

Council/Agency Meeting Held: _____	_____ City Clerk's Signature
Deferred/Continued to: _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Conditionally Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Denied	
Council Meeting Date:                      9/4/2007	Department ID Number:      PD 07-008

**CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH  
REQUEST FOR CITY COUNCIL ACTION**

**SUBMITTED TO:** Honorable Mayor and City Council Members

**SUBMITTED BY:** Penelope Culbreth-Graft, DPA, City Administrator *PCG*

**PREPARED BY:** Kenneth W. Small, Chief of Police *KWS*

**SUBJECT:** Staff Report on Spay, Neuter, and Microchip Program for Dogs and Cats

Statement of Issue, Funding Source, Recommended Action, Alternative Action(s), Analysis, Environmental Status, Attachment(s)

**Statement of Issue:**

On April 10, 2007, the City Council directed staff to research the cost and other issues associated with adopting a Mandatory Spay, Neuter, and Microchip Identification Ordinance in the City of Huntington Beach.

The purpose of such an ordinance would be to reduce uncontrolled breeding of dogs and cats in the City of Huntington Beach. Microchipping would provide a reliable method to identify pets for a successful owner reunification process. Fewer stray and abandoned dogs and cats can improve public safety and reduce the euthanasia of strays picked up in Huntington Beach by the Orange County Animal Care Services (OCACS). Although the primary goal of the ordinance would be to provide a more humane way of managing the city's pet population, the ordinance would also reduce the strain on OCACS resources.

**Funding Source:**    There is no funding required for the recommended action.

**Recommended Action:    Motion to:**

1. Provide staff with direction regarding drafting an ordinance that requires spaying, neutering, and microchipping for dogs and cats.

**Alternative Action(s):**

1. Determine that no ordinance that requires spaying, neutering and microchipping for dogs and cats should be drafted and direct staff accordingly.

*F-2*

# REQUEST FOR CITY COUNCIL ACTION

MEETING DATE: 9/4/2007

DEPARTMENT ID NUMBER: PD 07-008

---

**Analysis:** See attached staff report.

**Strategic Plan Goal:**

The proposed ordinance supports the following City of Huntington Beach Strategic Plan Goals:

**Engaging the Community**

Education of the community regarding opportunities to become involved in reducing pet overpopulation.

**City Services**

This proposed program would improve the level of service provided to the City of Huntington Beach by reducing the number of adoptable pets euthanized and the number of pets picked up as strays by OCACS. In addition, positive identification of animals through microchipping will help to ensure that more pets are returned to their owners.

**Environmental Status:**

**Attachment(s):**

City Clerk's Page Number	No.	Description
3	1.	Staff Report on a Spay, Neuter, and Microchip Program for Dogs and Cats

F2 . 3

# ATTACHMENT #1


**INTENTIONALLY  
LEFT  
BLANK**



# CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH

## INTER-DEPARTMENT COMMUNICATION

**TO:** Dr. Penelope Culbreth-Graft, City Administrator

**FROM:** Kenneth W. Small, Chief of Police 

**DATE:** August 20, 2007

**SUBJECT:** Staff Report on Spay, Neuter, and Microchip Program for Dogs and Cats

---

### PURPOSE

On April 10, 2007, the City Council directed staff to research the cost and other issues associated with adopting a Mandatory Spay, Neuter, and Microchip Identification ordinance in the City of Huntington Beach.

The purpose of an ordinance would be to reduce uncontrolled breeding of dogs and cats in the City of Huntington Beach. The purpose of requiring microchipping would be to provide a reliable method of identifying pets for a successful owner reunification process. Fewer stray and abandoned dogs and cats will improve public safety and reduce euthanasia of strays picked up in Huntington Beach by the City's contract agency, Orange County Animal Care Services (OCACS). Although the primary goal of an ordinance would be to provide a more humane way of managing the pet population, a by-product of an ordinance would be a reduction in the strain on OCACS resources, which is responsible for the impounding and caring of these animals. A reduction in the number of stray and abandoned dogs and cats may also result in a reduction in the city's contract costs for OCACS.

