

Buchanan, Rita

From: cityclerk
Subject: FW: California Federation of Dog Clubs - Opposition to Spay/Neuter Ordinance
Attachments: Pasadena October 2014 MSN.pdf

From: Geneva Coats [<mailto:genevacoats@aol.com>]
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2014 5:54 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; De La Cuba, Vannia; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; bod-cfodc@yahooogroups.com
Subject: California Federation of Dog Clubs - Opposition to Spay/Neuter Ordinance

Please see attached email, in pdf form, to be printed and included in the public record

Thank you,

Geneva Coats, R.N.
Secretary
California Federation of Dog Clubs

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

October 24, 2014

Request to be included in the official record.

Dear Mayor Bogaard, Vice Mayor Robinson, and City Council Members,

The California Federation of Dog Clubs urges you to reject the ill-conceived spay-neuter proposal. 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 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 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
Secretary
California Federation of Dog Clubs

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



P. O. BOX 2341 LANCASTER CALIFORNIA 93539
WWW.CFODCONLINE.ORG

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

October 24, 2014

Request to be included in the official record.

Dear Mayor Bogaard, Vice Mayor Robinson, and City Council Members,

The California Federation of Dog Clubs urges you to reject the ill-conceived spay-neuter proposal. 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

room 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 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 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
Secretary
California Federation of Dog Clubs

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

Buchanan, Rita

From: cityclerk
Subject: FW: Mandatory spay/neuter ordinance Pasadena, CA 10.27.14
Attachments: Pasadena MSN CaRPOC10.27.14.pdf

From: florence blecher [<mailto:browndogz@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, October 26, 2014 1:51 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill
Cc: district1; Morales, Margo; West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; De La Cuba, Vannia; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; Sprouse Sarah
Subject: Mandatory spay/neuter ordinance Pasadena, CA 10.27.14



October 27, 2014

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

**Re: CaRPOC Opposes Proposed Mandatory Spay/Neuter Ordinance
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF PASADENA ADDING CHAPTER 6.09 TO TITLE 6 OF
THE PASADENA MUNICIPAL CODE REQUIRING ALL DOGS AND CATS WITHIN THE CITY TO
BE SPAYED OR NEUTERED**

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 and breeders. We are writing to express our **OPPOSITION** to the proposed ordinance requiring all dogs and cats within the City of Pasadena to be spayed or neutered, adding to Chapter 6.09 Title 6 of Pasadena's Municipal Code, and to plead for an eleventh hour rejection of this proposed ordinance.

The Pasadena City Council meeting on October 6th was an evening of sad irony, at least to me. With great fanfare, Pasadena's Mayor and City Council boldly claimed the month of October as Bullying Prevention Awareness Month. You collectively recognized the horrible consequences of bullying and intimidation.

Next was a discussion of California Proposition 47. The Mayor and City Council unanimously championed the concept of proposing to reduce nonviolent crimes from felonies to misdemeanors. As a body, you recognized that minor misdeeds should not haunt or cripple someone for the rest of their life.

Unfortunately, when it came to applying those same principles to animals and their owners, bullying and a heavy-handed, one strike orientation prevailed. Compassion, understanding and fairness were lost.

As conceived and drafted, this is a poorly written, vague and ambiguous proposal that is based on false assumptions and that overreaches. The perceived "need" for the heavy-handed, bullying in this proposal is not justified by the facts.

Throughout the months of discussion on this matter, state of the art, current documented health studies, data and up-to-date facts have repeatedly been rejected in favor of formulaic half-truths and "we've always done things this way" reasoning combined with hysteria and fear.

Where have all the willing PETA volunteers been until now? Why doesn't the Pasadena Humane Society already have an effective education program in place or ready to go? Why doesn't PHS have arrangements in place with mobile spay and neuter groups to serve lower income residents? What have Mr. McNall and Ms. Campo been doing for 18 months in preparation for this?

