



Commission of Animal Control & Welfare

Commissioners

Michael Angelo Torres

Chairperson

Irina Ozernoy

Vice-Chair

Mikaila Garfinkel

Secretary

Nick Chapman

Commissioner

Michael Reed

Commissioner

Dayna Sherwood

Commissioner

Department Representatives

Amy Corso

San Francisco Department of Animal
Care and Control

George Han, MD, MPH

San Francisco Department of Public
Health

Gregory Sutherland

San Francisco Police Department

Christopher Campbell

San Francisco Recreation and Park
Department

January 10, 2026

City Administrator Carmen Chu
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 362
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Recommendation in Support of Proposed Mandatory Spay/Neuter Legislation

Dear City Administrator Chu,

As part of its responsibility to advise the Office of the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and the Office of the City Administrator on matters related to animal welfare, the San Francisco Animal Commission submits this letter in support of the proposed mandatory spay/neuter policy changes put forward by San Francisco Animal Care and Control (SF ACC).

Under the proposed mandatory spay/neuter legislation, all dogs one year of age or older would be required to be spayed or neutered (except for a few clearly defined exceptions). The legislation would also replace San Francisco's current breed-specific mandatory spay/neuter requirement for pit bulls, thereby establishing a more equitable, breed-neutral policy.

San Francisco is currently facing significant post-pandemic challenges related to animal homelessness, particularly among dogs. SF ACC has reported a sustained increase in shelter intake, including a sharp rise in puppies entering the system. In Fiscal Year 2019, SF ACC took in 2,643 dogs and placed 2,129. In the most recent fiscal year, intake increased by over 20% to 3,179 dogs, but only 2,355 placements. Puppy intake alone rose from 243 in FY2020 to 470 last year. These trends underscore the urgent need for proactive, preventative policy measures.

This legislative change is modeled after a program implemented by Los Angeles County in 2006, which has demonstrated measurable success. Since the adoption of its mandatory spay/neuter law, Los Angeles County reduced its annual dog intake from approximately 90,000 dogs per year to roughly 34,000 dogs per year. Aligning San Francisco's policy framework with this proven approach represents an innovative step toward improved animal well-being outcomes.

This proposed legislation is strategically designed to reduce the number of dogs entering San Francisco's shelter system, thereby decreasing the likelihood of prolonged shelter stays and euthanasia when placement cannot be found. The Commission recognizes that no one wants dogs to



Commission of Animal Control & Welfare

experience homelessness or to be euthanized, and that as a community, we share responsibility for preventing these outcomes.

It is also worth noting that California state law already requires all dogs adopted from shelters to be spayed or neutered. The proposed legislation extends this preventative framework beyond the shelter system, addressing the upstream causes of animal overpopulation. Enforcement would be complaint or report-based, further ensuring that implementation remains reasonable and targeted.

Based on the data presented by SF ACC, the demonstrated success of similar legislation in other jurisdictions, and the shared goal of reducing animal homelessness and euthanasia, the San Francisco Animal Commission strongly recommends adoption of the proposed mandatory spay/neuter legislation.

Thank you for your consideration of this recommendation. Should you have any questions or wish to discuss this matter further, please feel free to reach out to me.

Sincerely,

Michael Angelo Torres
Chair, San Francisco Animal Commission – Commission of Animal Control
and Welfare

San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Rm 362
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Phone: (415) 554-6074
Email: michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org

From: [Michael Nulty](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mahmood, Bilal \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Alan \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#); [Abd6membership](#)
Subject: 251162 Health Code - Spaying, Neutering, and Sterilizing of Dogs
Date: Saturday, March 7, 2026 2:20:43 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Honorable Members of the Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee,

The Alliance for a Better District 6 strongly supports the proposed mandatory spay/neuter legislation introduced by San Francisco Animal Care and Control (SF ACC). This breed-neutral policy would require all dogs one year of age or older to be spayed or neutered, with clearly defined exceptions, while eliminating the current breed-specific requirement for pit bulls. We believe this change promotes equity, animal welfare, and effective management of our city's animal homelessness crisis.