### PROPOSED ORDINANCE

The ordinance proposed by the H-Item would require a mandatory spay, neuter and microchip identification program for all dogs and cats (6 months or older) in the City of Huntington Beach. Exemptions would be provided when:

- A veterinarian determines the surgery is unsafe due to age or condition of the animal.
- The animal is a law enforcement dog and is used by a law enforcement agency for law enforcement purposes.
- The animal is a service dog that assists the disabled.
- The animal is a "competition" dog or cat.

The exemption of "competition" animals allows legitimate cat and dog breeders the opportunity to continue that activity. A "competition" animal is a dog or cat which is used to show, compete or breed, and which is recognized by and registered with an

approved dog or cat breed registry. In addition, the owner of a "competition" animal must comply with one of the following:

1. Compete in at least one sanctioned dog or cat show or sporting competition per year;
2. Earn a title in their area of competition from a sanctioning dog or cat registry;
3. Be a member of a purebred dog or cat breed club representing their animal's specific breed. The club must be approved by OCACS, which maintains and enforces a code of ethics for animal breeding.

## **FACTS**

Yearly, thousands of unwanted animals enter the OCACS shelter. In Fiscal Year 2006-2007 OCACS impounded 10,121 stray dogs and 13,462 stray cats countywide. Out of those impounded stray animals 3,872 dogs, or 38%, and 8,530 cats, or 63%, were euthanized. In Fiscal Year 2006-2007 OCACS impounded 825 dogs and 763 cats in the City of Huntington Beach. During that year 165 dogs, or 20%, and 320 cats, or 42%, were euthanized. OCACS maintains records regarding the reasons that animals are euthanized. The following information was recorded regarding Huntington Beach animals.

### **Dogs**

<b>Reason</b>	<b>Number</b>
Poor adoptable candidate	34
Aggressive to other animals	7
Aggressive to people	1
Euthanized at a vet hospital	1
Poor behavior history	7
Poor behavior history as observed at shelter	40
Medical reasons	17
Owner requested	45
"Head test" after biting someone	10
Too old to be adopted	2
Lack of shelter space	1

### **Cats**

<b>Reason</b>	<b>Number</b>
Poor adoptable candidate	41
Too young/under age	44
Irremediable suffering	15
Euthanized at a vet hospital	6
Poor behavior history as observed at shelter	83
Medical reasons	110
Owner requested	20
"Head test" after biting someone	1

Animal welfare issues strike an emotional chord with a public that demands significant reductions in euthanasia rates. Both the City of Huntington Beach and Orange County Animal Care Services (OCACS) are committed to a pro-life, pro-adoption philosophy within the context of an open-admission shelter. An open-admission shelter means no animal is ever turned away. Unfortunately, there are not enough homes for the increasing number of cats and dogs born every year. In order to achieve the goal of a significant decrease in euthanasia, the City must reduce the number of dogs and cats entering the shelter system. In the past, this issue has been addressed primarily through public education, incentive-based licensing, and low-cost spay/neuter services provided by local non-profit organizations. An ordinance would support a pro-life, pro-adoption philosophy by reducing the number of dogs and cats born and/or running loose in Huntington Beach. That reduction will, in turn, reduce euthanasia rates for Huntington Beach's animals.

### **PUBLIC SAFETY**

Stray dogs are public safety hazards because they can bite or attack people or other animals, cause traffic accidents, spread disease, damage property and harm the quality of life for residents in a community. Dogs that are not sterilized are also more likely to stray.

### **ANIMAL IDENTIFICATION AND REUNIFICATION**

The most common reason animals are not reclaimed is that they have no identification, and an owner cannot be notified their animal has been impounded. Microchips will improve the OCACS returned-to-owner rate and lessen euthanasia in the County shelter. While tags can become lost or damaged and tattoos can fade or be altered, microchips provide permanent identification with unique numbers that cannot be changed. Due to the presence of microchips, OCACS has reunited owners with pets that had been missing for up to five years.

Microchipping is a simple, non-surgical procedure. The microchip is approximately the size of a grain of rice and is injected underneath the skin with a needle. No anesthesia is required and even the smallest animals such as puppies and kittens can be safely microchipped. The cost of microchipping a dog or cat is approximately \$20.00- \$40.00, however, there are organizations that provide financial assistance to animal owners.

