

*"The CIP (Call Interested Party) hold, which allowed a person bringing an animal to ACC to place a hold on the animal so that that person would be informed if an animal was to be euthanized, in order to possibly rescue that animal, worked VERY well for many years and saved MANY animals' lives. Over the last 20 years, I personally rescued five cats from euthanasia at ACC because I put a CIP hold on each one the day I brought the cat in. Each time I got a call from ACC because of the CIP hold, I never questioned the reason for the decision. I simply told them I would come right away and take the cat. I took all five cats to my vet, had them treated for medical conditions if that was the reason given for the possible euthanasia, and then placed them in foster homes. All five were adopted to wonderful people who adore them and take very good care of them. And that is only my story. I'm sure there are many more animals who have been saved through the CIP hold. Unfortunately, without giving any reason, several years ago ACC decided to eliminate that hold, so those of us who have brought stray animals, including kittens, to ACC in the last few years have been unable to have the possibility of rescuing those animals if they were in danger of euthanasia at ACC. Sorry for the long explanation, but I wanted to to be sure that you and the other Commissioners understand why this is an important issue and definitely needs to be part of the discussion about problems at ACC."*

- Nadine

November 9, 2022

VIA E-MAIL

San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
City Hall, Room 224  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

**RE: Proposed Legislation Banning the Use and Sale of Dog Training Shock Collars in San Francisco**

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Olivia [REDACTED] and I am a San Francisco resident and owner of a 2-year-old french bulldog. I would like to express my concern with this proposed legislation. I have had the benefit of working with a professional dog trainer who recommended using an e-collar during the training of our dog. This tool did not cause any harm whatsoever to our beloved dog, and has helped him tremendously to understand commands that keep him safe from doing things like running off into traffic, etc.

I do not feel that this proposed legislation will benefit dogs in any way. I regularly see many misbehaved dogs at the dog park that cause danger to other dogs and humans. These dogs would *benefit* from training and tools like e-collars to keep themselves and others safe. It is, instead, the lack of training with tools that causes more danger.

Professional dog trainers should have the ability to use tools that they are experienced using and can teach owners to use. I am concerned about the misinformation being spread regarding e-collars for training from those who do not actively work with dogs and are not professional dog trainers.

Please consider hearing from professional dog trainers as you evaluate this legislation to understand the benefits that tools can have in creating safety and improving dogs' lives.

**Background on e-collars:**

- **How an e-collar works:** An electronic collar is designed to send a radio signal from a handheld remote control to a receiver collar worn by the dog. This signal activates a mild, but annoying, stimulation that a dog can feel or hear, similar to a TENS (Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation) machine used by physical therapists to help reduce pain and muscle spasms caused by a wide range of conditions such as arthritis, endometriosis, sports injuries and is even used to alleviate labor pains.
- **Purpose and benefits of using an e-collar:** Contrary to the bad reputation electronic collars have been given, e-collars work to offer better, clearer, more efficient communication between the handler and the dog. Proper use of an e-

collar allows an almost instant channel of guidance and reinforcement of behaviors the dog already has been taught. Here are just a few reasons to use a remote training collar:

1. Provide the handler with a method to reinforce behaviors the dog already knows at a distance.
2. Provide a better, faster and clearer form of communication to the dog.
3. Improve a dog's ability to perform behaviors while distracted in a state of high arousal.
4. Improve control of a dog's behaviors both on and off the leash.
5. Off-leash reliability, which equates to more freedom for the dog.
6. Improve behavior in serious behavior cases, such as human and dog aggression, therefore, potentially saving dogs that would otherwise be euthanized.
7. Give the dog a bigger, fuller life - a trained dog is a happy dog.

I would be grateful for the opportunity to be a part of any discussions in determining the standards and requirements impacting professional dog trainers so that it may serve the intentions of the legislation without placing unnecessary restrictions on professionals and thus, potentially limit their ability to serve their communities.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

Olivia [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

cc: Commission of Animal Control and Welfare  
Board of Supervisors  
[chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
[DorseyStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:DorseyStaff@sfgov.org)  
[MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org)  
[Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org](mailto:Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org)  
[MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org)  
[Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org](mailto:Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org)  
[Dean.Preston@sfgov.org](mailto:Dean.Preston@sfgov.org)  
[Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org](mailto:Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org)  
[Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org](mailto:Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org)  
[Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org](mailto:Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org)  
[Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org](mailto:Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org)