As highlighted in the San Francisco Animal Commission's recent letter of support to City Administrator Chu, San Francisco faces ongoing post-pandemic challenges with elevated dog intakes and placements at SF ACC. Intake rose over 20% in recent years, with puppy intake nearly doubling in some periods, straining resources and increasing risks of prolonged shelter stays or euthanasia. This legislation addresses root causes by extending preventative measures beyond shelter adoptions—where spay/neuter is already mandated under California state law—to the broader pet population through a complaint-based enforcement approach that remains reasonable and targeted.

The proposal draws inspiration from Los Angeles County's successful 2006 mandatory spay/neuter ordinance, which significantly reduced annual dog intake from around 90,000 to approximately 34,000. Several other California jurisdictions have adopted similar mandatory spay/neuter policies for dogs (and often cats), demonstrating a broader trend toward proactive, breed-neutral approaches to curb overpopulation. These include:

- Long Beach (requiring dogs over 6 months to be spayed/neutered, with exemptions for medical, show, service, and certain grandfathered animals)
- Lake Elsinore (mandating spay/neuter for dogs and cats over 4 months, paired with microchipping)
- Menifee (requiring spay/neuter or an unaltered dog license/permit for dogs)

- Bakersfield (implementing mandatory spay/neuter programs with certification options)
- Moreno Valley (along with nearby cities like Riverside and San Bernardino, enforcing mandatory ordinances)

Many cities in Los Angeles County have also aligned with the county's ordinance for dogs and cats over 4 months. Santa Cruz County has maintained a longstanding mandatory policy since 1995 for animals over 6 months (with unaltered certificates available). These examples illustrate that mandatory, equitable spay/neuter requirements—when paired with exemptions, education, and accessible services—can yield positive outcomes in reducing shelter burdens and euthanasia rates.

The Alliance for a Better District 6 urges the Committee to advance this legislation. By adopting a proven, fair, and comprehensive policy, San Francisco can lead in preventing animal homelessness, improving community safety and neighborhood well-being, and upholding our shared responsibility to protect vulnerable animals.

Sincerely,

Michael Nulty
Executive Director
Alliance for a Better District 6

Michael Nulty

P.O. Box 420782
San Francisco, CA 94142-0782
(415) 339-8327 - Direct
(415) 339-8779 - Alliance for a Better District 6
(415) 339-8683 - Central City Democrats
(415) 937-1289 - North of Market Business Association
(415) 820-1412 - Tenderloin Futures Collaborative
<http://abd6.cfsites.org/>

From: [Project Open Paw](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Chok, Liam \(ADM\)](#)
Subject: Proposed spay/neuter mandate
Date: Thursday, March 12, 2026 12:33:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Mr. Dorsey, I am Paul Crowell, founder and president of Project Open Paw, a charity organization here in SF that benefits pets belonging to unhoused folks.. Over my 10 years of service in The City I have witnessed the mass breeding of puppies in this community on a scale that is disturbing.. Spay and Neuter is highly frowned upon in the culture of this community, to the point of it being almost a taboo subject, for various reasons, none of which seem to be to the benefit of the voiceless dogs forced to provide litter after litter for sale or trade, or to be given to other homeless individuals to land in less than ideal lives and continue the cycle of unchecked breeding... The proposed measure from SFACC concerning mandatory spay/neuter for dogs 1 year old and older could make a foreseeable positive difference in curbing some of this unethical business on our streets and benefit it's innocent animal victims immeasurably.. I most certainly endorse passing this legislation for the greater good of animals and our city alike.. Thank you so much for your consideration... Best, Paul
Crowell Project Open Paw

From: [Noah Price](#)
To: [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Ordinance (File #251162) to amend the health code, requiring all dogs over a certain age to be spayed, neutered
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 2:16:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

March 16, 2026

Monique Crayton, Committee Clerk
San Francisco Public Safety & Neighborhood Services Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244,
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Ordinance (File #251162) to amend the health code, requiring all dogs over a certain age to be spayed, neutered

Dear Monique Crayton, Committee Clerk:

My name is Noah Price, and I am a long-time San Francisco resident and dog owner. I am testifying today in opposition to the proposed mandatory spay/neuter ordinance for all dogs.

