



Because of the secret process of this takeover, the city has not had the opportunity to explore any alternatives. Others may have more but here are just some:

1. Operate the Northeast Valley shelter the same as the other LAAS shelters with LAAS staff: The City Administrative Officer's (CAO) report seems to say that we could open the Northeast Valley shelter as the fully functioning shelter envisioned by Proposition F if we could cut 9 open-to-public hours from all the other shelters. It need not be confusing. And it need not require that any shelter close for any additional day. Instead, the needed hours can be conserved for example this way:

Instead of being open from 8am to 5pm Tuesday thru Saturday (and 11am thru 5 pm Sunday), have the shelters open on Tuesday and Thursday from 3pm to 7pm (all other hours as usual). This way we save not just the needed 9 hours of savings but a full 10 hours of open time, plus the public and rescues will gain evening hours two nights of the week which they want and which helps increase adoptions and rescues. This would give us 7 public operating shelters and equivalent services provided throughout the city, without any loss of any open shelter day.

2. Operate the Northeast Valley shelter as an adoption center keeping it an LAAS facility with LAAS employees, as well as using the LAAS employees to house at the Northeast Valley shelter the evidence animals, hospital animals, mamas with pups and kittens, and animals from disasters, as it had been doing since 2008.

For example, an LAAS Adoption Center could open to the public only during peak adoption hours such as 3pm to 7pm Thursday thru Sunday. The additional cost above how the shelter had been operating until August 1st would be for one clerk for those hours. This would require a far more modest modification to hours at the other shelters.

3. Either of the above two ideas could be done by LAAS alone. However, doing either with Best Friends' assistance would supercharge the program. Welcome Best Friends' assistance with much of what they offered but not the part that would create problems.

Best Friends offered LAAS three things:

- a) To operate a spay/neuter and low cost veterinary clinic for the Northeast Valley shelter and public animals. We would all embrace that enthusiastically!
- b) Public outreach including mobile adoptions, animal training, education and the amazing Best Friends publicity expertise. We would all embrace this enthusiastically too!
- c) An adoption center. As already discussed this is not a viable option in a Proposition F shelter, but it could be an excellent option if operated by LAAS employees with the above mentioned assistance of Best Friends.

Any of the above three options would allow LAAS to continue operating Northeast Valley the same way it has been operated since it opened in 2008, and enable LAAS to avoid having to compress an additional 1,100 to 1,200 animals into the other extremely other overcrowded LAAS shelters.

By incorporating the best of Best Friends' offer with either of the first two options, Best Friends could still operate the spay/neuter and low cost veterinary clinic that is so desperately needed in that area, provide all of the public education and outreach that Best Friends has been wanting to do, and provide creative adoption publicity and strategies in a very unique format to help shelter animals.

Another important beauty of this meshing of Best Friends and LAAS as a publicly operated shelter with Best Friends assistance is that it stands true to Proposition F and public shelter operations, while providing a truly unique testing ground for all sorts of new ideas Best Friends has over time for enhancing community relations inside and outside of a public shelter. Successful new strategies developed and refined in this unique collaboration could resonate with shelters across the country and could conceivably benefit not just LAAS animals but animals throughout the country.

These ideas show that alternatives exist. No alternatives have been considered. It is impossible to know if any other ideas, which have not been requested or reviewed, would deliver more lives saved, more cost savings, additional benefits to the city, or fewer concerns than the one proposal received. This is why the consideration of the proposal should be delayed until alternatives can be sought out and evaluated, which has not yet been done.