While it is not always possible to physically verify the spayed status of a female dog or cat, the information contained on an animal's microchip can provide an easy way to verify if the animal has been altered. The presence of a microchip is tied to the animal's licensing records and enables OCACS to verify ownership as well as compliance with an ordinance.

Microchipping will prevent the substitution of one animal for another as well as other fraudulent attempts to obtain an unaltered dog or cat license and thereby avoid compliance with an ordinance. For example, purebred dogs and cats closely resemble others within their breed. Microchipping would allow OCACS to positively discern and differentiate animals of the same breed in order ensure compliance with the provisions of an ordinance.

## **EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT**

Compliance with an ordinance would be encouraged by providing reduced pet license fees for altered animals, an identification process to reunify stray dogs and cats with their owners, education through various County and City media outlets such as the websites, other community resources, the OCACS public education program, and neighborhood door-to-door canvassing by OCACS representatives. It would be supported by penalties related to the Civil Citation process, which would impose incremental increases in fines for continued non-compliance.

The primary method of enforcing an ordinance would be the County's licensing program. The City of Huntington Beach has an approximate 30-40% market penetration of dog licenses, compared with a national average of less than 10%. Through the County's database, all licensed dog and cat owners would be notified of the steps necessary in order to comply with the City of Huntington Beach's spay, neuter, and microchip ordinance.

Another education/enforcement tool, which would be implemented, is contact with the owners of impounded dogs and cats. Before receiving an impounded unaltered pet from OCACS, an identified owner:

1. Must prove their animal is exempt from the ordinance
- OR
2. Receive a *City of Huntington Beach Civil Citation*. Compliance with the civil citation process is explained below.

The City of Huntington Beach, in cooperation with OCACS, would provide up-to-date information on their respective websites including fees, forms, and available resources for subsidized spay/neuter, and microchip programs.

As part of the existing contract for services, OCACS currently conducts door-to-door canvassing regarding pet licensing. OCACS can provide additional canvassing on a more widespread basis to educate/enforce a spay/neuter ordinance for an additional fee.

## **DETERMINING EXEMPTIONS**

When licensing a dog or cat that has not been altered, a Huntington Beach resident would need to provide proof of an exemption. OCACS would accept any of the following documents supporting waiver of the requirement to alter their pet:

- A signed letter from a veterinarian verifying and providing medical support for claims that altering would put the animal at significant physical risk;
- Verification of law enforcement status from the law enforcement unit employing the animal;
- A certification from a qualified training organization verifying that the animal has been trained and is employed as a service animal;

- Proof of participation in a sanctioned dog or cat show or sporting competition (e.g. receipt for entry fee, certificate indicating participation, proof of title earned as a result of competition, etc);
- Proof of the owner's membership in an OCACS-approved purebred dog or cat club representing the breed of the dog or cat to be licensed.

Owners of those animals receiving exemptions, with the exception of law enforcement or service animals, would be required to pay an increased fee for the animal's license.

## **PENALTIES**

Citations issued for violations of an ordinance would be handled as civil violations and not criminal violations. Within 30 days following receipt of a citation, the animal owner must show proof that the pet is sterilized, microchipped, and licensed to avoid a penalty. After the 30-day grace period, the pet owner would be fined \$150. If a violation was not corrected, the penalty would increase by \$50 every 30 days up to a maximum of \$500.00. These increasing fees would provide the financial basis for the collection recovery process and would also serve as an incentive for pet owners to comply.

It would be recommended that all citations issued for violating the mandatory spay and neuter ordinance be handled under an administrative citation process similar to that used by Code Enforcement and the Police Department for other specified municipal code violations. OCACS would be the primary enforcement agency and would cite violators using the City of Huntington Beach citation form. Collection of fees and delinquent payments would be processed by the City Treasurer's Office. This would eliminate valuable court time spent processing citations.

