

**Committee Name:**  
**Senate Committee –**  
**Judiciary, Corrections and Privacy**  
**(SC–JCP)**

**Appointments**

03hr\_SC–JCP\_Appt\_pt00

**Committee Hearings**

03hr\_SC–JCP\_CH\_pt00

**Committee Reports**

03hr\_SC–JCP\_CR\_pt00

**Clearinghouse Rules**

03hr\_SC–JCP\_CRule\_03–

**Executive Sessions**

03hr\_SC–JCP\_ES\_pt00

**Hearing Records**  
**03hr\_ab0423a\_pt02**

03hr\_sb0000

**Misc.**

03hr\_SC–JCP\_Misc\_pt00

**Record of Committee Proceedings**

03hr\_SC–JCP\_RCP\_pt00

# Glenn Grothman

STATE REPRESENTATIVE  
58TH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

**Office:**  
Post Office Box 8952 • Madison, Wisconsin 53708-8952  
(608) 264-8486 • Toll-Free: (888) 534-0058  
Rep.Grothman@legis.state.wi.us  
[www.legis.state.wi.us/assembly/asm58/news/index.html](http://www.legis.state.wi.us/assembly/asm58/news/index.html)

**Home:**  
111 South 6th Avenue  
West Bend, Wisconsin 53095  
(262) 338-8061

**TO:** ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY AND SENATE  
COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, CORRECTION, AND PRIVACY  
ELECTIONS MEMBERS

**FROM:** REPRESENTATIVE GLENN GROTHMAN

**SUBJECT:** ASSEMBLY BILL 423

**DATE:** 08/21/2003

---

The purpose of this statement is to put a human, errr, a canine face on the drab legalese contained in Assembly Bill 423. Last year a constituent of mine had a chocolate lab named Copper – a loving and gentle family pet who is almost the fourth child in the family. Copper was involved in an automobile accident in which his lip was cut, unfortunately, a \$1000 of damage was done to a car. The family filed a claim under their homeowner's policy and the insurance company paid it. The family thought this was the end of the matter. Unfortunately, due to language contained in Wisconsin Statute 174, Copper will be penalized in future legal actions as if he was a vicious dog that bit someone. This family would not have their homeowners insurance renewed unless they put Copper to sleep. After about three weeks and going through three different insurance agents the family finally found insurance at almost twice the former rate. This is ridiculous.

I was in the legislature when the current law was passed. The intent was to deal with dangerous dogs. It is important to immediately change this law before any family pets must be put asleep unnecessarily. I ask the committee to move this bill quickly to the respective floors of the legislature.

PRESIDENT  
Lynn R. Laufenberg, Milwaukee  
PRESIDENT-ELECT  
Bruce R. Bachhuber, Green Bay  
VICE-PRESIDENT  
David M. Skoglund, Milwaukee  
SECRETARY  
Daniel A. Rottier, Madison  
TREASURER  
Robert L. Jaskulski, Milwaukee  
IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT  
Keith R. Clifford, Madison



[www.watl.org](http://www.watl.org)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
Jane E. Garrott  
44 E. Mifflin Street, Suite 103  
Madison, Wisconsin 53703-2897  
Telephone: 608/257-5741  
Fax: 608/255-9285  
[exec@watl.org](mailto:exec@watl.org)

**WISCONSIN STATE SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY,  
CORRECTIONS AND PRIVACY  
SEN. DAVE ZIEN, CHAIR  
AND  
WISCONSIN STATE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY  
REP. MARK GUNDRUM, CHAIR**

**PUBLIC HEARING ON  
ASSEMBLY BILL 423 AND SENATE BILL 229  
August 21, 2003**

**TESTIMONY OF  
ROBERT L. JASKULSKI  
ON BEHALF OF THE  
WISCONSIN ACADEMY OF TRIAL LAWYERS**

Good morning, Senator Zien, Representative Gundrum and committee members. My name is Robert L. Jaskulski. I am a partner in the Milwaukee law firm, Domnitz, Mawicke and Goisman, S.C. Today I appear on behalf of the Wisconsin Academy of Trial Lawyers (WATL), where I currently serve as Treasurer of the organization. On behalf of WATL, I thank you for the opportunity to appear today to testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 423 and Senate Bill 229.