I support reducing shelter intake and euthanasia, but a one-size-fits-all surgical mandate ignores the evolving veterinary science on reproductive hormones and long-term health. Recent reviews and cohort studies show that the health impacts of gonad removal are complex and highly individual, varying by breed, sex, and age at surgery (Arroube & Pereira, 2025).

First, there is growing evidence that keeping a dog intact, or at least delaying sterilization, can reduce the risk of certain orthopedic problems. Large cohort work in popular breeds like Labradors and Golden Retrievers has shown that early neutering (especially before 12 months) is associated with significantly higher rates of hip dysplasia, cranial cruciate ligament tears, and elbow dysplasia compared with intact dogs, sometimes increasing joint disorders four- to five-fold. These joint diseases are painful, expensive to treat, and can permanently reduce mobility and quality of life (Hart, Hart, [et.al](#) 2014).

Second, several studies suggest that lifetime exposure to natural hormones may be protective against some cancers and other chronic conditions. A long-term database analysis of tens of thousands of dogs found that sterilized dogs had higher odds of dying from certain cancers and autoimmune diseases, while intact dogs were relatively less likely to die from these causes. More recent work on hormone-sparing approaches, such as vasectomy or ovary-sparing spay, has found that dogs with longer exposure to their natural hormones had reduced odds of a range of health problems and nuisance behaviors and lived longer than those who had their gonads removed early in life. In other words, completely removing hormones is

not the only way to be a responsible owner and may in some cases trade one set of health risks for another (Hoffman, Creevy, et. al 2013).

Third, major evidence reviews now emphasize that the risks and benefits of neutering are not uniform and that decisions should be made case-by-case between an owner and their veterinarian, considering breed, size, intended activity, and individual medical history. For some dogs, especially small mixed breeds, early spay/neuter may be appropriate. For others, particularly large or athletic dogs, the best choice for long-term joint and cancer risk may be to remain intact longer, use a hormone-sparing procedure, or time surgery later in life. A blanket legal mandate removes that nuance and forces owners and vets to follow the law rather than the science for the individual dog in front of them (Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, 2026).

This ordinance also risks unintended welfare consequences. Owners who are wary of the health trade-offs or cannot obtain timely surgery may avoid licensing, delay vet visits, or even relinquish dogs rather than comply, undermining the goals of responsible ownership and good veterinary oversight. More effective and less intrusive alternatives exist, such as targeted low-cost or free sterilization programs in high-intake neighborhoods, voluntary age- and breed-specific guidelines, education about accidental litters, and support for hormone-sparing sterilization options that prevent reproduction without removing the health benefits of natural hormones.

As a responsible pet owner, I want to work with my veterinarian to choose the approach that best balances my dog's individual cancer, orthopedic, and behavioral risks—not be compelled by law into a surgery that may increase certain serious health problems. For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to reject this ordinance in its current mandatory form and instead pursue evidence-based, community-supported strategies that reduce shelter intake without sacrificing canine health and owner autonomy.

Thank you for your consideration.

Noah Price
218 Cambridge Street
San Francisco, CA 94134

References

Arroube, A., & Pereira, A. F. (2025). Dog Neuter, Yes or No? A Summary of the Motivations, Benefits, and Harms, with Special Emphasis on the Behavioral Aspect. *Animals: an open access journal from MDPI*, 15(7), 1063. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani15071063>

Hart, B. L., Hart, L. A., Thigpen, A. P., & Willits, N. H. (2014). Long-term health effects of neutering dogs: Comparison of Labrador Retrievers with Golden Retrievers. *PLOS ONE*, 9(7), Article e102241. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0102241>

