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| **BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE** Interested parties contend that the police departments of certain municipalities, such as the City of Paducah in Cottle County, should be the animal control authorities for those municipalities. S.B. 2283 seeks to address this issue by designating certain police departments as animal control authorities for certain purposes. |
| **CRIMINAL JUSTICE IMPACT**It is the committee's opinion that this bill does not expressly create a criminal offense, increase the punishment for an existing criminal offense or category of offenses, or change the eligibility of a person for community supervision, parole, or mandatory supervision. |
| **RULEMAKING AUTHORITY** It is the committee's opinion that this bill does not expressly grant any additional rulemaking authority to a state officer, department, agency, or institution. |
| **ANALYSIS** S.B. 2283 amends the Health and Safety Code to establish that, for purposes of provisions relating to dogs that attack persons or are a danger to persons and provisions relating to dangerous dogs, the police department of an incorporated municipality that has a population of more than 1,000 and that is the county seat of a county with a population of less than 1,600 is the animal control authority for the municipality in all areas in which a dog is kept and that are subject to the authority of the police department.  |
| **EFFECTIVE DATE** September 1, 2017. |