

Communication from Public

Name: Forest Hostetter
Date Submitted: 10/06/2019 12:28 PM
Council File No: 16-1357
Comments for Public Posting: To the Personnel & Animal Welfare Committee and Los Angeles City Council Members, I am a naturalist, herpetologist, and dedicated educator, and I oppose the draft proposal for the Animal Exhibitions Ordinance (file 16-1357). The current language used in this proposal seems overly ambiguous at times, and would open the door to unintended consequences which would ultimately harm the animals and species that we are all so passionate about protecting. Having worked with several animal shelters specializing in reptiles, and in the broader reptile community over 5 years, our public & child outreach programs are one of the cornerstones in our efforts to spread awareness & understanding about creatures that are so often demonized & misrepresented. As it stands now, this Ordinance would almost totally eradicate these necessary programs within the City of Los Angeles. PLEASE work with the affected stakeholders & qualified animal keepers who care so deeply about these animals to assist in formulating an ordinance. Their expertise & knowledge should not be dismissed, as they are the people who truly understand these animals and their needs. Thank you for your time and your deep & thoughtful consideration on this matter. All the best, Sincerely, Forest Hostetter

Communication from Public

Name: Deborah L Delloso

Date Submitted: 10/06/2019 10:12 PM

Council File No: 16-1357

Comments for Public Posting: I am opposed to the exotic animal ordinance in its current language being considered. I would like this entered into record. Please see attached letter

October 6, 2019

Dear Councilmember Koretz, chair, and Members of the Personnel and Animal Welfare Committee:

I would like this entered into record. I am opposed to the exotic animal ordinance in its current language being considered. I see several areas of concern with the definitions.

Dangerous animal is not clearly defined. Animal services should not be put in the position to discern that definition. As trainers and educators, our top priority is ensuring the safety of the animals and the people around them. We are professionals and take this very seriously.

Animal act or performance is not clearly defined. Animals are used for the entertainment industry, as well as wildlife education. The understaffed, overburdened Animal Services should not be put in the position to make this definition.

Insurance is not specific. Most animal educators carry \$1 million per occurrence, which is standard. The insurance required should be specific; otherwise this can hurt small wildlife educators.

Ten-day period for permits is too long. Many productions will not fall within this 10-day period and will have to go somewhere else. Often shoots are scheduled at the last minute and this would prohibit production companies from booking animals and animal trainers from working. The companies are all USDA and Fish and Wildlife permitted, there should be no further need for permitting of any kind.

Stakeholders Committee. I propose forming a committee of at least one representative from each of the following categories:

- Animal Services
- Stakeholders (wildlife educators, production company, film animal trainers)
- American Humane Association
- Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA)
- Zoological Association of America (ZAA)

The purpose of this committee would be to assist Los Angeles Animal Services to determine the definitions proposed in this ordinance.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife formed a stakeholders committee a few years ago to write Title 671.1 Permits for Restricted Species. The stakeholders were able to bring their varied experience together with DFW staff and proponents of new regulations to write the permitting requirements for restricted species in the state of California.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Deborah Delosso

Animal Trainer for film/tv

