, I'm a certified euthanasia technician. I recently attended certification training in clandestine graves investigations at the University of Florida's veterinary forensics division of their vet school. Also been certified in bite mark investigation comparison through the University of Florida veterinary forensics program. THE COURT: What are you reading from? THE WITNESS: I have a written resume. THE COURT: Is that an exhibit in this case, this resume? I'm asking. If it's not --MS. CHAN: I don't believe --THE COURT: I didn't see it on the list. I'm just saying, if you want to -- just in the interest of time, if you want to mark that and move to admit it as an exhibit at some point before you rest, at least I'll have that. Because there is no way I can write all of that down. I hear what you are

```
saying, but it appears he's reading his resume.
 1
 2
              THE WITNESS: I kind of had to read it myself to keep
 3
     track.
 4
              THE COURT: That's fine. I'm not criticizing your
 5
     doing that. I'm just saying, we'd save time if you'd mark
     that.
 6
 7
             MS. CHAN: Your Honor, we could mark it as an exhibit
    that is not listed. It would be new exhibit number, I guess
 8
 9
     13.
10
              THE COURT: All right. Why don't we mark it. I'll
11
    have Mr. Keech mark it. And perhaps he can make a copy at the
12
    break.
13
              Is there any objection to admitting Exhibit 13?
14
             MS. SPADE: City has no objection.
15
              THE COURT: All right. So we'll admit Exhibit No. 13,
     which is his resume. That way we can get into the substance of
16
17
    his testimony.
18
              Where Is Bay County, Florida?
19
              THE WITNESS: Bay County, the largest town is Panama
20
     City. We're located on the panhandle between Pensacola and
21
     Tallahassee.
22
              THE COURT: Okay.
23
             All right. Let's continue.
24
             MS. CHAN: Thank you.
25
     BY MS. CHAN:
```

Mr. Crosby, have you ever been accepted as an expert in any 1 2 other legal proceeding? A. Yes, ma'am. I've been accepted as an expert both for court 3 4 testimony and for written testimony in the states of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, West 5 Virginia, Michigan, Washington state, Texas, and I think I'm 6 7 forgetting a couple. But I believe it's a total of 13 states. Q. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Crosby, in regard to the specific 8 case that we're here for today, have you reviewed the ordinance 9 10 that was promulgated by the City of Aurora, the city council, 11 of which I believe it consists of four -- well, let's see, it's 12 right here. It's called Article 1, general provisions. 13 May I ask the witness to look at this to see if he has 14 reviewed it? 15 THE COURT: Let's do this: The ordinance, if it's the 16 same ordinance is Exhibit C on defendant's list --17 MS. CHAN: Okay. 18 THE COURT: Is there any objection to admitting 19 Exhibit C? I just want to move some things along here. 20 MS. SPADE: Your Honor, it was our understanding it 21 had been stipulated to. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Exhibit C will be received. 23 ordinance is now in evidence. 24 (Exhibit C admitted.) 25 BY MS. CHAN:

- 1 | Q. Mr. Crosby, if you would look there at ordinance C, I'm 2 | going to ask you questions.
- $3 \parallel A$ . Exhibit C?
- 4 Q. Have you found it?
- 5 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 6 Q. Okay. Do you see on what my copy says page 1, at the top
- 7 | it says "A Bill."
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. And then we have the first four paragraphs, where it
- 10 says, and I quote, finds that pit bulls tend to be stronger
- 11 | than other dogs, and has a few sentences there. In the first
- 12 | two sentences on page 1, I'd like you to look -- and I will
- 13 | state, this is -- this is all in one sentence, so I'm going to
- 14 | read straight from here, "The City Council of the City of
- Aurora, Colorado, finds that pit bulls tend to be stronger than
- 16 other dogs."
- I would ask you at this time, do you have any belief
- 18 as to this sentence, that the pit bulls tend to be stronger
- 19 | than other dogs?
- 20 | THE COURT: Hold on. Before he gives opinions, even
- 21 | though you use that word, I want you to designate him as an
- 22 expert in some area so I can understand the scope of this
- 23 | expert testimony. So what -- designate him in some area or
- 24 | areas consistent with his background, experience, and training.
- 25 MS. CHAN: Okay. Thank you.

BY MS. CHAN:

1

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Mr. Crosby, do you have any direct experience with the type of dog known commonly, generically as, quote, pit bulls, as I
- 4 | just stated from that page?
- 5 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 6 Q. Can you give me an example, so we could get an idea of the 7 scope.
- A. Within probably better than 2,000 dogs that I have trained during my career as a professional trainer, I have dealt with several hundred of the dogs commonly lumped under the umbrella, including those specifically listed by the City of Aurora, as pit bulls. In that time, I have observed most of the breeds—at least many of the breeds listed specifically in this ordinance.

During my investigations of fatal dog attacks, I have also encountered a number of dogs identified by their owners and other means as pit bulls and part of the pit bull complex of dogs.

Further, in my evaluations of potentially dangerous, dangerous and aggressive dogs, both before my employment with Bay County and during my employment with Bay County, I have encountered a number of those animals. And while serving as the director of animal control at the animal control division of Bay County, I have had occasion to evaluate, handle and deal with a large number of those animals.

- 1 ||Q|. Okay. And have you actually personally trained any?
- 2 | A. I've personally trained them, I have personally evaluated
- 3 | them, both -- not only limited to, but including animals that
- 4 have bitten people and have attacked people and killed them.
- 5 Q. Okay. Is there any other training in your background,
- 6 including being at the shelter where you directly work with
- 7 dogs known, quote, in a term of, quote, pit bull, which would
- 8 | encompass probably quite a few types of dogs?
- 9 A. Some of my clients, as far as behavior problems and
- 10 | obedience problems, also possess dogs of that breed complex.
- 11 | So, yes, I've --
- 12 | Q. Okay. I believe you stated that you have evaluated dogs.
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. Okay.
- 15 | A. I've evaluated dogs both for courts, for animal controls,
- 16 and for individuals, as to -- and also for municipal agencies,
- 17 | such as the Jacksonville Housing Authority in Jacksonville,
- 18 | Florida, as to whether dogs were or were not vicious,
- 19 dangerous, or potentially so.
- 20 | Q. And in some of the other cases where you testified, were
- 21 any of those involving the subject matter today, dangerous dogs
- 22 or dogs or -- or a dog that may be known as a pit bull?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. Thank you. Mr. Crosby, yesterday one of the animal control
- 25 officers testified that the American Pit Bull Terrier, or,

quote, pit bull, is responsible for the majority of severe injuries in city of Aurora. And I believe that you have reviewed dog bite incidents from Aurora? A. Yes. I was provided 459 dog bite reports as part of the preparation for this case, went through those, and evaluated them based on a bite continuum tool, originally established by Dr. Ian Dunbar of California, who -- excuse me. Dr. Ian Dunbar, who is a Ph.D. veterinarian in California. With his permission, I have tweaked that slightly and have taught that evaluation form across the country and in Canada. I evaluated the 459 bite reports that I was given as part of preparation for this court and found that --THE COURT: Hold on. I just -- I know there are no objections, but she only asked if you had evaluated the documents. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Yes, I did. THE COURT: And I'm going to insist, Ms. Chan, before you ask him opinion questions, I want you to simply tell me through request for designation, the areas in which or for which you're seeking to elicit opinions. If you don't do that, I won't let him answer any questions about opinions. I want to understand the scope of the areas where you seek to have him give opinions.

BY MS. CHAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Mr. Crosby, in your tenure working as an animal control --

- 1 | working as a director of the animal control -- you said that's
- 2 what you do?
- 3 || A. That is my job right now.
- 4 | Q. Okay. Do you have cause to have to work with animals being
- 5 | impounded and dog bite reports?
- 6 | A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Okay. And would that encompass almost any kind of dog?
- 8 | A. That would encompass all animals brought in --
- 9 | Q. Okay.
- 10 A. -- during the course of which I evaluate the behavior,
- 11 | observe behavior, and evaluate the dangerous or not dangerous
- 12 or adoptable behaviors of those animals.
- 13 ||Q|. Okay. And would that include the, quote, generic term of a
- 14 | pit bull dog? Would you have cause to take such dog into the
- 15 | shelter?
- 16 A. Yes, we do. And as part of my duties at the shelter, I do
- 17 | evaluate the behavior of pit bull and other type animals that
- 18 | come in.
- 19 Q. Okay. And are you also doing that with another person, or
- 20 | just you?
- 21 A. My staff participates in the process, but I have the final
- 22 say so.
- 23 | Q. Okay. And do you help do any training?
- 24 | A. Currently, I'm not doing any active training. However, I
- 25 have ten years of active training behind me.

1 Q. Okay. And so when dogs come in and you have to evaluate

- 2 | them, how long does that take?
- 3  $\mid A$ . Depends on the dog and how much time we have.
- 4 | Q. Okay. Is there a procedure that you use?
- 5 A. At my shelter, we do not have a specific temperament test
- 6 | that we use, no.
- 7 Q. Okay. And the reason for that is?
- 8 | A. I don't have the staff.
- 9 Q. Oh, okay. So you do have a procedure that you use, though,
- 10 | for temperament testing?
- 11 A. I have procedures that I personally use, having been
- 12 | trained in such, which include the American Temperament Testing
- 13 | Society evaluation, the canine good citizen evaluations taught
- 14 by the American Kennel Club, I have been trained in Sue
- 15 | Sternberg's save-a-pet method. I'm also familiar with the
- 16 | safer dog evaluation temperament testing.
- 17 | Q. Okay. I believe the safer dog method, could you briefly
- 18 | say what that is.
- 19 MS. SPADE: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance.
- 20 | THE COURT: How is that relevant to any opinions he
- 21 | may give in this case?
- 22 MS. CHAN: Your Honor, that particular program that
- 23 he's speaking of is a tool that is used in most shelters for
- 24 | rescued dogs, because they have to try to take out the marginal
- 25 dogs from the non-marginal. And because this ordinance is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Direct

saying that these dogs are more than marginal, when they come in, they have to be evaluated. Knowing how to use that particular testing method is something that shows they have to have the ability to do that. THE COURT: Okay. MS. CHAN: Not everybody has that ability. THE COURT: Okay. Objection overruled. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: I am not certified in the safer method. I have been run through it. I can't give you the process off the top of my head. But it's something that if I was going to do a safer test, I would refer to the reference material that is out there for it. BY MS. CHAN: Q. Okay. So when you have the dogs come in, then, apparently it sounds like your shelter is rather small, but --Yes. A . You get a lot of dogs. We have -- we will have taken in almost 10,000 dogs by the -- dogs and cats by the end of this year. Q. Okay. And in your evaluation of, I guess, less than 10,000 dogs, because you said you took another animals --Uh-huh. A . -- you probably have helped evaluate quite a few dogs? In the course of my tenure there, and in the course of my

other duties, yes, I have evaluated quite a few dogs. And in

- 1 | other cases where I've been certified as an expert, it has been
- 2 | in the fields of animal behavior, dangerous animals --
- 3 dangerous dogs, particularly, and in the area of dangerous dog
- 4 attacks and dog aggression.
- 5 Q. Okay. As to dog aggression and dangerous attacks, I
- 6 | believe you stated at the beginning on your CV, that you had --
- 7 | I believe you said you were one of the persons in the United
- 8 | States that had done the most -- you said you had done the
- 9 most, I believe you said it was examinations on dogs.
- 10 A. To the best of my knowledge, and I've talked to most of the
- 11 other experts and so-called experts, I have individually
- 12 on-scene investigated more fatal dog attacks and handled more
- animals who have killed humans after such attack than has ever
- 14 been done before.
- 15 | Q. And when you said "more than anyone else," you mean, hands
- 16 on, touching a dead dog; is that what you mean?
- 17 | A. The ones that I do hands-on evaluation of the dogs, it
- 18 | means I go in and physically handle and evaluate hands on the
- 19 | live dog that has killed a person.
- 20 | Q. Okay.
- 21 A. Before it's euthanized.
- 22 | Q. Do you do autopsies on the dogs?
- 23 | A. I am not trained to do necropsies on dogs, no. I'm not a
- 24 | veterinarian.
- 25 Q. Okay.

