

BOARD OF ANIMAL SERVICES COMMISSIONERS CITY OF LOS ANGELES Tuesday, September 13, 2011 10:00 A.M.

Los Angeles City Hall 200 North Spring Street Room 1060 Los Angeles, California 90012

Melanie Ramsayer, President Ruthanne Secunda, Vice-President Tariq Khero Terri Macellaro Kathleen Riordan

Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, you are advised to make your request at least 72 hours prior to the meeting you wish to attend. For information please call (213) 482-9501.

Si require servicios de traduccion, favor de notificar la oficina con 24 horas por anticipado.

COMMISSION MEETING

1. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD - (Comments from the public on items of public interest within the Board's subject matter jurisdiction and on items not on the Agenda.)

Public Comments: The Brown Act prohibits the Board and staff from responding to the speakers' comments. Some of the matters raised in public comment may appear on a future agenda.

2. COMMISSION BUSINESS

- A. Approval of the Commission Meeting Minutes for August 23, 2011.
- B. Oral Report by the Commissioners on Meetings and Events attended .

Board of Animal Services Commission Meeting Commission Meeting Agenda for September 13, 2011 Page 2

3. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- A. Oral report and discussion on Omnibus Licensing Ordinance and Citations.
- B. Discussion regarding new sources of funding to assist New Hope Partners.
- C. Oral Report on Veterinary Pricing Survey.

4. GENERAL MANAGER RECOMMENDS FOR BOARD ACTION

A. Updates and Amendments to the Department's Spay/Neuter Program to increase the effective use of the Spay/Neuter Trust Fund particularly in low income neighborhoods, generally increase the number of Spay/Neuter Surgeries funded, and improve efforts to educate the public on Spay/Neuter availability and the City's Spay/Neuter law.

BOARD ACTION RECOMMENDED:

That the Board authorize the General Manager to amend, effective immediately, the methodology for determining and verifying qualified very low income companion animal owners for the purpose of providing subsidized spay/neuter surgeries as described in the "An Alternative Approach" section of this report, and, to vigorously pursue the more efficient and effective usage of available spay/neuter funding throughout the City of Los Angeles. The methodology shall simplify the qualification procedures by basing eligibility on residence in zip codes that meet the income and unemployment level criteria established by the City for its job training and placement programs. Additionally, that the Board instructs staff to study options for improving the sustainability of the very-low-income subsidy program, ensure the effective operation of spay/neuter clinics in the City's shelters and develop methodologies for opening the clinics in the West Valley and North Central Animal Care Centers.

5. ORAL REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER

6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

7. ADJOURNMENT

Next Commission Meeting is scheduled for 10:00 A.M September 27, 2011, Los Angeles City Hall, Room 1060, 200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.

AGENDAS - The Board of Animal Services Commissioners (Board) meets regularly every second (2nd) and fourth (4th) Tuesday of each month at 10:00 A.M. Regular Meetings are held at City Hall, 200 North Spring Street, Room 1060, in Los Angeles, CA 90012. The agendas for Board meetings contain a brief general description of those items to be considered at the meetings. Board Agendas are available at the Department of Animal Services (Department), Administrative Division, 221 North Figueroa Street, 5th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90012. Board Agendas may also be viewed on the 2nd floor Public Bulletin Board in City Hall East, 200 North Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. Internet users may also access copies of present and prior agenda items, copies of the Board Calendar, MP-3 audio files of meetings as well as electronic copies of approved minutes on the Department's World Wide Web Home Page site at http://www.laanimalservices.com/CommissionAgendas.htm

Three (3) members of the Board constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Some items on the Agenda may be approved without any discussion.

The Board Secretary will announce the items to be considered by the Board. The Board will hear the presentation on the topic and gather additional information from Department Staff. Once presentations have finished, the Board President will ask if any Board Member or member of the public wishes to speak on one or more of these items. Each speaker called before the Commission will have one (1) minute to express their comments and concerns on matters placed on the agenda.

<u>PUBLIC INPUT AT BOARD MEETINGS</u> – Public Participation on Agenda Items. Members of the public will have an opportunity to address the Board on agenda items after the item is called and before the Board takes action on the item, unless the opportunity for public participation on the item was previously provided to all interested members of the public at a public meeting of a Committee of the Board and the item has not substantially changed since the Committee heard the item. When speaking to an agenda item other than during Public Comment (see Public Comment below), the speaker shall limit his or her comments to the specific item under consideration (California Government Code, Section 54954.3).

