



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
RECEIVED
2014 JUL 14 AM 10:25

July 8, 2014

Dear Members of the Pasadena City Council,

The Irish Setter Club of Southern California (ISCSC) would like to voice its opposition to any and all mandatory spay/neuter laws. ISCSC has been involved in not only promoting the Irish Setter, but all responsible dog ownership, since 1929. We are one of the oldest AKC dog clubs in California and strongly believe in responsible breeding programs, spaying/neutering when appropriate and educating the public on the importance of correct health care, breeding programs and overall dog ownership responsibilities.

We are attaching letters from the American Kennel Club that state our position much better than we can, but please consider these points:

- Studies have shown dogs end up in shelters because of ***irresponsible dog ownership*** - the dog was purchased on an impulse, as a gift, was never trained, was never socialized, financial reasons. Mandatory Spay/Neuter laws will not fix irresponsible ownership. Education is the only answer.
- Studies have also shown an increase in the number of dogs in shelters after mandatory spay/neuter laws are passed. The cost of spaying/neutering can be quite expensive. It is sad, but people will opt to just give up the pet, either for financial reasons or opposition to the mandatory law.
- Enforcing such laws is very difficult and will increase animal control costs. Please review costs incurred in Santa Cruz County and Dallas, as well as other cities and counties that have tried this. Animal Control costs went up, as did animal deaths.
- Recent studies have shown early spay/neutering to have negative health effects on animals. We are attaching a copy of recent study. Government should not have the right to dictate the health and well being of someone's pet. That should be a personal decision between the owner and their veterinarian.

There are numerous other reasons why mandatory spay/neutering is a bad idea. Education is the answer - city sponsored training programs, offer low cost spaying/neutering, seminars, work with the local dog clubs. This is much cheaper for the city and much more effective and proactive. You have an excellent club in the Pasadena Kennel Club. Have you gone to their show in June, at Brookside Park? Have you talked to the dog owners that attend their show? Have you looked at the income the show produces for Pasadena? I can assure you that many

dog owners will not support a city that has mandatory spay/neuter laws. You are sending the message that you do not support dog owners or welcome them.

I highly suggest you attend a dog event and talk to responsible dog owners, before you take on such an issue. I think you will find that the only problem is that of irresponsible pet ownership.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Nancy Fenoglio". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned to the right of the word "Sincerely,".

Nancy Fenoglio
President
Irish Setter Club of Southern California

We need to bring to light the truths behind spaying and neutering your pets. The big push to spay and neuter our pets, in particular before puberty, was brought about as a response to the explosion of stray animals without homes. These strays ultimately have to be euthanized at shelters so it was a valiant effort to address a real problem.



The suggestion that dogs and cats should be spayed and neutered over time has evolved into the suggestion that they should be spayed and neutered because it is healthier. We at Angryvet disagree. There is a lot of evidence to support the logical claim that your pets may actually be healthier if left intact.

Think rationally. How would removing a child's reproductive organs before puberty affect their growth, maturation, and development? Puberty and sexual maturation is imperative for bone, brain and organ development. The same is true for your dogs and cats.

The go to argument that veterinarians tell their clients is that neutering eliminates testicular cancer and prostatitis. Spaying eliminates breast, ovarian and uterine cancer.

What they don't tell people is that at least one study shows that intact animals live LONGER. Spaying and neutering not only potentially shortens the lifespan but also has been correlated with various illnesses. Obesity (sometimes not even responsive to extreme calorie restriction), osteoarthritis, Anterior Cruciate Rupture, diabetes, hypothyroidism, prostatic cancer, hemangiosarcoma, osteosarcoma, urinary incontinence, urinary tract infection, juvenile vulva are just a few conditions that are overly represented in spayed and neutered pets. We will discuss some of these correlations and published findings in our blogs.

In our opinion the healthiest pet is one that keeps its reproductive tract. This does pose challenges. Male cats mark and spray. It can be burdensome to have a non-spayed female dog bleeding in the house. Female cats, when they are in heat, will drive you nuts! Male dogs can become dog aggressive and mark their territory or the house.

The best compromise, if any of these things is too much to deal with, would be to spay and neuter at a minimum of one year if not two years of age. Allow your pet to reach full maturation and reach adulthood before considering surgery. We have seen

shelters that spay and neuter at 6 weeks of age! Clearly, this aggressive a surgery at such an early stage of development is not warranted.

Understand that there are options. Educate yourself and take the approach that best suits you and your pet. Use this website (and others) as a resource to ask and answer questions.

- See more at: <http://www.angryvet.com/spaying-and-neutering/#sthash.MTO3LS3e.dpuf>



**AMERICAN
KENNEL CLUB®**

MANDATORY SPAY/NEUTER LAWS

BACKGROUND:

Mandatory spay/neuter laws are usually considered by state and local governments in response to animal control concerns in the community. Proponents believe that mandatory spay/neuter laws will reduce the number of animals at the local shelters and strays roaming in neighborhoods. However, these laws have not proven an effective solution to animal control concerns and punish responsible breeders.

POINTS TO CONSIDER:

- **MANDATORY SPAY/NEUTER LAWS ARE INEFFECTIVE**
Mandatory spay/neuter laws have not proven effective in reducing shelter populations. In fact, some shelters have seen an increase as owners choose to leave their dogs at a shelter if they are unable to pay the costs associated with having their dog spayed or neutered. Moreover, many national research organizations have reported that the majority of unwanted dogs in the United States come from irresponsible owners who are unwilling to train, socialize, or care for their dogs. Imposing a mandatory spay/neuter law will not resolve the issue of irresponsible ownership.
- **MANDATORY SPAY/NEUTER LAWS ARE DIFFICULT TO ENFORCE**
Mandatory spay/neuter laws are extremely difficult to enforce and can be evaded by irresponsible animal owners. Mandatory spay/neuter laws often result in a decrease in the number of dogs licensed, because some individuals choose to not license their animals in order to avoid spaying and neutering their pets.
- **MANDATORY SPAY/NEUTER LAWS ARE COSTLY TO THE COMMUNITY**
Mandatory spay/neuter laws greatly increase the work load of animal control offices, many of which are already strained financially. Animal control offices also find they are euthanizing more animals at the taxpayer's expense, because some owners choose to leave their animals at the shelter rather than complying with the law. A mandatory spay/neuter law also communicates the message that the municipality is not "dog friendly" and sends a strong message that AKC events, which generate a significant amount of revenue for the local economy, are not welcome in the community.
- **MANDATORY SPAY/NEUTER LAWS ARE UNFAIR TO RESPONSIBLE DOG OWNERS**
Mandatory spay/neuter laws target all dog owners, regardless of their level of responsibility or the behavior of their animals. The AKC believes responsible owners have a right to use their own discretion in determining whether to alter their animals. In addition, these laws would restrict the rights of numerous responsible breeders who breed and raise purebred dogs for the purpose of showing. These breeders make a serious commitment to their animals and to ensuring the future health, welfare and breed type of their individual breeds. The AKC believes the decision to spay/neuter is best left to responsible owners in consultation with their veterinarian.

