

ANIMAL ISSUES MOVEMENT

420 N. Bonnie Brae Street
Los Angeles, CA 90026-4925
Animallssu@aol.com
(213) 413-ADOPT (cell)

February 25, 2018

Los Angeles City Council
City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles CA 90012

Mike Feuer, City Attorney (Attn: Dov Lesel)
City Hall East, 9th Floor
200 N. Main Street
Los Angeles CA 90012

CF 18-0130 - OPPOSITION TO REQUEST TO POLICY TO ALLOW COMMUNITY MEMBERS TO CARE FOR FOUND DOGS AND CATS UNDER CERTAIN GUIDELINES

Animal Issues Movement affirms its letter of May 22, 2017, in opposition to the subject issue and it is included herein by reference. The City cannot enter into a verbal or written contract/agreement with finders of lost pets to grant permission of possession of such personal property until after the legal holding period, during which the animal is available and observable at the local shelter for the owner to redeem. Redemption and legal fees also increase revenue to the shelter..

If anyone finds a pet and wishes to report it to the shelter and keep it in their possession—and the shelter does not demand surrender of the animal—that is a personal choice by the finder. If the finder *knows* the owner of the dog/cat owner and does not return it, the law states that is “theft.” Los Angeles Animal Services should not risk becoming involved or enabling the possibility of a crime and should demand that the animal be brought to the shelter so that the owner has an opportunity to find it.

1. **This will discriminate against low-income pet owners.** Not all owners in many Los Angeles areas will have the sophistication to search for their pet online, and many of those in low-income areas do not have easy access to computers. The majority of them come directly to the shelter to look for their pet.
2. **This proposal creates immense, unnecessary physical and legal complexities** that are totally unsupportable in the real world of Los Angeles. Although the General Manager names humane societies which are experimenting with this, they are nowhere near the size or volume of animals and they are not municipal, government shelters.
3. **GM Barnette will be offering a favored status to certain individuals and groups to act as "agents"** but who do not indemnify the City for loss nor operate under the provisions, restrictions and requirements of a contractor.
4. **This is an attempt to legitimize quasi-animal shelters in residential locations**, which will act as the “agents” of the DAS. The shelter cannot create civilian “agents” to do this job merely by a change of policy nor can it change state liability laws.
5. **How will these “group” be paid/rewarded for these services if/when the owner is found (or is not found)?** Does the owner feel obligated to give them a “reward” or do they ask for total expenses?
6. **What happens if the owner is NOT willing to pay and there is a conflict at the location? Animal Services has no authority to intervene in a civil situation.**

Taxpayers' pay \$44 million per year for DAS to insure the safety of their own and others' pets if they are lost. They expect, for that money, to be able to have the shelter make every effort to pick up lost pets and keep them where there is veterinary care available, safe and sanitary conditions and proper diet and care.

Any owned dog is “stray” if it has left its property, even if it appears to have identification. Until the legal hold period and efforts to contact an owner has passed the City cannot make that determination.

Pets are personal property and the City cannot enter authorize someone keeping a licensed, microchipped OR stray dog/cat—the latter is clearly mandated to be taken to a shelter by State law.

This would be a costly mistake to the Department of Animal Services, the animals and owners involved and the City of Los Angeles.

Phyllis M. Daugherty
Phyllis M. Daugherty, Director

'Finders, Keepers': LA Doesn't Want Your Lost Dogs or Cats in City Shelters

PHYLLIS DAUGHERTY

29 MAY 2017



[PREVIOUS ARTICLE](#) Former LAUSD Supe Draws Remarkable \$238k Pension

[NEXT ARTICLE](#) Could Music Account for California's Rising Advanced Placement Scores?

ANIMAL WATCH--If your dog or cat goes missing in the city of Los Angeles, Animal Services GM Brenda Barnette has a plan to keep it out of her shelters, but you may not be happy with this alternative.

Facebook Twitter Google+ Share

Her proposal was approved on May 23 by the Animal Services Commission--with no singular or collective animal-sheltering experience among them. There was no discussion about the welfare or safety of pets and no probing questions as to the logistics that would make this cumbersome, confusing and risky policy viable.

Barnette's "finders-keepers" proposal is to allow lost pets to stay with a person who picks them up and reports this to the shelter.

This isn't a program where the finder comes in and is vetted and background checked. It would place your pet in a location unknown to you, eliminate your ability to identify your furry family member on-line, and impede your ability to get it home.

Experts I have contacted say it is illegal. But, Deputy City Attorney Dov Lesel was present and made no objection.

THIS IS SCARY! Every pet owner in the City needs to know about it before it is actually implemented. Please share with your neighbors and friends.