Facts:

- AVMA & CVMA oppose mandatory spay/neuter of owned animals.
- The ASPCA, Alley Cat Allies, the No Kill Advocacy Center, Canine Companions for Independence, American College of Theriogenologists & the Society for Theriogenology all oppose mandatory spay/neuter of owned animals.
- The following extremely current health studies document the adverse effects of juvenile neutering:
 - "Evaluation of the risk and age of onset of cancer and behavioral disorders in gonadectomized Vizslas" 2.1.14 - <http://avmajournals.avma.org/doi/abs/10.2460/javma.244.3.309>
 - "Neutering Dogs: Effects on Joint Disorders and Cancers in Golden Retrievers" 2.13.13 - <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0055937>
 - "Long-Term Health Effects of Neutering Dogs: Comparison of Labrador Retrievers with Golden Retrievers" 7.14.14 - <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0102241>

In summary, from the ASPCA's Position Statement on Breed-Specific Legislation, "Often, such laws are responses to a particularly violent individual dog attack." This is exactly what happened when Councilman Madison was alarmed by a local incident and initially sought a breed-specific ordinance for Pasadena. The report further states, "The ASPCA instead favors effective enforcement of a combination of breed-neutral laws that hold reckless guardians accountable for their dogs' aggressive behavior." That includes:

- "Enhanced enforcement of dog licenses laws with adequate fees to augment animal control budgets and surcharges on ownership of unaltered dogs to help fund low-cost pet sterilization programs.
- "Laws that mandate the sterilization of shelter animals, ideally before adoption, and make low-cost sterilization services widely available.
- "Enhanced enforcement of leash/dog-at-large laws, with adequate penalties to ensure that the laws are taken seriously and to augment animal control funding.
- "Dangerous dog laws that are breed-neutral and focus on the behavior of the individual guardian and dog with graduated penalties according to the seriousness of the dog's behavior.
- "Laws that hold guardians financially accountable for a failure to adhere to the animal control laws.
- "Laws that prohibit chaining or tethering."

"In summary, the ASPCA advocates the implementation of a community dog bite prevention program encompassing media and educational outreach in conjunction with the enactment and vigorous enforcement of breed-neutral laws that focus on the irresponsible and dangerous behavior of individual guardians and their dogs." These are exactly the type of laws that are effective in Calgary, Alberta, Canada and that could be equally successful in Pasadena.

Local, ethical dog breeders are assets to their communities. Laws like this unwarranted, flawed proposal will stop them from selling animals to Pasadena residents.

We at CaRPOC hope that the honorable Mayor and council people of the City of Pasadena will carefully review what we have written and will REJECT the proposed ordinance. We hope that you will look carefully at the facts, not at saving face or succumbing to emotion, bullying or hysteria.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Florence Blecher
President
California Responsible Pet Owner' Coalition

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

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.

- "Every No Kill community in America does not have a mandatory spay/neuter law.
- "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 and public health... 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 and 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... Such laws pit poor pet owners in an adversarial relationship with law-enforcement officers, dramatically increasing tensions in poor communities."

Buchanan, Rita

From: cityclerk
Subject: FW: Mandatory Spay/Neuter

Importance: High

From: Mitten, Robert A Jr CTR (US) [<mailto:robert.a.mitten2.ctr@mail.mil>]
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2014 7:44 AM
To: Bogaard, Bill; district1; Morales, Margo; West, Jana; Sullivan, Noreen; De La Cuba, Vannia; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry
Subject: Mandatory Spay/Neuter
Importance: High

Please do not pass this Mandatory Spay/Neuter Law. It is BAD for the future of California and California's purebred dogs.

There are many people in the Pasadena area that make a living out of Breeding and Showing quality show dogs.

Robert A. Mitten, Jr.
63rd RSC Education Services Office
Education Service Advisor
AHCi LLC

Buchanan, Rita

From: cityclerk
Subject: FW: FOR OFFICIAL RECORD - Proposed Mandatory Spay/Neuter Ordinance - OPPOSED

From: CAROLE RASCHELLA [<mailto:carole@raschella.com>]
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2014 4:55 PM
To: Bogaard, Bill
Subject: FOR OFFICIAL RECORD - Proposed Mandatory Spay/Neuter Ordinance - OPPOSED

FOR OFFICIAL RECORD

Proposed Mandatory Spay/Neuter Ordinance

I sent this letter to you prior to that first fiasco of a hearing held on October 6th. Even though it seems quite obvious that, with the exception of Councilmembers Tornek, Kennedy and Robinson, no one on this Council a. read it, b. was capable of reading it, or c. gives a crap about facts, statistics, or their constituents, I am, ever the optimist, sending it again:

I am a Director with the California Federation of Dog Clubs, founded more than 20 years ago to fight for the health and welfare of dogs and the rights of their owners. My only question for you is **WHY?** What purpose is your proposed changes to the law supposed to have other than making pet ownership more and more difficult? What do you have against intact dogs?