WATL, established as a voluntary trial bar, is a non-profit corporation with approximately 1,000 members located throughout the state. The objectives and goals of WATL are the preservation of the civil jury trial system, the improvement of the administration of justice, the provision of

facts and information for legislative action, and the training of lawyers in all fields and phases of advocacy.

At common law, owners of animals were liable without fault for the activity of animals likely to roam (cattle, horses, sheep), wild or dangerous animals and domestic animals with vicious propensities.

Under Wis. Stat. § 174.02(1)(a), if a dog owner has no notice, liability for injury can be imposed on the owner of a dog for a person's full amount of damages if a dog injures or causes injury to a person, domestic animal or property.

Under Wis. Stat. § 174.02(1)(b), if a dog owner had notice his or her dog caused a previous injury; the dog's owner is liable for two times the full amount of damages.

The purpose of Wis. Stat. §174.02 is to protect those people who are not in a position to control the dog.

The current statute protects the public from dangerous dogs. Once owners learn they can be liable for double damages the second time a dog injures another person, domestic animal or property, there is a strong incentive for the owners to take steps to avoid future problems — training, leashing it or keeping it away from doors. We understand the attachment many individuals have with their dogs, but a dangerous dog is a threat to public safety. The double damages provision is an important safety feature and WATL opposes the changes in AB 423/SB 229.

We understand more insurance companies are looking hard at covering injuries caused by dogs. This is more of an insurance issue than a liability issue. Insurance companies may exclude coverage for dog injuries, especially if a dog has caused more than one injury. They also write policies excluding coverage for certain breeds of dogs. A recent *Wall Street Journal* article (Article attached) outlines how insurance companies are reevaluating risks in homeowner insurance policies. The article says,

Nationwide Insurance, for instance, won't insure homes where certain breeds of dog are present. Those include pit bulls, Dobermans, Rottweilers, chow-chows, Presa Carnarios and wolf hybrids. Nationwide says those dogs present an "increased risk of injury or death to children, adults or other animals."

Insurance companies know, probably better than most, which dogs are the biggest risks to cause injuries. When owners of dogs who harm people learn that their insurance carriers will no longer insure further dog injuries, the owners must make a decision — keep the dog that may attack again and lose your homeowners insurance or dispose of the dog.

If insurance availability is the main problem facing dog owners, this bill does nothing to address that problem. Nothing in AB 423/SB 229 guarantees insurers offer insurance coverage for all dogs. As the *Wall Street Journal* article reports, insurance coverage for dogs is an issue being faced across the country, not just in Wisconsin. Many of the insurance companies appear to have taken a position nationally on this issue. An insurance company writing insurance in several states is not likely to change its policy from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Therefore, AB 423/SB 229 serves only to punish victims of dog attacks.

Dog injuries are not isolated problems. Dog injuries have reached epidemic levels in the U.S. Nearly 2% of the U.S. population is injured by a dog each year according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in Atlanta, Georgia. This is more than 4.7 million people per year, most of who are children.

Ten to twenty people die each year as a result of dog injuries in the U.S. By far, the majority of victims are children. But for each fatality the researchers estimate there are 670 hospitalizations; 16,000 emergency room visits, 21,000 doctor and clinic visits; and 187,000 injuries that didn't require medical attention. Researchers estimate dog injuries cost more than \$100 million a year. The median age of a dog injury victim is 15, with children aged 5 to 9 having the highest rate of incidence.

We have seen numerous instances where a dog can injure a person, without biting or breaking the skin of a person. For example:

- A dog jumped through a screen door at a visitor and knocked her down the stairs backward and she suffered a severe head injury.
- A similar case, where a dog jumped through a screen door at a visitor and knocked her off the front steps causing back injuries.

- A dog jumped up and knocked over a bicyclist and bit him, but did not break the skin.
- A dog jumped up and knocked over an elderly person causing serious injury, but did not bite her.
- A dog ran into a person on a beach and blew out his knee.

In many of these instances, the owner knew the dog in question had these propensities and had done it in the past. There is no rhyme or reason why the first injury to give rise to double damages has to be a "bite that breaks the skin." Aggressive dogs can cause injury by jumping on/knocking down, or causing a person to be injured while trying to escape. The fortuity of an actual bite does not necessarily reflect either the aggressive nature of the dog or the awareness of the owner.

