

residents:

--- On Thu, 8/26/10, Marsha Moutrie <Marsha.Moutrie@SMGOV.NET> wrote:

From: Marsha Moutrie <Marsha.Moutrie@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: RE: Cat and Dog Limits in Santa Monica
To: "'edwardmuzika@sbcglobal.net'" <edwardmuzika@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Thursday, August 26, 2010, 3:18 PM

Ed,

I haven't advised anyone that we could implement County limits.

Marsha Moutrie

DIJULIO LAW GROUP
A LAW CORPORATION

330 N. Brand Blvd, Suite 702
Glendale, CA 9120-1938
(818) 502-1700 Facsimile (818) 500-8799

August 26, 2010

Councilmember Bill Rosendahl
Councilmember Paul Koretz
Los Angeles City Council
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: CF No. 10-0982
Amendment to Limit of Animals Owned by Residents

I would like to commend your support of increasing the animal limit for Los Angeles City residents. I submit this letter in support of the proposed amendment to the Los Angeles Municipal Code ("LAMC") to increase the current cat and dog limits per residential property from three to five. Increasing the allowed number of animals will only benefit the Los Angeles Animal Shelters ("LAAS"), City residents, the City of Los Angeles and homeless animals.

The amendment will benefit LAAS by increasing adoption, decreasing both the number of animals the LAAS must care for and the financial drain required for their care.

This amendment will also benefit City residents with the resources and desire to care for animals by allowing them to legally own additional pets. In particular, persons such as myself who currently have the maximum limit of pets would be able to legally provide foster care to two additional animals. Those few who have opposed the amendment have attempted to argue that the amendment will contribute to animal hoarding, unhealthful conditions and other unsupported fearful predictions. In fact, there are ample LAMC code sections prohibiting hoarding, improper care of pets and the like in Chapter 5 Public Safety & Protection, Article 3 Animals & Fowls,

sections 53.00 et seq. There is simply no evidence to suggest that the amendment will cause an increase in the number of persons who break the law by abusing their pets and being nuisances to their neighbors because these persons *already* disregard the law, and because these people are still subject to the existing laws prohibiting abuse. Thus, it is ridiculous to argue that these lawbreakers will decide to obtain additional animals to abuse (in violation of animal abuse laws) because the amendment would make it legal to own more pets! But even if this were the case, again there are ample LAMC sections to bring these persons to justice.

This amendment will benefit the City as a whole because increased pet adoption will increase city revenue via the required license and registration fees.

Lastly, this amendment will benefit homeless pets deserving of good homes because more residents will be able to legally adopt them and because the LAAS will have additional resources to better care for those still in its care.

In sum, there is no downside to this amendment, only positive change for pet owners, homeless animals, LAAS and the City as a whole.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Krog
Attorney at Law