Public Comment. The Board will provide an opportunity for public comment at every regular meeting of the Board. Members of the public may address the Board on any items within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board as part of Public Comment.

Speaker Cards. Members of the public wishing to speak are to fill out one speaker card for each agenda item on which they wish to speak and present it to the Board secretary before the item is called.

Time Limit for Speakers. Speakers addressing the Board will be limited to one (1) minute of speaking time for each agenda item except in public comment which is limited to three (3) minutes. The Chairperson, with the approval of a majority of the Board, may for good cause extend any speaker's time by increments of up to one (1) minute. Total speaker time on any agenda item will be limited to ten (10) minutes per item and fifteen (15) minutes for Public Comment, unless extended as above.

Brown Act. These rules shall be interpreted in a manner that is consistent with the Ralph M. Brown Act, California Government Code Section § 54950 et seq.

Please join us at our website: <u>www.LAAnimalservices.com</u>

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT. Speakers are expected to behave in an orderly manner and to refrain from personal attacks or use of profanity or language that may incite violence.

All persons present at Board meetings are expected to behave in an orderly manner and to refrain from disrupting the meeting, interfering with the rights of others to address the Board and/or interfering with the conduct of business by the Board.

In the event that any speaker does not comply with the foregoing requirements, or if a speaker does not address the specific item under consideration, the speaker may be ruled out of order, their speaking time forfeited and the Chairperson may call upon the next speaker.

The Board, by majority vote, may order the removal from the meeting of any speaker or audience member continuing to behave in a disruptive manner after being warned by the Chairperson regarding their behavior. Section 403 of the California Penal Code states as follows: "Every person who, without authority of law, willfully disturbs or breaks up any assembly or meeting that is not unlawful in its character, other than an assembly or meeting referred to in Section 302 of the Penal Code or Section 18340 of the Elections Code, is guilty of a misdemeanor".

VOTING AND DISPOSITION OF ITEMS – Most items require a majority vote of the entire membership of the Board (3 members). When debate on an item is completed, the Board President will instruct the Secretary to "call the roll". Every member present must vote for or against each item; abstentions are not permitted unless there is a Conflict of Interest for which the Board member is obliged to abstain from voting. The Secretary will announce the votes on each item. Any member of the Board may move to "reconsider" any vote on any item on the agenda, except to adjourn, suspend the Rules, or where an intervening event has deprived the Board of jurisdiction, providing that said member originally voted on the prevailing side of the item. The motion to "reconsider" shall only be in order once during the meeting, and once during the next regular meeting. The member requesting reconsideration shall identify for all members present the Agenda number and subject matter previously voted upon. A motion to reconsider is not debatable and shall require an affirmative vote of three members of the Board.

When the Board has failed by sufficient votes to approve or reject an item, and has not lost jurisdiction over the matter, or has not caused it to be continued beyond the next regular meeting, the issue is again placed on the next agenda for the following meeting for the purpose of allowing the Board to again vote on the matter.



BOARD OF ANIMAL SERVICES COMMISSIONERS CITY OF LOS ANGELES Tuesday September 13, 2011 10:00 A.M. LOS ANGELES CITY HALL 200 N. Spring St. Room 1060 Los Angeles, CA 90012

Melanie Ramsayer, President Ruthanne Secunda, Vice-President Tariq Khero Terri Macellaro Kathleen Riordan

Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, you are advised to make your request at least 72 hours prior to the meeting you wish to attend. For information please call (213) 482-9501.

Si require servicios de traduccion, favor de notificar la oficina con 24 horas por anticipado.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL HEARING

- A. Barking Dog Case Number: BD 103137 WL Appellant: Wossenyelesh Tesfa Complaining Witness: Bernard Fischler Field Operations Supervisor, West Los Angeles Animal Care Center, Lt. Jesse Castillo Hearing Coordinator, Department of Animal Services, Ross Pool, Management Analyst II
- B. Barking Dog Case Number: BD 11316 EV Appellant: Colette Barris Complaining Witness: Larry Toth Field Operations Supervisor, East Valley Animal Care Center, Lt. Troy Boswell Hearing Coordinator, Department of Animal Services, Ross Pool, Management Analyst II

BOARD OF ANIMAL SERVICES COMMISSIONERS

MELANIE RAMSAYER

RUTHANNE SECUNDA VICE PRESIDENT

COMMISSIONERS TARIQ A. KHERO TERRI MACELLARO KATHLEEN RIORDAN

City of Los Angeles

CALIFORNIA



DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL SERVICES 221 North Figueroa Street 5th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90012 (888) 452-7381 FAX (213) 482-9511

BRENDA F. BARNETTE GENERAL MANAGER

ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA

Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners

Brenda F. Barnette, General Manager

COMMISSION MEETING DATE: September 13, 2011

PREPARED BY: Brenda Barnette, General Manager

- REPORT DATE: September 8, 2011
- SUBJECT: Updates and Amendments to the Department's Spay/Neuter Program to increase the effective use of the Spay/Neuter Trust Fund particularly in low income neighborhoods, generally increase the number of Spay/Neuter Surgeries funded, and improve efforts to educate the public on Spay/Neuter availability and the City's Spay/Neuter law.