Commission of Animal Control and Welfare  
[michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org](mailto:michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org)

Fw: Proposed E-Collar Ban

From: Frances [REDACTED]  
 Sent: Tuesday, November 8, 2022 3:58 PM  
 To: DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>  
 Cc: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safal, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safal@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Torres, Michael Angelo (DPH - Contractor) <michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org>  
 Subject: Proposed E-Collar Ban

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

November 8, 2022

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

City Hall, Room 224

San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

**RE:**  
**Proposed Legislation**  
**Banning the Use and Sale of Dog Training Shock Collars in San Francisco**

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco professional dog trainer and resident of Marin County. I am writing to you regarding proposed legislation banning the sale and use of e-collars. I have been a professional dog trainer servicing San Francisco for 14 years and specialize in pet dog training, behavior modification, canine sports, foster and rescue / rehabilitation work for euthanasia cases as well as owners seeking guidance after facing dangerous dog court orders. I studied at the Michael Ellis school for dog trainers, have mentored under several San Francisco Bay Area dog trainers, have attended countless seminars, courses and workshops. I strive to always add to my toolbox and continue my education to find the most humane and effective methods that work best for dog owners, their beloved dogs and the community around them.

An electronic collar is designed to send a radio signal from a handheld remote control to a receiver collar worn by the dog. This signal activates a mild, but annoying, stimulation that a dog can feel or hear, similar to the technology of a TENS (Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation) machine used by physical therapists to help reduce pain and muscle spasms caused by a wide range of conditions. The electronic stimulation delivered by TENS has no physically injurious consequences. Electronic stimulation works by activation of local skin receptors called nociceptors, which sends a signal to the brain, perceiving the physiological sensation. By scientific definition, electronic collars do NOT provide a high voltage electric "shock" or electrocution resulting in burns and physical injury. For reference, high quality e-collars (such as the Mini Educator 300) have 100 levels. I can not feel anything lower than an 8, and that level feels about 1/2 the intensity of a dryer static cling. Most of the dogs I work with, are on a level 6-12.

Contrary to the bad reputation electronic collars have been given, e-collars work to offer better, clearer, more efficient communication between the handler and the dog. Proper use of an e-collar allows an almost instant channel of guidance and reinforcement of behaviors the dog already has been taught. Here are just a few reasons to use a remote training collar:

1.
  - Off-leash reliability, which equates to more freedom for the dog. Less risk of accidental situations such as getting hit by a car, chasing after a cyclist or runner, attacking wildlife, startling equestrians. This is especially true for San Francisco dog owners who share city parks, beaches and trails with the many children, runners, wildlife, cyclists, busy city streets.
2.
  - Provide the handler with a method to reinforce behaviors the dog already knows at a distance.
3.
  - Provide a better, faster and clearer form of communication

to the dog.

4.

Improve a dog's ability to perform behaviors while distracted in a state of high arousal.

5.

Improve control of a dog's behaviors both on and off the leash.

6.

Improve behavior in serious behavior cases, such as human and dog aggression, therefore, potentially saving dogs that would otherwise be euthanized.

7.

Give the dog a bigger, fuller life - a trained dog is a happy dog.

8.

Less risk of noise complaints in densely populated apartment buildings and neighborhoods resulting in dog owners having to surrender or rehome their dog if they can't afford moving expenses.

9.

Allowing elderly and disabled persons to safely manage their dogs, even with physical limitations.

My primary goal in working with pet dog clients is to always consider what the dog needs to live a biologically fulfilled life while also meeting the needs and lifestyle of their families living in a modern world, and keeping the community around them safe. The root of all scientifically proven training is rewards based methods. However, many of our beloved family dog breeds were bred to chase, hunt, guard, herd, bite and attack, which are deeply ingrained self reinforcing behaviors. While we do our best to train, manage and set our dogs up for success...it is impossible to compete with genetics. It is unwise to assume that every dog will respond uniformly to any one method of training. While some may be motivated by food, toys or affection, others may be motivated by controlling the environment around them, hunting wildlife, or chasing children at the park.