A BETTER SOLUTION IS AVAILABLE

Rather than impose a mandatory spay/neuter law on all dog owners, governments should instead focus on enforcing effective animal control laws and increasing public education efforts. Strongly enforced regulations such as leash laws would prevent irresponsible owners from allowing their pets to run loose, which can lead to accidental breeding. A strong public education campaign teaches community residents how to properly care for their pets and the importance of being a responsible pet owner. The American Kennel Club, as well as many local dog clubs, can assist communities in developing effective animal control laws and public education programs that address the issue of irresponsible ownership while still protecting the rights of responsible owners and breeders.



Issue Analysis: Why Mandatory Spay/Neuter Laws are Ineffective

No dog should ever go unloved or unwanted. Stories of dogs being relinquished to shelters break the hearts of every dog lover.

These issues are the result of a variety of causes. National research organizations have reported that the majority of unwanted dogs in the United States come from owners who are unable or unwilling to train, socialize, and care for their dogs.

As part of encouraging responsible dog ownership, the American Kennel Club (AKC) urges pet owners to spay and neuter their dogs if they do not want to participate in AKC dog shows or performance events or use them in a responsible breeding program. The AKC supports public education programs that teach future pet-buyers and help current

mandatory sterilization policies.

Identifying the Problem

Although MSN may sound like a logical solution to the problem of unwanted dogs, they only address a symptom of the problem. A truly effective solution will require addressing this larger issue.

National studies and anecdotal experiences of shelters across the country demonstrate that economics also plays a significant role in animal relinquishment. Unemployment, tighter budgets, and other monetary concerns including unexpected relocation all contribute to families to giving up pets.

As communities recognize that there are irresponsible dog owners who do not properly train their dogs and who allow

basic animal control laws they are already tasked with enforcing.

Many communities that enact MSN laws find that enforcement can be expensive. A mandatory spay/neuter law enacted in Dallas, Texas, in 2008 resulted in a 22 percent increase in animal control expenditures, as well as an overall decrease in licensing projected to reduce revenue by \$400,000. The City of Santa Cruz, California, experienced a 56% cost increase over the first 12 years of implementation. The City of Los Angeles' budget ballooned from \$6.7 million to \$18 million following implementation. Similar increases in animal control costs following the establishment of mandatory spay/neuter laws have been experienced in communities

“Nearly one in every two families in the United States has a dog, generating a significant demand for well-bred puppies.”



BULLDOG - ISABELLE FRANCAIS FOR AKC

dog owners understand the great responsibility that comes with dog ownership.

Some policymakers and groups assert that the solution is mandatory spay/neuter (MSN) laws. The AKC disagrees. Unlike voluntary programs, mandatory spay/neuter laws have proven to be ineffective. Numerous studies have found they result in significant cost increases and many other unintended consequences for responsible dog owners, local shelters, and the community at large – *without addressing the real underlying issue of irresponsible dog ownership.*

For these reasons, the American Kennel Club is joined by numerous organizations including the American Veterinary Medical Association, the National Animal Interest Alliance, and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in opposing

their dogs to roam or otherwise create a nuisance, it becomes increasingly evident that most problems stem from owner irresponsibility. Mandatory spay/neuter laws will not address these problems; however, they will punish law-abiding citizens who wish to keep an intact animal, while those who already neglect their responsibilities will likely continue that behavior.

Unintended Consequences

Mandatory spay/neuter laws also have a tendency to create problems for communities because they are very difficult to enforce and can be easily evaded by avoiding dog licensing.

MSN laws also greatly increase the workload for animal control officers, who must now also verify the sterilization of residents' pets in addition to the

throughout the country from Colorado to North Carolina to Washington.

Mandatory spay/neuter policies prove expensive for the public as well. When these laws are established, many cities find that their publicly-funded low-cost spay/neuter programs cannot meet the demand, which forces dog owners to pay full price for the procedure. This can be a huge financial burden for low-income dog owners, who may ultimately be forced to choose between harboring an illegal unsterilized dog and turning it over to a shelter because they cannot afford the procedure.

Unintended broader public health and safety consequences should also be considered. The American Veterinary Medical Association's "Dog and Cat Population Control" policy notes that the mandatory nature of these laws may

Continued on next page

result in pet owners avoiding rabies vaccinations and other general veterinary care in order to hide their lack of compliance.

Another disturbing trend arises when these laws prevent responsible breeders from being able to breed and raise quality family pets. Nearly one out of every two families in the United States has a dog. This generates a significant demand for well-bred puppies.

Responsible breeders are committed to raising healthy purebred dogs and provide the opportunity for local residents to purchase a quality dog from an expert in the breed who is also knowledgeable about the needs, temperament, and background of the puppy offered for sale. These breeders help potential new owners understand the breed and ensure that a prospective buyer is a good lifestyle fit with the new puppy.

If responsible breeders are forced out of business, those who wish to purchase a purebred dog are forced to seek other avenues. This may include buying puppies over the Internet, where the dogs may be imported from countries with fewer health and safety standards than the United States. Anecdotal evidence has shown a significant increase in the number of dogs being transported into the country, with little to no veterinary oversight and care before the dogs are given to the new owners. A number of these dogs have become seriously ill with diseases such as rabies that are dangerous to both the dog and humans.

Why Exemptions Aren't Enough

Sometimes, instead of an outright spay/neuter mandate, lawmakers will opt to enact laws with stricter regulations on those who choose to not sterilize their dogs. Intact animal permits and differential licensing require those who choose not to sterilize their dogs to obtain a license that is often significantly more expensive than those for sterilized dogs. Some communities do not require licenses unless a dog is intact. Other policies provide exemptions for owners whose dogs are listed with a nationally-recognized registry.

These policies, including exemptions,

punish responsible dog owners simply because they choose to own an intact dog. Responsible dog breeders and owners have a right to own an intact dog if they so choose without being subject to regulations beyond those of other dog owners.



SOFT COATED WHEATEN TERRIER- MARY BLOOM © AKC

“Public education about responsible dog ownership improves public safety, reduces economic burdens on a community, and preserves the rights of dog owners – all while helping dog owners learn how to care for their pets.”

The AKC encourages dog owners to sterilize their pets unless they wish to participate in responsible breeding programs, performance events, or AKC conformation dog shows. As conformation shows are ultimately designed to judge the quality of breeding stock, all dogs entered into these events must be intact. Mandatory spay/neuter defeats the whole purpose of traditional dog shows!

Some laws offer exemptions to MSN policies for “show dogs”. However, this exemption misses the point that spaying/neutering should be an individual decision made by an owner, not forced by the state. It is also very difficult to prove whether or not a dog is being kept for exhibition. Some mandatory spay/neuter schemes require a dog to be shown at least once a year in order to be exempted from the sterilization policies, but not all breeders show all their dogs every year. In addition, many breeders choose to breed their female show dogs after they have finished showing them to their championships. Other owners may choose to see how a dog develops before making a decision about whether to show

the dog. There are many valid reasons for an exhibitor not to show a dog every year, and this choice should be respected.

