



Adam Lid <adam.lid@lacity.org>

Please OPPOSE The Proposal for Best Friends to Take Over Northeast Valley Animal Shelter

2 messages

Paula Hsien <phsien@hotmail.com>
To: councilmember.english@lacity.org
Cc: adam.lid@lacity.org

Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 4:35 PM

Dear Councilmember,

I am writing you to ask you to please oppose the proposition of Best Friends taking over the Northeast Valley Animal Shelter.

Proposition F funded the building of the Northeast Valley Shelter. It provided overflow space for the other shelters, housed animals, and would take in additional animals in case of natural disasters.

- The Northeast Valley Shelter was funded by Proposition F and its cost was \$19 million. Its aim was to help end overcrowding of the other shelters. While Northeast Valley has not functioned at its full capacity, it has functioned as an overflow shelter for the animals held for cruelty cases, evidence, nursing moms with babies, and animals awaiting out of state transport. And since LA Animal Services is part of the Emergency Response team, Northeast Valley Shelter would be used to house additional animals in need in case of natural disasters or emergencies such as fires and earthquakes. If a natural disaster is to occur in Los Angeles, where will the animals in need go?

Closing of Northeast Valley Shelter= even more overcrowding and more euthanasia at the six shelters

- Now that NE has closed its door, its previous responsibilities have fallen onto the shoulders of the six shelters. As things stand, all shelters are already overcrowded. If Northeast remains closed or is given to Best Friends to operate, more euthanasia is only immediate and imminent simply because there is no longer an overflow shelter to help house the animals. Each shelter will have to house its own evidence dogs, and nursing mom with babies. And when it comes time to process out of state shelter transfers, the shelter doing the out of state transfer work will have to give up its Isolation and Hospital space in order to quarantine and accommodate the animals pending transfer. This process takes weeks to complete. Where will the sick and injured animals of that shelter go? There will be no room in Evidence kennels either because those too, will be occupied by evidence dogs.

Best Friends will not perform animal control activities and will only keep an average of combined 50 dogs and cats

- The Northeast Valley Shelter has the capacity to hold at least 120 dogs in its regular kennels and 60 dogs in Isolation and Hospital, and has space to hold over 100 cats, which means they can hold a minimum of 300 dogs and cats. In the past, the Northeast Valley Shelter housed at least 175 dogs and cats on average.
- In the proposal to the City, Best Friends states that it will not perform any animal control related activities or take in any animals from the public as these responsibilities will continue to be performed by the existing 6 shelters. Also, its operation at Northeast Valley will "reduce the number of animals euthanized due to time and space constraints...". How will Best Friends' proposal help to alleviate the overcrowding when it will only have "on average a combined 50 dogs AND cats"? And what will they do with the 200 empty kennels and cat cages? Will they use that as a boarding facility for animals they

take from other areas? Does this mean a LA City taxpayer funded project will be used to house animals that belong to a private organization?

The City will still pay for the maintenance and utility expense at Northeast Valley Shelter under Best Friends occupation and operation

- The City will continue to pay for facility maintenance and utility expenses while Best Friends operates the shelter, which is budgeted at \$200,000. The proposal also states that by giving Northeast Valley Shelter to Best Friends to operate is not only cost neutral to the general fund, the City will also gain \$1 million to \$3.3 million "in services". How did they come up with \$1 million to \$3.3 million when its primary function at Northeast as stated in the proposal is to house and adopt animals while other services are secondary and tertiary? How can the City use the taxpayers' money to support a private organization that will only perform a fraction of the responsibility of a city animal shelter?

The closing of the Northeast Valley Shelter will have detrimental impact on the community and its animals. It only means more euthanasia because of the constraints placed upon the current city shelters, especially on East Valley and West Valley shelters. Best Friends occupation and operation of Northeast Valley Shelter is not the answer, for its proposed benefit does not outweigh the disadvantages. Meanwhile, there are still too many unanswered questions about its operation there. We cannot afford to close the Northeast Valley shelter. This is not the answer to the budget issue we face, and this is hardly a step towards moving LA to "no kill".

Thank you for your time.

Best Regards,
Paula Hsien

Paula Hsien <phsien@hotmail.com>
To: councilmember.alarcon@lacity.org
Cc: adam.lid@lacity.org

Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 4:43 PM

[Quoted text hidden]