BOARD ACTION RECOMMENDED:

That the Board authorize the General Manager to amend, effective immediately, the methodology for determining and verifying qualified very low income companion animal owners for the purpose of providing subsidized spay/neuter surgeries as described in the "An Alternative Approach" section of this report, and, to vigorously pursue the more efficient and effective usage of available spay/neuter funding throughout the City of Los Angeles. The methodology shall simplify the qualification procedures by basing eligibility on residence in zip codes that meet the income and unemployment level criteria established by the City for its job training and placement programs.

Additionally, that the Board instruct staff to study options for improving the sustainability of the very-low-income subsidy program, ensure the effective operation of spay/neuter clinics in the City's shelters and develop methodologies for opening the clinics in the West Valley, North Central and the new South (when it opens) Animal Care Centers.

Page 2

BACKGROUND:

1. General

A. <u>Targeting</u>: Amongst spay/neuter advocates, there remains a lively debate about whether mandatory spay/neuter laws or voluntary programs are more effective in reducing pet overpopulation and euthanasia rates. But there appears to be general agreement that untargeted spay/neuter subsidy programs accomplish neither because they too often provide subsidies to owners who can otherwise afford to pay for the service themselves and would spay or neuter their pets without the monetary support.

New Hampshire-based Peter Marsh of "Solutions to Overpopulation of Pets" has opined that for every dollar spent on untargeted subsidies, 75 cents is wasted. That is to say, he feels that it doesn't contribute anything significant to reducing euthanasia rates. Marsh advocates shifting all subsidy resources to programs targeted to low-income pet owners and suggests using enrollment in Medicaid (the federally funded, stateadministered health care subsidy program; in California it's known as Medi-Cal). This would require that owners simply show their enrollment card. Marsh also believes that there are three categories of animals whose sterilization should take precedence for the use of public subsidies: Companion animals belonging to low-income owners, pets adopted from shelters, and free-roaming cats.

At present, the Department addresses the first two and is prohibited by a court injunction from addressing the third unless and until the City takes an action to certify an environmental clearance per the California Environmental Quality Act to justify whatever involvement the Department has with sterilizing free-roaming cats. A project is underway to complete such a study but, as of the date of this report, it is not yet clear when it will be accomplished.

B. <u>Cost Factors</u>: During the preparation of the City's spay/neuter ordinance back in 2008, veterinarians warned staff that the ordinance could lead to two unfortunate consequences: An overloading of surgery providers and consequent long waiting periods, and the possibility that supply-and-demand factors could impact the prices offered by providers.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that both are true to some extent, and that, in terms of the impact on affordability, they are manifested most notably with the most affordable providers. Understandably those providers draw the most demand and longest waiting lists, while those providers with little or no waiting list allegedly tend to charge what they think the market will bear, sometimes adding mandatory examination, medicine and boarding fees to the price of the surgery. Of course, the latter reduces the impact and effectiveness of the Department's \$30 and \$70 vouchers while driving more business to the providers who already are the busiest.

Page 3

Additionally, as has been discussed with the Commission in past years, the question of what constitutes a workable business model for low-cost surgery providers comes into play. Certain affordable providers in Southern California have reported that their costs run higher than \$100 per surgery and that their long-term survivability depends upon being able to sell additional services and/or obtaining financial support above and beyond the amount provided by the City via the voucher program or direct payments for the sterilization of animals being adopted from City shelters.

2. In Los Angeles

A. <u>Legislative History</u>: In June 1977, the City Council amended the Administrative Code to include Chapter 5, Article 3, Section 5.199, creating the "Animal Sterilization Trust Fund." This fund, in various forms, has been used since then to underwrite the sterilization of hundreds of thousands of animals residing in the City of Los Angeles. This Code section gives the Department authority to determine how the funds are used within the guidelines set forth in the section, including the establishment of eligibility requirements regarding whose pets the funds may be used to sterilize and under what circumstances.