1 | A. I have, however, harvested tissue samples and brain matter

2 and harvested other samples for study at the University of

3 | Florida, of which I am part through the McKnight Brain

4 | Institute, the department of psychiatry, University of Florida.

5 | Q. Okay. I think what I'm trying to establish is that, when

6 you said you were the one who had done the most, and you went

into it very briefly exactly what you did in regard to

8 dangerous dogs and the fatal attacks, I assume that the fatal

9 | attack is involving what we would call a dangerous dog. Am I

correct in saying it was a dangerous dog that allegedly --

since -- is this the case you're working on, am I understanding

12 | that?

7

10

11

14

16

24

25

13 | A. We need to define dangerous dog. When I use the words

"dangerous dog," I mean a dog which has been found by a

15 competent authority under the statute or ordinances of that

jurisdiction as being legally a dangerous dog.

17 | Q. Okay.

18 A. That is what constitutes, when I'm discussing a dangerous

19 dog, what is dangerous.

20 Very few -- in fact, I don't recall any of the dogs

21 | that I have evaluated or dealt with that have killed people or

22 previously adjudged or adjudicated by a competent authority as

23 | being dangerous animals.

Q. Is that unusual?

A. Actually, what it seems to be is that the dangerous dog

1 ordinances and legislation, as they apply to specific,

- 2 | individual dogs, based on their behavior, works. And that once
- 3 | those animals are individually labeled through process as
- 4 dangerous animals, they become less a threat to the public in
- 5 general.
- 6 | Q. You're talking about generically speaking?
- 7 | A. I'm talking about adjudged dangerous animals who have been
- 8 | through the legal process. At that point it seems that the
- 9 process of addressing those individual animals works guite
- 10 | well.
- 11 | Q. Okay. So -- I just want to make sure I understand it. You
- 12 | mean, like, if there was a dog, let's just say it was a lab,
- 13 and it did certain things, and according to the code, it
- 14 | became, quote, dangerous, in the dog code for that state, then
- 15 | you're saying the law -- that would say, okay, now this dog has
- 16 | to have these restrictions?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Based on what the dog did.
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. Okay.
- 21 A. And those laws in my direct observation seem to work well.
- 22 | Either the people do not keep that animal, or the animal is
- 23 | very aggressively managed and maintained. The penalties for
- 24 | violating those laws range from felonies to misdemeanors in
- 25 most states.

6

James Crosby - Direct

Okay. Now, seeing as how you're the director of the shelter, and apparently you have -- sounds like you have a lot 2 of hands on because you said you didn't have a direct helper to 3 4 do something there. If you have impounded dogs, and you said 5 that you've impounded even pit bull dogs in your shelter, have you had any direct experience with impounding dogs that would 7 be, quote, of the pit bull type, that would -- have expressed something such as they were more destructive because they were 8 9 impounded? 10 A. Across a class of dogs, I cannot say that any particular 11 breed is more destructive than any other breed. 12 Q. Okay. How about if one of the, quote, generic pit bull 13 dogs comes in, have you seen any -- are there different type 14 behavior the dog would express? 15 MS. SPADE: Objection to the form, Your Honor. 16 getting confused. 17 THE COURT: Sustained. I don't understand --18 Ms. Chan, what are you doing? I don't understand what you're 19 doing. 20 This witness, you spent a lot of time telling me what his qualifications were. All I asked you to do was to 21 22 designate the areas where you seek to elicit opinions. 23 think it would be helpful to then elicit the opinions, because 24 I don't know what he's saying. Maybe you don't want me to 25 know.

James Crosby - Direct

Do you understand what I mean when I say, designate him as an expert?

MS. CHAN: Your Honor, I thought that Mr. Crosby, even though he was designated, I was trying to elicit things that were specific to the ordinance. I was concentrating on these three paragraphs.

THE COURT: Let me explain: In this court, before a witnesses give opinions -- and, of course, if we had a jury trial, I wouldn't be saying this -- I just need to know the areas where you're designating him as someone to give opinions based on background, experience, and training under Rule 702 so that if he give opinions outside that scope, I have ability to rule on an objection if made.

I'm simply asking you to designate the areas where you believe, based on what the Court has already heard, he's qualified under Rule 702 to give opinions.

So you have to do that through questions. And so the simple thing I'm asking you to do is to designate him as someone who can give opinions in the areas of, and then you have to fill in the blank.

Now, I sort of have a sense what he's saying already.

He's already said he has experience in animal behavior,

dangerous animals, dangerous dogs, dangerous dog attacks and

dog aggression, plus the things he does as an animal control

officer. But I haven't heard you request that he be designated

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Direct

to give opinions in those areas and any other areas. So I want you to do that next. And then after you do that, you need to then ask some questions that will elicit from him what his opinions are. MS. CHAN: I would need a copy of the CV. Since we didn't submit it, I don't have that here. THE COURT: Well, his CV is not the issue. You heard what he said. Let's do this: I'm going to move this along. This is frustrating --Go ahead, take a seat. I'm not going to ask the questions. You need to ask your own questions. Take his CV, if you need to, which is Exhibit 13. But I've already heard what he said. I'm not asking you to regurgitate what I already heard. I'm asking you to simply ask a threshold procedural question that will help me understand the subject matter or categories or areas where you seek to get opinions from him. No more, no less than that. It could be some of the areas I already designated a moment ago, because I heard that with my own ears. But it's not my role to do the direct examination or cross-examination of any witness, although I tend to ask questions in trials to the Court so I can understand what a witness is saying. BY MS. CHAN:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Direct

Mr. Crosby, with your qualifications that you stated to the Court and with your past experience and what you've given to the Court, including working as a director at the animal care shelter and having trained dogs, having done the attack bite, I think you said, examinations, and having done more than any other person with the hands-on that you said at the beginning, I think it would be fair to say that plaintiff would hold out Mr. Crosby as having expert experience and first-hand experience in probably dog bite injuries, fatal attack studies, canine behavior, in particular --MS. SPADE: Objection, Your Honor. Is counsel testifying, or is the witness being asked a question? THE COURT: I'm not sure what she's doing. MS. CHAN: Your Honor, I'm just trying to state the --I tried to narrow it down to four. We're talking about dangerous dogs, and I believe that --THE WITNESS: To kind of answer your question: I have been previously accepted as an expert in the areas of dog behavior, aggressive and dangerous dogs, fatal dog attacks, fatal dog evaluation -- bite evaluation, bite comparison, and also in the duties and normal procedures of an animal control director. MS. CHAN: Your Honor, plaintiffs submit that Mr. Crosby, then, be considered as an expert on the areas that he testified to prior, including the four that I just stated.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Direct

And all of the -- all of the items that he listed in the beginning, which there were so many. But particularly in the area of dangerous dogs, fatal attacks, dog bite injuries, and also working in animal control. He's got over 10 years, I believe, he said. THE COURT: All right. So you're seeking to have him designated in the areas of dog behavior, aggressive and dangerous dogs, fatal dog attacks, fatal dog evaluation, bite evaluation, bite comparison, and the duties and procedures that he's familiar with in his capacity as an animal control director; is that your designation? MS. CHAN: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Any objection? MS. SPADE: No objection. THE COURT: The witness then may give opinions in those areas. MS. CHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. CHAN: Q. Earlier, Mr. Crosby, I asked you the question that had you reviewed the dog bite incident reports from the City of Aurora, and you stated you had. A. Yes. I've reviewed 459 separate reports of dog bites provided. Thank you. Now, my question is, after having reviewed all

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Direct

the reports, is it -- is it your opinion, or do you have an opinion that the pit bull terrier -- that's a generic term -- I have to say this because it consists of --MS. SPADE: Objection, Your Honor, leading. THE COURT: Well, let me hear the entire question. MS. CHAN: I have to just say -- I always qualify "pit bull" as a generic term because it also encompasses four separate breeds so I don't have to name the four breeds. That's part of the ordinance. THE COURT: Ms. Chan, reask your question. You started to ask a question, then you interrupted it by defining what "pit bull" meant. Let's just have you ask a question, so if there is an objection, I could hear the question. BY MS. CHAN: Q. Mr. Crosby, you reviewed the Aurora dog bite incident reports. And my question was, as to the pit bull terrier -and that's when I insert the generic type, meaning it encompasses all the other four breeds, without naming them all out -- do you believe that they are responsible for the severe injuries in the reports that you saw? A. Not significantly, no. THE COURT: I'm not interested in his beliefs. interested in his opinions. Let's hear his opinions. BY MS. CHAN:

Q. What would be your opinion of what you saw regarding the --

A. My professional opinion, based on the review of the 459 dog
bites I was given, comparing the bite severity based upon a
quantifiable scale that I used to evaluate dog bites, I do not
see any significant difference between the class of breeds
known as pit bull terriers and many of the other breeds
expressed in those reports.

Pit bull -- the generic group of breeds known as pit

bull terriers — which I must assume are the breeds contained in the Aurora statute, because that's the label used by Aurora Animal Control — comprise 1.9 percent of the level 5, or serious, dog bites reported in that group of dog bite reports by Aurora. These same percentage as the chow. So only slightly greater than the number by the labrador retriever.

BY MS. CHAN:

- Q. Okay. As to -- as to the impounding of the dog, did you look at each piece of paper where they had the list of the breed in there?
- 18 A. Yes, I reviewed each one of those physical reports.
- 19 *Q.* Okay.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

25

- 20 A. And looked at the description of the bite and of the listed 21 and described breed as according to Aurora Animal Control.
- Q. Okay. And would it be your opinion, then, that the, quote, pit bull terrier dogs, would inflict more damage when attacking?
  - A. I would have to answer that question based on my

observations of pit bull attacks, not on the basis of the reports by animal control in Aurora.

- Q. Your personal experience.
- 4 A. In my personal observation and contact and investigations
- of far more attacks than just these, it is my opinion that pit
- 6 bull terriers, or the pit bull group of dogs, do not inflict
- 7 more serious injury than any other breed of dog of a similar
- 8 size. =

3

- 9 | Q. Mr. Crosby, have you reviewed what's listed as Plaintiffs'
- 10 Exhibit No. 7, Bates 3000 to 3029, which is a canine genetics
- 11 | written academic paper by Dr. Stur?
- 12 A. Yes, I have looked over that.
- 13 MS. SPADE: Objection, Your Honor? That was not
- 14 disclosed in Mr. Crosby's report. I believe Rule 26(a)(2(B)
- 15 requires that any data or information considered by the witness
- 16 | be disclosed. And this report was not disclosed in his report,
- 17 || sir.
- 18 THE COURT: Respond, Ms. Chan. Because, obviously, I
- 19 | haven't seen his expert report, so I don't know what it says or
- 20 | doesn't say.
- 21 MS. CHAN: This particular exhibit is a -- actually,
- 22 | is part of a learned treatise from Dr. Stur. And so I think it
- 23 | would -- I don't even have to admit it, actually, for purposes
- 24 of him testifying about it. I'm not going to ask him to
- 25 | testify about the report. Just ask him, had he read it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Direct

THE COURT: Well, I'm confused here. Reask your question so I can understand what you're asking him regarding this exhibit. I'll sustain the objection, but I'll let Ms. Chan rephrase it. MS. CHAN: Thank you. BY MS. CHAN: Q. Mr. Crosby, I asked you on Exhibit No. 7, which is plaintiffs' exhibit, Bates No. 3000 to 3029, canine genetics, it's a written academic paper, and it's by Dr. Stur. I asked you, have you read that? Yes, I've looked over it. Q. Okay. Now I'm going to ask you a question regarding dogs, not just the American Pit Bull Terrier. But you did say you looked at the Aurora ordinance, and you noticed there were other breeds listed? A. Yes. I don't have it in front of me. But there is ten breeds, I believe, that they mention. THE COURT: It's Exhibit C. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Yes, this does list several breeds of dogs. BY MS. CHAN: Okay. Do you know what those other dog breeds look like? Yes, I do. I have not personally encountered a Tosa fighting dog or a Cane di Macellaio or the Sicilian Branchiero.