## **FISCAL IMPACT ON THE CONTRACT SERVICES PROVIDED BY OCACS**

OCACS would provide the majority of the operational support associated with implementing the Spay, Neuter, and Microchip Program. Initial costs for implementation of the program would be associated with public education, website updates, phone calls, preparation and processing of additional documents during licensing and a potential increase in OCACS costs for canvassing. The associated cost for the implementation and support of the Spay, Neuter, and Microchip Program would be \$75,338 per year. This is in addition to the \$583,011 the City of Huntington Beach would pay OCACS in fiscal year 2007-2008 for contract animal care services.

The minimum level of support needed to implement the City of Huntington Beach Mandatory Spay and Neuter Ordinance would be for OCACS to add one staff assistant. This would be a new position, which would be responsible for the program administration, computer entry, reviewing and approving exemptions, and other unanticipated duties. This position would not be involved in education or pro-active enforcement.

OCACS has two different approaches to identify and educate dog and cat owners about county and city ordinances related to pet ownership. OCACS uses canvassers to go door to door in contract cities and county areas to educate citizens on licensing, pet related ordinances, and other Animal Care services. The canvasser can also collect

fees for licenses and could be used to educate the public and identify dog and cat owners whose pets may be required to be spay or neutered. Huntington Beach is currently covered by a .77 FTE (approximate ¾ full time equivalent) Canvasser which covers a little more than 10% of the households in a year at a cost of \$52,285 / year.

OCACS could also hire a public education officer who would be responsible for special events including informational presentations to the community and schools, coordinating microchip and licensing clinics, promoting and facilitating mobile adoptions, and creating promotional materials.

As is the case with other fines and fees collected by OCACS for services provided in the City of Huntington Beach, any revenue generated by fines and fees related to a Spay and Neuter Ordinance would be used to offset costs. It is anticipated that administrative fines and fees collected from owners of previously unlicensed pets identified by canvassers or hired extra help may increase revenues, but without any prior history the amount cannot be estimated at this time. One important aspect of an ordinance to consider is whether to require that a portion of all fines and fees should be placed in a "Sterilization Fund" to be used for the spay and neuter program. The intent of the ordinance should not be to increase revenue, but to use the fees and penalties for incentives to spay and neuter pets and to offset costs of the program. The police department would closely monitor and track all revenues and expenses related to any ordinance adopted and make recommendations for modification to the City Council.

Refer to the Attachment A of the staff report for an estimated cost increase to the City of Huntington Beach for contract services provided by OCACS to support a Mandatory Spay and Neuter Ordinance.

### **GRACE PERIOD DURING IMPLEMENTATION**

Based on research of other jurisdictions, a one-year grace period would be recommended prior to enforcement of an ordinance. While an ordinance would be in effect during this grace period, no fines or penalties would be levied until the beginning of the second year. The grace period would give the City of Huntington Beach and OCACS time to evaluate the effect the ordinance would have on staffing and agency cost, and it would give adequate time to inform the public and allow them to prepare for implementation.

### **CONCLUSION**

The impact of an ordinance will be measured by a reduction in the numbers of dogs and cats admitted to the shelter from Huntington Beach and by the reduction in the number of healthy, adoptable Huntington Beach animals euthanized. In addition to the emotional toll of euthanasia on staff and volunteers, it is costly to the City and County to provide housing and care for these animals.

A primary tenet of the pro-life, pro-adoption philosophy is to reduce the euthanasia of healthy, adoptable animals. This philosophy is embraced by both Animal Care Services and the community. The Spay, Neuter, and Microchip Program can help further a pro-life, pro-adoption commitment.

An example of a Mandatory Spay and Neuter Program ordinance from Los Angeles County, Attachment B, is attached to this staff report.

**INTENTIONALLY  
LEFT  
BLANK**

**Attachment A**

***Estimated Costs Options for Contract Services Provided by OCACS to Support a  
Mandatory Spay and Neuter Ordinance***

**REQUIRED COST INCREASE**

Annual cost for an added ***Staff Assistant*** to OCACS:

**\$75,338**

**OPTIONAL SERVICES AND SUPPORT OFFERED BY OCACS**

Annual cost for each full time ***Canvasser*** dedicated to the City of Huntington Beach:

**\$67,884**

Each ***Canvasser*** can cover approximately 14% of the city in a year. In order to cover the entire City of Huntington Beach in a year, OCACS would need to supply 7.2 FTE Canvassers. The cost for one year would be:

