



Irish Wolfhound Club of America, Inc.

July 8, 2009

The Honorable Kevin de Leon
Chair, Assembly Appropriations Committee
California State Assembly
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: **Oppose SB 250 as Proposed to be Amended**

Dear Assembly Member Kevin de Leon, Chair & Assembly Member Jim Nielsen, Vice Chair and Members of the Appropriations Committee:

I am writing you today as the delegate to the American Kennel Club representing the Irish Wolfhound Club of America, a national breed club of nearly 1000 members, many of whom live in California. As well, I also represent two California breed clubs, the Northern California Irish Wolfhound Club and the Irish Wolfhound Club of the West Coast with a combined total of 500 members, and I am a member of the IWCA's large and active legislative committee. I am also President of my local all breed club, Skyline Dog Fanciers of San Mateo County, Inc.

We ask you to oppose Senate Bill 250 when it comes before your committee and to be certain to record our opposition to SB 250 in the Assembly Business and Professions Committee analysis. Our many strong objections to SB 250 are based on our recognition that, if enacted, SB 250 will unreasonably penalize owners of intact animals by forcing castration of an animal for virtually every violation of animal control laws whether such laws are necessary public health measures or as irrelevant to the well-being of the public as SB 250 itself.

Moreover, most of the violations for which an animal can be castrated under SB 250 have no relationship to the animal's reproductive status, but instead are acts of vindictiveness from the legislature to California's animal owners. Do any of you really think that castrating a dog is going to keep him from running away from home if he is so inclined? You might as well use amputating his feet as punishment. Or, far more constructively, require the owner of wandering dogs to construct secure fences and other measures of containment to the owner's property.

We also wish to call to your attention that, because SB 250 would have the effect of statewide mandatory castration, in addition to the costs of enforcement, it could potentially cost the state of California \$319,200 to \$1,075,200 for every dog show canceled due to lack of eligible entries. As there are over 400 dog shows held in California every year, that is a staggering loss to the California economy at a time when the state's reading scores are among the lowest in the nation and its library services among the most under-funded in the nation.

I have been raising Irish Wolfhounds for 37 years. We have bred 14 litters resulting in 100 puppies. 46 of these puppies have grown and finished their AKC championship titles. Our dogs have won top honors around the country. I have not kept track of the money I have spent in 37 years because the amount is staggering. Food, veterinary care, toys, gasoline, entry fees, hotels, meals, donations have averaged \$1,000 to \$1,500 per month since the beginning. That's a great deal of money going into our economy directly related to the dogs....and I'm just one of many people who make the same expenditures month after month. I have also spent countless hours mentoring the public and my puppy owners on responsible ownership and proper care of their dogs. I request that any owner who cannot keep their dog return it to me at any time and at any age and for any reason. My local all breed club also sponsors a cluster of dog shows in Vallejo, California each year that bring 7,500 dogs together for competition over four days. These shows bring tens of thousands of dollars into the community every year and allows us to invite the public for education and mentoring. I am also pleased to share with you that the Irish Wolfhound Club of America is holding their National Specialty in 2010 in Pleasanton, California which will be a boost to the local economy there.

Existing state law that already doubles the licensing fees for intact animals (Food and Agriculture Code Section 30804.5] and that provide for enhanced and graduated fines for owners whose intact dogs are impounded (Food and Agriculture Code Section 30804.7) are sufficient incentives for the vast majority of owners to either castrate their animals or comply with animal control statutes. These statutes are also sufficient to deal with the exceptional owner or animals in repeated violation.

Meantime, SB 250 will not improve the lives of cats and dogs, will negatively impact responsible owners and breeders who will exercise their dismay in the voting booth, and by placing additional burdens on owners of intact animals, may lead to an increase of animals in shelters. Concentrating animal control efforts on dogs whose behavior demonstrates that they are a problem for the community, regardless of their reproductive status, would be a much better use of taxpayer funds.