1 However, I have either seen or physically come in contact with 2 the other breeds.

- Q. Okay. And then I'd like to ask you, on Exhibit No. 8,
- 4 | Bates 3033 to 3053, which is talking about the mechanical
- 5 | advantage in a pit bull dog by Jesse M. Bridgers III, that was
- 6 submitted by Aurora. Have you ever read or looked at that
- 7 particular study, that is Exhibit No. 8?
- 8 A. Yes, I've looked over that, after I was given it, when I got here.
- 10 | Q. Okay. Now --

3

13

20

21

22

- 11 MS. SPADE: Again, Your Honor, we would raise the same objection. This was not disclosed in the expert's report. So
- 14 THE COURT: Well, the question was simply, has he read
  15 it. And he said he read it, but I've not heard him say he's
  16 basing any of his opinions on this. So I don't know that the
  17 objection really relates to what he's saying regarding Exhibit
- 18 8. So objection is overruled. So the --

again, we are invoking Rule 26(a)(2)(B).

- 19 | MS. CHAN: Mr. --
  - THE COURT: Hold on. So the Court will accept as a proper question and answer the fact that he's reviewed this, whatever that may mean.
- 23 BY MS. CHAN:
- Q. Mr. Crosby, have you ever done any personal work in the realm of your dog experience, where you actually worked on

1 canine skulls, including the part of the jaw?

- 2 A. I have dissected canine skulls, and including the jaw, and
- 3 | also been taught how to take dental impressions and make dental
- 4 comparisons by a human forensics odontologist.
- 5 Q. The scientific words you used in the beginning part of the
- 6 sentence, could you explain that? I didn't understand what you
- 7 meant.
- 8 | A. Yes. In the course of the course of research, I have cut
- 9 off dogs' heads and cut them apart and looked at how they were
- 10 put together.
- 11 Q. So it would be the head and --
- 12 | A. Including the jaw.
- 13 Q. Okay. When you do that, do you have any cause to have --
- 14 answering a question regarding the amount of pressure the dog
- 15 uses on the jaw, biting?
- 16 A. I can't answer the amount of pressure based on what I
- 17 observed.
- 18 | Q. No. Do you ever do that? Have you ever been asked to do
- 19 | it?
- 20 A. I have never conducted a pressure study on those jaws, no.
- 21 Q. Have you done any other kind of studies on the jaws?
- 22 | A. I have looked at the jaws and physically examined those
- 23 | jaws that I have taken apart, be it from a pit bull or from a
- 24 Rottweiler or a similar-sized dog. And to my eye, I have
- 25 | observed no significant difference, no special mechanisms that

1 | would identify a pit bull jaw from the other jaws.

- 2 Q. Okay. Do you have any opinion as to whether the pit bull
- 3 | terrier, quote, generic pit bull terrier, has a stronger bite?
- 4 | A. Based on the jaws I have observed and the bites I have
- 5 | seen, it's my opinion that a pit bull bite, given the same
- 6 | intensity and intent of the dog during the attack is
- 7 | approximately the same as any dog of approximately the same
- 8 | size. Bite intensity or bite damage, bite severity, if you
- 9 | want to use that term, in my opinion depends on three things:
- 10 | The intensity of the bite, which is related to the intent of
- 11 | the animal. Is this a warning, or is this a predatory action?
- 12 And the frequency of the bites, the number of bites. Four
- 13 | hundred Dachshund bites are going to do far more damage than
- 14 one Great Dane bite.
- 15 | Q. And that's in regard to the -- which element?
- 16 A. In regard to what I have observed as the physical injuries
- 17 and damage to the human body caused by those bites.
- 18 Q. Is it possible to look, in your opinion -- you said you
- 19 were reviewing fatalities, which would be dogs killing people;
- 20 | is that correct?
- 21 | A. That's what dog -- dog fatalities, yes.
- 22 | Q. Yes, okay. When you review what the dog did to the
- 23 person -- let's say we had a smaller dog -- and you've seen
- 24 | smaller dogs that have killed?
- 25 A. Humans have been killed by dogs ranging from Dachshunds and

- 1 Pomeranians to 140-pound Presa Canarios and wolf hybrids.
- 2 Q. Okay. When you take an autopsy report, do you get to see
- 3 pictures of the damage?
- 4 | A. Yes, I do.
- 5 Q. Okay. When you look at the picture, and if it didn't tell
- 6 you what dog did the damage, can you tell by looking that it
- 7 | might be a pit bull?
- 8 | A. No.
- 9 Q. Why is that?
- 10 | A. Because it could be any dog with a similar -- of similar
- 11 | size, with a similar sized jaw. If you have a jaw that's
- 12 | 4 inches long and 3 inches deep, it's pretty much going to make
- 13 | the same size of hole no matter what is attached to it.
- 14 | Q. When you say "hole," are you referring to canine incisors?
- 15 | A. I'm talking about the damage to the human body, not just
- 16 the incisors or the canines or the molars, but simply the
- 17 physical damage done. If you hit something with a 40-pound
- 18 | sledgehammer versus a 16-pound roofing hammer, the 40-pound
- 19 sledgehammer is going to make a bigger hole in what you hit.
- 20 | Q. Okay. So, then, you're saying, then, that when you look at
- 21 | the picture of damage done, even if it's really severe and --
- 22 | you can't conclude automatically what dog had did it?
- 23 A. No. In fact, in training from the human forensic
- 24 | odontologist, dog bites -- the court has recognized, at least
- 25 | in Florida, if not in other states, that dog bites are

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Direct

exclusionary evidence, not identifying evidence. A dog bite does not identify -- I cannot look at a dog bite and tell you what breed did it. I can only use a dog bite and the pattern of bite to exclude potential dogs to a reasonable medical certainty. THE COURT: Let the Court ask a couple of questions here. I'm trying to understand what you're saying and not saying. If you go to Exhibit C, if you look at the whereas's in the Aurora ordinance. The first one says: "Whereas the City Council of the City of Aurora, Colorado, finds that pit bulls tend to be stronger than other dogs, often give no warning signals before attacking, and are less willing than other dogs to retreat from an attack." Now, I want to ask you some questions about this so I can understand what you're saying or not saying about this. Do you have an opinion as to whether or not pit bulls tend to be stronger than other dogs? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do have an opinion. THE COURT: What's your opinion? THE WITNESS: That opinion is no, sir, they do not. THE COURT: Why not? THE WITNESS: They are as strong or as not strong as they are trained to be. If I have a 140-pound Rottweiler that has been trained to pull carts in a weight-pulling competition

James Crosby - Direct

and has been exercised as an athlete, versus a 50-pound pit bull that is a couch potato, there is going to be a lot more strength on that Rottweiler's side than on that pit bull's. They're not magically endowed with superstrength.

Just like people of similar sizes and similar backgrounds and similar training. There is no difference. If it's a 50-pound pit bull and a 50-pound standard poodle and a 50-pound Rottweiler, I don't see any significant difference in the overall strength. One dog can be trained to be stronger than another.

THE COURT: Well, but, let's assume all of them are trained the same way. You used three dogs, you said a Rottweiler, a poodle and a pit bull. Suppose they're all trained the same way, and the training requires them to be in good shape, and they engage in training that exercises their jaws and their biting mechanisms so that they are more acute than otherwise. Do you — would pit bulls tend to be stronger than those other two dogs, if all of them are trained the same way?

THE WITNESS: Not -- not in the cases I've observed, no, sir. If all three of those dogs were trained by, as some of the irresponsible people will do, hanging from an object to make them hang on as long as possible and were then reinforced behaviorally for hanging on for an extended time, all three of them would have the potential for hanging for just as long as

the other two and biting just as hard.

THE COURT: Are you saying -- are you aware of any -- what is your opinion as to whether or not there is evidence that exists anywhere that would support the finding in this ordinance that pit bulls tend to be stronger than other dogs?

THE WITNESS: I believe that's -- my opinion is that's an urban myth with no scientific basis at all.

THE COURT: The next thing is "pit bulls often give no warning signals before attacking." What is your opinion as to the accuracy of that portion of the --

THE WITNESS: My opinion as to the accuracy of that, based on my studies and also studies into canine body language and behavior is, no, pit bulls do give submissive licks like any other dog. They will give appeasement signals such as yawning. They will growl. Their ears, even though they may be severely cropped by irresponsible human intervention, still move forward and backwards in various attacks attitudes. Their tails, even if cropped, may be up or down or tucked between their legs. Their body posture, they may be facing you frontally, or they may be facing you at an angle. Each of those behaviors that are readable by other dogs and humans are present in the grouping of dogs that we call pit bulls, just as much as in other dogs. You just have to look for it to see it and know what you're looking at.

Dogs to dogs understand each other quite well. People

to dogs sometimes don't pay attention.

THE COURT: Well, the next prong of this first whereas talks about "pit bulls are less willing than other dogs to retreat from an attack." What is your opinion about the accuracy of that statement?

Statement. If it was true, police agencies would strictly use pit bulls to hold suspects. In my experience as a police officer and working — although not as a canine handler, working with the canine units, those dogs are trained and reinforced to trap and hold a suspect for an extended period of time until the handler gets there.

The dogs of choice are not pit bulls, because pit bulls are not any more likely to hold on for a long period than any other dog, especially if the dogs have been reinforced for those behaviors or not reinforced for those behaviors.

THE COURT: All right. Hold on a second.

Now, the next whereas is "Whereas, the City Council finds pit bull attacks more often than other types of dogs result in multiple bites and attacks of greater severity."

So the City Council for the City of Aurora, makes a finding here in its preamble, that pit bull attacks more often than other types of dogs result in multiple bites and attacks of greater severity. What is your opinion on the accuracy of that statement?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Direct

THE WITNESS: My opinion on the accuracy of that statement, is it is inaccurate, both based on my personal observation and on the numbers and reports provided by the City of Aurora. In the City of Aurora, if that was true, then, labrador bites would not outnumber pit bull bites. THE COURT: So you're basing your testimony here on the bite incident reports you reviewed? THE WITNESS: On both the bite incident reports I reviewed, the bite incident reports that I have observed in other locations, and the behavior of animals I have observed in other locations. Pit bulls are not the number one biter in my jurisdiction either. THE COURT: All right. Next whereas, whereas -- well, no, I don't need to ask you about that one. All right. Go ahead. Ms. Chan, you can ask some questions. MS. CHAN: Thank you. BY MS. CHAN: Q. Let's see. I think, Mr. Crosby, your last question was in regard to whether they retreated from an attack; is that correct? In my opinion, pit bulls are no less likely to retreat from an attack that any other dog. = Q. Okay. And your observation in the shelter, is it your opinion from all of your time spent with dogs, would the

generic term of, quote, pit bull dogs be more likely to actually bite people more times?

A. No, ma'am.

- Q. And why is that?
  - A. Dog bites revolve around the behavioral intent, what the dog wants to achieve. Your typical dog bite, which makes up the most huge percentage, no matter where you look, is what I call an engage and release. It is a single bite of very, very limited power that serves as the dog's behavioral warning to whatever has frightened, scared, bothered, anger, whatever, the dog, to basically back up and get out of my face. That is the largest number of bites across every breed out there. That is how dogs communicate. When body language communication breaks down and the other side isn't listening, that's the way they raise their voices.

