

**CORRESPONDENCE**  
**(Continued)**

**Stewart, Jana**

---

**From:** Joel Aldape <joealdape@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 09, 2014 2:39 PM  
**To:** Madison, Steve  
**Cc:** Bogaard, Bill  
**Subject:** Against breed-specific legislation

Mr. Madison:

I am completely opposed to breed-specific legislation. I own a 3 year old pit bull who is the most loving, loyal and gentle dog you could ever know.



Human beings are the reason why dogs (all breed types, not just pit bulls) behave badly.

Educating humans about the importance of being responsible dog owners is the solution.

Investigating and charging humans who lead dog-fighting operations is the solution.

Dogs are innocent victims at the hands of humans.

There are many good people out there who teach humans to be responsible dog owners.

One of them is Dog Man, who helps owners train pit bulls (and other breeds) for free every Sunday morning at the LA Coliseum.

<https://www.facebook.com/PitForLife>

Another organization is Los Angeles Responsible Pit Bull Owners.

<http://www.meetup.com/LARPBOCOMMUNITY/>

I suggest you contact these organizations to learn about their good work and to develop a constructive solution (other than breed-specific legislation) to prevent dog bites.

Sincerely,

Joel Aldape  
Concerned Pit Bull Owner

**Stewart, Jana**

---

**From:** Zia Bossenmeyer <ziasavesdogs@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 16, 2014 2:28 PM  
**To:** Bogaard, Bill  
**Subject:** Disappointed with no meeting  
**Attachments:** MSN Pasadena.pdf

Dear Mr. Mayor,

I'm disappointed that you don't have time to fit into your schedule to talk to anyone before the very important vote occurring on Jan 27. Mandatory Spay Neuter is a policy or ordinance that will create a lot of ill affects for the community and larger.

Please don't make the same mistakes Riverside County and San Bernardino County have recently made. Attached is a document with ACTUAL VERIFIABLE research, case studies, etc from REAL SOURCES. Not hate groups like [dogsbite.org](http://dogsbite.org) website Madison keeps sourcing which is a hate group founded by a lady who was bit years ago.

I URGE YOU TO PROPERLY EDUCATE YOURSELF BEFORE THE VOTE. Please review the attachment.

**Stewart, Jana**

---

**From:** Danielle Bradford <dbradford121@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 5:08 PM  
**To:** De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry  
**Subject:** Pitbull ban

I oppose any law that discriminates against a breed of dog

**Stewart, Jana**

---

**From:** Petrea Burchard <pb@petreaburchard.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 21, 2014 2:40 PM  
**Subject:** Potential BSL in Pasadena

Dear Mr. Mayor and members of the City Council,

I look forward to an interesting discussion January 27th about potential Breed-Specific Legislation in Pasadena. I saw some video from a previous meeting and it seems that the issue is being approached emotionally from both sides. In an effort to present an even-handed view, here is a report from the American Bar Association's magazine, dated 2009, that was sent to me by a resident of District 6.

[https://www.americanbar.org/newsletter/publications/gp\\_solo\\_magazine\\_home/gp\\_solo\\_magazine\\_index/pitbull.html](https://www.americanbar.org/newsletter/publications/gp_solo_magazine_home/gp_solo_magazine_index/pitbull.html)

I hope you'll all take the time to read it as there's a great deal of food for thought here. Between now and the 27th, I'll see if I can find more recent, reliable information.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Petrea Burchard Sandel  
626-253-1441  
91104

## Stewart, Jana

---

**From:** Petrea Burchard <pb@petreaburchard.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 23, 2014 10:21 AM  
**Subject:** More on BSL

Dear Mayor Bogaard and members of the City Council,

I've been researching Breed-Specific Legislation on the internet, limiting myself to websites operated by reputable organizations. There are emotionally biased sites on both sides but I don't find these reliable.

In addition to the organizations below, I have written to the American Kennel Club to find out their position and will share that with you if and when they respond.

\*\*\*\*\*

The ASPCA's position paper on BSL says "The consequences [of BSL] have been disastrous..." (for municipalities). (see paragraph 5). This relates not only to outlawing a breed but to targeted spay/neuter laws as well.