Put more simply, doesn't this committee think increasing library services for California's students is a better use of taxpayer money than paying for the x-rays that would be necessary to determine whether every female dog or cat in California is spayed or intact?

The IWCA's legislative committee and membership respectfully urge you to do what is right for California and for its animal owners and **oppose SB 250**.

Sincerely,

Scotia Brosnan for Linda Souza
Delegate from the Irish Wolfhound Club of America to the American Kennel Club

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE BILL ANALYSIS

AMENDMENT DATE: May 5, 2009
POSITION: Oppose

BILL NUMBER: SB 250
AUTHOR: D. Florez

BILL SUMMARY: Dogs and Cats: Spaying and Neutering

This bill would make it unlawful to own an unsterilized dog or cat unless specified conditions are met. The bill would also require sterilization of dogs upon the first violation of specified infractions, and require owners/custodians of an impounded or cited unsterilized dog or impounded cat to comply with impoundment procedures.

FISCAL SUMMARY

This bill would result in a substantial increase to the General Fund cost of the Animal Adoption mandate. The Animal Adoption mandate currently costs more than \$24 million annually to reimburse local government shelters' cost to care for impounded animals. Given the current economic climate, requiring the owners of dogs and cats to pay for sterilization procedures would result in more animals being abandoned or surrendered because of the owners' inability to finance the sterilization procedure and pay additional fines.

This bill could create a new state-mandated local program by requiring local agencies to utilize existing procedures or establish new procedures for unaltered dog license denials and appeals, which would create additional pressures on the General Fund. The increased administrative costs of these new tasks are unknown.

Because fines for owning an unsterilized dog or cat would only be assessed if there were a concurrent citation for another violation, this bill would also limit local agencies' ability to collect additional revenue to offset new costs associated with enforcing the bill's new provisions.

COMMENTS

The Department of Finance is opposed to this measure because it would increase costs for an existing state-mandated local program, potentially create a new state mandated local program, and result in General Fund costs that are not included in the 2009-10 Budget Act.

Mandatory spay and neuter provisions have failed throughout California at the local government level. According to the National Animal Interest Alliance (NAIA), Los Angeles City experienced a 20 percent increase in shelter impounds and a 30 percent increase in shelter euthanasias after passage of a mandatory spay and neuter ordinance. NAIA also indicates that in Santa Cruz County, animal control costs doubled after mandatory spay and neuter ordinances were passed.

Los Angeles City Controller Laura Chick's 2008 audit on the Los Angeles Department of Animal Services found that the Department was "ill-prepared to implement or enforce mandatory spay and neuter law and that very few veterinarian providers are responding to the City's call for bids for services." The audit also found that, "though Animal Services is charged with enforcing the mandatory spay and neuter law, it does not intend to do so." The report goes on to state, "the Department, as it does with leash law and dog licensing, will rely on voluntary compliance." Expanding local animal control efforts would likely increase

Analyst/Principal (0221) R. Baker Date Program Budget Manager Todd Jerue Date

Department Deputy Director Date

Governor's Office: By: Date: Position Approved Position Disapproved

BILL ANALYSIS Form DF-43 (Rev 03/95 Buff)

D. Florez

May 5, 2009

SB 250

local agencies' budget demands; however, there is no conclusive evidence that these efforts would result in additional revenue to the state or counteract animal overpopulation.

BILL ANALYSIS

Existing law requires fines for owners of unsterilized dogs and cats that are impounded as follows:

- First occurrence: \$35
- Second occurrence: \$50
- Third and subsequent occurrences: \$100

This bill would preclude local animal shelters or other agencies that impound animals from receiving fines for each additional "occurrence" because upon the first occurrence for dogs and cats, the animal must be sterilized and no additional fines may be charged. These funds are expended for the purpose of humane education and programs for low cost spaying and neutering of dogs. Reducing funding for these programs is counterintuitive to the purpose of this bill.