Hoffman, J. M., Creevy, K. E., & Promislow, D. E. (2013). Reproductive capability is

associated with lifespan and cause of death in companion dogs. PloS one, 8(4), e61082.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0061082>

Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS) Knowledge. (2026, February 19). Benefits and risks of neutering pets – What is the evidence?
<https://www.rcvsknowledge.org/resource/benefits-and-risks-of-neutering-pets-what-is-the-evidence/>



Fw: Proposed Spay Neuter Legislation in San Francisco

From Chok, Liam (ADM) <Liam.Chok@sfgov.org>

Date Mon 3/16/2026 9:07 AM

To Chok, Liam (ADM) <Liam.Chok@sfgov.org>

From: NorCal Bully Breed Rescue <norcalbullybreedrescue@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, March 15, 2026 4:07 PM

To: Jones, Kathryn (ADM) <kathryn.jones@sfgov.org>

Subject: Re: Proposed Spay Neuter Legislation in San Francisco

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

NorCal Bully Breed Rescue submits this letter to express our strong support for proposed legislation that would require the mandatory spaying and neutering of all dogs, with limited exceptions, over one year of age in San Francisco. As a member of the local dog rescue community, we have witnessed firsthand the overwhelming impact that shelter overcrowding has on the ability of rescues and shelters to keep up with the needs of the dogs who have been discarded, abused, or forgotten by the humans that once cared for them.

Currently, the City's spay and neuter requirements are breed-specific, applying only to pit bull-type dogs. The current legislation, unanimously approved by the Board in 2005, does not go quite far enough to address the larger issue of canine overpopulation across all breeds. We hope that the current Board sees the benefits of applying the same principles to all breeds that have been deemed appropriate for pit bull-type breeds for the past two decades.

Our rescue focuses primarily on bully breeds, and we have seen a recent dramatic increase in the number of backyard breeders who have taken the opportunity to make money off the sale of "trendy" breeds such as French Bulldogs. The popularity of the breed has resulted in an unprecedented proliferation of French Bulldogs in shelters and rescues. Our foster-based rescue has seen such a huge influx of French Bulldogs in the past five years that we often cannot find enough foster homes for them and have to turn down our shelter partners' requests for help with alleviating their overcrowding.

By expanding the focus of the existing legislation from only pit bull-type dogs to all breeds, this spay/neuter legislation will help to curb irresponsible backyard breeding. Additionally, the legislation will limit the number of litters that legitimate breeders can legally produce, which will reduce the number of French Bulldogs and other trendy breeds that end up being dumped or surrendered to shelters.

Overcrowded shelters struggle to provide adequate space, medical care, and attention to every animal. The shelters rely on their rescue partners to help with the overcrowding by taking dogs into rescue. However, the number of dogs that rescues like ours can support has also been pushed to the limit by

the multitude of dogs finding themselves in shelters right now. This results in a tragic number of dogs being euthanized simply because there are not enough resources or space to care for them all.

By mandating spaying and neutering for all dogs, regardless of breed, San Francisco can take a significant step toward reducing shelter overpopulation and improving outcomes for animals citywide. This legislation would enhance the well-being of the community's pets, support the efforts of local rescues and shelters, and help ensure that no healthy, adoptable dog loses its life simply because there was no room left.

We urge you to support this important measure and help make San Francisco a more humane city for all dogs.

With best regards,

Leslie Bird
Co-Founder/Executive Director
NorCal Bully Breed Rescue





To: Committee Chair Matt Dorsey and Clerk Monique Crayton

From: Jill Leiva, Senior Director, Copper's Dream Rescue

Date: March 21, 2026

Subject: Support for Proposed Mandatory Spay/Neuter Ordinance for SF

Dear Board of Supervisors, Council Members and SF Community,

I am writing on behalf of Copper's Dream Rescue to express our support for the proposed mandatory spay and neuter ordinance for dogs over one year of age. Both private rescues and municipal shelters have been operating far beyond capacity for far too long and something needs to be done.