This is not about the protection of lost pets. It is about not having lost animals counted on impound stats.

In her apparent increasing desperation to declare L.A. City shelters "no kill," Barnette may have finally gone too far and crossed the line of ethics and legality in devising a plan that permits her to make decisions regarding lost animals that exceed her authority and interfere or usurp pet owners' property rights.

Barnette is planning to **enter into agreements** with finders a lost dog or cat which allows them to keep it without impounding it for the legal-hold period at the shelter so that its photo appears on line and/or an owner can physically locate it.

HERE'S THE BASIS FOR BARNETTE'S THEORY

GM Barnette is basing her "finders-keepers" plan on the theory that everyone who finds an animal and reports it has good intentions and the ability to provide the same (or better) care than her own animal shelters.

State law does not agree, stating that, "*The Legislature finds and declares that it is better to have public and private shelters pick up or take in animals than private citizens. The Legislature further finds that the taking in of animals is important for public health and safety, to aid in the return of the animal to its owner and to prevent inhumane conditions for lost or free-roaming animals.*"

But Barnette prefers the wording of an archaic 1967 [LAMC Code Sec. \(53.09\)](#). Here's the exact wording, in pertinent parts:

"... persons taking up such animal shall, within four hours thereafter, or within two hours thereafter if such animal is attached or hitched to a vehicle, give notice to the Department or to some police officer, of the fact that he has such animal in his possession, and shall furnish thereto a description of such animal and a statement of the place where he found and where he has confined the animal."

"(b) Any person taking up any such stray animal found running at large or contrary to the provisions of this article shall surrender such animal to the General Manager of the Department or his duly authorized representative upon demand thereof."

Brenda's reasoning for not continuing the department's traditional requirement to have such animals brought to the shelter or picked up from the finder is that this occasionally creates "conflict" with the staff member when the finder does not want to release the animal to the shelter.

So, she opines, it is better to just let them stay with the finder for at least 30 days (the length of time after which the owner could legally lose property rights to the pet *if all diligent efforts to find the owner have been exhausted.*)

Sec. 53.09 provides that the finder must provide a photo to the shelter and distribute flyers where the animal was found (which may be miles from where it was lost), but **it does not include that the City can enter into an agreement/contract to grant continued possession to the finder. This changes the arrangement and can expand the City's liability**, according to animal-control professionals.

Barnette describes in her May 17 report that the finder would have between 30 to 35 days to "try out" the pet and then either surrender or adopt the animal.

However, not impounding the pet in a city shelter removes the key method by which the pet could be located, and, therefore, may not allow legal transfer of title to the finder. (State law has safeguards to assure this 30-day window cannot be used to hide and essentially "steal" an animal.)

DO YOU WANT A STRANGER KEEPING YOUR LOST PET?

In 2000, Los Angeles residents approved [Prop. F](#). This provided \$154,000,000 in bond funds to expand the City's 300 dog kennels to 1200 and, among other benefits, meet industry standards, assure a safe and humane environment, and increase the number of animals reclaimed by their owners.

Additionally, Los Angeles residents paid \$44,000,000 in taxes last year alone for animal control services--and to assure pets would be easily redeemable if lost. LAAS shelters must not be discriminatory—they must provide the same opportunity for all found animals to be viewed on-line or by visiting city shelters.

The City does not gain property rights until the end of the legal hold period (which at most shelters is now four to seven days, depending upon the number of hours/weekends open to the public), at which time the shelter becomes the legal owner and can offer the pet for adoption/sale.

But in order for this transfer of title to be upheld by courts, the shelter must have complied with State statutes, according to the [Animal Legal & Historical Center](#), which concludes:

"Shelters must be aware of their obligations and limitations in caring for lost or abandoned animals . . . Following state law is essential not only to protect the rights of animal owners, but also to protect the shelter from tort actions by the owner; state law also ultimately protects the animal itself."

OWNER OF A LOST ANIMAL RETAINS LIABILITY FOR DOG BITES

CA dog-bite law (CA Civil Code Sec. 3342), **holds the dog owner strictly liable for any dog bite--even while lost--**until it is legally transferred by the owner (or title is transferred to a shelter by relinquishment.)

This law states that a dog's owner may be held liable for another person's damages if: (1) the person's injury was caused by a dog bite, and (2) the injured person was in a public place or lawfully in a private place when the bite occurred.

LAAS entering into an agreement (contract) with a finder to keep a found dog on his/her property, still **leaves the dog owner liable under CA statute. Could the City also be liable by agreeing to this arrangement** and for failing to impound the dog?