In subsequent years the City's approach to promoting spay/neuter involved a voluntary approach, with various strategies employed over time to make sterilization services available to the public's animals. These included the operation of spay/neuter clinics at various of the City's animal shelters, the subsidization of surgeries via direct payments to veterinarians or using discount coupons and full-cost vouchers for the pets of very low-income community members, and the funding of mobile spay/neuter clinics. All of these approaches are still being pursued to one extent or another.

In 2000, the City Council approved an ordinance creating a pricing structure ("differential licensing") for dog licenses that incentivized spay/neuter by setting the licensing fee at \$10 a year for altered dogs and \$100 for unaltered dogs. A portion of each license payment is dedicated to the aforementioned spay/neuter trust fund. The Council has twice subsequently increased the altered dog license fee, first to \$15 in 2006 and then to \$20 in 2010.

Accompanying the original 2000 action was the appropriation of funds and authorization for the creation of a mobile spay/neuter clinic that would make free or low-cost sterilization surgeries available in communities throughout the city. This program has been well-received and expanded. The Department currently has contracted with the Amanda Foundation to operate its primary mobile sterilization clinic service, focusing primarily on low-income neighborhoods. The Department also supports other mobile clinic operations within the city limits.

In January 2008, the City Council approved the aforementioned spay/neuter ordinance intended to require the majority of companion animals in Los Angeles to be sterilized.

Page 4

The ordinance became fully effective in October 2008. Public Service television and radio spots were created and distributed to stations (and movie theaters) to encourage public awareness of the ordinance and the Department's Animal Control Officers (ACOs) began enforcing the ordinance in the context of their day-to-day enforcement-related activities.

B. <u>Advisory Committee Recommendations</u>: The Council's action mandated the creation of a Spay/Neuter Advisory Committee, whose March 2009 preliminary report and October 2009 final report set forth a number of potentially useful strategies for enhancing the City's spay/neuter activities. The Department has implemented a number of key concepts set forth in the reports, including the creation of updated spay/neuter literature, updating of information on the Department's website, staff training on spay/neuter issues and programs, data-driven targeted spay/neuter outreach and service provision programs in high-need areas, increased emphasis on targeting subsidies to low-income pet owners, improved procedures for tracking D-300 temporary exemptions from spay/neuter for animals adopted from shelters, partnerships with private sector entities to expand spay/neuter services in the city, and fundraising to provide additional funds to subsidize spay/neuter surgeries.

Another key Committee recommendation was to work to open the remaining unopened spay/neuter clinics in City shelters. The recent City Council action authorizing a partnership with the Best Friends Animal Society to operate the Northeast Valley (Mission) shelter will lead to that clinic being opened in the coming months. At that time, five of the Department's seven in-house spay/neuter clinics will be operational. Methodologies are still being explored for operating the West Valley and North Central shelter clinics.

C. <u>Consequences</u>: Over the past two years, the Department and others (such as Found Animals Foundation, the Heigl Foundation and Best Friends Animal Society) have made an effort to quantify the correlation between the point of origin of animals being relinquished to, or turned in as strays at, the Department's shelters. The relationship between numbers of animals and neighborhoods that are economically disadvantaged has been consistent and statistically significant.

At the same time, certain aspects of the administration of the \$70 voucher program have contributed to an unanticipated decline in the amount of funds invested in spay/neuter surgeries over that period. Deployment of mobile clinics to high-need neighborhoods has generated good participation, but not as good as it could be. Based on the experience of the Department with the mobile clinic operators, as well as clinic operators in the shelters and private veterinarians, a key impediment to maximizing the targeted expenditure of spay/neuter funding on surgeries has been the requirement that very low income pet guardians obtain \$70 vouchers in person at City animal shelters.

Additionally, verification requirements requiring financial documentation constitute a secondary impediment. Service providers have reported that owners will show up at

Page 5

mobile or stationary clinics with their pets ready to have them sterilized only to find that they need to obtain hard copies of vouchers at shelters that sometimes are not geographically convenient. Too often the owners do not follow through with obtaining the voucher and an important opportunity to make another inroad in a high-need community is lost, at least for the time being.

3. An Alternative Approach

A. <u>Qualifying Subsidy Recipients</u>: In its efforts to boost employment in low-income neighborhoods, the City has developed criteria to determine which residents are qualified to access local/disadvantaged preferences for certain training programs and job opportunities. Using census data and periodic updates of that data, the City maintains lists of zip codes in which there is a preponderance of very-low-income (50% of the Average Mean Income or less) residents and/or high unemployment rates. Depending upon the precise criteria for a given program, residents in these zip codes qualify to participate in the applicable program.