<http://www.aspc.org/about-us/aspc-policy-and-position-statements/position-statement-on-breed-specific-legislation>

"...the ASPCA is not aware of credible evidence that breed-specific laws make communities safer either for people or other companion animals. There is, however, evidence that such laws unfairly target responsible pet guardians and their well-socialized dogs, are inhumane, and impede community safety and humane sheltering efforts (Sacks et al., 2000; Wapner, 2000; Taylor, 2004)."

\*\*\*\*\*

The **National Canine Research Council** has a BSL FAQ page. They answer many questions, including those about costs to the city for enforcement, kenneling while awaiting identification and litigation, and euthanasia.  
<http://nationalcanineresearchcouncil.com/dog-legislation/breed-specific-legislation-bsl-faq/>

"Effective laws hold dog owners responsible..."

### **Q. How costly is it to implement and enforce BSL?**

BSL is very costly, penalizes responsible pet owners, diverts resources, and is open to challenge.

- - • Use the Best Friends Fiscal Impact Calculator: <http://bestfriends.guerrillaeconomics.net/> to calculate an estimate of the additional expenses for your community (and you as a taxpayer) that will result from BSL: costs for enforcement, kenneling, euthanasia and litigation, among others.

- See more at: <http://nationalcanineresearchcouncil.com/dog-legislation/breed-specific-legislation-bsl-faq/#sthash.7bEf5ZL8.dpuf>

## Q. How costly is it to implement and enforce BSL?

BSL is very costly, penalizes responsible pet owners, diverts resources, and is open to challenge.

- - • Use the Best Friends Fiscal Impact Calculator: <http://bestfriends.guerrillaeconomics.net/> to calculate an estimate of the additional expenses for your community (and you as a taxpayer) that will result from BSL: costs for enforcement, kenneling, euthanasia and litigation, among others.

- See more at: <http://nationalcanineresearchcouncil.com/dog-legislation/breed-specific-legislation-bsl-faq/#sthash.7bEf5ZL8.dpuf>

\*\*\*\*\*

The **American Humane Association** says simply, "BSL does not work."  
<http://www.americanhumane.org/animals/stop-animal-abuse/fact-sheets/breed-specific-legislation.html>

\*\*\*\*\*

The **American Veterinary Association's** website, while not coming out and saying they're against it, has a page on "why BSL is not the answer:"  
<https://www.avma.org/public/Pages/Why-Breed-Specific-Legislation-is-not-the-Answer.aspx>

\*\*\*\*\*

I admit to my own bias on the subject. However, the only websites I could find that advocate BSL are emotion-based and unreliable. If we look at statistics and stick with science, we discover that Breed-Specific Legislation does not work. Even for a spay/neuter law, we must include all dogs.

Our pet legislation could use some updating. For example, our current dog licensing laws are perhaps too soft on people who don't spay/neuter their animals. One thing we could do is make the licensing fee much higher for non-neutered animals. You may note that in the report I sent you January 21st from the American Bar Association, most dog bite incidents involved non-neutered dogs and could have been prevented by proper care, socialization and training (see below).

[https://www.americanbar.org/newsletter/publications/gp\\_solo\\_magazine\\_home/gp\\_solo\\_magazine\\_index/pitbull.html](https://www.americanbar.org/newsletter/publications/gp_solo_magazine_home/gp_solo_magazine_index/pitbull.html)

"The National Canine Research Council has identified the most common factors found in fatal dog attacks occurring in 2006:



97 percent of the dogs involved were not spayed or neutered.

84 percent of the attacks involved owners who had abused or neglected their dogs, failed to contain their dogs, or failed to properly chain their dogs.

78 percent of the dogs were not kept as pets but as guard, breeding, or yard dogs."

Thanks for reading.

Sincerely,

Petrea Burchard Sandel

District 3

626-253-1441

## Stewart, Jana

---

**From:** randa thibodeaux <randat@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 4:17 PM  
**To:** De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry  
**Subject:** Please consider

Dear City of Pasadena Council Member:

Please do not ban Pit Bulls, they are very good and loyal dogs. It is poor owners that make bad dogs. Instead make stronger laws and policies against animal abuse to punish the people who are hurting dogs and forcing them to hurt others. Also, providing the opportunity to control the dog population with neutering and spaying help control the number of animals in shelters that are innocent yet killed.

Please seriously consider this - the Pit Bull Terrier is not a bad dog, they have been mistreated by humans and forced to fight and trained to be aggressive, they are not naturally aggressive. The research is out there and supports these facts!

