

Problems with the Riverside County Ordinance 630.12 Mandating Microchipping/Forced Sterilization of Dogs and Cats

The public hearing on the ordinance is scheduled for *Tuesday January 13th at 9:30 AM* at the Board chambers, 1st floor, 4080 Lemon St. Riverside. The Board plans to pass the ordinance after the hearing unless convinced otherwise.

- Trust
 - Director's pledge to involve Dog Legislation Committee in draft was not honored
 - Scheduling of introduction and hearing appear timed to minimize opposition
- Health
 - Long term physical and behavioral risks of early sterilization will exceed any benefits
- Results
 - Experience in numerous jurisdictions across the U.S. shows forced sterilization legislation is counter-productive
- Measurement
 - How would success be measured?
 - What statistics, trends, data are available to define the current problem and success?
- Wanted becomes unwanted
 - How does this solve the problem of a wanted pet becoming an unwanted pet?
 - The top 10 reasons for turn-in
- State Vote and Polls
 - California State Senate voted 27-5 against similar legislation
 - Several polls show significant public sentiment against forced sterilization
- Unlikely to be revenue neutral as intro suggests
 - Cost of implementing and maintaining database for required reporting
 - Experience of other jurisdictions shows licensing and licensing revenues will decrease
 - Due to cost of impoundment, microchipping and forced sterilization some owners will elect to abandon their pets resulting in increased care cost to county

- Unavailability of low cost spay/neuter
 - Although it is offered, the availability is spotty and low income people in some areas cannot afford to travel for the service
- Impossible to guarantee an animal won't escape regardless of efforts made
 - The county can require sterilization of an impounded animal even if the events leading to impoundment are uncharacteristic of owner
- Arbiter in appeals cases is appointed by Animal Services
 - How fair is this?
- Intro states that microchips will be used for law enforcement purposes other than returning animal to its owner
- What will be the use and what are the protections against misuse of the data generated by the required reporting?
 - Microchip database is redundant since registries already exist
- Oklahoma City example
 - City Council passed an ordinance providing free spay/neuter as an incentive with the Council believing it to be the most effective approach

- Please contact the Supervisors by phone, e-mail or US Postal Service mail or all three to register your opposition.

| | | | |
|--------------|----------------------------|--|--------------|
| 1st District | Supervisor Bob Buster | district1@rcbos.org | 951 955-1010 |
| 2nd District | Supervisor John Tavaglione | district2@rcbos.org | 951 955-1020 |
| 3rd District | Supervisor Jeff Stone | district3@rcbos.org | 951 955-1030 |
| 4th District | Supervisor Roy Wilson | district4@rcbos.org | 951 955-1040 |
| (Chair) | | | |
| 5th District | Supervisor Marion Ashley | district5@rcbos.org | 951-955-1050 |

4080 Lemon St
 5th Floor
 Riverside, CA 92501