Adapting this concept to the \$70 voucher program would allow the Department to focus on place of residence as the primary qualifying criterion for use of the vouchers. Instead of requiring that prospective voucher-users travel to a shelter with financial documentation to obtain a voucher and then take their companion animal to a participating surgery provider, the owner would simply have to bring a utility bill or other indication of permanent residence to the surgery provider. The Department would provide the City's list of qualified zip codes to the provider so that a simple qualifying procedure could take place at that time. This zip code list is updated periodically by the City and updates would be provided to participating surgery providers as necessary.

The Department would base its qualifying criteria on language substantially as follows:

"Disadvantaged Resident'" means an individual whose primary place of residence is within the City and who, prior to receiving assistance to spay or neuter an owned companion animal, either: (a) has a household income of less than 50% of the Average Mean Income; or (b) (i) whose primary place of residence is within the City and within a zip code containing at least part of one census tract with a rate of unemployment in excess of 200% of the Los Angeles County unemployment rate at the time of application or containing all or part of a Concentrated Poverty Neighborhood; or (ii) is an individual whose primary place of residence is within the City and is within the zip code containing at least part of one census tract with a rate of unemployment in excess of 100% of the Los Angeles County unemployment rate at the time of application."

B. <u>Adequacy of Subsidy</u>: The adequacy of the City's payment for surgeries of the animals owned by very-low-income households is, at best, questionable. With providers being asked to accept \$70 as full payment for services that typically cost at least the

Page 6

most affordable of them \$100 or more to deliver, the viability of the program is being placed at risk.

The Department has, over time, been studying options for addressing this issue. One option has been to discontinue issuance of untargeted \$30 discount vouchers and shift those resources to the funding of additional targeted \$70 vouchers. Another option could be to discontinue the \$30 program and consider investing those savings in boosting the value of the subsidy to very-low-income owners so that it more adequately covers the providers' costs. Additional study and review would be require to fully understand the potential consequences of these or other alternatives.

SUMMARY:

The effectiveness of the Department's spay/neuter program depends on resources being spent in ways that address the City's pet population issues efficiently, leading to reductions in shelter intake and the subsequent killing of unadopted animals. The Department thus should take steps to make its targeted program to spay and neuter animals owned by very-low-income residents function in a more user-friendly manner. The proposal to qualify participants based on their residence in low-income, high unemployment neighborhoods should accomplish this in a manner that also is simple for staff and surgery providers to administer.

The Department also should continue to explore ways to make the cost-structure of the subsidy program for very-low-income pet owners more sustainable for both the program and surgery providers.

Finally, the Department should work to ensure that the spay/neuter clinics in its shelters are being effectively operated and continue to explore options to bring the clinics in the West Valley and North Central and new South (when open) shelters on-line at the earliest opportunity.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Implementation of the amended approach to qualifying very-low-income pet guardians for use of \$70 vouchers has no impact on the General Fund. Funds are provided for public spay/neuter programs (\$30 and \$70 Vouchers and the Mobile Spay/Neuter Clinic) through a combination of the General Fund allotment of \$810,000 and a surcharge on dog licensing of about \$600,000 a year. Funds are available in existing spay/neuter accounts to pay for these services.

The impact of altering the cost-structure of the spay/neuter voucher programs and of opening additional clinics in City shelters has yet to be determined.

Page 7

Approved:

Brenda F. Barnette, General Manager

BOARD ACTION:

Pass	ed	Disapproved _	
Pass	ed with noted modifications	Continued _	
Table	ed	New Date _	

Aline,

ORDINANCE NO.

Draft ordinance amending Sections 53.11, 53.13, 53.15, 53.15.3, 53.15.4, 53.27, 53.53 and 53.54, and deleting Section 53.16, of Article 3, Chapter 5 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to streamline the dog licensing process of the Department of Animal Services including the online licensing of dogs and related changes.

THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Subsection (j) is added to Section 53.11 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to read as follows:

(j) Any person adopting an impounded dog of any age that has not been spayed or neutered due to a medical condition as determined by the Department shall in addition to and consistent with any other charges imposed by this Article, pay a sterilization deposit and a license tax and fee equal to that for a spayed or neutered dog, and enter into an agreement with the Department to spay or neuter the dog as soon as medically feasible and provide periodic updates and proof of spay/neuter to the Department as required by the agreement. The license shall not be valid until such satisfactory proof of spay or neuter is received by the Department.