While the majority of my clients are not on e-collars, I find them to be incredibly useful in certain situations where other methods are ineffective. I use e-collars alongside reward based training to clearly communicate with the dog which behaviors are unacceptable or non negotiable when it comes to safety and management. If I had the choice for my dog to feel a low level e collar sensation that he is conditioned to respond to...vs a potentially dangerous situation with a wild animal, causing injury to another person or getting hit by a car resulting in expensive veterinary bills, lawsuits or death...I would always choose the safest, least painful, most effective and humane option: the e collar. I would rather have it and not need to use it, vs the risk of endangering those around me or the health and safety of my own dogs as well as dogs in my care.

A sales ban will financially impact not only my business, but the businesses of thousands of professional dog trainers, particularly significant in the post COVID environment, where people are trying to get back to work and thrive. This ordinance creates a barrier to people with a passion and aptitude for entering the canine professional industry. I understand that the canine professionals who proposed this ordinance don't agree with seeking other training methods if rewards based methods are ineffective, but I think it is unfair to use the city of San Francisco as a way to monopolize the market and push out dozens of canine professionals with decades of experience in helping dog owners train and safely manage thousands of pets.

My mother is a retired San Francisco police officer, I spent many holidays at Bayview police station as a child, and so much of my inspiration to work with dogs professionally stemmed from the SFPD K-9 unit officers who were like family to me. SFPD K9 units use e-collars both in training and for public safety. If this ban were to take place, it would potentially criminalize the ways SFPD train and handle their own dogs. In Berlin, when the e collar ban was enforced, 46/130 police dogs had to be suspended and pulled from duty so that police officers weren't breaking the law in working with them. I have spoken with SFPD dog owners and training clients and each expressed serious concern regarding this proposed ban, and some have even said that they would have no option but to continue using the tools anyway. I think it's extremely important to discuss the ways this may affect the many police and K-9 units with SFPD, and to consider negative implications that this may cause.

While there is plenty of scientific research conducted demonstrating that both rewards based methods and electronic collar usage are effective, oftentimes the studies showing harmful effects are biased and flawed. There are so many considerations to take into account regarding individual dog and their temperaments, genetic propensities, what each dog finds aversive or motivating in real life scenarios. If e collars weren't effective, hundreds of thousands of dog owners wouldn't be using them. If they were inherently abusive and harmful, you wouldn't find millions of videos on the internet of highly accomplished working and sport dogs enthusiastically competing, and even more videos of happy pet dogs hiking off leash safely.

I recently had a dog owner in San Francisco desperately call me when she was at her wits end. She had worked with several rewards based trainers, but unfortunately her bird hunting breed of dog was riddled with anxiety, couldn't be off leash and was incredibly neurotic. She lived in an apartment and could not afford to move, but could not receive more barking complaints. She had to send her dog to a daycare she could not afford (\$2500/month) just to go to the office or even to the gym. The dog could not go off leash without trying to catch squirrels, birds, or taking off after deer. She was always worried he would get hit by a car, and was forced to take him into fenced in dog parks because on leash he would drag her down the sidewalk as well as on hiking trails. Unfortunately, he wasn't a good candidate for dog parks. Anxiety medications weren't working. And, he had previously shattered his shoulder and had orthopedic surgeries so he also wasn't a candidate to wear a harness. His head halter was rubbing his snout raw. What the dog needed, to be biologically fulfilled is to have the ability to run off leash and go to appropriate hiking trails. After a long period of training a recall using rewards based methods, she hit a wall and decided to try e collar training. Within a few sessions the dog had a perfectly reliable off leash recall on hiking trails, without the risk of going after wildlife or getting hit by a car. Once she was able to start hiking him in the morning, his inherent anxiety dissipated. He no longer vocalized or destroyed her house when alone for a few hours. She no longer had to worry about getting evicted and losing her apartment, or rehoming her dog. He finally was able to live a fulfilled and content life, and no longer needed expensive sedative medication that he grew a strong tolerance to. While this is just one dog, I've had countless clients in similar situations with the same outcome.

