Communication from Public

Name: Phyllis M. Daugherty
Date Submitted: 08/04/2019 10:37 PM
Council File No: 18-0130
Comments for Public Posting: Personnel and Animal Welfare Committee Meeting August 7, 2019 RE: Revised Proposed Ordinance by City Attorney This must be a joke! This is a license for people to steal pets or hold them for ransom--high rewards demanded for return in parking lots--or sale on Craigslist.! City cannot waive its liability because it is making each finder an agent, with required duties. If the animal causes injury to myself or others, I can merely claim that the City did not provide me with proper training in handling and caring for the animal to carry out the task it assigned to me. This is totally unenforceable and there is no penalty for violation. There is no inspection of the premises to assure the animal will be safely confined and receive care and safety. This will largely hurt the pets of low-income families. The pet will not receive vaccinations or veterinary care and there is no way the City can force them to do so. The pet MAY be returned to the owner because the finder won't make it available. There is no agreement as to how to return animals without confrontation, how to collect money owed for care and this will result in confrontations between finders and owners that can turn ugly and even violent, and the City will be responsible. This is just begging for the identity and address of owners to fall into the hands of those who may be less than ethical. It will allow unaltered pets to stay in a home, possibly with an unaltered dog of the opposite sex, and breed so that GM Brenda Barnette can have more puppies to sell in the shelter, except that the "finder" will probably just keep the dog without taking it to the shelter so they can sell the puppies and make the profit. Why doesn't the City just do its job? The claims and lawsuits that will result from this will be far more costly then just taking in lost pets and collecting the fees to return them when owners come to the shelter, which is where they will look for their pet. This proposal deprives pet owners of the right to locate a lost pet by the City giving possession of someone's personal property to strangers. (Will LAPD next let finders of cars exceeding the parking limit keep them and post a flyer for the owner?) The taxpayers of this City pay for L.A. Animal Services to pick up, or at least take in, lost and stray animals. What is Barnette doing with the $47 million budget for this Department? She claims to have no staff and is almost no-kill. That should mean she has ample space and money to provider the public safety services for

which City residents pay her--IF she is telling the truth. What has the PAW Committee and Council done to assure services are rendered? Maybe the Grand Jury should look into where the funds are going. There is no one major city in the U.S. that has this plan, and only small humane organizations in other areas have tried it. It is a bad idea and it should not be approved. Phyllis M. Daugherty Los Angeles