BARNETTE'S PLAN UNDERMINES LA'S SHELTERING SYSTEM

Please read her own poorly written and typo-studded report [here \(scroll down to report for Item 6-A.\)](#) This is an example of the work product of an L.A. City department manager paid over \$230,000/yr. Imagine the nightmare of trying to administer this vague, emotion-based "plan" but, most of all, imagine your pet being subject to this conundrum and you not knowing where it is.

It contains no requirement that a shelter veterinarian examine the animal to assure it is not sick or injured (some injuries and illnesses are not visually recognizable) nor that a microchip check be done only by the shelter to assure an accurate report.

This will apparently allow the finder to keep altered or unaltered lost pets, and there is no indication that other dogs in the home must be altered and licensed.

Barnette's "guidelines" (see below) say that the person would show the shelter proof of insurance (who evaluates the policy?), no history of animal abuse (how is that proven?)

There is no plan identified for coordination or processing of these complex tasks.

Barnette states "The purpose of this change is simple."

1. Gives lost dogs and cats home care, and medical care if appropriate
2. Keeps dogs and cats out of municipal shelter system.
3. Alleviate concerns of citizens about turning dog in to the shelter out of fear s/he will not be claimed or placed.
4. Expands our foster program and gets community involved helping find the dog's owner, or with walks, and other care.

Here are some **FACTS**:

1. Lost dogs and cats impounded in LAAS shelters get veterinary care, appropriate diet, exercise and a chance to be quickly found by their owner. There is no way to guarantee or regulate the quality of experience or care in an unknown household.
2. Brenda is discount her own job by advising, "Keep dogs and cats out of municipal shelter system."
3. Any citizen who turns in a dog (or cat) to the shelter can request to adopt the animal if the owner does not claim it.
4. Should your lost pet be used to expand the LAAS foster program? How does the "community" get involved in finding the owner when the dog is retained in a private home?

CAN BARNETTE'S PLAN BE TRUSTED?

Barnette recently avoided responding to whether pets of the homeless are checked for microchips and returned to their rightful owner if identified--as if being tied or caged in a tented, bacteria-littered encampment is an equal or more suitable "home" for someone's beloved lost (or stolen) companion.

Brenda Barnette has no prior animal control experience, having managed only the very small Seattle Humane Society before coming to LA. Plus, she has no administrative staff with animal-control experience, with the turnover of four Assistant GM's in her six-year tenure.

This policy, contrary to Barnette's claim there is "no fiscal impact," could evade the shelter's ability to recover costs for care of lost animals and therefore reduce funding for the shelters.

Another serious issue is the lack of concern about potential aggression of a found animal toward other pets or residents (including children) in a "finder's" home.

Barnette's "no kill" plan does not include picking up loose animals (#18 on the LAAS priority list) or encouraging bringing lost pets to shelters.

Brenda Barnette's real goal is to not have these animals show as impounds and reveal that the pet overpopulation problem in the City is not resolved and "no kill" is a statistical manipulation, rather than a reality.

In terms of problems, the General Manager appears to head the list. Her tenuous "finders-keepers" policy is a classic example.

HERE'S "ADDITIONAL INFORMATION" PROVIDED (Emphasis added)

(WARNING: THE FOLLOWING CAN RESULT IN CONFUSION/HEAD SCRATCHING)

1. Failure to release the animal to the shelter if owner is identified *could* result in an officer going to the location and *attempting* to seize the animal and *possible charges for theft* against the finder
2. If an owner identifies the animal by photo, arrangements will be made for the finder to bring the animal to the shelter so the shelter staff can show the animal to the possible owner to see if it is his or her animal.
3. If there have been mandatory veterinary care expenses incurred by the finder, the owner will be advised that those must be paid and that *his or her name and address will be provided to the finder for collection.*
4. If the animal is attacked by another animal or in any way injured or contracts a disease while in the care of the finder, the finder will be liable to the owner of the animal.
5. If the animal bites, attacks, or otherwise inflicts harm on a person or animal while the found animal is in their custody, the finder will be liable for the actions of his/her animal while it is in the custody of the finder.
6. If the animal escapes and causes an automobile accident in which someone is injured, the finder will be liable.
7. The Department may demand that the keeper of the animal show proof of insurance, has no history of animal abuse, and lives where the animal will be allowed.
8. If the animal is pregnant (whether or not it is obvious), the finder will be required to notify the shelter and to determine whether the finder is prepared to foster and bear the expenses through whelping and until the young ones are weaned and when all the young ones and mom will be returned to the shelter to be altered. *The puppies will be the property of the Department and will carry all of the rights for the finder that any foster volunteer has. (Note: this does not mention kittens.)*