Thank you for your time,

Randa Burden  
Pit Bull owner and  
Elementary school teacher!

## Stewart, Jana

---

**From:** csunbean@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 4:03 PM  
**To:** De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry  
**Subject:** Pitbulls

Ban or strongly restrict ownership of pitbulls and fighting breeds. The first fatality of 2014 has already occurred in Texas. Groups are getting organized on and off line to fight the wealthy dog fighter supported pitbull fad that leaves a US citizen without a body part due to a pitbull attack every 4 days now.

We will vote accordingly. You can listen to the well organized pitbull groupies who will call, email, and show up, but as Miami Dade Florida showed recently, the quiet voice of voters overwhelmingly squashed the animal advocates by an over two to one margin, to keep their decades old ban.. Despite celebs, parades, petitions and hoopla promoting pitbulls for months. Farmers dropped pitbulls coverage for a reason.

There is truly nothing more positive you can do for the citizens than pass regulations to protect people from pitbulls..establish home rule and get it done.

The Pitbull propaganda machine revealed, Californians for pitbull regulations. and other facebook groups mean business. Victims rallies are being organized. I will vote for those who protect the innocent ... including the many children mauled and killed by pitbulls.  
thank you  
Joan Caldwell

**Stewart, Jana**

---

**From:** meromero15@gmail.com on behalf of Anna C <apchen15@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 20, 2014 5:02 PM  
**To:** Bogaard, Bill; Robinson, Jacque; McAustin, Margaret; Kennedy, John; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; Beck, Michael; Gutierrez, Julie; Mermell, Steve; Bagneris, Michele; cityclerk; Foster, Siobhan; Walsh, Eric  
**Subject:** No Breed Specific Legislation for Pasadena  
**Categories:** Yellow Category

Hello,

When I chose to purchase a residence in Pasadena two years ago, it was because I felt Pasadena was a beautiful city with a lot to offer. However, it seems that the longer I live here, the more this city is trying to restrict the things I love...one of which is my dog, whom I rescued three years ago and who has been nothing but a sweet, wonderful companion.

I am a responsible dog owner. I work constantly with my dog and make sure I am never in a position in which I cannot keep track of her because I know that even though she is very friendly, not everyone likes being approached by a dog. I had her spayed - not because the law told me to, but because I knew it was the right thing to do. I pay for her license and make sure her shots are up to date. And yet it seems that being a responsible dog owner is not enough to keep from being discriminated against, just because I chose to rescue a dog had the audacity to be born.

**I strongly ask the council to vote NO to any breed specific legislation. Breed specific legislation (BSL) is wrong, unfair to the owners, and to the animals in question. This type of legislation alienates residents, victimizes low-income families, and fails to ensure community and public safety as all it does it encourage discrimination under false pretenses and does nothing to educate the public.**

Enforce the laws already on the books, laws which apply to ALL dogs regardless of breed, and enforce the laws against ALL irresponsible pet owners. Focus on providing owner support and resources, rather than ineffective BSL measures. If this were really about overpopulation then it should address all dog breeds, and please don't tell me what other cities, or what Riverside or San Bernardino County is doing because I did not choose to live in those places - and the fact that they would pass BSL ordinances are just further marks against them in my book. I chose to live in Pasadena, and I hope that in the coming years, I do not come to regret this choice.

Thank you for your time.

Anna Chen  
355 S Los Robles Ave. #340  
91101

**Stewart, Jana**

---

**From:** Carolyn Deyoe <carolyn@labelimpressions.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 07, 2014 7:58 AM  
**To:** De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry  
**Subject:** Please don't discriminate

It has come to my attention that some council members from the beautiful City of Pasadena are trying to overturn the state wide law prohibiting breed specific legislation. While I'm sure you have received many zealous and fact filled emails, please just remember this: You would not want to be banned from something or somewhere due to your race, sex or religious preferences, so neither should any specific breed of dog be discriminated against. Some people do bad things, some dogs do bad things. Some people are kind, some dogs are kind. You cannot say all "\_\_\_\_\_ people are bad" and neither can you say "all pit bull type dogs are bad".

I, and most pit bull owners I know, are supportive of laws that keep people safe and dogs with a bite history out of the public. I do believe that those types of laws should apply to ALL dogs based on personal history rather than on one type of dog based on fear and misinformation.