One of my personal dogs, Edie, a miniature Australian shepherd, came to me after a single bite incident. While she is not aggressive, she is fearful and her previous owners had an extremely difficult time training her as she was not responding to rewards based methods. Because they couldn't teach her a recall, they resorted to chasing her down and catching her when off leash. One day, when cornered and scared, she bit them. When they took her to a local shelter for an evaluation, a certified trainer and behavior evaluator told them that because she was fearful and unmotivated by food and therefore difficult to train, that the shelter would not be able to take her in, and recommended that they euthanize her. They made an appointment the next day. I happened to meet them outside of the double doors to her death sentence and offered to take her in to see if I could help her. I spent weeks trying to teach her a reliable recall with rewards based methods, counter conditioning and low pressure food toss games. While she made a lot of progress, she still would not come when called when needed, even within my own yard or home. I decided to e collar condition her on a level lower than even I can feel, and within 3 days she had a perfect recall and no longer needed the tool. What \*she\* found aversive wasn't low level e collar, it was the terrifying experience of being chased down and caught. She now competes in detection sport, trains in agility, dock diving and trick training...and learned 100+ behaviors in the 3 months time we have spent together. She is by far the friendliest and easiest dog I have ever trained, and is loved by so many...it is devastating to think that this dog who is now my whole world, had a death sentence because of training methods that she didn't respond well to. She has her forever home with me.

That same dog, Edie, is the reason I decided to start a petition opposing the ordinance to ban e collars. My good friend and fellow dog trainer, Theophania Brassard, of Refined K9 in San Francisco, helped me write this petition. Within days, thousands of dog owners, veterinary professionals, rescue advocates and dog trainers signed the petition and left comments about how this tool can save lives and why they oppose legislations to ban the use and sale of them. We have just under 7,000 signatures as of today. Please take the time to read the petition as well as the comments of the many dog lovers who chimed in in support of having access to this live saving training tool.

Link to petition: [www.change.org/noecollarban](http://www.change.org/noecollarban)

I understand that this proposed ordinance's intention is to enhance dogs' safety, however, you should be advised that this will have the opposite effect. The ban takes away access to a tool that has proven to be extremely effective in training and communicating with dogs, and will result in more ill-behaved dogs, more injuries to both dogs and humans, and more dogs being abandoned or euthanized. This would disproportionately affect many elderly or disabled persons who benefit from having a dog trained using an electronic collar. There are many tools such as no-pull harnesses, head halters and flat collars, which cause orthopedic harm and discomfort to dogs, and are commonly used by opponents of electronic collar, and while I don't agree with the use of them in all cases, I don't think it's fair to ban them either.

We have to consider what is best for dog owners, what is safest for the community, and what is right for San Francisco; a dog loving city that has always been an inclusive place that is home to all. Criminalizing San Francisco's dog owners and canine professionals for simply doing what is best or safest for their dog is not the answer.

I would be grateful for the opportunity to be a part of any discussions in determining the standards and requirements impacting professional dog trainers so that it may serve the intentions of the legislation without placing unnecessary restrictions on professionals and thus, potentially limit their ability to serve their communities.

Respectfully,

Frances [redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]

Public Comment - Shock Collar Ban

Carolyn [REDACTED]

Thu 11/10/2022 1:17 PM

To: Torres, Michael Angelo (DPH - Contractor) <michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org>

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

Hi Mr. Torres,

Thank you for reviewing my comment. I was a resident of San Francisco from 2012-2020 and relocated to Oakland during the pandemic. I work in San Francisco and travel to San Francisco with my dog to enjoy the multitude of hiking opportunities, visit with friends and get veterinary care. I believe that the fine should be increased to \$1000 for violation of the ban and it should be a felony, not misdemeanor. To use one of these tools against a living being is the definition of violence, that is reflected in the charge as a felony. Raising the fee indicates the seriousness of the charge and respect for the living being who is subjected to the abuse. In addition, deaf dogs should also be protected from vibration collars which are still aversive and can have the same consequences. Deaf dogs are disabled and it is not acceptable to use a vibration collar simply because a sentient, living being is disabled. There are plenty of other safe tools, like harnesses and longlines that are humane. It is unacceptable to use a tool on someone due to their disability. My last comment is that the ban should apply to everyone in San Francisco, residents and visitors alike. I am very hopeful that Oakland will adopt a similar policy and save both people and animals from the risks associated with these aversive tools.

Thank you,

Carolyn [REDACTED]

--  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Public Comment: Support of Ecollar Ban Ordinance - SF

Karin [REDACTED]

Thu 11/10/2022 1:46 PM

To: Torres, Michael Angelo (DPH - Contractor) <michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org>

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

Dear Chairperson and Members of the Committee,

My name is Karin [REDACTED] and I am a dog owner in San Francisco who uses public SF parks and sidewalks on a daily basis.