The number of unwanted litters has increased dramatically over the last five years, creating an uphill battle that no shelter can simply 'adopt' its way out of. This crisis must be addressed at the source with unregulated and unethical breeding of dogs.

As a dedicated partner to San Francisco Animal Care & Control (SFACC) since 2008, we have witnessed the pet overpopulation crisis reach a breaking point. In the last three years alone, we have more than doubled our transfer intake from the city shelter. The most urgent generally include large, unplanned litters surrendered by overwhelmed owners, bottle babies requiring around the clock care and nursing moms which require long term placement.

As a foster-based rescue, these transfers consume a disproportionate share of our resources. Aside from the financial burden side of it, these rescues require an 8-week (or longer) commitment from our foster families. This cycle is unsustainable and not something we can adopt ourselves out of. We have to stop it at the source. When small rescues like ours are too full to help, the city's entire safety net fails. Please pass the mandatory spay and neuter law to help us in working towards solving this crisis.

Sincerely,

Jill Leiva, Senior Director

Copper's Dream Rescue

From: [Casa de Love Animal Rescue](#)
To: [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Proposed Mandatory Spay/Neuter Legislation
Date: Thursday, March 19, 2026 12:35:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Chair Dorsey and Members of the Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee,

I am writing on behalf of Casa de Love Animal Rescue to express our strong support for the proposed mandatory spay/neuter legislation introduced by San Francisco Animal Care and Control (ACC).

This policy is extremely time-sensitive and urgently needed to protect the welfare of dogs in San Francisco. Since the pandemic, ACC has faced a sustained rise in dog intake which has contributed to overcrowding and placed significant strain on the City's only open-admission shelter. These trends show no signs of reversing on their own and highlight the need for proactive action now.

ACC is uniquely responsible for accepting all animals in San Francisco, regardless of species, medical condition, age, or temperament. This essential public service function makes population management especially challenging when intake rises faster than resources or community placements. Although ACC has implemented numerous programs, such as free vaccination clinics, spay/neuter fee waivers, and pet food banks, these measures have not produced the necessary reduction in stray dog intake. The continued increase in unplanned litters and stray animals makes it clear that additional tools are needed to address the root causes of overpopulation.

The proposed mandatory spay/neuter ordinance provides humane approach to preventing unnecessary breeding and reducing the number of dogs entering the shelter system. California law already requires that shelters spay or neuter animals before adoption. Extending this principle to the broader community is a practical, equitable, and humane next step—one that aligns with the City's broader goals of minimizing animal homelessness and ensuring that public resources are used effectively.

Implementing this policy now can help stabilize intake, reduce crowding, shorten shelter stays, and prevent euthanasia when homes cannot be found. It is a necessary step for San Francisco

to address the post pandemic increases in stray and unaltered dogs and to maintain humane conditions for all animals in the City's care.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Board to adopt the proposed mandatory spay/neuter ordinance to improve outcomes for dogs and strengthen the City's animal welfare infrastructure.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Lindy Turner

President

Casa de Love Animal Rescue

From: [Gail MacGowan](#)
To: [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [Crayton, Monique \(BOS\)](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Ordinance to spay/neuter most dogs in S.F.
Date: Sunday, March 29, 2026 12:27:23 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed ordinance (File No. 251162) that would institute mandatory spay/neuter for nearly all dogs in San Francisco, as well as add the word "guardian" to law – potentially changing the legal status of animals in the city.

This proposal does not address the stray population, which is the primary driver of shelter overcrowding. A better solution is to fully fund low-cost spay/neuter programs and ensure the public is aware of available services.

I am not a dog owner, or "guardian," but I am a San Francisco resident who feels that this proposed ordinance is a massive overreach of government into the lives of those whom it represents.