As a member of the Los Angeles Responsible Pit Bull Owners I know that there are amazing, calm, well trained pit bulls everywhere. Proper training and proper lifestyle/socialization of dogs of all breeds is integral to keeping the public safe. Let's all work together for this better solution.

Sincerely,  
Carolyn Deyoe  
714-470-3258

PIT BULL

**Stewart, Jana**

---

**From:** teresa5183@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 08, 2014 8:55 AM  
**To:** De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry  
**Subject:** pitbull elimination

I am a teacher, grandmother, and animal owner. This idea that everything would be safer without one breed of dog is ludicrous. Animals are creatures from God and unfortunately it is people who treat them wrong or raise them to be aggressive that makes them the way they are. As a taxpayer I feel outraged that you would consider using money to get rid of dogs. I think that using it to put more restrictions on pet owners would be better use of your money. There is so much abuse out there and killing dogs will not correct the concerns you have. You need to get to the root of the problem. I don't have a pit bull, but I have met many that are sweet, kind creatures because they have been raised with love. I'm not sure how killing these animals can be an answer to anything. Please use your position to make things better for these innocent animals.

Terry Earsley

**Stewart, Jana**

---

**From:** owenfelks@netzero.com  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 8:46 PM  
**To:** De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry

To whom it may concern

I am writing you this letter in regard to the movement to enact Breed Specific Laws to ban Pit Bulls. I have owned and still own a Pit Bull. I am a responsible pet owner and have taken the time to ensure my pets have been cared for and trained properly. The BSL's you are proposing will be taking family dogs that are loved and cared for as family away without cause. Those who are not taking care of their pets will continue to do so without regard to any laws enacted by yourself or any other city considering such laws. The current laws that are there to protect all animals can't be properly enforced now, we don't need more laws to prevent law abiding citizens from responsibly owning their dogs. We however do need to enforce the laws that are out to protect these animals from the abuse they are suffering every day. I also believe that the cost of enforcing such laws would be much more useful in offering low cost spay and neutering, vaccination, public education and training.

Sincerely,  
Robert Felkins

---

**How Cruise Lines Fill All Those Unsold Cabins?**  
(HINT: You will want to book a cruise after you read this...)  
[LifestyleJournal.com](http://LifestyleJournal.com)

## Stewart, Jana

---

**From:** Carrie Fleig <ohcarie@live.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 10:55 PM  
**To:** De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry  
**Cc:** Carrie Fleig  
**Subject:** Breed Specific Ordinances being considered by Pasadena

Hello,

I hear that you are considering enacting a breed specific ordinance on Pasadena. I ask that you seriously reconsider this action as it is discriminatory and ineffective. Twelve years ago I went to the LA County shelter and stumbled across what was labeled as a "staffordshire terrier mix." I fell in love, but went home to research the breed. Apparently it's a euphemism for pit bull, and the information I discovered had some negative parts, yet I found overwhelming evidence for people being happy with these wonderful creatures.

I immediately returned to the shelter to adopt this young pit bull and brought her home to my three cats and roommates in Los Feliz. To this day, she has never chewed a shoe, never harmed a fly, and now is my right hand girl to rehabbing foster cats for the shelter (we have 8 currently). Everyone who meets her loves her within minutes, despite their prejudices going in. She has better manners than any dog I know and is invited to all get togethers (I get chastised when I do NOT bring her to parties.)

She has cheered up numerous old folks at the convalescent home nearby and can almost cured all depression in her vicinity.

Come up with a better solution to your overpopulation problem, such as outreach for spay and neuter, expanded training and classes, and education. Come on, I expect better of one of California's most progressive city.

Sincerely,  
Carrie Fleig  
Social worker, animal lover, and voter.