**\$488,766**

26.72 ***Extra Help*** employees would be needed to cover the entire city in 3 months. The cost for this service would be approximately:

**\$221,306**

The cost / year for an optional ***Public Education Officer***:

**\$77,453**

**INTENTIONALLY  
LEFT  
BLANK**

## Part 4 MANDATORY SPAY AND NEUTER PROGRAM FOR DOGS

### 10.20.350 Mandatory spaying, neutering of dogs.

A. No person may own, keep, or harbor a dog over the age of four months in violation of this section. An owner or custodian of an unaltered dog must have the dog spayed or neutered or obtain an unaltered dog license in accordance with Section 10.20.355.

B. The owner or custodian of a dog which is unable to be spayed or neutered without a high likelihood of suffering serious bodily harm or death due to age or infirmity, must obtain written confirmation of that fact from a licensed veterinarian. The writing must also state the date by which the dog may be safely spayed or neutered. If the dog is unable to be spayed or neutered within 30 days, the owner or custodian must apply for an unaltered dog license. (Ord. 2006-0029 § 5 (part), 2006.)

### 10.20.355 Unaltered dog license--Requirements.

An owner or custodian of an unaltered dog over the age of four months must obtain an annual unaltered dog license for the dog. The license shall be issued if the department has determined that all of the following conditions are met:

A. The dog is one of the following: a competition dog as defined in Section 10.08.095; a dog used by a law enforcement agency for law enforcement purposes; a qualified service or assistance dog as defined in Section 10.20.090; or a dog which is unable to be spayed or neutered as set forth in Section 10.20.350 B;

B. The owner or custodian has submitted the required application and has paid the fee set forth in Section 10.90.010(VI)(A); and

C. The unaltered dog will be maintained in accordance with the provisions of Los Angeles County Code Section 10.40.010, and with applicable state animal care and control laws. (Ord. 2006-0029 § 5 (part), 2006.)

### 10.20.360 Denial or revocation of unaltered dog license--Grounds and re-application.

A. The department may deny or revoke an unaltered dog license for one or more of the following reasons:

1. The applicant or licensee is not in compliance with all of the requirements of Section 10.20.355;
2. The department has received at least one complaint, verified by the complainant under penalty of perjury, that the applicant or licensee has allowed a dog to run loose or escape, or has otherwise been found to be neglectful of his or her dog or other animals;
3. The applicant or licensee has been previously cited for violating a state law, county code or other municipal provision relating to the care and control of animals;
4. The unaltered dog has been adjudicated by a court or an agency of appropriate jurisdiction to be a potentially dangerous or vicious dog, or to be a nuisance within the meaning of the Los Angeles County Code or under state law;
5. Any unaltered dog license held by the applicant has been revoked;
6. A female unaltered dog has had more than one litter per year, or five or more litters in her lifetime; or
7. The license application is discovered to contain a material misrepresentation of fact.

B. Re-application for unaltered dog license:

1. When an unaltered dog license is denied, the applicant may re-apply for a license upon a showing that the requirements of Section 10.20.355 have been met. The department shall refund one-half of the license fee when an application is denied. The applicant shall pay the full fee upon re-application.

2. When an unaltered dog license is revoked, the owner or custodian of the dog may apply for a new license after a thirty-day waiting period upon a showing that the requirements of Section 10.20.355 have been met. No part of an unaltered dog license fee is refundable when a license is revoked and the applicant shall pay the full fee upon re-application. (Ord. 2006-0029 § 5 (part), 2006.)

### 10.20.365 Appeal of denial or revocation of unaltered dog license.

#### A. Request for hearing.

1. Notice of intent to deny or revoke. The department shall mail to the owner or custodian a written notice of its intent to deny or revoke the license for an unaltered dog which includes the reason(s) for the denial or revocation. The owner or custodian may request a hearing to appeal the denial or revocation. The request must be made in writing within ten days after the notice of intent to deny or revoke is mailed. Failure to submit a timely written hearing request shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal the license denial or revocation.