What's the Solution?

Targeting the issue of irresponsible ownership is the best solution for addressing dog-related issues in a community. This begins with gathering data about the extent and nature of a possible problem in a community. Does the community have reliable statistics on unowned or unwanted animal populations? Does the community currently have comprehensive animal control statutes to address at-large dogs, nuisance dogs, and stray animals? If so, how are they enforced?

Does enforcement include appropriate fines and penalties? Does the community need additional support to enforce these laws? If existing laws are not being followed or enforced, then adding more laws will not improve the situation.

Communities may also want to consider encouraging private organizations to provide/subsidize low-cost

spay/neuter clinics to help give low-income individuals the opportunity to sterilize their dogs if they wish.

One of the most effective ways to ensure compliance is through strong public education programs. These programs cover the basics of responsible dog ownership and local dog laws. The American Kennel Club has a wealth of materials to help shelters, community organizations, schools, and other public organizations educate the public about responsible dog ownership. The AKC also provides resources through thousands of local kennel clubs, located in all 50 states, who are willing to assist local leaders in designing and implementing positive canine education programs.

Addressing irresponsible dog ownership through strict enforcement of animal control laws and strong public education programs are effective and cost-efficient ways to address animal control issues. Public education about responsible dog ownership improves public safety, reduces economic burdens on a community, and preserves the rights of responsible caring dog owners – all while helping dog owners learn how to care for their pets.

Stewart, Jana

From: Elias <eliasbross@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 13, 2014 11:30 AM
To: Bogaard, Bill
Subject: Don't agree

Dear Mayor, I don't agree in your idea of spayed all dogs. I agree in spayed dogs but not all.

Stewart, Jana

From: Pauline <pauline3525@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 12, 2014 12:36 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill
Subject: spay neuter regulation is absurd.

The staff report indicates that the city is seeking to employ sterilization as a method to reduce dog bites. The literature on a relationship between dog bites and sterilization is mixed at best. A more effective option is to prevent situations that lead to dog through the use of a public education program. AKC has developed a video and workbook series, the Dog Listener, which teaches children about canine behavior, what to do when confronted with a strange or aggressive dog, and how to behave around dogs.

The American Kennel Club opposes mandatory spay/neuter as ineffective because it fails to address the underlying issue of irresponsible ownership. California state law already provides for the sterilization of animals adopted from shelters and mandates that the license fee for intact animals be at least double that of sterilized animals. The mandatory sterilization requirements proposed in this ordinance will merely punish those who are responsible owners and breeders, and the irresponsible owners who are not complying with current laws are likely to continue their behavior.

Many communities that have implemented mandatory spay/neuter policies have found them to be ineffective and expensive. For example, after Dallas, Texas enacted MSN policies in 2008, it experienced a 22 percent increase in animal control costs and an overall decrease in licensing compliance. MSN laws often result in owners either ignore animal control laws entirely, or relinquishing their pets to the public shelter to be cared for at the taxpayers' expense rather than pay for expensive sterilization surgery or breeder permits. According to the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), some owners also opt to avoid rabies vaccinations and other general veterinary care in order to hide their lack of compliance with MSN laws.

Stewart, Jana

From: Linda Ott <linda.lee58@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 9:23 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill
Subject: Oppose mandatory spay and neuter

Sent from my iPhone

Stewart, Jana

From: Doris J Watson <djwatson52@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 4:19 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill
Subject: Mandatory spay neuter

Responsible dog owners dont need ordinances. We have enough rules. The pet industry is a 60 billion dollar a year asset to any animals in your city. Vets are robbing people blind. Educate and offer FREE Spay Neuter for all city limit residents. Stop illegal fight rings and open more dog recreation areas. Dog owners cover all demographics and represent a great boost to any election. Stop adding to the problem be the solution. Doris Watson Registered voter Escondido CA

Sent from my iPhone

Stewart, Jana

From: Meg Prior <meg@megpriorconsulting.com>
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 4:03 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill; Morales, Margo; district1; West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; De La Cuba, Vannia; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry
Subject: Please: OPPOSE NEW DOG OWNERSHIP RESTRICTIONS

TO: Mayor Bill Bogaard, Vice Mayor Jacque Robinson, District 1 Councilmember Margaret McAustin, **District 2**, Councilmember John Kennedy, District 3, Councilmember Gene Masuda, District 4, Councilmember Victor Gordo Esq., District 5, Councilmember Steve Madison, District 6, Councilmember Terry Tornek, District 7_

No national animal welfare organizations support mandatory spay/neuter and in fact it is opposed by AKC, ASPCA, No Kill Advocacy Center, and the American College of Theriogenologists. This opposition exists because mandatory spay/neuter policies are ineffective at reducing shelter intakes or euthanasia. OR any correlation with bite incidents.

Thank you, Meg Prior
(818) 337-8182

Stewart, Jana

From: HARTUNGCC@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 3:03 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill
Subject: Use you Brain instead of our money

According to the staff report, 87% of licensed dogs are sterilized. Is there any proof that the remaining 13% are causing problems in the community? Only 4% of dogs were euthanized due to lack of space in fiscal year 2014. Given the expense and burden of enforcing a mandatory spay/neuter law, resources could be more effectively targeted to finding homes for that 4%. While it appears that Pasadena does offer some reduced cost spay/neuter services, it is unclear if there is a program to assist residents who may not have transportation to get their animal to the veterinarian for surgery.

All you governments like to do is toss our money at what ever you want with out any cost benefit analysis.

Craig
hartungc@aol.com

Stewart, Jana

From: Linda Dalessandro <mrsd1@live.com>
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 2:43 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill
Subject: Opposition to mandatory spay/neuter proposal

I am opposed to the mandatory spay/neuter proposal for a several reason. First, it has been tried in other cities and has not really worked. It cost the cities more money and did not reduce the number of dogs in shelter. I had heard that this is to prevent dog bites. I would like to know what studies you are relying on for this opinion. There is no reliable study that suggest this works. If you were to attend a dog show, you would see hundreds of unaltered dogs interacting with people and other dogs with no problem. Dog bites are a result of training or a lack of training. It would be more helpful if your proposal was for all dogs to undergo a basic obedience class.

There are also medical consequences for altering dogs. Attached is a UC Davis study which shows the harmful impact of neutering. http://news.ucdavis.edu/search/news_detail.lasso?id=10498

There is also a study on Vizslas that show similar results.