That is the most common bite. And pit bulls are no more likely in my observation to proceed beyond that than any other kind of dog.

Q. In reviewing the Aurora -- I'm going to go back to the reports of which you stated you read over 400 of them. Did you find that there was any discrepancies as to the purported bite severities alleged by Aurora in these dogs that you talked about? When you looked at these reports, were you of the opinion that they did in fact, then, do more severe bites overall, looking at those dog bite reports?

A. My review of Aurora's claims that they do more damage
versus my overview of the bite reports I have, the claims are
not supported by their own data.

Q. Why is that?

4

9

10

13

14

18

23

24

25

- A. The numbers just simply don't agree. They're claiming
  something that they're -- the data provided to me in those bite
  reports does not support.
- 8 Q. Okay. So we're looking at a number of factors it could be.

When you got your dog bite reports that you looked at from Aurora, how far back -- what years did you look at?

- 11 A. The reports that they gave -- that I was provided as part
- of this case dated from within 2003 through 2004 and into 2005.
  - Q. Okay. And in the year 2003 report, you have that in -- do you have that up there with you? If you don't, it's Exhibit 6.
- 15 THE COURT: It's Exhibit 6 in the big notebook.
- 16 THE WITNESS: I do have -- of the ones I was provided,
  17 I do have a folder that is the bites that I was provided, that
- 19 BY MS. CHAN:

are listed as 2003.

- 20 | Q. Okay.
- 21 A. I don't know if these are the same as are in Exhibit 6.
- 22 | Q. How many bites do you -- did you count?
  - MS. SPADE: Objection, Your Honor. If he could possibly look at the exhibit so that we could figure out if they are in fact the same items.

THE WITNESS: Sure. 1 THE COURT: I'll let him do that. 2 3 THE WITNESS: Counsel, do you have a list of how many 4 bites are -- so I don't have to waste the Court's time counting 5 pages -- are in the Exhibit 6 listing of the 2003 bites? So I know how many I counted that I was given. 6 7 MS. CHAN: We're looking for it. THE WITNESS: I have that -- what I was asking to 8 9 see -- asking the City of Aurora how many bites that they 10 showed that they provided so that we're talking about the same 11 number. Unless you want me to count the pages here. 12 MS. SPADE: Your Honor, I guess I'm confused. I was 13 under the impression this witness had the 2003 reports with 14 him. And I was just asking him to cross-correlate them with 15 Exhibit 6. THE COURT: Why don't you come -- why don't counsel 16 17 come up and look at what he has versus what you understand to 18 be in Exhibit 6. Approach the witness. Don't ask him any 19 questions, but look at what he has versus what is in Exhibit 6 --20 21 THE WITNESS: I can answer your question. I was 22 provided 99 bite reports for 2003. Your written claims show 23 213. The numbers just simply don't agree.

24

25

BY MS. CHAN:

Q. Okay.

- 1 | A. That's why I was asking if another set of bite reports
- 2 differ from what I had seen has been provided by Aurora. But
- 3 | we'll go with what I've got here, that's fine.
- 4 I'm sorry, Your Honor.
- 5 Q. So that was for the year 2003. And could you please repeat
- 6 | the numbers for me, for 2003, what you had --
- 7 | A. I found -- I was provided 99 human bite reports, one animal
- 8 | victim that occurred in 2003.
- 9 ||Q|. And you found -- you counted it was --
- 10 A. That's what I counted.
- 11 | Q. Okay.
- 12 | A. The paper that I was provided apparently from the City of
- 13 | Aurora was that they claim 213 bites occurred in 2003, which I
- 14 | find no verification of.
- 15 BY MS. CHAN:
- 16 Q. At this time, Mr. Crosby, I have to ask you, have you read
- 17 | Exhibit Plaintiffs' No. 12, the handwritten dog bite tally done
- 18 by Rita Grable, with affidavit by Ms. Conway of the Aurora
- 19 | Animal Care Facility?
- 20 | A. Yes, I have.
- 21 Q. Okay. When you looked at it, did you look at page 3?
- 22 | A. Yes, I did.
- 23 ||Q.|| Okay. What did you see on page 3?
- 24 | A. It's a handwritten piece of paper with a bunch of hash
- 25 marks next to what appear to be dog breed names, with no

- 1 | further explanation noted.
- Q. And on the front or the back, depending on how you received
- 3 | it, but it's marked Bates No. 3281 and 3282, a two-page
- 4 | affidavit executed by Cheryl A. Conway.
- 5 A. Yes. I have that.
- 6 Q. Okay. And did you read that affidavit with the two pages
- 7 | there?
- 8 | A. Yes, I did.
- 9 ||Q|. In particular, did you read -- well, there is four
- 10 delineated numbers, 1 through 4. In particular, did you read
- 11 No. 2, 3 and 4?
- 12 A. Yes, I did.
- 13 | Q. What was your opinion upon reading No. 2, 3 and 4, after
- 14 | you read it?
- 15 | A. My opinion is that based on my experience with the proper
- 16 professional standards and controls in an animal control
- 17 | shelter, this document is completely unacceptable and would
- 18 | not -- in my shelter, we would not allow it. Hash marks on a
- 19 piece of paper is not how you account for the disposition of
- 20 other people's legal property, which dogs are in all states, I
- 21 | believe.
- 22 Q. Does this affidavit mention anything about dog bite
- 23 reports?
- 24 | A. There is a notation on the bottom of the piece of paper
- 25 | that I don't know if it was added contemporaneously with the

1 | rest or not. This is 2003 DBI, whatever that would indicate.

- Q. What about on the affidavit, page 1 of the affidavit, No.
- 3 | 3.

- 4 | A. It seems to indicate that they have computerized dog bite
- 5 | reports, but states that they seem to have somehow lost five
- 6 months of bite cards.
- 7 ||Q|. So for the year 2003, where you just said where you
- 8 | counted, where Aurora claimed 213 bites allegedly for whichever
- 9 | breeds, you only could find 99?
- 10 A. I only have records for 99, which, according to that
- 11 deposition, seems to be missing almost half of the year.
- 12 | Q. Could this affidavit with these attached pieces of paper
- 13 | that list breeds out with hash marks, like you -- you tried to
- 14 describe it for the Court, it looks like a No. 1, a slash, and
- 15 | then after four, it slashes through 5, and it says "pit" there.
- 16 | Could this be the numbers that are missing that we don't have
- 17 | reports for?
- 18 A. I have no way to know what these numbers are. They're not
- 19 specific enough. They're not described as far as breed, as far
- 20 as the name of the owner of the dog, the date of the incident,
- 21 | the severity of the incident. There is just simply -- this is
- 22 | not the way business is done.
- 23 Q. When you said you read on there that they used a computer
- 24 | to enter data, do you use a computer at your shelter?
- A. Yes, we do.

Q. Do you have a specific program for that?

2 | A. Our entire shelter is run under what is called Chameleon

3 software. It is probably the most common and, as far as I

4 know, the current state of the art in shelter management tools.

- There are several others out there, but Chameleon seems to be
- 6 | the most that I've encountered.
- 7 Q. If Chameleon was used widespread, do you know the cost of
- 8 | buying that program?

1

- 9 | A. My understanding is current cost of Chameleon is somewhere
- 10 | in the neighborhood of over \$10,000. I do know that I pay
- 11 | approximately \$4,000 per year for the licensed usage for Bay
- 12 | County Animal Control, because I just wrote them a check for
- 13  $\parallel$  3,800 and change.
- 14 | Q. In your opinion, at your own shelter, your Chameleon
- 15 software program, which you say you run, if it were to go down,
- 16 and you had no computer, and you had no way to input, let's
- 17 | just say, dog bite reports, how soon would it be before you got
- 18 | that program back running?
- 19 A. I would be immediately on the phone to technical support
- 20 | for Chameleon. We have had that happen once or twice. It's
- 21 been up within a matter of hours or days. And during that time
- 22 | we have maintained duplicate hard copies until such information
- 23 | could be put into Chameleon. We don't just leave holes in the
- 24 record.
- 25 Q. So for the dog bite reports for 2003, then, would you say,

in your opinion, after you looked at that, you read the
affidavit --

MS. SPADE: Objection, Your Honor. Leading.

THE COURT: Well, it seems to be leading. But I didn't hear the entire question. So sustained. Let's ask a non-leading question.

7 BY MS. CHAN:

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

23

24

- Q. In your opinion, if you were running a shelter, and your computer system broke down, your software broke down, and you had no way to report bite data, you said you would probably let it go for a day, but you would get the system back up. In your opinion, would it be -- would it be a good business decision to leave the computer not working for a year?
- 14 MS. SPADE: Objection, Your Honor. Again, leading.

  15 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 16 BY MS. CHAN:
- 17 Q. What would be the longest amount of time you would leave 18 your computer down?
- A. If my computer, which it has done, went down, we are
  working on getting it up as soon as humanly possible, whether
  it be hours or a matter of a couple of days.
- 22 | Q. What's the reason for that?
  - A. Because as a public agency, and as an agency that is tasked with keeping stray animals for a specific period of time until they legally become my property, I cannot allow gaps in the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Direct

record keeping. Because, number one, I would not know when a specific animal came in, when it was mine, if I — if I was ever authorized to euthanize it, if necessary, whether it was adoptable, what its temperament was, because all of those things are noted in Chameleon.

Plus, under at least Florida law, I am required to track and to clear with the health department any dog bites for the public safety reason of rabies prevention. Therefore, I have to also keep accurate hard copy data, reports, showing if a dog has bitten -- or a cat, or a raccoon, or a squirrel, has bitten someone, what the disposition of that animal was, if it was checked for rabies infection, if it was, what the outcome was, if it was quarantined, if it was quarantined at my shelter, or if it was allowed to be quarantined at home. are a whole host of factors that legally have to be monitored on a case-by-case basis, especially in a public safety and public health issue like dog and cat bites. In your opinion for your shelter and how you keep data for the computer, and you said you would not let more than one day go by. When you looked at Aurora's 2003 dog bite reports -because it appears to be a discrepancy, I believe, you stated, you counted 99 bites that had data, that have a bite report for it in that exhibit folder. And you said Aurora counted 213 bites, of which, apparently, we don't have in that folder about 112 -- we're missing 112 dog bite reports that you couldn't

- 1 | look at; is that correct?
- 2 | A. It -- if the figures provided on this spreadsheet form by
- 3 | Aurora are accurate, there are approximately 114 pieces of
- 4 paper, individual bites, that were not included in the material
- 5 provided under discovery.
- 6 Q. So in your opinion, by looking at that, Aurora's claiming
- 7 | of 213 bites, can you substantiate it?
- 8 | A. Based on the paperwork I was given, I could not -- I could
- 9 | not substantiate those numbers at all, and, frankly, would have
- 10 | to throw them out.
- 11 | Q. Would you consider the reliability of a handwritten item
- 12 | that was never put in a computer reliable?
- 13 | A. I would not consider a handwritten item that is not
- 14 documented, stamped, no forms attached, no -- nothing more than
- 15 | a hash mark as being evidence of anything other than a hash
- 16 mark.
- 17 ||Q|. Would you find that the dog bite reports starting for the
- 18 | year 2003 for what you could see, would you consider that they
- 19 were reliable as a whole, overall?
- 20 A. Based on the information I've been provided, no.
- 21 Q. But yet you were still able to tell us that you found that
- 22 | restrictive breeds only did 1.9 percent?
- 23 | A. Based on the information which I was given, which I
- 24 | considered to be incomplete for that year. There are also
- 25 problems with the information provided for 2004 and 2005, where

their numbers that they published are different from the numbers that I got when I did the review myself.