**Stewart, Jana**

---

**From:** Shannon Graham <scgraham08@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 2:54 PM  
**To:** De La Cuba, Vannia; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; Tornek, Terry  
**Subject:** Request to re-consider your proposal to ban pit bulls in Pasadena

It's my understanding that the City of Pasadena is looking to ban the Pit Bull breed. I'm writing to urge you not to do that for ANY breed of dog. The Pit Bull is one of THE most mis-understood breeds. About 1 year ago, I was looking to rescue a dog from a local rescue organization and I came across a pit bull/boston terrier mix. His name is Zuko and has a cute crooked tail. There are so many pit bulls that are unwanted because of threats to a such ban, but I felt that I could be one of the few to adopt them. Zuko is such a good dog and alerts me when someone is at my door or approaching me. You see, I'm deaf and I trained him to respond to some sounds. It is because of him that I feel more secure at my own home, hotels, and on walks. I live in CA and would be heartbroken if my district or county were to ban pit mix breeds. I would urge you to re-consider the ban and redirect the focus to owners, by which require them to take dog classes or strengthen dog care policies, such as not allowing dogs to be chained outside, etc. Those kinds of laws would encourage owners to become aware of how to care for pets.

Sincerely,  
Shannon Graham

**Flores, Valerie**

---

**To:** cityclerk  
**Subject:** RE: Information regarding the Proposed Mandatory Spay and Neuter Ordinance of Pit Bulls in Pasadena

**From:** GP Juarez [<mailto:bullysonkid@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 22, 2014 12:22 PM  
**To:** Bogaard, Bill; Robinson, Jacque; McAustin, Margaret; Kennedy, John; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; Beck, Michael; Gutierrez, Julie; Mermell, Steve; Bagneris, Michele; cityclerk; Foster, Siobhan; Walsh, Eric  
**Subject:** Information regarding the Proposed Mandatory Spay and Neuter Ordinance of Pit Bulls in Pasadena



Good Afternoon,

I am hoping that my organization and I can be of assistance regarding the proposed ordinance mandating the spay/neuter of Pit Bulls in Pasadena. We have compiled information regarding the subject for your review from credible peer reviewed sources. The packet covers all facets of the subject, including the effects similar ordinances have had on other cities here in California. Please feel free to contact me to discuss as we would like to partner with the city to develop a program that addresses public safety and responsible dog owners.

Best Regards

*Garland Juarez*

*Executive Director*

*American Preservation Dog Registry*

*925.525.3661*

[gjuarez@apdrdogs.com](mailto:gjuarez@apdrdogs.com)

*We are what we repeatedly do. Excellence, therefore, is not an act but a habit. – Aristotle*



American Preservation Dog Registry  
3053 Freeport Blvd #425  
Sacramento, CA 95918  
916-800-DOGS (3647)  
info@apdrdogs.com

# **Opposition to Proposed Mandatory Spay/Neuter Ordinance in City of Pasadena**

## Public Safety And Dogs

A mandatory spay-neuter ordinance for pit bull type breeds has been proposed for the City of Pasadena. While well intended, this is a distracting and counterproductive policy for a number of reasons.

Mandatory spay-neuter ordinances have been implemented in several jurisdictions. The results of these are

- no decrease in dog bite incidents. A similar ordinance passed in San Francisco and dog bite incidents increased by 13%.
- increase in pets surrendered to animal shelters because low-income pet owners who cannot afford the fines or the costs for sterilization surgery end up having to relinquish their pets to shelters
- increase in euthanasias of pets in shelters due to the increase in owner surrenders
- increase in animal control costs associated with the increased shelter intakes and increased enforcement
- decrease in dog licensing compliance as many dog owners who fear losing their family pets hide them from authorities
- decrease in dog licensing income because of the decreased licensing compliance

While supporters of breed specific legislation point to a study by CDC researchers published by the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), both the CDC and AVMA have produced formal responses repudiating the use of this study for that purpose saying the study cannot be used to determine which breeds are more likely to cause fatal dog bites or other bites.

Laws that target specific breeds have been proven to be ineffective, too costly to implement and put all dogs at risk including all breeds and family pets. To help ensure public safety, the city should instead take an overall approach to amending its animal code, focus on enforcing responsible pet owner and provide a community-based, proactive educational program for its residents. Cities and governments that are effectively dealing with the issue have the following in common

**Programs** include the following components:

- **Guidelines for Responsible Pet Ownership**
- **Guidelines to Ensure Proper Containment of dogs including fencing**
- **Proactive Education Program for Grade school children**
- **Free and Low Cost Spay and Neutering Services**
- **Vaccination/Licensing/Training Clinics**
- **Dog Ownership Education and Handling Classes**
- **Public Incentive Program for Responsible Ownership**

We believe that we have many shared objectives in common and that it would be more effective and less costly to the City of Pasadena to partner with the APDR and other interested parties to provide community resources to help educate the “uneducated owners”, support the responsible owners and penalize the reckless owners all the while improving public safety and creating a compassionate community. Please contact us to explore alternatives to the proposed ordinance as in every instance it has been implemented it has failed with the issue getting worse on all levels. For your review we have compiled data regarding all aspects regarding the subject from credible sources.