Thank you

Linda D'Alessandro

Stewart, Jana

From: Lupe Ocampo <lupeishkyy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 1:26 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill
Subject: Spay/Neuter mandatory proposal

Mr. Bill Bogaard,

It has come to my attention that there will be a Pasadena City Council meeting on July 14, 2014 to propose a mandatory spay/neuter ordinance in the Pasadena area. As a resident and proud dog owner, I am against this proposal. Pure Breed dogs should not have to be spayed. For many years responsible breeders have worked hard to maintain high standards in the breeds. Dogs that are in shelters should be the only ones who should be spayed/neuter. As a responsible dog owner I am against spaying/neutering dogs, all animals should be left natural, the way they were born. We responsible pet owners pay lots of money to maintain our dogs healthy with shots, registering them under the AKC or paying license fees. Us owners should have the option to not spay/neuter our animals. Dogs that get fixed become sedentary and lose personality and often gain weight leading to health issues. We will be sure to attend this council meeting to oppose to it.

Thank you, Lupe Ocampo.

Stewart, Jana

From: Schuerger, Bob <bschuerger@hp.com>
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 11:50 AM
To: Bogaard, Bill
Subject: RE: Pasadena Mandatory Spay/Neuter law

As you can see from my address below, I live in Los Angeles which has already adopted this onerous law. I consider this law a very personal attack on my civil liberties. The City of Los Angeles and the State of California both believe they have the right to determine whether or not MY PETS are sterilized because I am much too irresponsible to decide for myself.

1. The most obvious FACT of LIFE that most legislatures seem TOTALLY IGNORANT OF is that **BY DEFINITION A CRIMINAL IS ONE WHO DOES NOT FOLLOW THE LAW.** If a CRIMINAL does not follow the law anyway, HOW CAN PASSING A NEW LAW POSSIBLY SOLVE A PROBLEM IN AN AREA WHERE THE EXISTING LAWS ARE NOT BEING FOLLOWED? Passing new legislation ALWAYS makes life more complex (and usually more difficult) for the LAW ABIDING CITIZENS.
 - a. The problem of animal control exists because many people do not follow the EXISTING LAWS. Passing a new law that WILL BE VERY UNPOPULAR WITH THE SILENT MAJORITY just ensures MORE PEOPLE WILL START IGNORING THE LAW.
 - b. How many people in LA do you think pay the \$500 for a breeder's fee and then \$100 for the license EACH YEAR instead of just not getting the pet a license in the first place? The \$100 a year license fee is plenty of encouragement for the people who do not feel strongly one way or the other about this issue to go ahead and get the pet sterilized.
 - c. "Puppy farms" have NOTHING to do with this issue. They would either be breeders or not be following the laws anyway. THIS LAW IS ALL ABOUT ENFORCING THE CITIZEN IN THE STREET TO STERILIZE HIS/HER PET.
2. The Constitution of the United States of America (at least what's left of it) grants SPECIFIC RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES TO LEGISLATURES. ANYTHING NOT SPECIFIED IS A RIGHT RETAINED BY THE PEOPLE. A man's house is his castle. GET OUT OF MY HOUSE. If my pets are running loose and causing problems IN THE STREETS, ONLY THEN do you have the right to do something about it.

Robert Schuerger
3311 La Clede Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90039

Stewart, Jana

From: Carroll <loverowdy91024@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 11:41 AM
To: Bogaard, Bill
Subject: Spay/Neuter Questio

Dear Mayor Bogaard:

The upcoming mandatory spay/neuter question coming on Monday's City Council meeting is a complete waste of time and money.

Pasadena Humane Society will have to hire more officers to patrol this "problem" and, therefore, charging the City more for their services. We are now over burdened with too many laws on the books. There are other issues in this city to be more concerned with than chasing down Joe Public for not neutering his dog or not.

Please give this careful consideration.

Thank you for taking time to read this email.

Sincerely,
Carroll Brown
626 822 0849

Sent from Samsung tablet

Stewart, Jana

From: Gigvicky@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 10:58 AM
To: Madison, Steve
Cc: Bogaard, Bill
Subject: Opposition to Spay Neuter

Dear Representative Madison,

I oppose the mandatory Spay Neuter proposition for all the reasons that I stated in my previous letter some months back. I do support your efforts to make it breed specific.

Regards,
Vicky Thomas
300 Manford Way
Pasadena, CA 91105

Stewart, Jana

From: Gage, Patricia <Patricia.Gage@ashford.edu>
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 12:38 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill
Subject: MANDATORY Spay/Neuter Law

Please do NOT proposed or make the I law. It will not benefit the entire community, and will end up costing tax payers more. Don't we pay enough taxes? !!!

PATRICIA GAGE/ ADMISSIONS COUNSELOR

Ashford University / *Technology Changes Everything*™

P / 800.798.0584 X / 6174 F / 877-285-1171

JOIN THE CONVERSATION: ashford.edu/social

P.S. You can change a life today! Who do you know that would benefit from speaking with me about earning a degree at Ashford University? Please provide their name, phone and/or email address. I will contact them and provide the same service that I have provided you. Please email me at: patricia.gage@ashford.edu or click this link:

[YES, I HAVE A FRIEND WHO IS INTERESTED!](#)

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This e-mail message is intended to be received only by persons entitled to receive the confidential information it may contain. E-mail messages sent from Ashford University may contain information that is confidential and may be legally privileged. Please do not read, copy, forward or store this message unless you are an intended recipient of it. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments.

Buchanan, Rita

Subject: FW: Opposition to spay / neuter

-----Original Message-----

From: Leellen Patchen [<mailto:leellen@mac.com>]

Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 4:15 PM

To: Morales, Margo

Subject: Opposition to spay / neuter

As a small and entirely responsible breeder I adamantly oppose any mandatory spay / neuter ordinance that would include pure breeds. I would however support mandatory spay / neuter for dogs that are not pure bred.

I would also support the breeders code of conduct that I personally adhere to which: 1) requires breeders to selectively interview adopting families; 2) guarantee the health of their puppies with a money back or exchange guarantee; 3) require mandatory microchipping prior to adoption; 4) require initial shots and worming prior to adoption; 5) provide educational materials to new owners and test them on the content of those materials prior to adoption; 6) provide training DVDs and other materials to new owners; 7) require AKC registration at time of sale (this along with a microchip would allow tracking of any purebred dog; and 8) provide ongoing support to adoptive families.

9) I also think all breeders should be required to take their puppies back if for any reason the buyer changes their mind about ownership and irresponsible owners should be required to return the dogs to the breeders if they change their mind about ownership... In this case, not a money back guarantee. In other words, to avoid irresponsible ownership and sales to irresponsible owners, the burden would be on the breeder. When/if a puppy is returned they would either need to either provide or find a new home for the puppy.

Any questions about my opinions on this matter please do not hesitate to call. Many of us enjoy dog showing as a sport, a very expensive sport. The social purpose of showing is to find the most perfect specimens of a breed standard and perpetuate the healthy breeding of only the best dogs.

It's not just about irresponsible people who breed mixed puppies and pit bulls. All of those people should actually be your target, not responsible breeders.

