

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kayla Chacon

**Date Submitted:** 10/10/2019 11:24 AM

**Council File No:** 16-1357

**Comments for Public Posting:** October 10, 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. Animal act or performance is not clearly defined. We participate in school fall festivals, community events, and science nights by presenting assemblies. These are conservation educational presentations that could be deemed an animal performance. 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. Three (3) days would be appropriate. 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, Kayla Chacon Intern Animal Trainer cc Councilmember John S. Lee Councilmember Curren D. Price, Jr.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sarah Lagerlund

**Date Submitted:** 10/10/2019 11:42 AM

**Council File No:** 16-1357

**Comments for Public Posting:** Although I believe each person who is involved in this issue has the animals' best interest at heart, I don't agree with the idea of not being able to transport wildlife in LA. The most obvious concerns are being able to transport rescued wildlife to a veterinarian or facilities that will care for them. If this ordinance is going to deny animals healthcare or a home should they be unreleasable, then isn't that in itself cruel to the animals? The other concern is that these animals would no longer be able to be transported to educational programs. These programs are what really encourages the public to understand wildlife and to care about the circumstances of their species. This is so extremely important for conservation. People do not care about what they don't know and understand and connect with; thus these programs and these animals are the bridge between that knowledge gap. In this way the ordinance is actually detrimental to the plight of wildlife.