Sec. 2. Section 53.13 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

(a) The owner or person entitled to the custody of any animal taken up and impounded under the provisions of this Article, may, at any time before the sale or disposal thereof as provided in this Article, redeem such animal by paying the Department the fees, charges, and, in the case of dogs which are unlicensed, by paying in addition thereto, the license tax and fee prescribed by this Article.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Article, a person who has relinquished a stray dog or cat to the Department may, until one hour after public operating hours begin on the first day the animal becomes available for sale and not thereafter, redeem such animal by paying to the Department the fees, charges, and, in case of dogs which are unlicensed, by paying in addition thereto, the license tax and fee prescribed by this Article.

Sec. 3. Subsection (a) of Section 53.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

(a) Any person owning or having custody or control of any dog shall pay an <u>annual</u> license tax of \$8.50 for each dog over the age of four months. For spayed females or neutered male dogs, or any dog certified by a licensed veterinarian to be incapable of breeding or being bred, the <u>annual</u> license tax shall be \$3.50. Such license tax shall not apply to any dog kept or maintained exclusively in any licensed dog kennel.

The license tax imposed hereunder shall be due and payable by the owner or custodian of such dog upon acquisition of said dog if the dog is four months of age or older, or once the dog reaches the age of four months, or upon expiration of any previously issued license, or upon notification by the Department that any previously issued license has expired and that such license tax is due and payable. Thereafter, except as otherwise permitted herein, such license tax shall become due and payable by such person on the date of expiration of any license previously issued for such dog. License taxes and fees shall be paid annually or every two or three years on or before the expiration date of a previously issued license. A three year license for an altered dog shall be discounted by \$5.00 off the cumulative fee amount due.

The Department is authorized to issue licenses for one, two or three years. The license may have a retroactive start date in order to expire upon the expiration date of the anti-rabies vaccination. The cost of the license shall not be prorated. In the event a license has been previously issued, subsequent licenses shall expire one, two or three years from the date of expiration of such previously issued license. Licenses shall be renewable upon payment of the appropriate license tax. The owner or custodian of a dog may choose the option of paying the <u>annual</u> license tax for said dog for a period of one, two or three years consistent with State law if such multi-year licenses are offered by the Department.

Upon payment of the license tax, the Department shall issue a license and a metal tag with the number thereof, together with the words "L.A. Dog License" plainly inscribed thereon. No portion of the license tax shall be refunded in the event ownership, custody or control of any dog is terminated during the license period or for any other reason.

The metal tag issued with the license shall be a permanent tag and shall be replaced only upon proof of loss or change of ownership.

A written certificate, signed by a licensed veterinarian, containing a full description of such dog as to its breed, color, sex, age and name, and reciting the fact that the female dog has been spayed or the male dog neutered or reciting the reasons why the veterinarian otherwise deems the dog described therein incapable of breeding or being bred, shall be exhibited to the person issuing a license in order to qualify for the lower tax and fee specified herein. The General Manager may accept other satisfactory evidence of spaying or neutering in lieu of such certificate where it is unavailable, or when provided in a manner prescribed by the Department, including but not limited to electronic transmission or facsimile, consistent with State law.

Sec. 4. Subsection (d) of Section 53.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

(d) No license for a dog shall be issued unless the owner shall have paid the applicable license tax provided therefor, and shall have exhibited to an authorized employee of the Department a certificate of anti-rabies vaccination of the dog, signed by

a duly licensed veterinarian, or provided other satisfactory evidence of current antirabies vaccination in a manner prescribed by the Department, including but not limited to electronic transmission or facsimile, consistent with State law, except as provided in Section 53.52 of this Article.

Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection (a) of this Section, any license issued by the Department shall expire on the date upon which the anti-rabies vaccination ceases to immunize the dog for which the license has been issued. A license may be issued for one, two or three years, and commence retroactively in order to expire on the expiration date of the anti-rabies vaccination. The cost for such retroactive license shall not be prorated. In the event such immunization ceases to be effective prior to the expiration of the license, the owner shall be notified in writing that the license is not valid, at the address last known to the Department prior to the date upon which the immunization ceases to be effective. Said license may become valid for the balance of the licensing period, without payment of any additional tax, upon presentation to the Department of a new certificate of vaccination or other satisfactory evidence of a current anti-rables vaccination showing effective immunization for the balance of such licensing period. For licenses issued before the effective date of this Subsection, in order to align the expiration date of the license and the expiration date of the anti-rabies vaccination, the Department may extend the license period for a dog license in less than a one year increment and charge a pro-rated amount therefor.

