



Adam Lid <adam.lid@lacity.org>

agenda item #161357

1 message

rande@roadrunner.com <rande@roadrunner.com>

Mon, Apr 24, 2017 at 4:54 PM

To: adam.lid@lacity.org, david.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, paul.krekorian@lacity.org

Please include this email content into public record to be included in any hearing, studies, or reports pertaining to this issue.

Dear Council Members,

I am writing to express my opposition to agenda item #161357.

Like a lot of folks who keep small pets, I am very concerned about the wording and intent behind this bill. Terms like "wild" and "exotic" can be interpreted to include anything that is not a dog or cat. Does the council intend to regulate the presentation of canaries, goldfish, hamsters, mice, lizards, frogs and turtles? All of these fall under some definition of "wild" or "exotic." These are popular animals to bring to schools, clubs, and other events where my friends and I are happy to educate the public and inspire folks to value the continued existence of such wildlife. There is nothing that captures public attention and appreciation of wildlife more than having an example right before their eyes. Besides educating others, I attend shows where I increase my own knowledge of the animals in my care, as new information becomes available or new discoveries in their husbandry come to light. Outlawing such events or creating too many hoops to jump through for these venues to exist does nothing to improve the welfare of animals.

The words "use" and "misuse" are easy to abuse as well. If the intent is to ensure proper care and treatment of animals, there is no intrinsic malevolence in them providing entertainment or amusement, so long as they are respected and cared for properly. In fact, it is the amusement value that provides the educational tool which motivates people to appreciate and learn about animals. Steve Irwin was effective because he understood that no one is inspired by dry and boring material.

My friends and I voluntarily exhibit our animals at schools, parks, and other venues including those sponsored by various other governmental agencies. Why therefore, does the City of Los Angeles fail to recognize and take advantage of the enthusiasm of its own community in this regard? The fact that such a bill affecting all of us was almost pushed through without notice suggests an adversarial disposition of The City in regard to its public.

I ask that the Council dismiss this motion and instead emphasize the enforcement of existing animal welfare laws to punish individuals guilty of abuse or mistreatment. Please do not use a "broad brush" to paint the majority of us as abusers and deny us the freedom to use these animals to their own benefit.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mr. Rande M. Gallant