I am writing public comment in support of the language of the proposed draft ordinance. San Francisco should prohibit the sale, distribution and use of ecollars. Owners should be held accountable for using an ecollar and a first time warning is enough. Oftentime, I see trainers and walkers use these tools at McClaren Park, Fort Funston and other areas. It is important that this regulation is enforced.

Would companies be able to deliver ecollars if ordered online? If so, I recommend prohibiting that explicitly in the ordinance, or else people would effectively buy them online and get them shipped to their place in San Francisco, to then use.

There should be a tool for enforcement like people being able to submit photos or evidence of group walkers in public SF areas using these tools on a daily basis. Perhaps adding a provision of where people can send information like that will be helpful to ensure walkers and trainers are following the regulations.

It is essential this ordinance remains strong and not get watered down in any way. There are multiple peer reviewed scientific papers evaluating the behavioral responses of dogs

I will provide one citation: Cooper JJ, Cracknell N, Hardiman J, Wright H, Mills D. The welfare consequences and efficacy of training pet dogs with remote electronic training collars in comparison to reward based training. PLoS One. 2014 Sep 3;9(9):e102722. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0102722. PMID: 25184218; PMCID: PMC4153538.

Because people have been using this tool as a popular method to suppress behavior through pain, it is important that this ordinance keep the language it has or be strengthened. This ordinance will educate people that other methods of training will result in the same response to training but will actually ensure the welfare of the animal is not compromised (like it is with the use of ecollars). (See conclusion of the paper cited).

Thank you in again, I support the ordinance as drafted.

Sincerely,

Karin [REDACTED]



**Public Comment - Shock Collar Ban**

Tony 

Thu 11/10/2022 3:14 PM

To: Torres, Michael Angelo (DPH - Contractor) <michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org>

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

I am thrilled that SF is the first city to ban shock collars, otherwise known as e-collars. There is no excuse to use electric stimulation to force dogs to obey us when we have the power to show kindness and compassion for the animals under our care. Dogs do not get to pick their family; we as humans keep them captive. Thus we have a responsibility and duty to the welfare of our dogs.

Public comment in support of banning shock collars in SF

Kelsey [REDACTED]

Thu 11/10/2022 11:59 AM

To: Torres, Michael Angelo (DPH - Contractor) <michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org>

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

Hello Michael and the rest of the commission,

I am a current resident of San Francisco and live in Bernal Heights. I have been a dog owner for over three years. I may not be able to attend tonight's meeting, but wanted to formally express my support of banning the use, sale and distribution of shock collars in San Francisco. We have progressive to more humane training, scientific and professional training methods.

One of my greatest focuses for my dog is keeping her safe in San Francisco on walks. One memorable experience was in February when we were rushed and backed into a garage corner by two off leash large dogs from across the street. They crossed the sidewalk and backed us into a corner and were barking, growling and lunging at us. These dogs were trained using a shock collar and prong collar. I pushed my own dog behind me in order to keep her safe and shouted at the owners to collect their dogs. It was one of the most terrifying evenings of the past year.

When we frequent San Francisco wonderful off leash areas such as Stern Gove, I do not let my dog interact with dogs who are wearing shock collars due to the risk of redirected aggression. If we do not let my 5 year old niece interact with any dog wearing one of these collars due to the risk of redirected aggression and causing her injury and trauma. I have witnessed SF dog owners buzz their dog to recall them and their dog begin attacking the dogs nearby it due to the pain they experienced from the collar.

SF has many business who do not support the use of shock collars on dogs; SF leads the country in many progressive and just policies. Banning the use of shock collars in San Francisco would continue to uphold that message of progressive and just policies.

I would strongly encourage my support of passing a ban on shock collars in San Francisco for the great safety of the public and to show our support of evidence-based and humane training methods.

Sincerely,  
Kelsey [REDACTED]  
Resident of Bernal Heights, San Francisco

**Public Comment - Shock Ban Collar**

Katie [REDACTED]

Thu 11/10/2022 2:59 PM

To: Torres, Michael Angelo (DPH - Contractor) <michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org>

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

To whom it may concern,

I hope that you will consider carefully the good that can be done for animal welfare with the proposed shock collar ban. San Francisco can lead the way to a safer future for pets.