And to go back to 2003, all I could evaluate were the bites — the bite reports placed in front of me. So I could only establish that 1.9 percent of severe bites, based on the credible or semi-credible information provided by those written reports.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Crosby, I think you testified earlier you had been admitted as an expert in some states, and you named the states.
- 11 | A. Yes.

- 12 Q. Okay. And that you have a designation in dealing with
  13 fatal attacks and taking apart the dogs and completing reports
  14 on those dogs, I think you mentioned.
- 15 | A. Yes.
  - Q. Now, with that background, and keeping in mind that there are other types of logs available, is it your opinion that this type of ordinance, which zeros in on, quote, the American Pit Bull Terrier type dogs, and then delineated other named breeds of which there are several, seven, eight or nine, I can't pronounce the names, but I know you saw them listed earlier on the ordinance because you said you read that, would it be your opinion that --
- 24 MS. SPADE: Objection, Your Honor, as to the form.
  25 I've gotten quite lost as to what she's asking.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Direct

THE COURT: Well, if your objection is leading, sustained. The witness needs to testify, not counsel. Objection is sustained. Let's ask a non-leading question. BY MS. CHAN: Q. Mr. Crosby, after reading the Aurora ordinance the way it was written and the dogs it named, do you believe in your own opinion that this type of law would protect the public? There are better ways to do it. Specifically, in the individual dangerous dog laws that are scattered around the country. Florida has a very strong dangerous dog law that under Florida statute is prohibited from taking breed into consideration as establishing dangerous nature. Dangerous dog laws, especially the most effective ones, address the individual documentable behavior of an individual dog. Just like crimes are specific to humans, we cannot go, for instance, claiming that a group of humans, particular -- always act a certain way. We only arrest people for the crimes they commit, not for what their racial or ethnic or other background might be. 0. In your tenure as a director for the shelter --THE COURT: Hold on. Let me understand why you're saying that. You're saying that breed specific -- if I understand -- tell me what your opinion is, in your own words, about whether or not breed-specific laws or dangerous dog laws are better.

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, dangerous dog laws are much better.

THE COURT: Why?

THE WITNESS: Because they address the actions of a specific dog and what it's done, and then punish it, just like in the criminal human — human criminal justice system. We cannot say that we're going to arrest all left—handed people because they have a propensity to run with scissors. What we do is, we say, you broke this specific law, and this is your punishment. We should do the same — and it works in other places with — the same with animals.

If you've got a dangerous dog, if you've got a dog that has mauled a child, I don't quite frankly care whether it's a wolf or a Chihuahua, that dog needs to be specifically regulated, and your actions with that dog need to be regulated, and you need to be held individually responsible for what that animal does.

Breed bans don't place responsibility on anybody. It avoids the whole question of the responsibility of owners. It just makes it somebody else's problem. It puts it in somebody else's backyard, instead of just shifting it, let's make the individual dog owner answer for what their dogs are doing or not doing.

That works a heck of a lot better. You can't -- legislative things doesn't work. Nobody has been shot in New

James Crosby - Direct

York City in 100 years, has there? Just outlawing things like pit bulls or Rottweilers or scissors doesn't stop Rottweiler or pit bull or scissor crimes. You have to regulate what the humans do. And by doing that, with a dangerous dog law, you establish that if your dog has been raised, and whether it's got a screw loose or you've abused it or you've never trained it or whatever, if it does X, then you have to either do Y or put the dog down. You have to meet that standard. And if after Y happens, your dog bites again, your — you go to jail.

of any literature in the public domain, even if you disagree with it, as to its rationale and its basis, which would support the enactment of breed-specific legislation, such as the Aurora ordinance?

THE WITNESS: I have read no studies that I find to be sufficiently documented that indicate that breed-specific ordinances actually increase the public safety by one whit.

For instance, Miami-Dade is one of the two cities, along with Hollywood, Florida, that passed a breed ban just before Florida enacted its non-BSL provisions. People are still bitten by pit bulls every day in Miami, and they're bitten by other dogs too. The number of dog bites in Miami-Dade has continued to rise every year since the implementation of the pit bull ban there.

If I can use a human analogy. If you've got a bunch

James Crosby - Direct

of drive-bys where the suspects are all driving low-rider Chevrolets, you don't ban Chevrolets. They just shift. The irresponsible people, even if they follow the ban, are just going to pick another breed of dog. They're going to treat them the same way, and you're going to have the same result.

In Hollywood, Florida, as far as I know, the bites there continue to go up, despite the fact that they're not allowing pit bulls there.

In Canada, there are pit bulls there. And yet in Canada, almost all of the fatal dog attacks in Canada are by sled dogs. Different people, different ownerships, different strategies, different way they treat their animals. If you go into certain areas, people are treating German Shepherds or Dobermans or Rottweilers poorly, and those animals wind up having behavioral issues. It has to do with -- it increases public safety more by regulating the humans and what they do with whatever dog they have.

People have been killed by falling into a nest of wiener dogs, literally. It's not just a Gary Larsen cartoon. If you've got people that are treating those dogs irresponsibly and acting irresponsibly, they're going to be just as much of a threat. It may take more of them, but they're still going to be a problem. Instead, address the individual dog.

I have personally since I've been in Bay County declared a golden retriever, a Rottweiler, pit bull, and --

what was the other dog -- a generalized mixed breed as 1 dangerous animals based on their behavior, not on what kind 2 they are. 3 4 THE COURT: All right. Let me do it differently. 5 Suppose the City of Aurora, rather than the plaintiffs, had called you as an expert in this case, and you had to give your 6 7 best opinion as to why the Aurora ordinance in question in this case is reasonable, what would you say in support of that 8 9 ordinance? 10 THE WITNESS: I'd have a tough time with it because --11 THE COURT: What would you say? 12 THE WITNESS: Why it's reasonable? 13 THE COURT: Why it's reasonable, from a public health 14 and safety standpoint. 15 THE WITNESS: The only way I could justify it as being 16 reasonable would be to say that the politicians that passed it 17 could be perceived as having done something, even if it was 18 ineffective. That would be the positive of that. I would, 19 instead -- and I have in other cities -- recommended that 20 instead of going down this path, they go for an aggressive, 21 clear dangerous dog statute. THE COURT: All right. Ms. Chan, back to you. 22 23 MS. CHAN: Thank you. BY MS. CHAN: 24 25 In your experience, Mr. Crosby, with shelters and laws

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Direct

involving canines, do you believe, and is it your opinion that the dangerous dog laws, what we call, quote, generic dog laws, where a breed is not mentioned, when you say that you believe they work well, are you aware of a particular place that they have had put this type of law in, and it's working great? A. There are a number of places where it works quite well. Jacksonville, Florida has an aggressive dog law that I helped write. Multnomah County, Oregon has a dangerous dog law. There are places in Washington state, there are places all over the country where dangerous dog laws, based on the model both produced by, for instance, the National Animal Interest Alliance, the type of models endorsed by the American Kennel Club, the type of model that's being presented by Best Friends Animal Society, all of those are good, solid models that can be applied and can actually work. Q. Do they -- those type of generic dog laws work the best where animal control enforces them? In my observation and opinion, yes. Instead of trying to spend your day driving around, deciding whether you're looking at the banned dog of the moment, you simply go to the calls, you investigate it, you look at the behavior of the dog, and then you make your recommendations as to whether this individual dog is something we want to have on our streets. That's what improves public health, whether that individual dog is a threat. And if it is, it needs to be taken off the

James Crosby - Direct

street, because we have that responsibility as animal control officers to protect the public from animals.

Q. What is one thing that a shelter could do in your opinion to actually make those dogs more known to people?

A. In Florida, if you have a dangerous dog, one of the things you have to do is, your yard must be posted that you have a dangerous dog on that property. You have to have specific secure enclosures so that the dog is not able to get out and run at large. If you have a dangerous dog, and it is running at large, you go to jail. If you have a dangerous dog, and you're going to take it out of your yard, it has to not only have a leash on it, it has to be muzzled, and it has to be in the presence of not your 6-year-old nephew, but a responsible, competent adult. There are plenty of measures that are put in.

One of the things we are adding in my county that is in place in other places such as Jacksonville, Tallahassee, Parker, Springfield, and other places in Florida, is a mandatory requirement for specific liability insurance so that if you have a dog that's been declared dangerous, you have to buy what is expensive insurance to make sure that your dog's next victim isn't going to lose because you're an irresponsible owner.

Q. So the insurance, in your opinion, if they were required to get it for a dangerous dog, then, would that tend to help the victim, if there ended up being a victim of the actual

1 | dangerous dog?

- 2 || A. It winds up helping the victim. And it also winds up
- 3 | winnowing out those people who are willing to spend 2 to 3 to
- 4 | \$4,000 a year to maintain a dangerous dog. It's expensive to
- 5 keep a dangerous dog, and it should be. A dog that has
- 6 | fulfilled those requirements is a potential threat to the next
- 7 person coming down the street. And those people should be held
- 8 responsible for that, and that dog should be regulated
- 9 strongly.
- 10 Q. One last question, Mr. Crosby. In your experience as a
- 11 | shelter director, have you ever seen any particular dogs
- 12 destroy property in the shelter, in their kennel?
- 13 | A. We actually have dogs that tear up toys all the time.
- 14 ||Q|. You give them toys?
- 15 A. Yeah, we give them toys and blankets and things to sleep
- 16 on. We try to enrich the shelter environment as much as
- 17 possible to try to make them adoptable. Because, after all, I
- 18 | don't want to kill one more dog than I have to.
- 19 Q. Do you give pit bulls toys?
- 20 || A. We give all of them toys.
- 21 Q. Do you put pit bulls in a kennel fencing like other dogs?
- 22 | A. The only differential containment we have is the dogs who
- 23 | have proved they're climbers. We recently had a German
- 24 | Shepherd that was. We put them in a kennel run that has a
- 25 | secure top so she couldn't get out and play with other dogs.

1 ||Q|. Has it been your experience at your shelter and in your

opinion, have you viewed any pit bull dogs that destroyed the

- 3 | fencing of their own kennel?
- 4 | A. In my shelter, I have not seen any damage caused by any of
- 5 | the dogs that we have. In other shelters and other
- 6 situations -- for instance, I own an AKC champion curly-coated
- 7 | retriever, that if he's mad at you, will chew his way through a
- 8 | chain-link fence. He's got no pit bull in him.
- 9 ||Q|. In your opinion, Mr. Crosby, do all dogs have the -- well,
- 10 this is probably a fact -- do all dogs have the same amount of
- 11 teeth?

- 12 A. I would have to check with a veterinarian to make sure. I
- 13 | believe so, but that's not within my training or education to
- 14 know that exactly.
- 15 Q. Okay.
- 16 | A. I know that breed standards, in the AKC and UKC, which I'm
- 17 | most familiar with, some of them do give a specific number of
- 18 teeth that are required. So apparently there is some
- 19 | variation, even within breeds of individuals that do not meet
- 20 | the breed standard. It's like you or I might have a missing
- 21 | tooth or an extra tooth.
- 22 | Q. You mentioned earlier, Mr. Crosby, that in doing the fatal
- 23 | attacks, I believe you said that a smaller dog versus a bigger
- 24 dog, you named some factors that would cause -- have some kind
- 25 of implication as to the damage done to a person.