Leellen Patchen
466 Foothill #144
La Canada, CA. 91011
818-625-0777
leellen@mac.com

Buchanan, Rita

Subject: FW: please vote against mandatory spay for all dogs in Pasadena

From: Bressler West [<mailto:furkids@westcourtcavaliers.com>]
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 1:00 PM
To: district1; Morales, Margo; West, Jana
Subject: please vote against mandatory spay for all dogs in Pasadena

This is ridiculous to pass a law for mandantory spay of all dogs in your town. Please vote against this and do something more likd outlaw driving without license and insurance in your town for eveyone including illegal aliens.

Thank you for your time and please do not pass that ridiculous law.

Sarah West



**AMERICAN
KENNEL CLUB®**

July 11, 2014

The Honorable Bill Bogaard
Mayor, City of Pasadena
Pasadena City Hall
100 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

Re: AKC Opposes Mandatory Spay/Neuter Ordinance

Dear Mayor Bogaard and Members of the Pasadena City Council:

The American Kennel Club (AKC) writes on behalf of responsible dog owners and breeders in Pasadena to express our opposition to the proposed mandatory spay/neuter ordinance. We respectfully ask that you oppose this costly, unfair, and ineffective ordinance.

The mission of the AKC is to advocate for dogs as family companions, to advance canine health and well-being, to protect the rights of all dog owners, and educate the public about responsible dog ownership.

Mandatory spay/neuter (MSN) laws and arbitrary breeder permits are ineffective because they fail to address the underlying issue of irresponsible ownership. California state law already provides for the sterilization of animals adopted from shelters and mandates that the license fee for intact animals be at least double that of sterilized animals. The mandatory sterilization requirements proposed in this ordinance will merely punish those who are responsible owners and breeders, while irresponsible owners who are not complying with current laws are likely to continue their behavior.

Other communities that have implemented mandatory spay/neuter have found it to be burdensome and expensive, particularly because a group of current law abiding dog owners will be criminalized by passage of this ordinance. For example, after enacting MSN policies in 2008, Dallas, Texas experienced a 22 percent increase in animal control costs and an overall decrease in basic licensing. Unfortunately, MSN also results in some owners choosing to ignore animal control laws entirely, or giving up their pets to the public shelter to be cared for at the taxpayers' expense rather than pay for expensive sterilization surgery or breeder permits. The American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), has also found that it results in some owners avoiding rabies vaccinations and other general veterinary care in order to hide their lack of compliance with MSN laws. Although the staff report states that the AVMA supports spay/neuter for certain health reasons, it fails to state that the AVMA specifically OPPOSES the mandatory spay neuter of owned dogs and cats.

In fact, none of the major national animal welfare organizations support mandatory spay/neuter. The AKC, ASPCA, No Kill Advocacy Center, and the American College of Theriogenologists are just a few of the groups that oppose mandatory spay/neuter policies because they are known to be ineffective at reducing shelter intakes or euthanasia. Recent studies have further demonstrated that early spay/neuter can contribute to increased incidence of joint problems and cancers as dogs age.

According to the Pasadena staff report, 87% of licensed dogs are sterilized. Is there any proof that the remaining 13% are causing problems in the community? Only 4% of dogs were euthanized due to lack of space in fiscal year 2014. Given the expense and burden of enforcing a mandatory spay/neuter law, resources could be more

effectively targeted to finding homes for that 4%. While it appears that Pasadena does offer some reduced cost spay/neuter services, it is unclear if there is a program to assist residents who may not have transportation to get their animal to the veterinarian for surgery. The report indicates that the Pasadena Humane Society can waive sterilization for fees for breeds that are overrepresented in euthanasia numbers but it is unclear if they are currently doing so. If they are not, this seems a more logical starting point than mandatory sterilization. Additionally, many residents may not have transportation to take their animals for surgery and providing mobile sterilization opportunities may be an effective way to reach those constituents rather than enacting a law with which they are unable to comply.

The staff report also indicates that the city is seeking to employ sterilization as a method to reduce dog bites. The literature on a relationship between dog bites and sterilization is mixed at best. A more effective option is to prevent situations that lead to dog bites through the use of a public education program. AKC has developed a video and workbook series, the Dog Listener, which teaches children about canine behavior, what to do when confronted with a strange or aggressive dog, and how to behave around dogs.

Local responsible breeders are as assets to their communities. These breeders make serious commitments to their animals by raising healthy, well cared-for dogs and by working to ensure that puppies are placed with responsible owners. They are in a unique position to support new pet owners and exemplify responsible animal ownership. Responsible dog breeders and owners are models for their communities and should not be penalized by being forced to comply with burdensome regulations.

Shelter populations are based on a variety of factors. Economics is often a primary cause of shelter population increases, as families are forced to give up their pet when they can no longer afford to care for them or are relocating. It is unfair to assume that owners of intact animals are the cause of animal population concerns in the community. Low cost spay/neuter clinics and public education programs designed to help citizens make good decisions before purchasing a pet and to help them care for those they own are a much more effective solution.

We respectfully urge you to oppose mandatory spay neuter laws and focus instead on enforceable laws that specifically address issues of irresponsible ownership without punishing responsible owners. The American Kennel Club would welcome the opportunity to work with you to develop effective, responsible legislation that would address your concerns without restricting the rights of responsible breeders or owners. Please do not hesitate to contact us at (919) 816-3720 if we can assist you in developing viable alternatives to MSN policies.

Sincerely,



Sarah Sprouse
Government Relations Manager

Cc: Members of the Pasadena City Council
California Federation of Dog Clubs
California Responsible Pet Owners Association

28039 Calzada Drive
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
11 July 2014

The Honorable Bill Bogaard
Mayor, City of Pasadena
Pasadena City Hall
100 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

Re: Oppose Mandatory Spay/Neuter Ordinance

Dear Mayor Bogaard and Members of the Pasadena City Council:

Although not a resident of your great city, I am writing as a responsible breeder/owner/handler of purebred conformation and performance Soft Coated Wheaten Terriers who has exhibited and earned titles on my dogs in Brookside Park at events hosted by the Pasadena Kennel Club and the Pasanita Dog Obedience Club. I represent the views of many friends and colleagues in the dog fancy throughout southern and northern California who also visit your city year after year to compete with their dogs at these shows and trials, as well as to attend other canine events.

In addition to my personal involvement in purebred-dog breeding and competition, I have also served on the boards of directors of both our national parent breed club, the Soft Coated Wheaten Terrier Club of America (SCWTCA), and the Soft Coated Wheaten Terrier Club of Southern California (SCWTCSC). I am currently the SCWTCA legislative liaison to the AKC and a past president and current rescue coordinator of SCWTCSC. SCWTCA has over 330 members throughout the USA, with the largest contingent in California (51 members, or 15 percent); SCWTCSC has 130 members throughout the southern California region.

Many members of both organizations regularly come to Pasadena to show their dogs, bringing revenue into the city from expenditures at hotels, restaurants, merchants and vendors at the show site. Moreover, many local club members are longstanding clients of leading Pasadena veterinary practices, including myself; several of those veterinarians have spoken to SCWTCSC members on canine health-education topics at meetings in the city, which we host quite often.