AB 423/SB 229 also require not only there be a dog bite, which "breaks the skin," but that the bite causes "permanent physical scarring or disfigurement." What happens if a minor child is viciously attacked and bitten, but then undergoes plastic surgery, which reduces the size and scope of the injury so it is hardly noticeable. Is it a "permanent" injury with the plastic surgery?

Also, why must not one, but two people virtually undergo dog maulings before double damages are allowed? That is like saying to count as attempted murder a person must be physically injured, but if the criminal misses his target he gets a free pass. It does not make sense.

We are perplexed by the addition of the "without provocation" language under proposed § 174.02(1)(b). The statute is already subject to § 895.045, Wis. Stat., the comparative negligence statute, which takes into account the actions of the dog, dog owner and the person bitten. It would appear the "without provocation" language is unnecessary. It is also uncertain how the court would view the additional "without provocation" language. For example, we envision a dog owner arguing his or her dog was provoked meaning he or she will be off the hook for any damages. An injured party would argue, it should be reviewed inside the framework of § 895.045 and reduce, but not eliminate liability entirely. The Court would have to decide what the Legislature intended.

The change may also be an important factor when dogs bite young children because under § 891.44, Wis. Stat., a child under age seven cannot be contributorily negligent. Does the Legislature intend by adding the "without provocation" language to hold children under age seven responsible when a dog bites them?

WATL has taken no position on the legislation raising the amount a dog owner can be fined when a dog causes injury by biting a person. We think it is a bit ironic that the fines are more than double when an owner has notice and a dog bites more than once, yet this bill limits the double damages provision for victims of dog bites. Why should the municipality recover a double fine, but the victim not be allowed double damages if a dog bites a second, third or fourth time?

WATL would support allowing any person to petition to have a dog killed if the dog caused serious injury on two occasions. This could save time and money for municipalities and allow people injured or threatened by dangerous dogs to be involved in protecting public safety.

A vicious attack by a dog is a frightening experience, which can result in serious injury and life-long scars. Owners of dogs who have injured someone should recognize the dog's dangerousness and take necessary steps to prevent it from happening again. If the owner does not take action and the dog injures again, we believe double damages are entirely appropriate because the purpose of Wis. Stat. §174.02 is to protect those people who are not in a position to control the dog. We urge committee members to reject AB 423/SB 229.



## The Legal Minefield In Your Own Backyard

### More Insurers Quit Covering The Staples of Suburbia; One Free Dog Bite Per Policy

By CHRISTOPHER OSTER

**P**LANNING ON a little backyard fun this summer? Your insurance company may have something to say about that.

Over the past year, homeowners insurers have gotten much stricter about who and what they will cover, as they try to turn around a business line that suddenly has become a huge money loser. That effort, which began with refusing to insure houses that had histories of water damage or multiple claims of any sort, is now spreading to a crackdown on some of the staples of suburban life. Among the targets: trampolines, swimming pools (especially those with diving boards) and even the family pet.

Insurers have become fixated on the tools of summer fun as a means of reducing their risks. While in the past a home inspection involved little more than an insurance-company employee taking a picture of a mailbox with an address number, this summer those reps are wandering into backyards to check for any risky apparatuses. Companies have in the past year added questions about trampolines to their policy application forms.

The result is that thousands of homeowners are being forced to scramble for basic coverage, some-

times paying hundreds of dollars a year in higher premiums in the process. Most insurers sell one-size-fits-all policies, which means that when certain items are creating outsize losses, they simply refuse to cover homes where those items are present. Nationwide Insurance, for instance, won't insure homes where certain breeds of dog are present. Those include pit bulls, Dobermans, Rottweilers, chow-chows, Presa Canarios and wolf hybrids. Nationwide says those dogs present an "increased risk of injury or death to children, adults or other animals."

But there are ways to get—or keep—coverage without spending a fortune on premiums. One is to turn the tables on your insurer. If they're giving you extra scrutiny, do the same to them by shopping around for coverage rather than staying loyal to one carrier. For example, Allstate Corp. covers diving boards while State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. doesn't, and Allstate will cover homes with pit bulls in some regions, but not in others.