1931 N. Meacham Rd.  
Suite 100  
Schaumburg, IL  
60173-4360  
  
phone 847.925.8070  
800.248.2862  
fax 847.925.1329  
www.avma.org

To Whom It May Concern:

Attached, as requested, please find a copy of the report titled "Breeds of dogs involved in fatal human attacks in the United States between 1979 and 1998" and published in the September 15, 2000 issue of the *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*.

In your review of this report, please be cognizant of the following:

- This study was NOT conducted by the American Veterinary Medical Association, but by individual investigators from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Humane Society of the United States, and the American Veterinary Medical Association. The report underwent the standard review process required for publication of scientific reports published in the *Journal of the AVMA*.
- In contrast to what has been reported in the news media, the data contained within this report **CANNOT be used to infer any breed-specific risk** for dog bite fatalities (e.g., neither pit bull-type dogs nor Rottweilers can be said to be more "dangerous" than any other breed based on the contents of this report). To obtain such risk information it would be necessary to know the numbers of each breed currently residing in the United States. Such information is not available.
- Data in this report indicate that the number of dogs of a given breed associated with fatal human attacks varies over time, further suggesting that such data should not be used to support the inherent "dangerousness" of any particular breed. More than 25 breeds have been involved in fatal human attacks over the 20-year period summarized in this report.
- Fatal attacks represent a small proportion of dog bite injuries to humans and, therefore, should not be the primary factor driving public policy concerning dangerous dogs.
- Strategies that can be used in an effort to prevent dog bites include enforcement of generic, non-breed-specific dangerous dog laws, with an emphasis on chronically irresponsible owners; enforcement of animal control ordinances such as leash laws; prohibition of dog fighting; encouraging neutering; and school-based and adult education programs that teach pet selection strategies, pet care and responsibility, and bite prevention.

*A copy of this report has been provided by the publisher for your convenience. It may not be reproduced in any manner, including (but not limited to) reprinting, photocopying, electronic storage or transmission or uploading onto the Internet. It may not be redistributed, amended, or overprinted, nor may it be attached to other documents containing company information or promotional messages.*



Search:

[Email this page](#)  
[Printer-friendly version](#)

View By Topics

**[A-Z Injury Topics](#)**

**[CDC Injury Fact Book](#)**

**[Data & Statistics](#)**

**[Fact Sheets](#)**

**[Funding and Research](#)**

**[Podcasts](#)**

**[Publications](#)**

**[Injury Response Overview](#)**

[Acute Injury Care](#)

[Alcohol Screening and Brief Intervention](#)

[Mass Casualties](#)

[State Programs](#)

[Traumatic Brain Injury](#)

**[Violence Prevention Overview](#)**

[Child Maltreatment](#)

[Intimate Partner Violence](#)

[Sexual Violence](#)

[School Violence](#)

[Suicide](#)

[Youth Violence](#)

**[Unintentional Injury Prevention Overview](#)**

[Child Passenger Safety](#)

[Preventing Falls](#)

[Among Older Adults](#)

[Fire Deaths and Injuries](#)

[Fireworks Injury Prevention](#)

[Impaired Driving](#)

[Older Adult Drivers](#)

[Playground Injuries](#)

[Poisoning](#)

[Teen Drivers](#)

[Water-Related Injuries](#)

**[Information Resources](#)**

[Calendar](#)

[Related Web Sites](#)

[Archived Features](#)

**[About CDC Injury Center](#)**

[Center Overview](#)

[Organizational Charts](#)

[Injury Center](#)

[Listserv](#)

**Contact CDC**

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,  
 National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (NCIPC)  
 4770 Buford Hwy, NE