In light of that background in the dog fancy, I urge you to heed the recommendation of the American Kennel Club (AKC) to oppose the above-referenced, proposed ordinance that is on the agenda of the City Council meeting for July 14, 2014.

The issue of responsible versus irresponsible dog ownership is at the heart of the matter of reducing animal-shelter populations, not mandatory spay/neuter (MSN) laws. As AKC points out in its legislative alerts on this proposed ordinance over the past week to its breeders, owners, judges and others in the dog world, MSN fails to address the root causes of irresponsible breeding and ownership, but rather causes punitive measures against reputable breeders—who breed for health, temperament and the betterment of their breeds, NOT financial gain, I can assure you—and responsible owners.

Sterilization alone without proper training also fails to prevent aggression against other dogs or humans. In females, sterilization may instead result in heightened aggressive behaviors in some individuals.

The Honorable Bill Bogaard

Page Two

As a rescue coordinator who works with county and municipal animal-control agencies over a nine-county area along with my team, the vast majority of dogs that we receive into our rescue program do not originate from homes with financial hardship or family misfortune, such as divorce or death of an owner. Our rescue dogs primarily come from commercial sources (commercial breeders, online brokers, and/or retail pet stores), have been improperly socialized as young puppies, purchased by owners who do not research individual dog breeds to find the right dog for their lifestyles, and finally, not trained in basic obedience as well-mannered companion dogs.

This chain of events is repeated time and again not only in our breed but also throughout over 160 AKC-recognized dog breeds, as well as mixes, including “designer breeds” such as the “Doodle” variations and other, more random combinations. Most of our rescue dogs, and those we cannot accept due to aggressive behavior, are already altered when they are relinquished by their owners. Their behavioral issues which cause their surrender stem from irresponsible breeding and ownership practices, not their reproductive status.

The unintended victim at the end of this unfortunate set of human choices is the dog, who most often winds up in a shelter. If it is lucky, it is surrendered to or signed out from a shelter by a rescue group to be evaluated, remediated for fixable health and/or temperament issues, and re-homed. Those dogs that have formed aggressive behavioral traits through bad breeding or lack of socialization and training remain unclaimed in shelters and are sentenced to death, most often at the taxpayer’s expense.

What is even more tragic is the fate of those dogs that are adoptable but are dumped in shelters by their owners for treatable health or temperament issues. In the case of the four percent of shelter dogs that were euthanized in Pasadena last year, how many were evaluated by the Pasadena Humane Society as adoptable, and how many rescue groups—all-breed and breed-club-sponsored such as ours—were contacted to save these animals?

As the AKC points out, public education for responsible ownership, including awareness of training resources available in your city, is the key to saving the lives of dogs as well as taxpayer dollars that are unnecessarily spent on shelter animals. You have two excellent resources in your jurisdiction, the Pasadena KC and Pasanita Dog Obedience Club.

A simple step to making owners aware of these organizations is to make their contact information available on your city website, as Ventura County Animal Services has done through their website (please see: <http://www.vcas.us/>). A more comprehensive activity would be for the city to co-sponsor a “Responsible Dog Ownership Day” with both groups mentioned above. Information on this AKC-supported event can be found online at <http://www.apps.akc.org/classic/clubs/rdod/events/index.cfm>.

Before reaching a binding decision, I urge each of you to direct your staffs to research the studies cited by the AKC and performed by leading veterinary and animal-welfare groups about the effectiveness of MSN, as well as the benefits of incentivizing the citizens of Pasadena toward becoming responsible dog owners, beginning with their initial decision to purchase a dog. **A vote for MSN will not prevent or remediate irresponsible breeding and ownership, but will instead penalize reputable dog breeders and owners in your city.**

Sincerely yours,

/s/

Constance Lynch Koehler

CC: Members of the Pasadena City Council

Buchanan, Rita

Subject: FW: American Pomeranian Club and City of Angels Pomeranian Club OPPOSED to mandatory sterilization proposal
Attachments: Pasadena MSN APC-COAPC.odt

From: Geneva Coats [<mailto:genevacoats@aol.com>]

Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 3:01 PM

To: genevacoats@aol.com; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; Cruz, Christian (Field Rep); West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; De La Cuba, Vannia; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; cfodc@yahoogleroups.com; lac-apc@yahoogleroups.com; apclegislation@groups.facebook.com; apc_board@yahoogleroups.com

Subject: American Pomeranian Club and City of Angels Pomeranian Club OPPOSED to mandatory sterilization proposal

American Pomeranian Club
City of Angels Pomeranian Club
c/o Geneva Coats, Legislative Liaison
13674 Geranium St.
Chino CA 91710-5080

Pasadena City Council
100 North Garfield Ave.
Room S249
Pasadena, CA 91101

July 11, 2014

Request to be included in the official record for City Council meeting of July 14, 2014.
Dear Mayor Bogaard, Vice Mayor Robinson, and City Council Members,

The City of Angels Pomeranian Club and the American Pomeranian Club urge you to reject the ill-conceived spay-neuter proposal on the agenda for July 14, 2014. We read through the Agenda Report from the Director of Public Works. This report is full of fabrications and outright lies.

The report claims that a law is needed to force people to alter their pets, yet on page three of this very same report, there is a graph that demonstrates that **87% of the owned, licensed dogs in the city of Pasadena are ALREADY ALTERED**. And, it would seem obvious to a kindergartener that feral cats do not have owners, don't read city ordinances, and won't turn themselves in for sterilization surgery. Citizens who care for feral cats do not consider themselves owners of such cats and in most cases will not make the effort to sterilize them.

OK, fair enough, you want to force that other 13% to spay and neuter their pets. The reasons why seem to include:

- *reducing "overpopulation"*

There is absolutely NO evidence that “overpopulation” of pets is a significant factor in the City of Pasadena. The latest report just released from 2012 claims on page 15 that “Our adoption placement rate is 98% for cats (excluding feral cats) and 96.2% for dogs”. It seems there is a SHORTAGE of adoptable pets in the City of Pasadena.

- *reducing the numbers of stray and roaming dogs*

The best tools for reducing stray and roaming dogs are known as “doors” “fences” and “leashes”. The evidence is poor at best that any other factor other than enforcement of existing leash laws affects the numbers of stray and roaming dogs. Intact and neutered dogs will both roam when they are not physically prevented from doing so. Dogs that are allowed to roam have bigger problems than an unplanned litter...such as being hit by a car, poisoned or killed by coyotes. Enforcement of confinement laws is the answer.

- *reducing numbers of dog bites*

Dog bites are the result of owners who fail to properly restrain or socialize their dogs. The studies do not support the assertion that neutered dogs are less likely to bite. In fact, there are several studies that demonstrate that neutering may decrease dog to dog aggression but that neutering will actually INCREASE dog to human aggression. This also holds true for spayed females. Spaying increases aggression in female dogs. See attached/linked veterinarian-authored paper with references.