2. Hearing officer. The hearing shall be conducted by the director's designee.

3. Notice and conduct of hearing. The department shall mail a written notice of the date, time, and place for the hearing not less than ten days before the hearing date. The hearing date shall be no more than thirty days after the department's receipt of the request for a hearing. Failure of the owner or custodian or his or her agent to appear at the hearing will result in forfeiture of the right to a hearing. The hearing will be informal and the rules of evidence will not be strictly observed. The department shall mail a written decision to the owner or custodian within ten days after the hearing. The decision of the hearing officer shall be the final administrative decision.

B. Change in location of dog. If the dog is moved after the department has issued a letter of intent to deny or revoke, but has not yet denied or revoked the license, the owner or custodian must provide the department with information as to the dog's whereabouts, including the current owner or custodian's name, address, and telephone number. (Ord. 2006-0029 § 5 (part), 2006.)

### **10.20.370 Transfer, sale and breeding of unaltered dog.**

A. Offer for sale or transfer of unaltered dog: An owner or custodian who offers any unaltered dog for sale, trade, or adoption must include a valid unaltered dog license number with the offer of sale, trade or adoption, or otherwise state and establish compliance with Section 10.20.350. The license and microchip numbers must appear on a document transferring the dog to the new owner.

B. Transfer of unaltered dog: The owner or custodian of an unaltered dog over the age of four months, which is not a competition dog as defined in Section 10.08.095, must demonstrate compliance with Section 10.20.350 and 10.20.185 prior to the transfer, and must notify the department of the name and address of the transferee within ten days after the transfer.

C. Notification of litter and sale or transfer of puppies: Within thirty days after a litter is born to a female dog, the owner or custodian of the female dog shall advise the department in writing of the number of live born puppies. When a puppy under the age of four months is sold or otherwise transferred to another person, the owner or custodian shall advise the department of the name and address of the new owner or custodian, and the microchip number of the puppy, if applicable, within ten days after the transfer. (Ord. 2006-0029 § 5 (part), 2006.)

### **10.20.375 Penalties.**

The penalties for violations of any provision of this part are as follows:

A. First violation. A first violation shall be an infraction punishable by a fine not to exceed \$250. If the owner or custodian fails to correct the underlying cause of the violation within 30 days after being notified of the violation, it shall be deemed a second violation.

B. Second violation. A violation within a year of a first violation shall be deemed a second violation. A second violation is a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment in the county jail for a period not to exceed six months or by a fine not to exceed \$1,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Each subsequent violation within one year shall be considered an additional misdemeanor. (Ord. 2006-0029 § 5 (part), 2006.)

### **10.20.380 Impoundment of unaltered dog.**

A. When an unaltered dog is impounded, the owner or custodian may reclaim the unaltered dog when one of the following occurs:

1. The dog is spayed or neutered by a department veterinarian at the expense of the owner or custodian.

Such expense may include additional fees due to extraordinary care required;

2. The dog is spayed or neutered by another department approved veterinarian. The owner or custodian may arrange for another department approved veterinarian to spay or neuter the dog, and shall pay to the department the cost to deliver the dog to the chosen veterinarian. The cost to deliver the dog shall be based on the department's hourly rate established by the Auditor-Controller, billed in minimum one hour increments. The veterinarian shall complete and return to the department within ten days, a statement confirming that the dog has been spayed or neutered and shall release the dog to the owner or custodian only after the spay or neuter procedure is complete; or,

3. At the discretion of the director, the dog may be released to the owner or custodian if he or she signs a statement under penalty of perjury, representing that the dog will be spayed or neutered and that he or she will submit a statement within ten days, signed by the veterinarian, confirming that the dog has been spayed or neutered.

4. If the owner or custodian demonstrates compliance with Section 10.20.350.

**B. Costs of Impoundment.**

1. The owner or custodian of the unaltered dog shall be responsible for the costs of impoundment, which shall include daily board costs.

2. The costs of impoundment shall be a lien on the dog, and the unaltered dog shall not be returned to its owner or custodian until the costs are paid. If the owner or custodian of an impounded unaltered dog does not pay the lien against the dog in full within fourteen days, the dog shall be deemed abandoned to the department in accordance with Section 10.36.310. (Ord. 2006-0029 § 5 (part), 2006.)