Gail MacGowan
2645 Sacramento St., Apt. 1A
SF 94115



Atlanta, GA · Bentonville, AR · Houston, TX · Kanab, UT · Los Angeles, CA · New York City, NY · Salt Lake City, UT

March 24, 2026

Re: Mandatory Spay/Neuter Ordinance

Dear Chairman Dorsey and Committee Members-

Best Friends Animal Society is a leading animal welfare organization dedicated to saving the lives of dogs and cats in America's shelters by implementing data proven programs that work across the country. Founded in 1984, Best Friends runs lifesaving facilities and programs nationwide in partnership with more than 5,000 shelters and rescue organizations. From our headquarters in Kanab, Utah, we also operate the nation's largest no-kill animal sanctuary — a destination that brings our mission to life for thousands of visitors each year. We maintain the most comprehensive animal sheltering data in the country and make it accessible to the public — empowering communities with critical insights into the needs of their local shelters and how they can help.

Best Friends does not support any form of mandatory spay and neuter law, regulation, or policy, including any provision that targets a specific breed. While often well intentioned, these types of laws are the wrong policy solution, and while we certainly agree that increasing the numbers of sterilized cats and dogs is a crucial component to ending unnecessary killing, these efforts should never be codified as a mandate.

Research has consistently found that most pet owners want to get their pets sterilized. What the same research has also found is that the lack of available low-cost or free spay and neuter services is the primary barrier for these owners (though certainly there are other interconnected factors such as transportation, limited capacity at sterilization clinics and the hours of available service). These barriers should be removed, and Best Friends is committed to being a part of that solution. In fact, we operate and/or support spay and neuter clinics across the country to help serve pet owners, and we have consistently found that demand for these services far outweighs supply. We will continue to work toward expanding access to these critically needed services.

Given what we know about the public's desire to sterilize their pets, the result of mandatory spay/neuter laws is often that they punish the most underserved and under resourced pet owners in a community. Removing pets from loving families because they are unable to access veterinary services is never the appropriate solution. What is more, these laws can perversely increase the number of animals entering and dying in our shelters, as owned, loved pets are seized and impounded for noncompliance or because families cannot afford the fines levied against them. That is exactly the wrong approach to building a safe and humane community, and it only serves to divide the animal welfare community and law enforcement from the public. What is more, thousands of communities across the country have achieved a lifesaving rate of 90% or higher without any form of mandatory spay or neuter law or policy.

We strongly believe that bridges within our community should be built and strengthened. Unfunded mandates like these laws destroy the goodwill and trust that shelters and animal control have worked for decades to foster. If we criminalize under resourced, underserved, and



Atlanta, GA · Bentonville, AR · Houston, TX · Kanab, UT · Los Angeles, CA · New York City, NY · Salt Lake City, UT

underprivileged communities, we add unnecessary barriers to reaching our goal of a no-kill nation.

Finally, in communities that have enacted these types of laws, there is no credible research to show that mandatory spay and neuter is responsible for any decrease in shelter intake numbers. What is more, given the research definitively showing that owners overwhelmingly want to sterilize their pets, if these laws are coupled with increased funding for veterinary services, there really is no reason to impose a mandate in the first place. Instead, our communities should strive to increase access to spay/neuter services and other veterinary resources; this is the proven method to increase lifesaving rates.

In addition, below are my specific issues with the ordinance that go beyond the basic policy opposition to mandatory S/N we have:

- This ordinance does not account for non-residents' dogs.
- Veterinary guidance on neuter is for the dog to be older than for spay - spay should be before first heat in 6-9 months, but neuter is up to 18 to allow for proper growth.
- Page 4 line 7: There should not be a fee for a dog who can medically not be sterilized - this will affect the willingness of folks to adopt old/sick/big dogs who cannot be sterilized.
- Page 6 line 12: Breed is too general a term and does not account for unintended litters.
- Page 7 line 22: should not be a Department-approved veterinarian – the surgery should be able to be done by any licensed veterinarian. Who is drafting this “certificate of sterilization” and is there some concern that vets will forge these?

Given the many concerns about the outcomes for people and pets, coupled with the lack of evidence to show their efficacy, Best Friends does not support mandatory spay and neuter or the proposed San Francisco ordinance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Lisa Kauffman".