NCIPC Bibliography of Articles on Dog Bites

**Dog Bite Prevention Navigation**  
[Prevention Week Publications](#)

- **AVMA Task Force on Canine Aggression and Human-Canine Interactions. A community approach to dog bite prevention.\* JAVMA 2001; 218: 1732-1749.** This 2001 report, intended for communities interested in developing a comprehensive bite prevention program, includes model legislation for the control of dangerous dogs.
- **CDC. Nonfatal Dog Bite--Related Injuries Treated in Hospital Emergency Departments--United States, 2001. MMWR 2003; 52(26): 605-610.**
- **CDC. Dog-Bite-Related Fatalities - United States, 1995-1996. MMWR 1997;46:463-7.** Details are provided on the approximately 12 annual deaths from dog attacks. Data are provided on dog breeds involved in fatal attacks from 1979. Recommendations on reducing dog bites are included.
- **Gershman KA, Sacks JJ, Wright JC. Which dogs bite? A case-control study of risk factors. Pediatrics 1994;93:913-7.** Biting and non-biting dogs in Denver are compared. Biting dogs were more likely to be male, unneutered, and chained.
- **Quinlan KP, Sacks JJ. Hospitalizations for Dog Bite Injuries [letter] JAMA 1999; 281:232-233.** Data are provided on the 6,000 hospitalizations for dog bites in 1994, and medical care cost estimates are provided for medically treated dog bites.
- **Sacks JJ, Sinclair L, Gilchrist J, Golab GC, Lockwood R. Breeds of dogs involved in fatal human attacks in the United States between 1979 and 1998. JAVMA 2000;217:836-840.** This article lists the breeds involved in fatal attacks over 20 years. It does not identify specific breeds that are most likely to bite or kill, and thus is not appropriate for policy-making decisions related to the topic. Each year, 4.7 million Americans are bitten by dogs. These bites result in approximately 16 fatalities; about 0.0002 percent of the total number of people bitten. These relatively few fatalities offer the only available information about breeds involved in dog bites. There is currently no accurate way to identify the number of dogs of a particular breed, and consequently no measure to determine which breeds are more likely to bite or kill.  
  
Many practical alternatives to breed-specific policies exist and hold promise for preventing dog bites. For prevention ideas and model policies for control of dangerous dogs, please see the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) Task Force on Canine Aggression and Human-Canine Interactions: A community approach to dog bite prevention.\*
- **Sacks JJ, Kresnow M, Houston B. Dog bites: how big a problem? Injury Prevention 1996;2:52-4.** Annually in the United States 4.7 million people are bitten by dogs. Of these, approximately 800,000 people require medical

## Animal Welfare Community No Longer Supports Mandatory Spay/Neuter

Much has changed in the past few years.

In 2007, many animal welfare organizations supported mandatory spay-neuter in the state legislature.


By 2009, NO respected animal welfare organization supported mandatory spay-neuter when it was again introduced.

The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) dropped its support for MSN, even though they had actively lobbied for it in 2007. HSUS said they have re-evaluated their position about mandatory spay/neuter.

The State Humane Association of California (SHAC), the state coalition of humane societies that had *sponsored* mandatory spay-neuter in 2007, dropped their support by 2009.

The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) does not support mandatory spay-neuter in fact their position statement says that mandatory spay/neuter doesn't work.

Home | Sitemap



ASPCA WE ARE THEIR VOICE

Home | ASPCA | ASPCA NYC | ASPCA IL | ASPCA VA

Find Animal Cruelty Adoption Pet Care Donate Online Community

Home > About Us > ASPCA Policy and Position Statements > Position Statement on Mandatory Spay/Neuter

### About the ASPCA

- ASPCA Policy and Position Statements
- FAQ
- History
- ASPCA April
- Corporate Partners
- Jobs
- The ASPCA's Programs & Services
- ASPCA Humane Awards
- The ASPCA Maclay
- Animal Behavior Center
- Animal Poison Control Center
- Free ASPCA Stuff
- Annual Report
- Legal Information
- Contact Us

### Position Statement on Mandatory Spay/Neuter Laws

#### Background


Nationwide, per capita shelter intake and euthanasia have been in a steady decline for the past several decades and research indicates that the main reason for this decline is the increasing incidence of spayed and neutered animals in the pet population (Zawistowski et al., 1998; Irwin, 2001; Clancy & Rowan, 2003). In fact, the veterinary community recently formally acknowledged the importance of safe, efficient, accessible sterilization programs as the "best antidote to the mass euthanasia of cats and dogs resulting from overpopulation" (Looney et al., 2008). There is, however, variation in the trend in shelter intake and euthanasia decline across communities as well as a difference between that for dogs and cats. As a result, many communities are currently searching for methods to reach the segments of the animal-owning population that are still contributing disproportionately to companion animal overpopulation. Attempts to reduce shelter intake and euthanasia through the passage of legislation mandating the spaying and neutering of companion animals has recently garnered much attention and debate.