- *“Veterinary science has demonstrated the safety and positive health benefits of spaying and neutering which is especially true if the animal is sterilized before maturity.”*

FALSE and the **OPPOSITE** of what modern science has demonstrated. Altering increases the risk for a host of health problems and the risk is higher the younger the age that the pet is altered! The short list of **health problems that are increased when the animal is altered** includes: hip dysplasia, patellar luxation, bone cancer, hemangiosarcoma, prostate cancer, bladder cancer, hypothyroidism, reduced lifespan, lymphoma, noise phobias and aggression, incontinence in females, pancreatitis and adverse reaction to vaccination. See attached/linked veterinarian-authored paper with references for further information.

- *“One un-spayed female cat and her offspring can be responsible for the birth of 73,000 kittens in six years’ time”*

This is utter baloney. If this were true we would have literally TRILLIONS of cats in the USA today. A study of feral cats (who are the ones most likely to reproduce) found that in 12 years, one stray unspayed female with all her unspayed female offspring can be expected to produce 3200 kittens if there is no human intervention. This does not, however, factor in the high mortality rate of the kittens and trap/neuter/release programs. It also assumes that all offspring survive, when in reality, their average lifespan is just two to three years. If you don't live, you can't reproduce. Jerry Folland, a mathematician with MIT, was quoted in an article saying he calculates that the actual number may be much lower, with less than 100 cats surviving after seven years.

We urge you to reject reports founded on untruths and exaggerations. Mandatory spay and neuter laws result in increased costs, increased animal intakes and deaths, increased risk of rabies exposures and a distrust of local government by the citizens. Such punitive laws are not only unnecessary, they are bad for pets and bad for the community.

Sincerely yours,

Geneva Coats
Legislative Liaison
American Pomeranian Club
City of Angels Pomeranian Club

http://www.caninesports.com/uploads/1/5/3/1/15319800/spay_neuter_considerations_2013.pdf

CC: Bill Bogaard, Jaque Robinson, Margaret McAustin, John J. Kennedy, Gene Masuda, Victor Gordo, Steve Madison, Terry Tornek



July 11, 2014

The Honorable Bill Bogaard
Mayor, City of Pasadena
Pasadena City Hall
100 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

Re: CaRPOC Opposes Mandatory Spay/Neuter Ordinance

Dear Mayor Bogaard & Honorable Council Members:

California Responsible Pet Owners' Coalition/CaRPOC is writing to you on behalf of Pasadena's ethical, responsible dog owners & breeders. We are writing to express our concerns regarding the proposed changes to Pasadena's Municipal Code requiring all dogs & cats within the City to be spayed or neutered.

Rather than reinvent the proverbial wheel, I will quote heavily below from The FixAustin Blog Blog <http://fixaustin.blogspot.com/2011/01/why-we-join-national-consensus-against.html?m=1> -- added emphasis mine.

"Every single data-based study of mandatory spay/neuter laws has demonstrated that such laws **do not increase spay-neuter compliance rates, nor do they reduce shelter intake, nor are they cost-effective, nor do they save lives.** In fact, the opposite is true: in community after community that has passed a mandatory spay/neuter law, **shelter killing & intake actually increase** because in poor communities, families who cannot afford the money or time to have their pets surgically altered are forced to surrender their pets (or the pets are seized). These pets are quickly replaced in the communities with additional unaltered animals, creating an enhanced cycle of killing. These laws do not work, have never worked in any community, & will not work."

"Mandatory spay/neuter laws do not work: The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) did an extensive study on such laws (in many varieties), & concluded that there is absolutely **"no credible evidence" that such laws have ever worked.** See <http://www.asPCA.org/about-us/policy-positions/mandatory-spay-neuter-laws.aspx>. Another national organization, Alley Cat Allies, did a study of its own & concluded that such laws are "counterproductive, costly, & unenforceable." See <http://www.alleycat.org/NetCommunity/Page.aspx?pid=794>."

"Mandatory spay/neuter laws are **based on a number of false policy assumptions.** Mandatory spay/neuter advocates falsely assume that most people aren't currently spaying & neutering their pets, & that if there were a law requiring spay/neuter, they would do so. Both of these assumptions are false. According to empirical evidence, **the overwhelming majority of Americans have already**

spayed or neutered their pets. In fact, a recent study demonstrated that over 90% of Americans earning \$35K or more have already spayed or neutered their pets (see <http://www.alleycat.org/NetCommunity/Page.aspx?pid=650>), & at least half of those families earning less than \$35K/year have already done so. As a result, the population of Americans who haven't spayed or neutered their pets is relatively small, & it's near-entirely a matter of financial means--- not legal motivation. That's why study after study after study has concluded that the *only proven way to increase spay/neuter compliance is through the provision of low-cost & free spay-neuter services, not through regressive laws that focus on punishing poor families rather than empowering responsible behavior.* See <http://www.asPCA.org/about-us/policy-positions/mandatory-spay-neuter-laws.aspx>."

"There is universal opposition to mandatory spay/neuter laws among national animal-welfare organizations who have spent time to empirically study such laws' effects. Indeed, given the frequent hostility between national animal-welfare organizations, the universal opposition to mandatory spay/neuter laws is telling. The organizations against such laws include: The ASPCA (cited above), Alley Cat Allies (cited above), the American Veterinary Medical Association (<http://www.avma.org/onlnews/javma/may09/090515j.asp>), the No Kill Advocacy Center (<http://www.nokilladvocacycenter.org/pdf/mandatorylaws.pdf>), Pet Connection (<http://www.petconnection.com/blog/2010/08/24/mandatory-spayneuter-sacrificing-animal-lives-to-ideology/>), both the American College of Theriogenologists & the Society for Theriogenology (which are the two groups of veterinarian specialists in spaying & neutering (<http://www.theriogenology.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=1&subarticlenbr=59>), & the Anti-Cruelty Society (http://www.anticruelty.org/site/epage/69344_576.htm), among many, many others. USA Today's veterinary expert has also come out against such laws (see http://www.usatoday.com/life/lifestyle/pets/2010-09-12-vetviews10_N.htm)."

"There are a number of significant, negative unintended consequences to mandatory spay/neuter laws:

- According to the experts, the passage of mandatory spay/neuter laws not only doesn't increase spay/neuter compliance rates or responsible pet ownership, it actually **reduces the provision of veterinary care to animals because the small group of remaining unaltered-pet owners (who either won't or cannot afford to alter their pets) will avoid getting veterinary care for their animals.** According to the American College of Theriogenologists, "[m]aking spay/neuter mandatory... may make the public more hesitant to seek veterinary assistance because they are afraid of fines & legal repercussions as a result of failing to spay or neuter their pets... By avoiding veterinary care for their pets, animals will be at increased risk of inadequate routine vaccination (including rabies) & inadequate deworming programs which may in turn result in increased transmission of disease to the public." See <http://www.theriogenology.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=1&subarticlenbr=59>.
- The **risk of higher rabies rates** (which is nearly always deadly to children) is not purely theoretical. According to the Anti-Cruelty Society, Fort Worth's mandatory spay/neuter law resulted in a significant reduction in rabies vaccinations, & to "an increase in reported rabies cases" in the city. See http://www.anticruelty.org/site/epage/69344_576.htm.
- In addition, San Mateo, California, experienced a 35% **decrease in pet licensing** registrations after passing such a law, meaning that fewer animals brought to the shelter were able to be reunited with their owners. (Same source.)
- Fort Worth changed its law due to the **reduction in rabies vaccinations.** Spay/neuter is no longer mandatory due to the ordinance's failure (one can now have an unaltered pet without penalty or payment so long as they attend a free class)."