Public Comment — Shock Collar Ban

Kathleen [REDACTED]

Thu 11/10/2022 1:58 PM

To: Torres, Michael Angelo (DPH - Contractor) <michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org>

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

Hello Mr. Torres,

I am writing in support of the ordinance as written to ban the use of shock collars in San Francisco and recommend that it doesn't get cut down. I am a dog guardian in Oakland and I hope San Francisco can set an example for other cities to ban the use of these aversive tools. The more we learn from behavioral scientists about animals and dogs specifically, the more obvious it is that we need to improve the welfare we as humans provide.

Thank you for your consideration and time,

Kathleen [REDACTED]

Shock Collar Ban

Chris [REDACTED]

Thu 11/10/2022 1:56 PM

To: Torres, Michael Angelo (DPH - Contractor) <michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org>

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

Hello Mr. Torres, I lived in San Francisco for 10 years and recently moved to Oakland. I continue to visit San Francisco regularly with my dog.

I support the shock collar ban and I encourage you to do what you can to increase the penalty and fee for violation as you write the text of the policy.

Thanks

Chris

Chris [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Public Comment - Shock Collar Ban

Micah [REDACTED]

Thu 11/10/2022 1:41 PM

To: Torres, Michael Angelo (DPH - Contractor) <michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org>

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

This comment is from a certified trainer working in the behavior department of an animal shelter. As a department that works with both the shelter dog population and clients in our community, we are on the front lines of the behavioral fallout that can occur from the use of aversive tools such as shock collars. The scientific evidence nationally and globally has been clear on these topics for DECADES. The use of aversive tools has strong, measurable, detrimental effects on the quality of life of our companion animals. Behavioral fallout from these tools includes increased fear, aggression, learned helplessness, and generalized anxiety. For every behavior which shock collars are promoted for, studies have proven there are more effective and humane methods. Every single one. This data is widely available. As a city who seeks to use peer reviewed science, evidence, and fact to inform their policy decisions, I urge you to do exactly that, and ban the use of shock collars.

Micah [REDACTED]  
Behavior and Training Specialist

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

SF Shock Collar Ban

Yishian

Thu 11/10/2022 11:49 PM

To: Torres, Michael Angelo (DPH - Contractor) <michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org>

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

Thank you for your consideration of animal safety and welfare. My name is Yishian. I am currently a dog walker and sitter that specifically works with reactive and aggressive dogs here in the Bay Area. I was formerly a supervisor in adoptions at the San Francisco SPCA, where I saw firsthand the outcomes of aversive fallout (despite claims that aversive methods are necessary to keep animals in their homes.) I also have received my certificate in applied animal behavior from the University of Washington. I have some additional thoughts and comments from my professional observations over the years that I would like to contribute as the commission mulls over this decision (as I have heard that after this evening, you will be revisiting your support).

Apologies for not getting this in earlier - I didn't hear about this until today and was walking dogs at the time. I realize it is far too late for a comment but hope the commission will consider the below:

The "balanced" (tool using) community is great at circling the wagons online and arguing their methods, but the undeniable truth is that aversive tools are very effective at stopping behaviors because they are aversive by design. This means they cause pain and discomfort, and that is not without fallout. There is a wealth of scientific research to support evidence of stress and fallout from aversive training, which has risks to the dog, handler, and the public at large. [This is a collection of just some examples, with citations and research linked.](#)

One commonly held point by the balanced community is that persons with disabilities need them to safely control their dogs. While I cannot ever presume the medical needs of another individual, I can only add to anecdotal data and say that as a small woman with herniated discs that have in the past caused me to be bedridden: I am able to walk large, reactive dogs professionally every day without the aid of an electronic collar. Additionally, Guide Dogs for the Blind in nearby San Rafael produces incredible service dogs and no longer uses aversive tools and made the switch to positive reinforcement, starting more than fifteen years ago. There are many strategies and management methods one can employ as a person with disabilities, and disabilities do not mean that an electronic collar is necessary.

Guide Dogs For the Blind was even included in a [Time Magazine article on the science of dog training](#): "A new dog can now be ready to guide its owner in half the time it once took, and they can remain with an owner for an extra year or two, because they're so much less stressed out by the job, says Susan Armstrong, the organization's vice president of client, training and veterinary operations."