A. Yes.

- 2 Q. Okay. So in your opinion, if you had a shelter dog that
- 3 came in that was 15 pounds, let's just say he has teeth
- 4 | relative to his size, whatever the number of teeth they have,
- 5 | let's just pretend it's 32, and that dog, you know, damaged --
- 6 | that dog damaged one of your shelter workers, could he -- could
- 7 | that dog possibly do extreme damage to a person?
- 8 | A. I've seen extreme damage done by dogs, again, ranging from
- 9 Presa Canarios at 140 plus pounds, to Dachshunds and
- 10 | Pomeranians at 6 to 10.
- 11 Q. Could you please tell the Court, there may be people that
- 12 don't know the sizes of those breeds you mentioned.
- 13 | A. Presa Canarios -- one of the fatal attacks I'm aware of,
- 14 | the Presa Canarios that killed a woman in Coral Springs,
- 15 | Florida, was around 140 pounds.
- 16 | Q. And --
- 17 | A. Pomeranian that I worked with that had bitten someone
- 18 severely several times was about 7 1/2 pounds.
- 19 ||Q|. And the other one? I think you said Chihuahua.
- 20 A. Chihuahua, what, 5 or 6 pounds. You know, if -- again, if
- 21 | it's got teeth, it can bite.
- 22 | Q. Last question for you Mr. Crosby. In your -- in your
- 23 statement earlier, I believe you testified that you have done
- 24 | the most on-hands reports of anybody in the country on
- 25 | fatalities of dogs against humans.

1 A. Right.

- 2 || Q. And is the number of people killed in the United States --
- 3 keep it to the United States -- is that a large number?
- 4 | A. Last year, in 2007, there were a total of 33 humans killed
- 5 | by dogs. That is out of a population what we -- somewhere
- 6 between 270 and 300 million. The year before it was a few less
- 7 | than that. This year, as of -- and I haven't seen this
- 8 | morning's media reports or anything. But as of yesterday,
- 9 there were 21, the 21<sup>st</sup> being the one that I just left up in
- 10 | Muncie, Indiana, before I came here.
- 11 The amount -- the number of people actually killed by
- 12 | canines is tiny in comparison to other causes of death. For
- 13 | instance, 120 people about every year are killed by cows. 300
- 14 some odd people on an average year die falling in bathtubs, and
- 15 I don't think we're going to ban the bathtubs.
- 16 | Q. In your fatal attack personal experience, can you recall if
- 17 | there was, in your opinion, one of the worst attacks you've
- 18 | ever seen?
- 19 A. The worst -- the worst attack that I have seen involved a
- 20 | 10-year-old child that was partially consumed and killed -- was
- 21 | killed on the spot, and then consumed by the dogs that attacked
- 22 | him.
- 23 Q. Does "consumed" mean that whatever dog --
- 24 A. Eaten. There were massive amounts of tissue gone. He was
- 25 | eaten on the scene.

THE COURT: What kind of dogs? 1 THE WITNESS: Four boxers and two generic Heinz-57 2 brown dogs, about half their size. 3 4 THE COURT: How many dogs attacked the kid? THE WITNESS: Total of six. 5 6 THE COURT: Where did this happen? 7 THE WITNESS: Dillon, South Carolina. I was on scene that one, and that -- that's the most gruesome one, and the 8 9 most egregious one I've seen. 10 THE COURT: Were those dogs killed? 11 THE WITNESS: Yes, except for the one that was stolen 12 before I got there. Somebody broke into animal control and 13 stole one of those dogs. 14 BY MS. CHAN: Q. Mr. Crosby, was there any fatal attack that you are aware 15 16 of that you participated in investigating involving a small 17 dog? 18 There was one -- I didn't go to the scene, but there was 19 one last year that involved a Dachshund. The first one of this 20 year was a Jack Russell terrier in Brooklyn, New York -- I'm sorry, the Dachshund was in Brooklyn. The Jack Russell was in 21 Kentucky, I believe. 22 23 How much does a Jack Russell terrier weigh? 24 A. 8, 9, 10, 12 pounds. The movie, My Dog Spot, that was 25 running around popular a few months back or a year back, that

1 | was a Jack Russell terrier.

MS. CHAN: Okay. I have nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Cross-examination.

MS. SPADE: Thank you, Your Honor.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

- 6 BY MS. SPADE:
- 7 Q. Sir, I believe you said you had retired as a police
- 8 officer?

2

3

4

- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. But you also told us that you were not in the canine unit;
- 11 | is that correct?
- 12 | A. That's correct. I was never actually assigned to the
- 13 | canine unit.
- 14 | Q. Thank you, sir. So your experience is primarily after your
- 15 | retirement?
- 16 A. While I was still on the police department, I would go out
- 17 on training days with the Jacksonville police canine unit. I
- 18 | would talk to the trainers. I would observe what they were
- 19 doing. I would help them from time to time. I was not
- 20 | actually assigned there, but when I had the time, I would spend
- 21 some time with them, and also participated with them in
- 22 | evaluating dogs with potential for, as detector dogs, both for
- 23 drugs and bombs, and also evaluated animals as suitable for
- 24 patrol dogs.
- 25 | Q. But, again, the majority your experience, that you've

- 1 | testified to today, comes from the time frame after your
- 2 | retirement; is that correct?
- 3 | A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. Okay. And have you ever been to Aurora, Colorado?
- 5 | A. Actually, my former in-laws live in Broomfield. So I've
- 6 probably driven through it, but wasn't aware of it at the time.
- 7 Q. So you were not aware of ever having been to Aurora,
- 8 | Colorado, correct?
- 9 | A. To the best of my knowledge, I've never come to visit, no.
- 10 Q. And have you ever spoken to any of Aurora's animal care
- 11 | officers?
- 12 | A. No.
- 13 ||Q|. Have you ever spoken to any Aurora City Council members?
- 14 | A. No.
- 15 | Q. Have you ever investigated any fatal cases in Aurora,
- 16 | Colorado?
- 17 A. During the time I've been doing this, there has not been a
- 18 | fatal case in Aurora that I'm aware of, so, no.
- 19 ||Q|. Have you ever spoken to any victims of dog attacks in
- 20 | Aurora, Colorado?
- 21 | A. In Aurora? No.
- 22 ||Q|. So without ever talking to any of these people, you know
- 23 | better than anyone else what the rational basis is of a law,
- 24 | correct, sir?
- 25 A. I know what the rational basis of the law is based on those

1 | places that I've observed it. And I don't believe that Aurora,

- 2 | Colorado is Mars. I think it's part of the country and pretty
- 3 | much like everywhere else.
- 4 | Q. Now, sir, do you know if Aurora, Colorado has a dangerous
- 5 | dog law?
- 6 A. Haven't asked them. If they don't, they should.
- 7 ||Q|. Just never occurred to you to even ask?
- 8 | A. I was not asked to review their dangerous dog law.
- 9 Q. And so if you were told that Aurora does in fact have a
- 10 dangerous dog law, would that surprise you?
- 11 | A. Wouldn't surprise me or not surprise me. Plenty of places
- 12 do. The entire state of Indiana does not.
- 13 Q. And so for a jurisdiction that has a dangerous dog law, in
- 14 | fact, those dangerous dog laws are not addressing citizen
- 15 | concerns, do you have a fallback position, sir, on how to keep
- 16 | the citizenry safe?
- 17 | A. Try enforcing the law you have. Citizen perception is not
- 18 | necessarily backed up by data. Citizens believe things all the
- 19 | time. Do you go with what people feel, or do you go with what
- 20 | the information says?
- 21 Q. Speaking of beliefs, you were asked by the judge if there
- 22 | are any reports or data that do support the opposite position
- 23 | to what you have. And as I understood your responses, you said
- 24 | that there were no studies that you found sufficiently
- 25 | documented; is that correct, sir?

- 1 A. That's correct. I have not seen anything that seems to 2 have been backed up by hard data.
- 3 Q. So there are studies that exist; is that correct?
- 4 A. I have not read any, no.
- 5 Q. You just said that they weren't backed up by hard data. So
- 6 you must have read something, sir?
- 7 A. There have been allegations that breed bans work in various
- 8 | places that I have not seen any written, backed up, hard data
- 9 on. So I have not read any studies with hard data on them that
- 10 state that this works.
- 11 Q. So, basically, the things that you have read that support
- 12 | breed-specific legislation, you don't agree with. And so you
- don't do any further investigation on those; is that correct,
- 14 | sir?
- 15 MS. CHAN: Objection, argumentative.
- 16 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 17 | THE WITNESS: I -- I have seen claims such as the City
- 18 of Aurora's claim that a breed ban is necessary and somehow
- 19 works. However, I have not seen any of those claims backed up
- 20 by hard data.
- If you have such a study, I would love to see it.
- 22 BY MS. SPADE:
- 23 Q. Now, you were given the dog bite reports from the City of
- 24 | Aurora, correct?
- 25 A. Correct.

- 1 Q. And you noted that you were informed that there were five
- 2 | months of cards that were missing; is that correct?
- 3 || A. Actually, the affidavit that was provided by the Aurora
- 4 | Animal Control officers stated that there were five months of
- 5 data missing. Other than that, I have no knowledge if there is
- 6 | or how much data is missing.
- 7 ||Q.|| And you have no reason to disbelieve that, do you?
- 8 | A. I have no reason to have an opinion either way.
- 9  $\parallel$  Q. Did you sit and match the cards up and see if there were
- 10 | five months that were missing?
- 11 | A. If they don't have the cards, it seems that's kind of hard
- 12 | to do.
- 13 | Q. Well, you can see where there aren't cards for, say, March,
- 14 | April, and May, correct?
- 15 A. If the stuff that's missing is sequential.
- 16 | Q. So you didn't bother to put the dog bite cards in a stack
- 17 | by year and then match them up against month?
- 18 A. I didn't go day by day, no, ma'am, I did not. I took what
- 19 | I was provided, believing that to be the total of what Aurora
- 20 | had. The evidence -- the statement that those things are
- 21 | missing came much later, and I only became aware of it
- 22 | yesterday.
- 23 | Q. And do you know what was going on in 2003 at Aurora Animal
- 24 | Care?
- 25 A. No idea.

- 1 Q. Never spoke to animal care to find out why those things
- 2 | might be missing?
- 3  $\parallel$  A. I was asked to review the documents I was given, not to
- 4 | investigate Aurora Animal Control.
- 5 | Q. And I'm guessing you don't know what the records retention
- 6 | policies are regarding Aurora Animal Care?
- 7 | A. I do not know what Colorado requires. I know that Florida
- 8 requires 75 years.
- 9 | Q. But you don't know what Colorado law is?
- 10 | A. I'm not in Colorado. I don't work in Colorado.
- 11 Q. So if you heard that the retention period was three years,
- 12 | and then people are expected to purge them, would that surprise
- 13 | you?
- 14 A. Honestly, yes. Even the IRS tells you to keep seven years
- 15 of receipts.
- 16 | Q. And do you know if Aurora Animal Care was going through a
- 17 | renovation in that time period?
- 18 A. I don't know anything about Aurora Animal Control, even if
- 19 | they're certified.
- 20 | Q. Now, you have been the director of the Dade County shelter
- 21 | since February of this year, correct?
- 22 A. I've never been in the Dade County shelter. I am at the
- 23 | Bay County, Florida --
- 24 | Q. Bay County?
- 25 A. And took over as director in February of this year, that is

1 correct.

- 2 ||Q|. You know what, preconceptions. I misheard you, sir. So
- Bay County. You've been there since February, correct?
- 4 | A. Correct.
- 5 ||Q|. Have you ever had occasion to move your entire animal care
- 6 | shelter out of the building you're currently in and move it
- 7 | physically to another building?
- 8 | A. No, ma'am. I've been fortunate that I've actually got a
- 9 | nice building that was built about three years ago.
- 10 | Q. So you would have no idea what effect moving animal care
- 11 | from one building into a totally different building might have
- 12 on, say, a computer system?
- 13 | A. Here in Aurora, no. I can tell you that the records from
- 14 Bay County animal control that predate the move to the shelter
- 15 | that I am in are in boxes at my shelter and can still be looked
- 16 up. We did not put in the computer until 2006. And from the
- 17 | day the computer was started, all of our records are in place.
- 18 Q. You told us about your curly-coated retriever; do you
- 19 | recall that?
- 20 | A. I did mention that he will chew his way through a
- 21 | chain-link fence, yes.
- 22 | Q. And do you think that's a problem that should be addressed,
- 23 | if he's doing that consistently, sir?
- 24 | A. If I catch him doing it, he is corrected. And he has
- 25 stopped doing it, because he's been repeatedly corrected.