Another tactic is to make sure they've got all the facts. If you've got a screen around your trampoline, make sure the insurer knows it; State Farm prefers screens around trampolines, and Nationwide requires the yard be fenced. Some of these rules are included in policies as ironclad rules, but others are merely guidelines that underwriters will consider when deciding whether to insure a home. Farmers Insurance Group has instituted a one-free-bite policy, which stipulates that the company will pay on one dog-bite claim for a policyholder, but after that won't cover any liability.

If your insurer finds out you have a banned item, they can't cancel the policy immediately. What they typically do is send you a nonrenewal notice when your policy comes up for renewal. At

Please Turn to Page D2, Column 4



#### Plus

What some major insurers will and won't cover

See Page D2

## Protecting Yourself from Your Neighbor

Insurers are cutting back on what they're willing to cover in a homeowners policy. Here's what the major insurers will and won't cover.



COMPANY	TRAMPOLINES	POOLS	BOATS	DOGS
<b>State Farm</b>	Case-by-case underwriting, prefers netting around trampoline.	Won't cover diving boards. May cancel policy.	Covers boat and related property for \$1,000. Limited liability coverage with amount depending on horsepower, type of boat and motor.	No exclusions, but will consider a dog's history when underwriting policies.
<b>Allstate</b>	No exclusions or prohibitions.	Covers pools with diving boards.	Covers boat and related property for \$1,000. Offers liability coverage on many boats under 26 feet in length.	In some regions, company won't insure homes possessing certain breeds including pit bulls, Rottweilers.
<b>Farmers</b>	No exclusions or prohibitions.	Covers pools with diving boards, if yard is fenced.	Offers limited coverage for sailboats up to 25 feet. No jetskis.	Company pays claim for one dog bite, but future bites are not covered.
<b>Nationwide</b>	Will cover if yard is fenced.	Covers pools with diving boards, if yard is fenced.	No property coverage for boats. Offers liability coverage for selected low-power watercraft.	Won't cover homes with chows, Dobermans, pit bulls and Rottweilers.

## More Insurers Quit Covering the Staples of Suburbia

*Continued From Page D1*

that point, policyholders have little recourse but to get rid of the banned item or find another insurer.

Trying to hide a diving board or trampoline from your insurer isn't a great idea. If there's an accident on a device that you're not supposed to have, the insurer may argue in court that you don't have coverage. And if your policy has clear language banning that device, you may be out of luck.

Homeowner insurers pull in more than \$30 billion a year in premiums, the second-biggest line of insurance, behind only auto coverage. In the past, it was considered a loss leader for that auto business, which is roughly four times as large and considered much more profitable.

Now, after losing \$11 billion writing homeowner policies over the past two years, insurers have sworn to make a profit on the business. One way of doing so is by steering clear of items they consider liability time bombs.

In response, some homeowners have simply chosen to get rid of the offending items and modify their backyards. Insurance agent Trey Hutt, in Panama City, Fla., recently had to drive to a client's home and photograph a backyard swimming pool after an insurer said it wouldn't cover the home that had a pool-side diving board. Mr. Hutt not only had

to show that the board had been removed, but that the attaching bolts were gone. After seeing the pictures, Tower Hill Insurance Group, of Gainesville, Fla., reinstated the policy.

Insurers say the sheer increase in the number of trampolines has created a liability problem. In 1989, there were 140,000 trampolines sold. By 1998, that number had jumped to 640,000. The number of trampoline injuries in that period nearly tripled, to 100,000 in 1999.

Just the same, homeowners aren't likely to ditch their backyard diversions. Robert Hartwig, chief economist for the Insurance Information Institute, says people are putting jungle gyms and trampolines in their backyards to better keep an eye on their kids in response to Elizabeth Smart-type kidnapping stories.

In Chicago, agent Rebecca Woan said Hartford Financial Services Group Inc. wouldn't renew the policy for one of her clients late last year after the insurer discovered the policyholder had a trampoline in the backyard. "Up until that point, I wasn't aware they didn't want trampolines," says Ms. Woan. "Now it's part of their application process."

Hartford says it has declined to insure homes with trampolines and pool-side diving boards since 1996, although it says underwriters can consider loss history for policyholders renewing policies.

Some insurers simply won't cover cer-

tain items—as with Nationwide and certain dog breeds or State Farm with diving boards. If that's the case, a midsize insurer, such as Safeco Corp., may be perfectly willing to cover your trampoline.