To the knowledge of the ASPCA, the only method of population control that has demonstrated long-term efficacy in significantly reducing the number of animals entering animal shelters is the voluntary sterilization of owned pets (Clancy & Rowan 2003; FIREPAW, 2004; Secovich, 2003). There is also evidence that sterilizing very specific, at-risk sub-populations of companion animals such as feral cats and animals in shelters can also contribute to reductions in overpopulation (Zawistowski et al., 1998; Clancy & Rowan 2003; Levy et al., 2003; Lord et al., 2006; Natoli et al., 2006). In contrast, the ASPCA is not aware of any credible evidence demonstrating a statistically significant enhancement in the reduction of shelter intake or euthanasia as a result of the implementation of a mandatory spay/neuter law.



The California Veterinary Medical Association (CVMA) that had *sponsored* mandatory spay-neuter in 2007 no longer does so.

The American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) issued a position statement opposing all mandatory spay/neuter laws

AVMA  HOME | News | Issues | My AVMA | Jobs | Animal Health | Public Health | AVMA@WS

Search AVMA Search Tips | Advanced Search

---

**Search News**

Search within News only.

---

**News Archives**

2009  
Jul 1

2008  
Dec 15

2007  
Dec 15

2006  
Dec 15

2005  
Dec 15

2004  
Dec 15

2003  
Dec 15

2002  
Dec 15

2001  
Dec 15

2000  
Dec 15

Search by Headline Listing

JAVMA News Express archive


---

**Other Sources**


Biosecurity

Public Health

---

 = AVMA/AVMA Members Only

---

 AVMA READER

javmaNews

AVMA news


---

AVMA Journals > JAVMA News > Spay/neuter policy May 15, 2009

**EXECUTIVE BOARD COVERAGE**

## AVMA: Mandatory spay/neuter a bad idea

[Printer-friendly version](#)



The AVMA policy on "Dog and Cat Population Control" has been revised to express the Association's nonsupport for regulations or laws mandating spay/neuter of privately owned, nonshelter dogs and cats.


The Animal Welfare Committee recommended the changes to the policy, which reads, in part, as follows: "The AVMA does not support regulations or legislation mandating spay/neuter of privately owned, non-shelter dogs and cats. Although spaying and neutering helps control dog and cat populations, mandatory approaches may contribute to pet owners avoiding licensing, rabies vaccination and veterinary care for their pets, and may have other unintended consequences."

The policy was adopted in November 2004 and considered by the AWC in accord with the five-year review directive. After review and discussion, committee members agreed that the AVMA should not support regulations or legislation mandating spay/neuter of privately owned, nonshelter dogs and cats for a number of reasons, which were provided in the background of the recommended policy changes.

Although spay/neuter is an important part of effective population control programs, and may benefit individual dogs and cats if performed at the appropriate time, whether and when to spay/neuter specific animals requires the application of science and professional judgment to ensure the best outcome for veterinary patients and their owners. Prevention of unexpected litters; reduced incidences of some cancers and reproductive diseases; and prevention and amelioration of certain undesirable behaviors have been documented as benefits to spaying/neutering dogs and cats. However, potential health problems associated with spaying and neutering have also been identified, including an increased risk of prostatic cancer in males; increased risks of bone cancer and hip dysplasia in large-breed dogs associated with sterilization before maturity; and increased incidences of obesity, diabetes, urinary tract infections, urinary incontinence, and hypothyroidism.

There are conflicting reports regarding euthanasia rates and animal control costs achieved in communities that have enacted mandatory spay/neuter.

Mandating spay/neuter can increase canine, feline, and zoonotic disease risks because some people will attempt to avoid detection of their unaltered pets by failing to seek veterinary care.

The AVMA policy on "Dog and Cat Population Control" can be read along with other Association policies at [www.avma.org](http://www.avma.org) in the Scientific section under Policy. 

[Return to top](#)