- 1 ||Q|. And it has a physical impact, right?
- 2 | A. Certainly. It makes me fix the fence, and it wears down
- 3 | his teeth.
- $4 \parallel Q$ . And would you agree that if an animal care shelter was
- 5 | having that kind of physical impact, that would be a cause of
- 6 concern on a regular basis if that happened?
- 7 | A. Sure.
- 8 Q. All right.
- 9  $\parallel$  A. Try and replace whatever was being destroyed with something
- 10 | that wasn't quite as vulnerable.
- 11 Q. Have you done any fatal animal research in Colorado at all?
- 12 | A. Since I started this, I have not responded to the state of
- 13 | Colorado on a fatal dog attack, no.
- 14 Q. Did you respond to the attack in Elbert County?
- 15 A. Was that the little boy that's arm was taken off by the two
- 16 | chows?
- 17 Q. No, sir. That was a woman who was killed by three pit
- bulls when she went to go feed her horse.
- 19 A. What date was that? I did not come out for it. I just
- 20 | don't know if it was before I started responding or not.
- 21 Q. So, basically, since you aren't familiar with the case, you
- 22 | didn't come out and view --
- 23 | A. No, I didn't come out.
- 24  $\parallel Q$ . And you told us that you found 1.9 percent of the serious
- 25 dog bites in the Aurora dog bite cards were the same percentage

1 | as chows; is that correct?

- 2 | A. That is correct. Nine, what I term level 5. Which if
- 3 | you'll let me read it in is, multiple bites, one to four holes
- 4 | from a single bite, one hole deeper than one-half the length of
- 5 | a canine tooth, typically contact and punctures from more than
- 6 | the canines only, black bruising, tears and/or slashing wounds,
- 7 | dog clamp down or shook or slashed victims. Level 5, there
- 8 | were nine level 5 bites, as best I could tell from your
- 9 | figures, and nine pit bull bites at that level, the same
- 10 percentage of the total. However, that makes it 40 percent of
- 11 | the bites by chows were severe, as opposed to only 21 percent
- 12 of the bites by pit bulls.
- 13 Q. And you only concerned yourself as far as looking at level
- 14 | 5 bites; is that correct, sir?
- 15 A. No, I looked at level 3, 4, 5 and 6, 6 being fatalities of
- 16 which there are none documented in the time period in Aurora,
- 17 | Colorado.
- 18 | Q. And so --
- 19 | A. Let --
- 20 Q. Your base of complaint is that we should have outlawed
- 21 | chows too?
- 22 | A. No. My base of complaint was outlawing pit bulls was a
- 23 waste of time, effort and money and didn't accomplish anything.
- 24 | It was based on flawed data.
- 25 Q. This despite the fact that you didn't speak to any of the

- 1 | City Council people who passed this, correct?
- $2 \parallel A$ . Based on the review of the data. The data supports itself.
- 3 || Q. And do you know if the City Council only relied on dog bite
- 4 reports?
- 5 | A. I don't know what the City Council made their determination
- 6 on. I did not speak to them.
- 7 Q. Do you know how many City Council people are in Aurora?
- 8 | A. No.
- 9 Q. I believe you said that in your vitae, you had looked at a
- 10 | number of fatal dog bites; is that correct?
- 11 | A. That's correct.
- 12 | Q. And in your vitae, four of those involve pit bull type
- 13 dogs, don't they?
- 14 A. Actually, I'd have to look back through each one. I don't
- 15 remember exactly how many. I could tell you in just a few
- 16 | minutes, because I could pull it up. But I have investigated
- 17 | fatals by pit bull type dogs, yes.
- 18 Q. Pit bulls can inflict fatal injuries, correct, sir?
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 ||Q|. And in the case of 2006, Montgomery County, Texas, that was
- 21 | a fatal dog attack on an adult victim?
- 22 | A. That's correct.
- 23 ||Q|. That was a pit bull, right?
- 24 | A. That's correct.
- 25 Q. And in 2006, DeKalb County, Georgia, that was a serious

- 1 | mauling, there was an allegation that that was a pit bull-type
- 2 dog?
- 3 A. Yes, it was a pit bull-type dog.
- 4 | Q. And in 2005, Huntington, West, Virginia, that was a fatal
- 5 dog attack on a 2-year-old?
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 ||Q. Again, that was a pit bull-type dog?
- 8 | A. Actually, the owner claimed it was a Staffordshire Terrier.
- 9 Q. A Staffordshire Terrier is defined as a pit bull under the
- 10 ordinance, correct, sir?
- 11 | A. Then it is a pit bull-type dog, yes.
- 12 Q. In 2004, Nassau County, Florida, serious dog attack by pit
- 13 | bull terrier on an adult?
- 14 | A. That's correct.
- 15 Q. Now, you told us that pit bulls are no stronger than any
- 16 other particular dog; is that correct?
- 17 A. In my observation, no, they're not.
- 18 Q. And as part of your example, you told us about
- 19 | weight-pulling competitions, right?
- 20 | A. I used that as a generalized example, that if you -- in my
- 21 | observation, although I'm not a weight-pull judge, if you had
- 22 | similar-sized dogs that were similarly athletic, they would be
- 23 pulling similar-sized objects, if they were so prone to do.
- 24 | Q. So have you been to these weight-pulling competitions?
- 25 A. No. I'm not a weight-pulling participant, no. But I have

- 1 | handled pulling dogs, pretty much most breeds out there, and
- 2 | don't find that any one breed pulls on the leash based -- based
- 3  $\parallel$  on breed any more than a dog of a similar size.
- 4 | Q. I was going to ask you, sir, how many poodles you've seen
- 5 pulling weighted sleds at these weight-pulling competitions.
- 6 | But it sounds like you've never been to one, correct?
- 7 | A. I have not attended one, no.
- 8 Q. Would it surprise you to learn that pit bull-type terrier
- 9 dogs are a very popular breed when it comes to weight pulling?
- 10 | A. No, it would not.
- 11 | Q. Would it surprise you to hear that poodles are not used in
- 12 | weight pulling?
- 13 A. Poodles are actually used in an awful lot of things,
- 14 | including retrieving competition and other physical activity.
- 15 | So it actually surprises me if a poodle has never tried.
- 16 Q. But that's what poodles are bread for, right, sir,
- 17 | retrieving? They're hunting dogs.
- 18 A. Poodles are hunting dogs, yes. Poodles are also used in
- 19 | hearing competition, something they weren't bred for.
- 20 | Q. But dogs are bred for purposes, correct?
- 21 | A. Breeds have been established with general requirements,
- 22 general desires behind their use, yes.
- 23 | Q. So --
- 24 A. I have yet to see a dog, however, that is a single-purpose
- 25 animal.

- 1 Q. But they are more prone to doing one thing. For instance,
- 2 your curly-coated retriever is very good at water sports, I'm
- 3 guessing.
- 4 A. That particular one is, yes. I have another one that can't
- 5 | swim to save its own life.
- 6  $\parallel$  Q. And being a retriever, it retrieves, correct?
- 7 A. He does, yes.
- 8 ||Q|. And the pit bull-type dogs were bred to fight; isn't that
- 9 | correct, sir?
- 10 | A. Some of the pit bulls were selected for the ability to
- 11 | fight other animals, yes, that is true.
- 12 | Q. Now, I'm going to take you back to the bite cards. You
- 13 | observed that --
- 14 THE COURT: I'll tell you what, why don't we go ahead
- 15 and stop for lunch. We're going to break for an hour and a
- 16 | half, start again at 1:25.
- 17 How many more witnesses will the plaintiff call?
- 18 MS. CHAN: One expert and two more animal control
- 19 people.
- 20 | THE COURT: Okay. All right.
- 21 We'll resume in an hour and a half.
- 22 (Recess from 11:56 a.m. to 1:39 p.m.)
- 23 THE COURT: Let's continue with the cross-examination
- 24 of Mr. Crosby.
- 25 MS. SPADE: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 | THE WITNESS: I'm ready whenever you are.

- 2 BY MS. SPADE:
- 3 Q. Super. Do you know how many labrador retrievers live in
- 4 | the City of Aurora, Colorado, sir?
- 5 | A. Not for sure, ma'am. I know that the information provided
- 6 on the 2005 registrations showed that 919 labrador retrievers
- 7 | were, according to the City of Aurora, Colorado, registered --
- 8 | licensed, I'm sorry.
- 9 ||Q|. And you had noted earlier that there were slightly more
- 10 | labrador retriever bites than pit bull-type bites, correct?
- 11 A. Yes, according to the records, that's correct.
- 12 ||Q|. So if there are three times more labrador retrievers living
- 13 | in the city of Aurora than a slightly higher number of bites
- 14 | would actually be disproportionate statistically, wouldn't it,
- 15 || sir?
- 16 A. I'm not a statistician. I can't state statistically how it
- 17 | would fit within tolerances or what those tolerances would be.
- 18 Q. Kind of makes sense, sir, if you had 900 labradors and 300
- 19 | pit bulls and about the same number of bites, then the
- 20 | statistics are skewed, wouldn't they?
- 21 | A. I wouldn't be surprised to see more bites from labradors
- 22 | than pit bulls, no.
- 23 | Q. You had also testified earlier that all dogs give warning
- 24 | signs and that it's a myth that pit bulls never attack without
- 25 | warning.

- 1 | A. In my experience, that is correct.
- 2 Q. So you, yourself, have never seen a pit bull attack without
- 3 warning?
- 4 A. No. =
- 5 Q. Thus, you draw the conclusion it becomes impossible for
- 6 that to happen?
- 7 A. I did not say impossible. Impossible is a word that is
- 8 very difficult to apply. I can't say it's impossible you won't
- 9 be abducted by aliens.
- 10 | Q. But you were doing --
- 11 | A. I have never observed that.
- 12 Q. Sir, you were giving your expert opinion that all dogs give
- 13 off signals before they attack, correct?
- 14 A. In my experience, yes.
- 15 Q. And have you ever seen a pit bull wagging its tail and
- 16 basically acting like a really happy dog right before it
- 17 | attacked?
- 18 | A. Personally, no.
- 19 Q. So, again, because it's outside the realm of your
- 20 experience, you can't say whether that does or does not happen?
- 21 | A. I can say that I've never observed it.
- 22 | Q. You were also talking at one point about the majority of
- 23 | bites in Canada coming from sled dogs, I believe. Do you
- 24 | recall that?
- 25 A. Yes. That's what I was told by the director of Calgary,

- 1 | Alberta's animal control, Mr. Bill Bruce.
- 2 Q. And were you aware that the Ontario Court of Appeals has
- 3 | recently upheld a province-wide ban against pit bulls in
- 4 | Ontario?
- $5 \mid A. \quad Yes, I am.$
- 6 Q. This despite the fact that it's primarily sled dogs that
- 7 | engage in fatal attacks there, correct, sir?
- 8 | A. Yes. Which goes to the proof that the legislation isn't
- 9 always carried by the data.
- 10 | Q. Now, you're testifying here as an expert, correct?
- 11 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- 12 ||Q|. And as an expert, you had to submit a report on your
- 13 | findings, correct?
- 14 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- 15 | Q. As a matter of fact, you submitted two reports, didn't you,
- 16 | sir?
- 17 | A. I submitted a report, and then a cover sheet was amended to
- 18 | that report that I did not write, as I addressed in the
- 19 deposition.
- 20 | Q. Your first report was dated March 17, 2007, correct?
- 21 | A. I'm not sure, but I'll accept your word on that.
- 22 | Q. And that did not have the cover sheet.
- 23 | A. That's correct.
- 24 | Q. And the second report was not dated, but it came with the
- 25 | cover sheet, correct?