Lisa Kauffman
Campaign Senior Strategist, Electoral Initiatives
Best Friends Animal Society
lisak@bestfriends.org
(213) 712-5872

From: [shannon.green](#)
To: [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); crayton@sfgov.org; [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Concerns Regarding Proposed Mandatory Spay/Neuter Policy - File#251162
Date: Friday, March 20, 2026 1:18:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express serious concern regarding the proposed mandatory spay/neuter policy under consideration in San Francisco. While I fully support and advocate for responsible pet ownership, awareness and humane animal welfare initiatives, this proposal raises significant practical, ethical, and economic concerns that warrant careful reconsideration.

Mandatory spay/neuter laws have not demonstrated effectiveness in addressing the root causes of animal overpopulation. Shelter overcrowding is driven primarily by stray and unowned animals, animal surrendered do to housing concerns and the cost associated with Veterinary care, not by responsible owners or preservation breeders. This proposal does little to meaningfully reduce that population and instead risks misdirecting resources away from more impactful solutions.

In addition, the cost of veterinary care in San Francisco is already extraordinarily high, with spay/neuter procedures often reaching levels that are financially burdensome for many residents. Mandating such procedures without addressing affordability places an inequitable strain on responsible pet owners, particularly those who may not qualify for limited low-cost programs yet still cannot reasonably absorb these expenses. This approach risks penalizing compliance rather than encouraging it, and may ultimately lead to unintended consequences, including reduced veterinary care or avoidance of licensing altogether.

A more effective and humane approach would be to fully fund and expand access to low-cost spay/neuter services and lowering Veterinary costs while increasing public awareness of these programs. Ensuring accessibility—rather than imposing mandates—has proven to be a more successful strategy in encouraging compliance and improving community outcomes.

Additionally, this policy imposes unnecessary financial and logistical burdens on responsible dog owners and ethical breeders who already adhere to high standards of care. Rather than penalizing these individuals, the City would be better served by prioritizing comprehensive public education around responsible dog stewardship—equipping owners with the knowledge and resources to make informed, humane decisions—while also working to meaningfully reduce the cost of veterinary care across San Francisco. Expanding affordable access to veterinary services, including spay/neuter, and increasing awareness of available programs would drive far more effective and equitable outcomes than broad mandates, while still supporting the City's animal welfare goals.

The proposed exemption for competition dogs is overly narrow and fails to account for many responsible owners who maintain intact dogs for legitimate purposes outside of formal competition including the ongoing studies showing major health benefits associated with keeping dogs intact. This exclusion unfairly targets a broad segment of conscientious owners without justification.

Finally, the use of the term “guardian” in place of “owner” raises serious legal concerns. “Guardian” is a term traditionally reserved for human legal relationships, and its application to animal ownership may unintentionally undermine the legal status of dogs as property. This shift could restrict the ability of owners, veterinarians, and agencies to make necessary decisions for animal care, while also opening the door to increased litigation and higher costs associated with pet ownership.

In summary, I respectfully urge the City to reconsider this policy and instead focus on proven, balanced solutions: enforce existing laws, expand affordable spay/neuter and Veterinary access, and invest in public education. These approaches will more effectively address animal welfare concerns without placing undue burdens on responsible members of the community.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,
Shannon G.

From: [Jackel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); Crayton@sfgov.org; [WongStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MahmoodStaff](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File No. 251162; San Francisco proposed spay/neuter ordinance
Date: Friday, March 20, 2026 1:57:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello! I'm writing to share my thoughts and opinions on File No. 251162; proposed spay/neuter ordinance.

This is a terrible idea that does nothing to address pet overpopulation, while placing a noxious burden on responsible pet owners who are themselves likely to be helping to solve, not creating these problems.

I am a bay area local, graduate of USF School of Law, and frequent visitor, with my dogs, to the city of SF. I love this city dearly. I breed my dogs and exhibit them in conformation, tracking, scent work, obedience, field sports and agility. I have spent my life studying and working my borzois and collies.