**10.20.385 Allocation of fees and fines collected.**

All costs and fines collected under this part and the fees collected under Section 10.90.010(VI)(A) shall be paid to the department for the purpose of defraying the cost of the implementation and enforcement of this Part 4. (Ord. 2006-0029 § 5 (part), 2006.)

**INTENTIONALLY  
LEFT  
BLANK**

**Esparza, Patty**

---

**From:** Maurenglick@cs.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 26, 2007 8:06 PM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL  
**Cc:** Dapkus, Pat; Fikes, Cathy  
**Subject:** Spay/Neuter Ordinance

Dear Council Members:

Please vote yes on the spay/neuter ordinance.

Thank you,

Maureen Glick  
16931 Cod Circle  
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

9/4/07  
Communication  
F-2

8/27/2007

**Esparza, Patty**

---

**From:** Judy Henzie [jhenzie@socal.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 27, 2007 2:31 PM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL  
**Cc:** Dapkus, Pat; Fikes, Cathy  
**Subject:** Please!!

Please vote YES on the SPAY/NEUTER/MICROCHIP ordinance. We have so many unwanted and abandoned kittens, puppies, cats and dogs in our city. Those of us who love animals cannot care for them all. We must make pet owners responsible and insist on humane treatment for helpless animals.

Please,

Judith A Henzie  
Jennifer A Drescher  
Dale Cunningham

9/4/07  
COMMUNICATION  
F-2

8/27/2007

**Esparza, Patty**

---

**From:** Dapkus, Pat  
**Sent:** Monday, August 27, 2007 2:52 PM  
**To:** City Clerk Agenda  
**Subject:** FW: mandatory spay/neuter/microchip

Pat Dapkus  
(714) 536-5579  
(714) 536-5233 (FAX)

---

**From:** Johnna Lipuma [mailto:jlhealth@socal.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 27, 2007 1:43 PM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL  
**Cc:** Dapkus, Pat; Fikes, Cathy  
**Subject:** mandatory spay/neuter/microchip

**Dear HB City Council,**

Please visit the following webpage <http://www.spotsociety.org/fatedog.html> (please copy and paste in search engine).

As a middle School teacher for LBUSD I preach to my students the importance of learning about all sides of an argument so a person may make an educated decision. Please regulate the animal industry, so the animals do not have to suffer in order for others to profit.

The animal supply exceeds the demand and the solution now is euthanasia, in 2007 its appalling!!!

Please let this law be the start to end animal suffering!

Thank you,  
Johnna Lipuma  
Huntington Harbor  
16305 Niantic Circle  
HB, CA 92649  
Teacher/Animal Rescue Volunteer/Voter

9/4/07  
COMMUNICATION  
F-2

8/27/2007

## Esparza, Patty

---

**From:** Thomson, Kathy A [kathy.a.thomson@boeing.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 27, 2007 12:01 PM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL  
**Cc:** Dapkus, Pat; Fikes, Cathy  
**Subject:** do not approve mandatory spay/neuter/microchip ordinance for huntington beach

Please do NOT approve the proposal for a mandatory spay/neuter/microchip ordinance for Huntington Beach. This law merely punishes responsible owners, as irresponsible owners will simply ignore the law anyway.

I work competition obedience with my dog, but don't always actually compete once a year. Therefore, my dog would NOT be considered a "competition" dog one year, but would the next. He has three obedience titles and we're slowly training for the fourth. My dog happens to already be fixed so it is a moot point, but I could see how this arbitrary definition will cause problems.

Also, how is it the Council's expertise to determine when a dog of a specific breed should be fixed. Just as the age a pup should be removed from it's mother varies from breed to breed, the best time to spay and neuter is breed and even gender specific. Does the City Council propose to become experts in this field?

Again, I ask that you do NOT approve the mandatory spay/neuter/microchip ordinance for Huntington Beach. Huntington Beach is known as a dog friendly community. Please keep it that way!