- 1 | A. Correct. Which, as I said, I did not write.
- 2 Q. Who did you get that from?
- 3 A. The cover sheet was provided for me by Mr. Bui.
- 4 ||Q|. Did you get that by fax, e-mail, how did you get that?
- 5 | A. At this point, I honestly don't remember whether he
- 6 e-mailed it to me or faxed it to me. Possibly e-mailed it.
- 7 But I was given it for the purposes of proper form as far as
- 8 | submission to the Court.
- 9 ||Q|. And you wrote not a single word of that cover sheet?
- 10 A. Not of the front page, no. I was provided that cover
- 11 sheet.
- 12 | Q. And I believe you kind of characterized the difference in
- 13 the two reports as reformatting; is that correct?
- 14 A. That is the difference. Reformatting, I was given the
- 15 | format that the Court would require it to be in so that it was
- 16 properly worded and -- not -- I'm sorry, not worded, but
- 17 properly constructed.
- 18 Q. I quess I'm wondering, sir, how in reformatting, Report 1
- 19 goes from being slightly over half a page to being reformatted
- 20 | to slightly over two pages in Report No. 2.
- 21 | A. I don't have Report No. 1 in front of me. But the
- 22 | information contained is the same in both reports. There are
- 23 | no differences of fact.
- 24 | Q. I'm going to ask the clerk to hand you Report No. 1 and
- 25 Report No. 2.

1 First of all, in Report No. 1, sir, do you cite to any

- 2 scientific reports, materials or data? Do you name any
- 3 reports, sir?
- 4 A. I do not name any reports in the first one, no. I
- 5 mentioned my investigations.
- 6 | Q. So it's based solely on your experience, your
- 7 | investigations, correct?
- 8 | A. This report states that, based on my investigations. I do
- 9 | not go into the other supporting documents, no.
- 10 Q. If you could take a look at Report No. 2. I'll give you a
- 11 moment to look that over. And absent the cover page, which you
- 12 | did not write, in the report itself, do you cite to any
- 13 scientific materials, publications, or data, sir?
- 14 A. No. As you can see here, I have based this report and my
- 15 opinions on primarily my own observations and research.
- 16 Q. Okay. Now, Report No. 1 is written rather informally;
- 17 | would you agree with that statement, sir?
- 18 A. Yes, it was.
- 19 Q. And Report No. 2, you have formal delineations of areas
- 20 | that you're addressing, correct?
- 21 | A. Yes, I do.
- 22 | Q. That does not appear in Report No. 1, does it, sir?
- 23 A. No. It's actually a clearer, more properly formatted and
- 24 | explained report.
- 25 Q. When you said "reformatted," you're actually expounding on

- 1 Report No. 1 and kind of going beyond the ambit of Report No.
- 2 | 1; would you agree with that, sir?
- 3 || A. I would agree that this is the first report I prepared for
- 4 | the federal court and was not sure in how much detail to go.
- 5 | Had I wanted to, I could have gone for many more pages, but I
- 6 | focused on the high points of what I would be addressing.
- 7 Q. So you didn't think to check with counsel before you
- 8 | tendered that report, sir, the first report?
- 9 | A. I didn't think I needed counsel's permission to issue the
- 10 report that I was going to sign off on.
- 11 | Q. That's --
- 12 | A. Counsel didn't do the research; I did.
- 13 Q. But that's who you ended up sending both of these reports
- 14 | to, correct?
- 15 A. Both of these reports were sent to Mr. Bui. He forwarded
- 16 | them on to counsel, which I believe initially was a different
- 17 attorney.
- 18 Q. It was after you sent Report No. 1 that you received
- 19 | information from Mr. Bui that you needed to reformat things?
- 20 A. That I needed to reformat it, yes.
- 21 | Q. Expand your areas of concern, such as -- I believe it talks
- 22 | about physical jaw structure in Report No. 2, correct?
- 23 A. It talks about what I have observed in the pit bull dogs,
- 24 | including their jaws, yes.
- 25 | Q. And you didn't specifically home in on that in Report No.

- 1 | 1, do you, sir?
- 2 | A. I don't specifically mention that issue here. I mention
- 3 | that my investigation of numerous fatal attacks, but did not
- 4 | expound on the part of those investigations that dealt with the
- 5 | observations of the physical skulls and jaws of the dog.
- 6 | Q. None of that is in Report No. 1, right?
- 7 A. Report No. 1, no, it's not. Report No. 1 was not a report
- 8 submitted to the Court.
- 9 Q. Did you consult with Mr. Bui before doing Report No. 2,
- 10 | sir?
- 11 | A. As to the format, yes. As to the information, no.
- 12 | Q. So under format, did you talk about expanding your headings
- and getting more in depth about what your research had shown?
- 14 | A. Yes. I was asked to expand a bit on the information, but I
- 15 | had originally sketched out in the preliminary report, No. 1 --
- 16 MS. CHAN: Objection, Your Honor, relevancy.
- 17 || Exhibit --
- 18 THE COURT: Overruled -- go ahead, finish your
- 19 exhibit.
- 20 MS. CHAN: The exhibit has not been -- the exhibit
- 21 | she's talking about is not even listed on the exhibit list. I
- 22 | don't -- I've not -- you know, I don't have it here.
- 23 | THE COURT: These are his reports, aren't they?
- 24 MS. SPADE: Yes, Your Honor, they are.
- 25 THE COURT: I realize they're not marked as exhibits,

- but she can ask him about what he wrote in his report. It's
  proper cross-examination.
- 3 Objection is overruled.
- 4 BY MS. SPADE:
- 5 ||Q.|| Now, in Report No. 1, I believe it's in the top paragraph,
- 6 | you say you've investigated a variety of fatal dog attacks.
- 7 And those include pit bulls, correct, sir?
- 8 | A. Those include pit bull terriers, yes.
- 9 Q. And that kind of takes us back to your vitae, in terms of
- 10 pit bull-type dogs can be dangerous, correct?
- 11 | A. Yes, ma'am, absolutely.
- 12 Q. And in your vitae, you only list level 5 or level 6
- 13 | attacks; is that correct?
- 14 A. Actually, in my vitae, I do not list all of the attacks
- 15 I've consulted on, spoken to people, or worked on. If you'll
- 16 | notice on there, it says "selected consulting duties."
- 17 Q. I understand that, sir. But of the ones that you selected
- 18 | to put in your vitae, you've chosen level 5 or level 6 attacks,
- 19 | correct?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21  $\parallel$  Q. And of those -- we went over several of them -- I believe
- 22 | four of them involved pit bull-type dogs.
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 ||Q|. And of these selected cases, there are 12. So that means
- 25 | that one out of every three of these level 5 or level 6 attacks

1 | is a pit bull-type dog, correct?

A. Depends on the year. Actually, this year, it's a slightly different rate. Last year it was a different rate. Over time, it appears to be hovering around the 30 percent mark.

THE COURT: Just so the Court is clear, what are level 5 and level 6 attacks?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, they are classification of dog bite that I read from before. That explains bites, rather than, ooh, that's bad, or ooh, that's minor, gives a standard of engagement of the dog -- and I'm looking for my copy of it right now -- that can be compared across jurisdictions, across legal cases, across animal control agencies, and so forth, so that we can more appropriately quantify what one person thinks is a bad bite, the next person may not.

And as I'm sure Your Honor is aware, different -- even medical treatments or sutures is not consistent, because if, for instance, a dog bites a person who is not a model of some kind, in a non-visible area, the doctor may elect, based on their best judgment, to put a staple or two in. Where, frankly, if you have a small child with a facial bite of the same size, they may put a whole bunch of teeny, tiny sutures in so the child bears no scars through its life.

If you'd like, sir, this is a copy of the bite continuum. If you'd like the clerk to see that.

THE COURT: Yes, I would like to see that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Cross

Are level 5 and 6 bites the more serious? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. A level 5 bite, as defined -as you'll see defined, there is multiple bites of a serious nature, multiple level 4 or above bites. And a level 6 bite is any bite that results in the death of a human. THE COURT: Okay. BY MS. SPADE: So a level 6 bite is a fatality? Correct. A . And in your investigation of fatal dog attacks, I believe I heard you say that most of the fatal dog attacks were first-time bites; is that correct, sir? A. The largest -- I would have to say that there are a substantial number that are first-time bites. However, when one looks into the backgrounds of these dogs, there are behaviors that should have been a warning in those attacks, aggression focused on humans that may not have resulted in a bite, aggression focused on other animals that may not have been resulting in a human bite. Q. So the dangerous dog laws that you're advocating don't really protect the first-bite victim, do they, sir? Sure they do. Because you don't have to have a bite to a human to judge a dog dangerous. For instance, in my state, if a dog kills two or more domestic animals, it can be judged dangerous. If a dog charges in a means or mode of attack or

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

James Crosby - Cross

threatening manner, and such attack -- such charge, even though there is no contact, is witnessed by at least one person who gives written affidavit, that dog may be adjudged as a dangerous dog. There is no prerequirement for a human bite to judge a dog dangerous. It's on its behavior. Q. And, again, you aren't certain if Aurora has a law like that, correct? A. I haven't looked for it. If it does, I think it's a good idea. MS. SPADE: Thank you, sir. THE COURT: Redirect. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. CHAN: Q. Mr. Crosby, you looked at -- you testified before that you had looked at all of the Aurora dog bite data for the years 2003, 4 and 5; is that correct? I looked at all of the dog bite data that I was provided. Okay. Going on the assumption that you looked at what was provided, and you testified already as to what you saw, are you able to in your opinion look at the data that you were given on licensed dogs, or if they were licensed, to determine a population of how many breeds are in a city? A. I have no way to guess that. Dog licensing is erratic across the country. The best program I know of is Calgary, Alberta, where 95 percent of all animals are licensed. In the

James Crosby - Redirect

- 1 | town I lived in, Jacksonville, they would have been lucky and
- 2 | thrilled to get 10 percent. So there is no way to judge how
- 3 many of what, or what the actual population is.
- $4 \parallel Q$ . And in your opinion, is there a correlation between
- 5 | licensed dogs and how many breeds of one type are in a city?
- 6 A. I know of no such correlation, no, ma'am.
- 7 ||Q|. Thank you. Are you aware -- in your fatal attack, all of
- 8 | the stuff you have done, that you testified to earlier, are you
- 9 aware of or do you know in your own opinion from what you have
- 10 seen and done personally, about how many breeds might be
- 11 responsible for fatal attacks overall?
- 12 | A. Most all of them. For instance, I've got a list that this
- 13 | year so far includes -- if I can find that piece of paper. So
- 14 | far this year, the fatal attacks include Dobermans -- I'm
- 15 | sorry, in 2007, they included --
- 16 | Q. Let me interrupt you just one moment. The question was, in
- 17 | your opinion, you know, how many breeds are responsible? I'm
- 18 | just asking you for a number.
- 19 | A. Many, most of them --
- 20 Q. More than ten?
- 21 | A. They're not limited -- there is 153 AKC breeds now and an
- 22 | incredible number of other registry breeds. Again, all I can
- 23 | say is, I've seen everything from Pomeranians and Dachshunds to
- 24 Presa Canarios and wolf hybrids. I've never broken it down to
- 25 | exactly how many breeds were involved.

Dated at Denver, Colorado, this 1st day of December, 2009.

24 s/Therese Lindblom

Therese Lindblom, CSR, RMR, CRR