I am sure you have been presented with reams of statistics and info that mandatory spay/neuter doesn't work (if not, I can certainly provide them). In fact, rather than saving lives and lowering costs, it has the opposite effect, increasing numbers in shelters and therefore the number of dogs killed. It also increases the expenses, and has proven health complications, including the risk of dying during surgery (as happened to my beautiful, happy, healthy 5-year-old dog). And by creating restrictions that 95% of hobby breeders can't possibly meet, you are making breeding illegal. Why? Do you really want to eliminate all dogs? Any student of Biology 101 can tell you that will be the eventual outcome. As for the myth of pet overpopulation, that is no longer the case. There are shortages of dogs in many areas and whole new industries are springing up in the transportation of dogs. It even has a name: retail rescue.

Los Angeles happens to have a great number of Chihuahuas, which isn't surprising considering that thousands of them are smuggled across the border every year. And Pit Bulls, which is due to their popularity with gangs. That's it. Two breeds, although Pit Bull is actually a type, not a breed and most of the time misidentified (as we have seen in the Breed ID Workshops CFODC presents to shelters and their employees).

So how does sterilizing all mixed breeds and, with a few minor exemptions, all purebreds, have any effect whatsoever on the number of Chihuahuas and Pit Bulls in LA shelters? Obviously, it doesn't, so let's go back to my original question...Why?

This is a nasty, malicious, spiteful law. One violation and ALL the owner's dogs are sterilized? Intact license revoked based on something that may have happened 20 years ago? And of course that one about sterilization on first impoundment even if the gardener left the gate open. What is WRONG with you? Why are you being so petty, so vicious and mean? Are you like this to everyone or just dog owners?

It's so wrong I don't know where to begin. I just want to know WHY. And by the way, if you insist on clinging to the myth of pet overpopulation, then what does sterilizing a dog for barking have to do with it?

Four years ago, I and many, many others made the long trip to Sacramento to fight against AB 1634, the proposed law to make mandatory spay/neuter a state law. It was defeated, for all the reasons I have just mentioned, but also because people DO NOT WANT IT! Don't you care that the citizens of California, and therefore Pasadena, don't want this?

I personally happen to believe the statistics that say sterilizing (mutilating) dogs shortens their lives, and leads to endless physical problems, including cancers of all kinds. Whether YOU believe it or not is irrelevant. These are my dogs, not yours, and yet you want to destroy their quality of life. I have never bred a dog or ever plan to...why are my dogs being punished for something they did not create?

And so we come full circle...WHY?

By the way, before you throw these onerous laws on Pasadena's dogs, how about looking at the THOUSANDS of dogs imported into this country every year from third world countries? Don't believe me? Look it up! The end result of your proposal will be the elimination of healthy, well-adjusted American dogs, to be replaced by street dogs entering this country with rabies, as well as diseases we eliminated years ago. Is this what you want for your children and grandchildren?

Carole Raschella
Director
California Federation of Dog Clubs

Buchanan, Rita

From: cityclerk
Subject: FW: Oppose Mandatory Spay Neuter

From: silverfoxsams@frontiernet.net [<mailto:silverfoxsams@frontiernet.net>]
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2014 8:16 AM
To: Bogaard, Bill
Subject: Oppose Mandatory Spay Neuter

October 27, 2014
The Honorable Bill Bogaard
Mayor, City of Pasadena
Pasadena City Hall
100 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101
Re: Oppose Proposed Mandatory Spay/Neuter Ordinance

Dear Mayor Bogaard & Honorable Council Members:

Statistics consistently prove that mandatory spay neuter is harmful to pets, harmful to their owners and does not "fix" what ever issue that has made the news cycle. Those who propose mandatory spay neuter have their own agenda, and it is not the welfare of animals.

As an outsider looking in, it certainly appears that Pasadena is not a pet friendly place. The proposal actually indicates a hatred for animals; it ignores the real, physical harm that is done to pets; many die during sterilization surgery - major surgery - something that veterinarians and those with agendas don't talk about. Studies have shown many adverse effects such as bone cancer. MSN consistently results in an increase in the shelter population. Is this really the result you seek?

Should this ordinance pass, I certainly will not be spending my hard earned dollars in Pasadena - either physically or with online businesses - and I would never, ever bring my dog to a city that so blatantly hates his species.

Please use facts and critical thinking skills, not emotion and agenda driven by animal rights radicals, who are more concerned with ideology than any actual animal welfare.

I really would like to visit your city and enjoy the sunshine. Please Oppose mandatory spay neuter in Pasadena.

Sincerely,

Judie Lucas
McCall, Idaho