Thanks,  
kathy thomson

9/4/07  
COMMUNICATION  
F-2<sup>1</sup>

**Esparza, Patty**

---

**From:** reverendginger@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, August 27, 2007 12:27 PM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL  
**Cc:** Dapkus, Pat; Fikes, Cathy  
**Subject:** spay/neuter/microchip ordinance

I am not able to attend the upcoming counsel meeting when you will be addressing this issue. We have switched from Timewarner to Verizon for cable so we unfortunately no longer get the counsel meetings. I would however, like to express my one concern over the mandatory spay/neuter/microchip ordinance you will be considering and that concern centers around microchip required for felines. I have lived in Huntington Beach since 1972 and my husband since the late 1950's. All of our pets are already spayed and neutered and our dogs are microchipped. We did these procedures because we care about our animals, and we wish all folks did the same. I discussed microchip for our cats and our vet didn't think it was necessarily advantageous. While we would microchip our felines if necessary, I'm more concerned about those who might not find it affordable and how would you enforce it. I do think that spay and neuter is a definite yes, and yes for canine microchip, but unless microchip for felines is reasonably priced (\$5 each) I truly wonder what the advantage would be.

Thank you for your time.

---

Email and AIM finally together. You've gotta check out free [AOL Mail!](#)

9/4/07  
COMMUNICATION  
F-2

**Esparza, Patty**

---

**From:** Dapkus, Pat  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 28, 2007 8:16 AM  
**To:** City Clerk Agenda  
**Subject:** FW: Spay/Neuter/Microchip Ordinance

Pat Dapkus  
(714) 536-5579  
(714) 536-5233 (FAX)

---

**From:** c allen [mailto:charlie613hb@socal.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 27, 2007 11:14 PM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL  
**Cc:** Dapkus, Pat; Fikes, Cathy  
**Subject:** Spay/Neuter/Microchip Ordinance

Dear City Council Members,

As a resident of Huntington Beach since 1979 and Vice President of Catnip and Carrots Animal Bunch, I wholly support the Spay/Neuter/Microchip Ordinance being considered by the City. I hope you will all have the good sense to pass this ordinance for the sake of thousands of animals that are "put down" due to overpopulation. Thank you for your time and consideration'

Sincerely,

Charlean E. Allen  
8216 Foxhall Dr.  
HB 92646

9/4/07  
COMMUNICATION  
F-2

8/28/2007

**Esparza, Patty**

---

**From:** Dapkus, Pat  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 28, 2007 10:09 AM  
**To:** City Clerk Agenda  
**Subject:** FW: dog and cat spay and neutering

Pat Dapkus  
(714) 536-5579  
(714) 536-5233 (FAX)

---

**From:** EILEEN GREGORY [mailto:begregory1@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 26, 2007 2:57 PM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL  
**Cc:** Dapkus, Pat; Fikes, Cathy  
**Subject:** dog and cat spay and neutering

This is to let you know that I fully support the spay/neuter/microchip bill. As a Huntington Beach resident I have saved many of animals because of other peoples neglect. I think this would be a wonderful bill, its not right to have to kill these poor animals because there are not enough homes to go around. So lets not let this keep going on. Lets show others that the people of Huntington Beach are willing to stand up for are pet and what is right.

Thank you,

Eileen Gregory

9/4/07  
COMMUNICATION  
F-2

**Esparza, Patty**

---

**From:** Dapkus, Pat on behalf of Coerper, Gil  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 28, 2007 9:33 AM  
**To:** City Clerk Agenda  
**Subject:** FW: Mandatory Spay/Neuter/Microchip Ordinance

Pat Dapkus  
(714) 536-5579  
(714) 536-5233 (FAX)

---

**From:** Tanaka, Miyako [mailto:MTANAKA@SYCR.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 28, 2007 9:33 AM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL  
**Cc:** Dapkus, Pat; Fikes, Cathy  
**Subject:** Mandatory Spay/Neuter/Microchip Ordinance

Although I have spayed and microchipped my dog, I do not believe the City Council should be deciding WHEN or IF a dog/cat should be fixed. The exceptions don't make any sense. I believe all service and law enforcement dogs are altered and "competition" dogs/cats don't always compete once a year and I believe the County already has permits for breeders.

PLEASE DO NOT PASS the Mandatory Spay/Neuter/Microchip Ordinance. We do not need more "government" trying to control our lives.

Miyako Tanaka  
Huntington Beach, CA

9/4/2007  
COMMUNICATION  
F-2