"Every No Kill community in America does *not* have a mandatory spay/neuter law.

- The communities in America with the highest shelter save rates are: Reno, NV (90%), Ithaca, NY (95%), Charlottesville, VA (90+%), & San Francisco, CA (86%). None has a mandatory spay/neuter law. The communities with the highest shelter save rate in Texas are Austin (72%), Plano (77%) & Williamson County (77%). None has a mandatory spay/neuter law.
- Los Angeles, CA, recently passed a mandatory spay/neuter law, & its **shelter killing & intake increased by 30% following the law's passage**. Kansas City, MO, recently passed a breed-specific mandatory spay/neuter law, & **intake & killing of those breeds increased by a jaw-dropping 80%** according to local experts. Waco, TX, just passed a mandatory spay/neuter law, & even before the law's passage, it has seen a substantial spike in owner surrenders (& shelter killing) due to financial inability to pay.
 - San Antonio has a mandatory spay/neuter ordinance, & **its shelter kills more than 70%** of all impounded animals. In fact, every large city in Texas other than Austin kills more animals than it saves. Austin, this past year, saved 72%.

“There is no evidence whatsoever that a mandatory spay/neuter law would increase public safety or decrease dog-fighting. Indeed, the opposite is true with regard to rabies & public health, & it is egregiously illogical to think that a criminal who willingly risks felony dog-fighting charges & prison time would somehow be swayed by a unaltered-pet registration fee. In addition, because we know that mandatory spay/neuter laws do not increase spay/neuter compliance rates, we can logically conclude that they will have no impact on dog bites either (even assuming that dog bites are correlated with lack of spay/neuter). In fact, the most preeminent national expert on dog bites & dog-caused deaths concludes that dog-caused deaths are nearly always caused by unsocialized, "backyard" dogs who have never been cared for, loved, or treated responsibly by a loving owner. There is absolutely no logic or evidence to suggest that such an irresponsible owner would be swayed by a fee or fine; again, the empirical evidence demonstrates that the opposite is true: the laws don't change irresponsible behavior.”

“Mandatory spay/neuter laws unfairly target the poor. It has been empirically proven that the lack of financial resources is the primary reason for the failure to alter pets by the small percentage of remaining unaltered-pet homeowners. Persons who cannot afford to alter their pets will be the primary targets for enforcement, therefore. In Kansas City, this resulted in Animal Control authorities doing "sweeps" through poor neighborhoods in which they would literally pull dogs & cats out of the arms of poor children & families. And, contrary to popular belief, there are not enough free spay/neuter resources to provide such services to all unaltered animals. According to estimates of the unaltered pet population by the ASPCA compared to the number of free spay/neuter resources in Austin, for example, it would take an astonishing 31 years to provide free spay/neuter services to the current population of unaltered pets. That means that only 1 in 31 pets could be altered in year one (much less in month 1) if such a law was passed in Austin. The remaining pets would be either surrendered to animal control, or seized, if the pet owner cannot afford the surgery. Such laws pit poor pet owners in an adversarial relationship with law-enforcement officers, dramatically increasing tensions in poor communities. Again, in Kansas City, animal advocates have had to go into communities to teach families about their legal rights in order to protect them from unlawful searches & seizures purportedly resulting from "enforcement" of the mandatory spay/neuter ordinance.”

Pasadena-specific:

- MSN laws & breeder permits are arbitrary & ineffective (please see above) & fail to address the underlying issue of irresponsible pet ownership.
- CA state law already requires sterilization of animals adopted from shelters & mandates license fee at least double for intact animals.
- Recent/current studies have documented increased structural, temperamental & cancers in animals that experienced juvenile spay/neuter.

- 87% of licensed dogs in Pasadena are already neutered. What evidence is there that the remaining 13% are responsible for the “problems?”
- PHS euthanized 4% for lack of space in fiscal year 2014. Given burdensome MSN enforcement costs, it would be more cost-effective to find other options for those few animals.
- Does Pasadena have a program currently in place to help residents without transportation avail themselves of available spay/neuter opportunities? To enact a law to which a portion of society cannot comply is unreasonable.
- More thorough information is needed regarding Pasadena Humane Society's ability to waive sterilization fees for breeds overrepresented in euthanasia data. Is PHS currently doing so & if not, why not? If they are not, this would seem like a reasonable place to begin.
- Data substantiating any correlation between dog bites & an animal being intact is inconsistent. Public education has been proven to be a much more effective means of preventing situations that might result in bites. The AKC has a video & workbook program, **The Dog Listener**, that teaches children about canine behavior & about how to behave around strange or aggressive dogs.
- We are still very much in the throes of a depressed economy. As people's financial stability suffers, it further seeps down & affects the care of our animals. If people cannot afford to properly feed & care for their animals, surely they cannot afford the added costs of MSN, especially if they lack transportation to & from possible low- or no-cost options.
- Low- or No-cost spay/neuter clinics, transportation options to & from those clinics in conjunction with an effective public education campaign with follow-up have proven to be much more effective means of dealing with animal population issues.
- Local, ethical dog breeders are assets to their communities. They have a strong, personal stake in raising & producing healthy, well-socialized, stable pets. They also serve as an ongoing resource to their puppy buyers & their community for the life of the pet & often beyond. Burdensome regulations like those proposed drive them out of their communities only to the detriment of that community.

California Responsible Pet Owners' Coalition/CaRPOC respectfully urges you to oppose mandatory spay/neuter laws & instead to enact enforceable laws that specifically address issues of irresponsible ownership without penalizing responsible owners & ethical dog breeders. We urge you to work with the American Kennel Club to craft reasonable, enforceable laws that address problems of irresponsible pet ownership in the City of Pasadena.

California Responsible Pet Owners' Coalition/CaRPOC was founded by a group of like-minded animal lovers. Our founding supporters include pet owners, rescue volunteers, working dog owners, service and therapy animal owners and clients, trainers, veterinarians, as well as show cat and dog breeders and enthusiasts. Our goals include supporting reasonable animal legislation in the State of California.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Florence Blecher

Florence Blecher
 President
 California Responsible Pet Owner' Coalition

Cc: Members of the Pasadena City Council
 The American Kennel Club