

Alberto Quintanilla

From: Richard Godfrey <ridgodfre77@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 12:01 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Tonight's meeting - 9/20/22

A brief written comment - Please do not update The Animal Code until adequate time has been provided to the Beekeepers of Fremont and Alameda Beekeepers have had opportunity to meet with Animal Services and the Police Department. There are effective strategies for bee management that involve us on a daily basis. Thank you.

I would also like to make a public comment if I may.

Thank you,
Richard Godfrey
38600 Canyon Hgts Dr., Fremont

Alberto Quintanilla

From: Jonathan Sandoe <jsandoe@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 9:48 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Public Comment for the Upcoming 7 PM City Council Meeting 09/20/22

Concerning Agenda Item 7A, Amendments to the Animals Ordinance.

A bit more than a year ago, this City Council asked staff to propose amendments to the Animal Ordinance guided by the goal to encourage Urban Agriculture. A couple of weeks ago staff presented a draft in a Zoom meeting for public comment. I don't think the proposed ordinance meets the goal of encouraging Urban Agriculture and that Council should send it back for a retry.

The proposed ordinance is, in some small ways, more permissive of agricultural animals than the present ordinance, but it also adds many new restrictions which make it difficult for the animal owner to comply. I think the overall effect is to discourage legal, above-board ownership of these animals. I don't think this is what the Council intended.

One particularly puzzling restriction is the allowed number of goats. "Exactly two". Not one or two, but exactly two. This means that if one does get two goats, but eventually, one dies, one is suddenly out of compliance. It is a bizarre regulation.

The Council referral occurred in July of 2021. I kept an eye out for any opportunity to provide comment or input. The first opportunity I am aware of for the community to provide feedback, or indeed to see anything about the proposed amendment, was September 8, less than two weeks ago. I am aware of a number of local organizations who might have rendered some help. I see no indication in the documents provided that any community organizations were engaged. I think the proposed ordinance would have been much better if the community were involved much earlier and at a deeper level.

One organization that should have been engaged is the Alameda County Beekeepers Association (ACBA). This is the oldest and among the most respected of California's county beekeeping groups. ACBA Swarm Hotline volunteers handled 77 swarm hotline calls in Fremont in 2021 of which 40 were honeybee swarms. They rescued 40 colonies of honeybees and calmed many a nervous homeowner. So, it is active in our community providing a valuable service at no cost. The ACBA also provides training and education for newbie and experienced beekeepers and outreach to the larger community and has done so for many years. It deserved a place at the table.

I urge you to reject the proposed ordinance amendments in their current form and direct staff to engage more with the community before returning with a better proposal.

Thank you,

Jonathan Sandoe

Alberto Quintanilla

From: Elham <elham@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 10:49 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Public Comment for City Council Meeting 9/20/22

Hello –

My name is Elham Marder, and I am an attorney and resident of Fremont. I intend to speak tonight during public comment, but since I have only 2 minutes and I am discussing nuanced legal provisions, I thought I would also email my comments.

I have a few thoughts on the Animal Ordinance:

Section 6.10.030 – Are horses considered livestock? I have seen a house on Mission Blvd. that has a horse in their front yard. What are the requirements on keeping a horse on residential property?

Section 6.10.040 - Why are Fremont residents permitted to keep pigeons and doves? I have not heard of them as pets. And why are these birds mentioned versus other birds that people keep as pets?

Section 6.40.035 (b) - Goats held on residential property should not be used for food (dairy or meat). No one should be slaughtering goats that they keep on their residential property. Secondly, goat milk comes from a lactating mother goat who has had a baby. Goats on residential property should not be used for their dairy. What happens to their baby? Also, how do they become pregnant? Subsection (d) provides the males need to be neutered.

I also recommend language on the use of chickens for food. No one should be slaughtering chickens on their residential property and eggs produced by hens should be for personal consumption (not commercial purposes).

Section 6.10.070 – This section on “shelter and shelter maintenance” needs some clarification:

- A shelter provides cover to an animal whereas an enclosure is the space the animal is confined to, and it may not necessarily have shelter.
- I think this section needs to be divided between shelter requirements and enclosure requirements. It currently blends them.
- I agree with the shelter requirements, but I think we need to add more clarity as to enclosure requirements. For example, an enclosure must be large enough - giving the animal sufficient room beyond just sitting, standing, and turning. They should be able to exercise normal behaviors.

The connection between **Section 6.10.070** and its requirements versus **Section 6.10.130 “Chickens—Enclosure and shelter”** needs some clarification. Section 6.10.070 should still apply to chickens, correct? That needs to be clarified.

The connection between **Section 6.10.070** and its requirements versus **Section 6.40.035(f) “Goats”** needs some clarification. Section 6.10.070 should still apply to goats, correct? That needs to be clarified.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Elham