Whether or not to alter a dog is a complex personal question that depends on the dog's temperament, intended use, health status (including complex hormonal and endocrine issues), training level or goal and value or lack as a breeding animal. There are many reasons this serious medical procedure might be helpful or harmful. This is a private decision to be made by an owner who is ideally well advised by their vet, breeder or trainer. There is no need for legislative involvement.

Providing free spay/neuter to low income pet owners, outreach into stray populations and especially ensuring that the city offers sufficient pet friendly low income housing would be excellent ways to use municipal funds to help at-risk pets and their handlers.

I stand behind all of the AKC's points below:

- Mandatory spay/neuter laws have not proven an effective solution to animal control concerns — this proposal does not address the stray population, which is the primary driver of shelter overcrowding.
-
- A better solution is to fully fund low-cost spay/neuter programs and ensure the public is aware of available services.
-
- Mandatory spay/neuter laws impose significant costs on responsible owners and breeders. The city should instead enforce existing animal control laws, expand low-cost spay/neuter access, and fund public education on responsible dog ownership.
-
- The competition dog exemption is narrowly defined and will exclude many responsible dog owners who simply choose to keep their dogs intact.
-
- The term “guardian” is a legal term used by courts to protect people and is not appropriate when referring to dogs. The use of this term may reduce the legal classification and value of

dogs as property, which would restrict the rights of owners, veterinarians, and government agencies to protect and care for dogs. It could also provide the basis for a vast increase in the number of frivolous and expensive lawsuits being filed, which would result in higher costs for pet care.

As an attorney, I particularly agree that 'guardian' should not be used as a legal or municipal term for the owner or handler of a dog. I prefer 'owner, and/or handler.'

Thanks for your time and attention.

Summer Jackson

From: [Jan Dykema](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: file number 251162
Date: Wednesday, March 25, 2026 7:59:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Why pass laws you cannot enforce? Offer free spay neuter along with free rabies vax for all dogs (and cats). Rabies is a HUMAN health hazard especially among poor people and homeless. Can you imagine a rabies outbreak in a homeless camp? Do something that will help, not something that never has helped anywhere it has been passed. Homeless people and poor people have no \$\$ to make sure their pets do not procreate.. and arresting them and taking their pets is heartless. So a \$186.00 "permit" will not apply to them, their dogs will be taken and then the shelters will be even more crowded.. Use your heads. DO NOT PASS
Jan Dykema

From: vcd3tervs@att.net
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Comments on File No. 251162 - Mandatory Spay/Neuter
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2026 11:40:37 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

While I am not a SF resident, I am writing to oppose the mandatory/spay neuter in SF (File No. 251162). This will not solve the problem of overcrowded shelters and will prevent responsible breeders in SF from being able to affordably breed a litter (if they can at all), as well as create burdens for the average pet owner. It creates burdensome and overreaching regulations. People need to have a source for their pets, and the best source is the responsible small breeder that can properly socialize the puppies and educate their puppy buyers and assure that the puppy is a good match for the new owner's lifestyle.

What is needed is affordable voluntary spay/neuter clinics. It cost me over \$1000 dollars to have my dog spayed last summer when her conformation show career was over. This is beyond the reach of most families struggling with the high cost of living in the Bay Area.

I also oppose the use of the term "guardian" when used for dog ownership. The use of this term may reduce the legal classification and value of dogs as property, which would restrict the rights of owners, veterinarians, and government agencies to protect and care for dogs. It could also provide the basis for a vast increase in the number of frivolous and expensive lawsuits being filed, which would result in higher costs for pet care.

I am worried what this will do to the future of dog shows in San Francisco and to the show dogs that live there, as well as pets that people do not choose to breed but who do not want to have them spayed or neutered for health or personal reasons.

Regards,

Linda Knowles

San Jose, CA

Elsa (Belgian Tervuren) - Safari Living The Adventure VCD3 UDX BN VER RE TDU2 MXB MJB MFS T2B2 SWM SCME SHDE TKI, GCH-Br AAD (bn 3/20/20)