In the Bay Area and West Coast we are fortunate to have access to a wealth of behavioral expertise in the form of Board Certified Veterinary Behaviorists and behavior focused veterinarians. I urge you to seek the opinions of these professionals, such as [Dr. Sung at the SF SPCA](#) or any of the practicing behavior resident veterinarians there, [Dr. Sophie Liu](#) (formerly SF SPCA, now practicing on her own), [Dr. Jeanine Berger](#) (formerly of SF SPCA,) the [behavior science department at UC Davis](#), [Dr. Keely Commins](#), [Dr. Pachel of Instinct Dog Training](#) in Portland, and more. These professionals are members of the [American College of Veterinary Behaviorists](#), the [American Veterinary Society of Animal Behavior](#), and/or the [American Veterinary Association](#), all of which have position statements against aversive training methods or supporting the reduction of stress, pain, discomfort, and fear and advocating for science. I would urge you to look over these positions as well as speak to some of these professionals in your assessments, as the dog training field is unregulated but these professionals have been through rigorous education, training, and residency.

**As we have learned all too well these last several years: it is not always the case that both sides of a position are equally qualified to give truly expert opinions.**

In addition to the issues already raised regarding welfare, there is a practicality and safety issue in that electronic collars also tend to instill a false sense of security in the handler. Dogs can (and do) blow straight through electronic collars, despite advocates of the tool insisting it is a safe, secure way to let 'high drive' dogs off leash. I have been present when a dog has blown straight through an electronic collar on the highest setting to chase a coyote. If the only thing that makes a dog 'safe' off leash is an electronic collar, then it is not safe for that dog to be off leash in San Francisco.

San Francisco is a dense city full of residents of all species and backgrounds, who all deserve to enjoy shared spaces safely - without discomfort or pain from an aversive tool, or threat and fear of an unsafe off leash dog.

Thank you so much for your time and work, please do reach out if you have any questions or concerns whatsoever!

Yishian

ecollars in SF

Mika [REDACTED]

Fri 11/11/2022 8:47 AM

To: Torres, Michael Angelo (DPH - Contractor) <michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org>

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

Hello,

I'm writing in support of the efforts to ban shock collars in SF. I live in San Francisco near USF and I regularly visit Rossi, Mountain Lake Park, Fort Funston, and Crissy Beach with my dog. We do not use forceful methods and I have concerns about trainers who rely on them.

Please consider continuing to explore options to ban ecollars.

Thank you,  
Mika

--  
[REDACTED]



Public Comment: Support of Ecollar Ban Ordinance - SF

Roxanna [REDACTED]

Fri 11/11/2022 2:48 PM

To: Torres, Michael Angelo (DPH - Contractor) <michaelangelo.torres@sfdph.org>

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

[REDACTED]

---

Dear Chairperson and Commissioner members,

My name is Roxanna [REDACTED] and while I live in Daly City, my dog goes with walkers to SF parks and I go to Fort Funston daily, which is located in SF.

I am writing public comment in support of the letter to ban ecollars in SF.

It is well-established and backed by evidence based veterinary medicine that ecollars create pain and anxiety in dogs to suppress behavior and results in a detrimental effect on the welfare of animals. Veterinarians have studied this extensively and there are many peer-reviewed scientific papers about many studies conducted to evaluate whether there is truly an adverse impact to animal welfare. Their conclusions are that ecollars, even when used in best practice, worsen animal welfare, and these papers are available for the Commission to read online.

Just like how the use of vaccines are supported by evidence based medicine, evidence based veterinary medicine recommends against the use of ecollars. This is why veterinary behaviorists and vet associations have public statements against the use. "Trainers" who have no continuing education and can buy a certification overnight, stated that ecollar is a minor ping. If you read statements from vets, this is simply not true. I urge the Commission to search for this research themselves, as I am only limited to comment for 2 minutes.

Second, someone made a unsubstantiated comment that countries who have banned ecollars want to revoke the ban. This is not substantiated by any citation. In fact, if you search online, you will see that these countries are still strongly against the sale and use of ecollars. They have now committed to doing outreach and education in the community to teach people how to effectively train dogs without ecollars.

Furthermore in 2020, PetCo ended the sale of ecollars and has a public statement explaining its reasons why, which include statements from qualified vets and vets with PhDs. There is no reason for its use in San Francisco. There is a high density of dogs, and using one also has a serious risk of aggressive reaction when used. Animal welfare is the mission of the Commission - I urge you to focus your decision about animal welfare, not a trainer or walker's convenience.

I urge the Commission to continue forward with the letter of support for ecollar ban in San Francisco.

Regards,  
Roxanna [REDACTED]