This bill would require owners and custodians of dogs and cats to "comply with impoundment procedures." While this language is vague and unclear, the most probable outcome is that owners and custodians of dogs and cats will be forced to either pay for the cost of the sterilization procedure or abandon the animal to the licensing agency.

This bill would add the term "custodian" to the Food and Agricultural Code, which would have far-reaching implications. Specifically, the term "custodian" may reduce the legal status and value of dogs and cats and restrict the rights of owners, veterinarians, and government agencies to protect and care for animals. The term "custodian" would also discourage volunteers from participating in trap/neuter/release programs for feral cats, also resulting in increased rates of impounded cats.

This bill would require sterilization of dogs or cats that "roam at large." It is unclear what constitutes "roaming at large", and therefore could lead to numerous complications relating to enforcement, licensing, and license appeals of unsterilized dogs.

This bill would exempt hunting dogs, as specified, from the sterilization requirement; however does not exclude other working or herding breeds. Service dogs that work off lead, such as search and rescue dogs, would also be subject to sterilization requirements. Exempting specific types of dogs from the sterilization could subject the state to litigation.

Specifically, this bill would:

- Require an owner or custodian of an unsterilized dog to have the dog sterilized at six months of age, provide a license of sterility, or obtain an unaltered dog license, as specified.
- Establish criteria by which an unaltered dog license can be denied or revoked and the appellate process thereof.
- Require an owner or custodian who offers any unsterilized dog for sale, trade, or adoption at the age of four months or older to provide an unaltered dog license as well as provide that the ownership document include the unaltered dog's license number and any existing microchip number.
- Require an owner or custodian of an unsterilized cat to have the cat sterilized.
- Require an owner or custodian who offers any unsterilized cat for sale, trade, or adoption to notify the licensing agency, if applicable, of the name and address of the transferee within ten days after transfer and provide that the ownership transfer document include any existing microchip number.
- Authorize any penalty to be imposed upon an owner or custodian of an unsterilized dog for violating the bill's requirements only if the owner or custodian is concurrently cited for another violation under

D. Florez

May 5, 2009

SB 250

state or local law pertaining to the obligations of a person owning or possessing a dog, as specified, and require that the dog to be sterilized.

- Require an owner or custodian of an impounded, unlicensed, and unsterilized dog or cat to provide written proof of the animal's sterilization, or have the animal sterilized.
- Require an owner or custodian of an unsterilized dog or cat be held responsible for impoundment costs, which if not paid, would require the animal to be abandoned to the licensing agency.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

The Department of Finance is opposed to this measure because it would increase costs for an existing state-mandated local program, potentially create a new state mandated local program, and result in General Fund costs that are not included in the 2009-10 Budget Act.

Mandatory spay and neuter provisions have failed throughout California at the local government level. According to the National Animal Interest Alliance (NAIA), Los Angeles City experienced a 20 percent increase in shelter impounds and a 30 percent increase in shelter euthanasias after passage of a mandatory spay and neuter ordinance. NAIA also indicates that in Santa Cruz County, animal control costs doubled after mandatory spay and neuter ordinances were passed.

Los Angeles City Controller Laura Chick's 2008 audit on the Los Angeles Department of Animal Services found that the Department was "ill-prepared to implement or enforce mandatory spay and neuter law and that very few veterinarian providers are responding to the City's call for bids for services." The audit also found that, "though Animal Services is charged with enforcing the mandatory spay and neuter law, it does not intend to do so." The report goes on to state, "the Department, as it does with leash law and dog licensing, will rely on voluntary compliance." Expanding local animal control efforts would likely increase local agencies' budget demands; however, there is no conclusive evidence that these efforts would result in additional revenue to the state or counteract animal overpopulation.

Code/Department Agency or Revenue Type	SO	(Fiscal Impact by Fiscal Year)							Fund Code
	LA	(Dollars in Thousands)							
	CO	PROP	2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		
	RV	98	FC	FC	FC	FC			
8994/St Mandates	SO	No	----- See Fiscal Summary -----						0001