The best way to find out who covers what is by shopping online—at sites such as insurance.com and insure.com—and by checking with an independent agent.

You might wind up paying more, however, no matter how hard you check. James Armitage, an independent agent in South Pasadena, Calif., recently replaced his client's insurers with Safeco because of problems with a trampoline. But in doing so, the person wound up paying \$200 more a year in premiums, because the client no longer had his home and auto insurance with the same insurer, which had earned him a discount.

For some items, the best bet may be to buy a separate policy. If it's a Jet Ski or Ski-Doo—or a bigger powerboat—you're after, plan on finding a separate policy.

One thing that isn't an option, getting a policy that excludes the one thing at your house the insurer doesn't want to cover. "If they decide they're not comfortable with a trampoline, they'll decline the entire house," says Ms. Woan. "We've asked companies to add a surcharge for something that's a higher risk. They tell us they just don't want them."

**Testimony of Sharon Tague  
601 S. Pine Street  
Weyauwega, Wisconsin 54983**

**Speaking Against Assembly Bill 423 and Senate Bill 229**

May 23, 1995 started as an ordinary day for my husband, John Tague, a U.S. postal worker. As usual, John was walking from house-to-house delivering the mail to the residents of Appleton, Wisconsin. However, something startling happened that day.

While on his route, two dogs broke through a screen door and ran to where my husband was delivering mail, two doors down from where the dogs escaped. Obviously frightened, John turned to ward off the dogs. As the two dogs were barking, they and came within a foot and a half of John's feet and he collapsed backwards down the steps. Because of the stress placed on my husband's heart by the surprise dog attack, he died of sudden cardiac death due to ventricular fibrillation. John was only 45 years old when he died.

Apparently the dog owner had just left his house to go to the grocery store leaving the front door to his house open, with only a thin, mesh, screen door keeping his two dogs inside. The dogs easily broke through the mesh to chase my husband.

Initially the dog owner denied responsibility and claimed this was an isolated incident. However, prior to this incident, the dog owner was repeatedly placed on notice about his dogs' disturbing conduct. On 8/21/94, 11/1/94, 12/24/94, 1/2/95, and again on 3/4/95, the dog owner received notice from the police that his barking dogs were creating a public nuisance. Several days after the 3/4/95 notice, the owner told the police that he would make sure his dogs did not get outside when he was not present. Weeks later, on 3/24/95, he received notice from the police that his two dogs were running at large.

After all of these complaints, after all the dog owner's assurances, and after his two dogs caused the death of John, the conduct did not change. On 6/13/95, the dog

owner received a citation because his dogs were again running at large. On that particular instance, the dogs came through the front door, just as they had for John. Although a police officer came to the owner's house to ask questions, he refused to answer the door. The officer noted in his report that the dog owner had also received a prior summons for a dog at large on 9/15/94. Days later, on 6/17/95, Roth again received a citation because his dogs were running at large. On 7/2/95, Roth received a citation because his barking dogs were creating a public nuisance.

In other words, the dog owner knew that his dogs had a tendency to run at large. He also knew that his dogs continuously bark at all hours, disturbing the neighbors. While the owner knew the propensities of his dogs, he failed to take the reasonable step of closing the front door to his house and preventing his dogs from escaping to chase my husband.

I believe the dog owner was negligent. Whether he is home, away, or leaves his dog with another keeper, the owner consistently fails to keep his dogs under control. Because of the owner's negligence, his neighbors are disturbed and society is at risk. Moreover, because of his conduct, my husband is dead.

In this instance, the dogs did not bite, but they did kill my husband. Under Assembly Bill 423 and Senate Bill 229, this injury would not be subject to double damages. I think that is wrong. Dogs can cause serious injuries and even death without biting someone.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

**Re: Assembly Bill 423  
Potential Change to Wis. Stat. 174.02**

Dear Judiciary Committee Member,

On July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2003, our 3 year old son, 'Skyler', was **attacked and severely mauled by a neighbor's 120lb. dog, 'Gilbert'**. He spent a week in two hospitals and underwent two plastic & reconstructive facial surgeries, including repair of orbital (facial) fractures from one of the bites. Further surgery is anticipated. This is in addition to the significant emotional trauma he has endured, and will yet need to deal with going forward. His 7 year old brother was near him and witnessed the attack, screaming helplessly, and now feels responsible for not having helped his little brother. Our family life, of course, has been turned upside down from the entire traumatic event and its aftermath.