Sec. 5. Subsection (f) of Section 53.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

(f) The Department shall issue one license at 50% of the current altered license tax for one dog to any disabled individual or to any individual 62 years of age or older who owns and maintains said dog, provided that the combined adjusted gross income of all members of the household in which such individual resides is less than the "very low income" limitation for residents of the City of Los Angeles, as determined by the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, using the figure in effect on the preceding first day of April as published by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.

For the purpose of this Subsection, an individual shall be considered to be disabled if he or she meets the definition promulgated by the California Fair Employment and Housing Act or by the United States Department of Labor.

The dog for which application for a discounted license is made must be a spayed female, a neutered male, or a dog certified by a licensed veterinarian to be incapable of breeding or being bred. Evidence that a dog is spayed or neutered, or incapable of breeding or being bred shall be provided by the owner to the Department in the same manner and form as it is specified in Subsection (a) of this Section.

No individual may apply for, be issued, or possess more than one discounted license provided for by this Subsection at any given time, and no more than one

discounted license per household shall be issued. The provisions of this Subsection shall not eliminate the duty of any individual to apply for and obtain a license for each dog owned by said individual.

Any individual who is entitled to a discounted license under the provisions of this Subsection may file an application with the Department for such a license. The license shall be automatically rendered invalid by any change in ownership of said dog. It shall be a misdemeanor for any person to knowingly receive the benefits of the discounted license provided for by this Subsection when the basis for such a discounted license either does not exist or ceases to exist.

Sec. 6. Subsection (g) is added to Section 53.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to read as follows:

(g) Puppy certificate. For a dog under the age of four months old, the Department shall, in addition to any other fees charged at the time the dog is adopted by the Department, charge an amount equal to the annual license tax and fee for a spayed or neutered dog and issue a puppy certificate for such dog. The puppy certificate shall expire when the dog is four months old. Within 45 days of the expiration date of the certificate, if the Department is provided with satisfactory evidence that the dog has been sterilized and has received an anti-rabies vaccination, the owner shall be provided with a valid license at no extra charge. The one year license shall expire on the expiration date of the anti-rabies vaccination. Any person adopting or purchasing a dog from any other source may also purchase a puppy certificate from the Department or from any person or organization authorized by the Department to issue a puppy certificate.

Sec. 7. Subsection (h) is added to Section 53.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to read as follows:

(h) Late fee, If the license tax imposed hereunder is not paid within <u>45</u> days of the time <u>a previously issued license is to be renewed</u>, a late fee equal to <u>25%</u> of the <u>cost of the license</u> or such other amount as determined by the Board of Animal Services Commissioners and approved by the City Council, shall be due and payable in addition to any other civil or criminal penalties imposed by this Article. A \$25.00 field collection fee or such other amount as determined by the Board of Animal Services Commissioners and approved by the City Council, shall be due and payable when the tax for a license is collected at the property where the dog or dogs are maintained.

Sec. 8. Subsection (i) is added to Section 53.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to read as follows:

(i) The owner of any dog that has not been spayed or neutered and meets one of the exemptions in Section 53.15.2 (b)(2) shall pay a license tax equal to that of an intact dog. In the absence of such immediate proof of exemption, the owner shall enter into an agreement with the Department to provide proof that the dog is exempt

ĺ	Deleted: s
ĺ	Deleted: 30
	Deleted: required hereunder
	Deleted: of \$20.00
ĺ	Deleted: for a sterilized dog or
ĺ	Deleted: \$100.00 for an unsterilized or intact dog
ĺ	Deleted: following previous notice to the owner by the Department

and is or will be in compliance with Subdivisions (3) and (4) of Section 53.15.2 (b), or have the dog spayed or neutered and provide satisfactory proof to the Department within 60 days that the dog is exempt in compliance with Section 53.15.2 (b) or that the dog has been spayed or neutered. Failure to provide the required proof shall subject the dog owner or custodian to the penalties enumerated in Section 53.15.2 (b)(7). The license shall not be valid until such satisfactory proof is provided to the Department. No portion of the license tax shall be refunded in the event the dog is spayed or neutered during the license period.

Sec. 9. Subsection (j) is added to Section 53.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to read as follows:

(j) The late fees codified in Subsection (h) above and the administrative penalty codified in Section 53.15.3 (b) will become effective after March 31, 2012.

