



Adam Lid <adam.lid@lacity.org>

Please add this to the file for TODAY'S PAW Committee item 13-1513

1 message

CatNose1@aol.com <CatNose1@aol.com>

Tue, Jan 20, 2015 at 1:23 AM

To: adam.lid@lacity.org

Dear Mr. Lid,

Would you please add this to the file and make sure the PAW Committee members see it?

Thank you very much!

Laura Beth

From: CatNose1@aol.com

To: paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.koretz@lacity.org, David.Hersch@lacity.org,
Joan.Pelico@lacity.org, Felipe.Fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org,
asad.baig@lacity.org, Mitch.OFarrell@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org,
Christine.Peters@lacity.org, Richard.Llewelyn@lacity.org

Sent: 1/20/2015 12:08:19 A.M. Pacific Standard Time

Subj: URGENT: Vote NO on Tuesday's Cat Limit Increase - Bad Unintended Consequences!

Dear PAW Committee Members,

The proposed cat limit will create PROBLEMS and will NOT reduce euthanasia. I write this even though I have long advocated for a cat limit increase -- but this particular proposal is **horribly counter-productive**.

Under the guise of wanting to reduce cat euthanasia, this proposal WILL INCREASE cat homelessness, cat hoarding and cat euthanasia -- while draining the LAAS budget and LAAS personnel. **Please VOTE NO.**

SEE THE BETTER SOLUTION BELOW.

With the current proposal, here are the problems you will be creating if you approve:

1. Proposal will REDUCE rescues from shelters, INCREASING euthanasia.

a. Fee and inspection based permits will drive rescuers away from LAAS.

b. Over 20% of cats leave LAAS alive with New Hope Partners. New Hope Partners do not want fees, permits or inspections. LAAS certainly has no monopoly on the supply of homeless cats -- they are on streets, with owners who want to dump them, and at nearby County shelters which do not require fees, permits or inspections. Rescuers can simply go to those places to rescue cats, instead of rescuing from LAAS.

c. With reduced rescues from LAAS, euthanasia will increase.

2. Proposal will INCREASE unwanted litters -- causing even more euthanasia:

a. The spay/neuter requirement in the report is illusory at best. The Report fails to clarify that, other than the medical exception, NO spay/neuter ordinance exemptions will apply. Thus, people will rely on the other spay/neuter ordinance exemptions.

b. No enforcement plan or resources for spay/neuter violations: Brenda Barnette's spay/neuter enforcement (and spay/neuter education) record is abysmal. By allowing up to 20 cats per household, even more spay/neuter enforcement will be needed, yet we will be relying on the same abysmal spay/neuter enforcement.

c. Allowing up to 20 cats under one roof with no reliable spay/neuter enforcement WILL cause an increase in cat births, more unwanted cats being dumped, and increased cat euthanasia at the shelters.

3. Proposal will HURT LAAS' budget and HURT LAAS staffing.

a. The permit fees range from \$55 (4-9 cats) to \$150 ("16 to 20+ cats"). Yet the proposal requires annual inspections (obviously meaning on-site inspections including driving to and from the location, scheduling and conducting inspections of the premises outside and inside as well as checking the cats and records for spay/neuter), administrative work by the permits officer, handling forms and money, sending denial letters, and even conducting hearings and appeals. The permit fee is inadequate to cover this, for a net loss to LAAS' budget.

b. LAAS is understaffed. This proposal with the required annual inspections, permitting process, handling money, checking records, hearings and appeals will drain LAAS' staffing.

c. The Report fails to explain where the necessary personnel will come from, and what work will not be done because personnel will have to be diverted (or hired) to handle the inspections, permitting and hearings.

4. Proposal will ENCOURAGE HOARDING.

a. By increasing the cat limit to 20 cats per household, even with the permit technically required, many are likely to see only the numeric increase; they will ignore or not see the permit requirement, and they will simply collect more cats, also ignoring the spay/neuter requirement which is already not enforced.

b. Result? Hoarding is encouraged and increases. With no added tool to prevent it.

SUMMARY:

This ill-conceived proposal has so many very serious unintended consequences that it must be rejected. The result will be fewer rescues from LAAS, increased

unwanted litters, increased euthanasia, a drain on the LAAS budget, a drain on LAAS personnel, and an invitation to hoarding without any added tool to prevent it. **Please vote NO.**

A BETTER SOLUTION? EASY!! Here it is:

Increase the cat limit to whatever number you want to choose. More than 3 cats are allowed ONLY if ALL of these conditions are met:

1. ALL cats are sterilized. (Not just cats # 4 and above). NO exception applies except certified medical.
2. ALL cats are kept indoors only. (Not just cats # 4 and above.)
3. Compliance with ALL existing animal care laws.

Simple: No permits. No fees. No annual inspections.

Better than the proposal: No allowing the first three to remain unsterilized -- less overpopulation and resulting euthanasia than under the proposal. No allowing the first three cats to go outdoors -- fewer neighbor complaints than under the proposal. Rescuers and the public do not stop adopting from LAAS because they oppose fee and inspection based permits -- more adoptions and less euthanasia than under the proposal. No drain on the LAAS budget. No drain on LAAS personnel.

What about conditions? Do complaint based inspections, exactly as already should be happening. We already have laws on the books and enforcement mechanisms to address conditions. Plus, because personnel will not be drained to do inspections and administer permits, there will be more staffing available for more complaint-based enforcement.

Sincerely,
Laura Beth Heisen