What makes this situation all the worse & unacceptable is the fact that **it was entirely avoidable and clearly predictable given 'Gilbert's' history**. The attacking dog was previously known to the owners to have aggressive behaviors, and only 18 months prior had injured another young girl in our neighborhood, 'Chloe'. While a visitor in their home, Chloe simply walked past the dog, and was suddenly attacked. She was knocked down to the ground by the force of the dog, with the animal surrounding & covering her entire face with his open mouth & teeth, pinning her down on the ground. The owner interrupted the attack at that point. Chloe was severely bruised in her face, as well as emotionally shaken. Fortunately, there were no breaks in her skin from the teeth...only the severe bruises and the cuts and scrapes from the attack. Chloe was lucky that someone was close enough to interrupt the attack. **Unfortunately for us, our 3 year old Skyler was not so lucky.**

This dog clearly showed to its owners it would, and had, attacked someone. It was only a matter of time until the next attack would occur. We, as citizens of Wisconsin, look to you, our legislators, to act in our behalf when constructing the laws of our state. The current Wisconsin statutes were written with such a goal in mind, holding someone with a dog who has portrayed its aggressive behavior by previously injuring another, to a higher level of responsibility & liability. There is absolutely no reason this should be changed. **AB 423** would seek to significantly reduce the protection of the citizens of Wisconsin, while at the same time significantly reduce the likelihood of any added liability/responsibility on the part of the owner of a dog who has previously injured. ***It would in effect actually encourage irresponsible dog ownership.***


To change the current law, and now require that a dog have '*bit a person previously with such force & to such an extent that it caused skin breaks & permanent physical scarring or disfigurement*', is not only sad, it is immoral & unconscionable.


**The only one who would ever benefit by such a change would be an insurance company.**


The laws of Wisconsin are here to guide & protect the citizens. **This is exactly why AB 423 is not only a bad idea**, it is a terrible idea and would be a shame for the people of Wisconsin. The laws are not in place to be bent and molded to insurance company desires. **The insurance industry has other, much more appropriate ways, to deal with this liability issue or any other it dislikes.** They have free will to write their homeowners policy (as they do with nearly all other policies) in any manner they desire, including the simple step of adding a single line that addresses dogs specifically, especially those with a prior history of injuring. As citizens, we have no easy alternative redress for protection. We depend upon the laws for this.

On behalf of my entire family, especially our helpless 3 year old son Skyler, and the countless others in Wisconsin who may one day find themselves in the unfortunate & totally avoidable situation we are now in, we urge you with all our hearts to **not support AB 423**. *Please keep the laws of Wisconsin as they now are, fair and just, by requiring responsibility on the part of dangerous dog owners.*

Thank you

  
Richard A. Chase, M.D.

  
Kristi M. Chase



## Vote Record

# Committee on Judiciary, Corrections and Privacy

Date: 1-8-4

Moved by: Fitz

Seconded by: Zien

AB 423 SB \_\_\_\_\_ Clearinghouse Rule \_\_\_\_\_  
 AJR \_\_\_\_\_ SJR \_\_\_\_\_ Appointment \_\_\_\_\_  
 AR \_\_\_\_\_ SR \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_  
 A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_ to A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_  
 A/S Sub Amdt \_\_\_\_\_  
 A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_ to A/S Sub Amdt \_\_\_\_\_  
 A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_ to A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_ to A/S Sub Amdt \_\_\_\_\_

Be recommended for:  
 Passage     Adoption     Confirmation     Concurrence     Indefinite Postponement  
 Introduction     Rejection     Tabling     Nonconcurrency

<u>Committee Member</u>	<u>Aye</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Not Voting</u>
Senator David Zien, Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator Scott Fitzgerald	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator Cathy Stepp <i>Poll</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator Tim Carpenter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator G. Spencer Coggs <i>Poll</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Totals:** \_\_\_\_\_

~~AAA~~

AB 423

SB 229

Gundram  $\Delta$ 's  
w/ Rep Stastunus

Ins Co's -  $\Delta$  1<sup>st</sup> "attack" to  
really mean an attack; eliminate  
property - (puppy chew teppanware,  
dog scratch paint on car)  
→ Surcharge for people who own dogs?