Sec. <u>10</u>. Section 53.15.3 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

(a) Any person owning or having custody or control of any dog shall pay, in addition to a license tax, a fee in the sum of \$91.50 for the processing and related costs of issuance of a dog license, except that for spayed female or neutered male dogs, or any dog certified by a licensed veterinarian to be incapable of breeding or being bred, a fee of \$16.50 shall be paid. The provisions of Section 53.15 of this Code with respect to eligibility for the lower license tax specified there shall be equally applicable to eligibility for the lower fee specified in this Section. Any person eligible under the provisions of Section 53.15 of this Code for a lower license tax shall also be eligible for the lower license fee imposed by this Section and any person exempt under the provisions of Section 53.15 of this Code from paying the license tax shall be exempt from paying any the license fee imposed by this Section. License fees shall be paid at the same time and in the same manner as the license tax.

(b) In the event any dog license tax and fee required by this Article is not paid within 45 days from the date of acquisition of a dog four months of age or older, within 45 days of the dog reaching the age of four months, within 45 days of the date of expiration of any previously issued dog license, within 45 days from the date of mailing of notice to secure a license to the owner or custodian of any previously unlicensed dog, or within 45 days of the expiration date of the anti-rabies vaccination, the owner or custodian may be subject to a criminal citation or an administrative penalty in the amount of \$250.00 for the first violation, \$500.00 for the second violation and \$1000.00 for the third violation through an Administrative Code Enforcement program established by ordinance. A violation of the license requirement of this Article may also be prosecuted as a misdemeanor.

Sec. <u>11</u>. Section 53.15.4 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

- Deleted: 9

- Deleted: 10

SEC. 53.15.4. VETERINARIANS AND OTHERS AUTHORIZED TO DISTRIBUTE DOG LICENSE APPLICATIONS OR SELL DOG LICENSES.

(a) The Department may authorize a duly licensed California veterinarian, pet hospital, pet store, licensed kennel or any duly licensed person engaged in the business of breeding, selling or otherwise transferring the ownership of dogs, to distribute dog license applications or puppy certificate applications to persons residing in the City of Los Angeles, and be paid for such services a sum not to exceed \$2.00 or such other amount as determined by the Board of Animal Services Commissioners and approved by the City Council, for each application processed and license issued by the Department.

(b) The Department may also authorize a duly licensed California veterinarian, pet hospital, pet store, licensed kennel or any duly licensed person engaged in the business of breeding, selling or otherwise transferring the ownership of dogs, to sell dog licenses or puppy certificates to persons residing in the City of Los Angeles and be paid for such services by entering into an agreement with the Department establishing the conditions of such sale. The amount to be paid for such services shall not exceed \$2.00 or such other amount as determined by the Board of Animal Services Commissioners and approved by the City Council.

Sec. 12. Section 53.16 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is hereby repealed.

Sec. <u>13</u>. Section 53.27 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

The owner or operator of any dog hospital or pet shop, and any person engaged in the business of breeding dogs or a veterinarian who sells, gives away or in any manner causes the ownership or permanent possession of any dog, whether over four (4) months of age or not, to be transferred to any person, shall notify in writing the Department of that fact within five (5) days after the date of such sale or transfer. Such notice shall state the kind of dog, the name of such dog, if any, and the name, address, telephone number and if known, the electronic mail address, of the person to whom such dog has been sold or transferred.

Sec. <u>14</u>. Section 53.53 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

Each duly licensed veterinarian, after vaccinating any dog, shall sign a certificate containing the following information:

- 1. The name and address of the owner or custodian of the vaccinated dog;
- 2. The kind of vaccine used and the date of the vaccination;
- 3. The year and serial number of the dog tag;

6

Deleted:	11			

Deleted: 12

Deleted: 13

4. The breed, age, color and sex of the vaccinated dog; and

5. Such other information as the General Manager may require or such other information as may be required by State law.

The veterinarian shall immediately present one copy of the rabies vaccination documentation to the owner of the vaccinated dog. A second copy shall be forwarded to the Department of Animal Services within five (5) calendar days after the end of the month in which the vaccination was administered, on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Department, including but not limited to electronic transmission or facsimile, consistent with State law. A copy of the certificate shall also be retained by the veterinarian.

Sec. <u>15</u>. Section 53.54 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

--{ Deleted: 14

SEC. 53.54. VACCINATION CERTIFICATES, PROOF OF STERILIZATION AND OTHER PROOF TO BE RETAINED BY OWNER.

A copy of the vaccination certificate or other proof of vaccination and proof of sterilization or proof of exemption from sterilization, in a form acceptable to the Department, shall be retained by the owner or custodian of any dog and where applicable, for any cat, for inspection by the authorized representatives of the Department.