

A. Chronology of Spay Neuter in Kern County

1992:

Community members began approaching the BoS indicating the need for low cost spay neuter services in Kern County.

1997:

The topic was again brought up to the BoS by community members.

November 2002:

A county commissioned task force issued a report recommending that the Fix It vouchers be increased in value. The Fix It program was later discontinued all together.

November 2004:

- This was my first involvement with Supervisor Maben's recently formed Kern County Partnership for Animals.
- The LIMO Committee presented their first report.
- Turnout of over 50 people, all of which felt county funding for spay neuter was a high priority.

December 2004:

Spay Neuter Committee presented their final report and recommendations to KCPA. They reported that four community organizations have made the commitment to contribute \$85,000 per year towards a county funded spay neuter program. Excellent resources for developing a successful program were provided.

August 2005:

- Citygate report presented to BoS. An efficient and aggressive spay neuter program was recommended as one of the "A" priorities. "A" priorities are described as mandatory, critical, urgent, and of the highest priority.
- Also indicated as an "A" priority was establishment of relationships with local non-profit groups and the City of Bakersfield to partner with the spay neuter efforts.
- Supervisor Watson identified the importance of a "vet clinic for the public to do spay and neuter." There was also discussion about

\$187,000 in Animal Control budgeted funds not spent in the previous year.

January 2005:

Kern County Partnership for Animals submitted their final report to the Board from the LIMO committee.

April 2006:

It was announced at the final KCPA meeting that the HOPE Animal foundation spay neuter program was coming to town.

July 2006:

TREAT announced they would be presenting their mandatory and low cost spay neuter proposal to the BoS at the upcoming meeting.

August 2006:

- TREAT made their proposal for mandatory and low cost spay neuter to the BoS. Discussion was extensive. Supervisor Watson strongly expressed his support. [Video](#) The BoS referred the proposal to the AC Commission to review and report back.
- TREAT presented their proposal for mandatory and low cost spay neuter to the AC Commission.
- "Commissioner Anderson said that the proposal was premature, especially considering the local efforts now underway to increase these types of services. We should focus on low cost altering."
- Although proceedings do not depict it, the attendees specifically remember a statement by Chairman Yraceburn which is paraphrased to indicate that the Commission would create a low cost spay neuter program, available to the community, as a compromise to the TREAT proposal.
- At that time, the decision to form a subcommittee to create the proposal, was made. I brought to Chairman Yraceburn's attention that the Animal Control Commission Ordinance allowed for community members to be appointed to sub-committees. Based on that, I was volunteering to help on that subcommittee. Chairman Yraceburn indicated that he wanted to keep the subcommittee composed of only commission members. At that time, he and Commissioner Weir were appointed to the subcommittee.

- Attendees were elated that this success was achieved by TREAT.

September, 2006:

- At the joint meeting of KCBoS and Bakersfield City Council, Jackie Sullivan of Ward 6, and Zack Scrivner of Ward 7, both publicly supported funding for spay neuter.
- Public again indicated focus should be on low cost spay neuter.
- At the AC Commission meeting sub-committee report included:
 - Brief mention of Riverside County program
 - Generation of revenue for spay neuter from licensing
 - Request of staff for information on early spay neuter, costs for spay neuter, cost for euthanization, anticipated numbers reduction from spay neuter program
- Attendees at the AC Commission meeting anticipated a written program proposal based on this requested information at the next meeting.

October 2006:

No substantial action was taken on low cost spay neuter.

November 2006:

- Language in the proceedings about low cost spay neuter begins to change. There is no mention of a proposal that would include subsidizing a program for the community.
- The sub-committee is not identified, and there is no report from them.

December 2006:

- Ordinance change recommendations are presented. No mention at all of spay neuter.
- The spay neuter program sub-committee is not identified, and there is no report from them.
- Attendees begin to wonder how the low cost spay neuter program is going to be proposed, as there has been no mention of it. Proceedings indicate that the topic is again continued to the next meeting.

January 2007:

- Sub-committee presents a draft of initial direction for an ordinance designed to combat Kern County's overpopulation and lack of owner responsibility.
- 15 points are outlined. The first states "BoS/County to subsidize low cost spay/neuter services." Attendees believe this to mean a program available to the community to have their animals altered at no or a reduced cost is being developed by the sub-committee.

February 2007:

- Memo from Mr. Price to the Commission narrows down the 15 points to 4, one of which is "Subsidize Low Cost Spay/Neuter Clinics." The memo further presents a set of staff recommendations, which include outside funding and partial staffing of a low cost spay neuter program.
- At the AC Commission meeting, the sub-committee is not identified, and there is no report from them.
- "Commissioner Yraceburn instructed staff to include language in the ordinance that addresses seizure for non-compliance and misdemeanor charges... He recommended that the 'large numbers' ordinance language and the 'breeders permit' language now be brought together for continued review because the two are overlapping and further discussion should encompass both programs. He requested each proposed ordinance item be delineated as dealing with the large numbers issue or the breeders permit issue..."
- What happened to the subsidized low cost spay neuter program? The two programs are 'spay neuter' and 'large numbers,' not 'breeders permit' and 'large numbers.' Attendees again wonder how a low cost spay neuter program is going to be presented and implemented.

March 2007:

- Memo from Mr. Price to the Commission outlines guiding principles for the two proposals: Large numbers and Spay neuter. The first bullet of these principles states "BoS/County to subsidize low cost spay/neuter services."
- Although the agenda item is titled "Low Cost Spay/Neuter Ordinance Proposal" the spay neuter program sub-committee is not identified, and there is no proposal from them.

April 2007:

- First formal draft entitled "Proposed Ordinance and Program Changes" is provided.
- Guiding Principles now include two separate bullets: "County to continue to subsidize cost of spay neuter procedures for adopted animals." "Board of Supervisors to subsidize low cost spay/neuter services."
- Key operational changes again suggest outside funding and partial staffing of a low cost spay neuter program.
- Attendees again wonder if the sub-committee is going to provide a program proposal under the above described title "Proposed Ordinance and Program Changes."
- "Commissioner Weir encouraged everyone in the audience to contact their County Supervisor regarding a low cost spay/neuter program."
- I initiate a letter writing campaign shortly after this meeting per Commissioner Weir's recommendation. Attached is a copy of my personal letter to Supervisor Maggard.

May 2007:

- In latest draft, Titles, Guiding Principles, and Key operational changes are all still the same.
- During the workshop, I ask where the low cost spay neuter program change is described in the documents being reviewed. I am told that:
 - Subsidies for spay neuter are already being provided for shelter animals. This is the only spay neuter item in the ordinance and program changes.
 - A low cost spay neuter program for members of the community would be a program change, not an ordinance change, and this is not the correct forum to discuss that.
- The title of the document is still "Proposed Ordinance and *Program Changes.*"
- When the audience reminds the staff and Commission that low cost spay neuter was the agreed upon compromise when TREAT presented their Mandatory Spay Neuter Proposal, and that a sub-committee was developed to create this proposal, we are told that it would have to be addressed after the workshops and current ordinance changes.