LA Animal Services GM Sends 'Finders, Keepers' Plan to Council ... City's Lost, Stray Pets Ignored

PHYLLIS M. DAUGHERTY

26 FEBRUARY 2018



[NEXT ARTICLE](#) LA Animal Shelters Vegan Dog-Food Proposal Hits Legal Snag

ANIMAL WATCH-Why don't LA Animal Services' General Manager Brenda Barnette and the LA Animal Services Commission want lost, stray, abandoned or unwanted animals brought to the Los Angeles City "No Kill" shelters (as recently [announced](#) by Mayor Eric Garcetti) for safety and quick return to owners searching for their furry (or feathered) family member? Barnette reports that dog impounds are down and owner redemptions are up at LA City shelters, so, why not continue a good thing? Could it be the stats aren't really telling the whole story? Or, could numbers have been achieved in a manner that is not sustainable and a new elusion is needed?

Facebook Twitter Google+ Share

However, under no political convenience -- lost/homeless animals have become lucrative political and financial pawns -- should appearing "No Kill" allow the City to risk entering agreements with unknown, unvetted individuals to keep lost, helpless, voiceless pets while their sleepless owners search frantically through shelters, obsessively scan online "found" ads and Craigslist, and agonizingly call their pet's name on dark streets at night, hoping for the slightest familiar whimper, bark or meow. Maybe the LA Animal Services Commissioners and GM Barnette have never lost a pet? That should be a prerequisite for managing a shelter!

On May 29, 2017, ['Finders, Keepers': LA Doesn't Want Your Lost Dogs or Cats in City Shelters](#) informed *CityWatch* readers that the Animal Services Commission -- with no singular or collective animal-sheltering experience among them -- on May 23 approved Barnette's "finders-keepers" proposal to allow lost pets to stay with any person who picks them up and reports this to the shelter.

This isn't a program where the finder comes in and is background-checked. It would place your pet in a location unknown to you, in potential danger of harm, and eliminate your ability to get it home.

Experts in law say it is inadvisable, and possibly illegal, for the City to purposely enter into such an agreement in regard to lost personal property, which changes the dynamic from merely notice to the Department to a contract with prescribed "guidelines" imposed by LA Animal Services. But, Deputy City Attorney Dov Lesel was present and made no objection.

'FINDERS, KEEPERS' PLAN MOVED FORWARD TO MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

On February 14, 2018, Council File No 18-0130, "Found Dogs and Cats / Home Care by Private Citizens / Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) / Amendment," was activated by the City Clerk and is now "pending" in Councilman Paul Koretz' Personnel and Animal Welfare (PAW) Committee.

This is not about the protection of lost pets. It is about emptying the shelters and not having lost animals counted in impound or euthanasia stats.

It is also the attempt to legally create quasi-animal shelters, run by local rescue groups in residences. Simultaneously, Councilman Paul Koretz is also attempting to change City zoning to allow unlimited animals throughout the City.

Barnette is, according to a prior presentation to the Commission, planning to **enter into agreements with rescuers -- as well as individual finders** -- to allow them to keep your pet without impounding it for the legal-hold period at the shelter. Rescuers cannot charge impound fees. Will they rely on rewards or some hold pets hostage for unregulated "fees" to cover their costs of care of found strays?

This would also deprive the animal of the required veterinary check it receives in LA's public shelters and the safety of separation in industry-approved kennels. It would also mean that a found animal could be in close contact with other lost or rescued animals without vaccinations and possibly aggressive behavioral propensities.

GM Barnette is allegedly basing her "finders-keepers" plan on the theory that everyone who finds an animal and reports it has good intentions and the ability to provide the same (or better) care than her own animal shelters.

State law and national and local experts do not agree. Barnette is relying on her interpretation of LAMC Code Sec. (53.09), which provides that the finder must provide a photo to the shelter and distribute flyers where the animal was found (which may be miles from where it was lost), but **it does not include that the City can enter into an agreement/contract to grant continued possession to the finder. This changes the arrangement and expands the City's liability, legal beagles agree.**

EXPERTS RECOMMEND TAKING PETS WITH NO ID TO ANIMAL SHELTER

The CA Hayden Law states, *"The Legislature finds and declares that it is better to have public and private shelters pick up or take in animals than private citizens. The Legislature further finds that the taking in of animals is important for public health and safety, to aid in the return of the animal to its owner and to prevent inhumane conditions for lost or free-roaming animals."*

American Humane Association advises, *Take pets with no ID to an animal shelter. If the animal has no ID tag or microchip, its best chance of being reunited with its owner is generally at an animal shelter. The shelter is the one obvious place where owners are likely to look for lost pets. Many people are not familiar with breeds and coat colors and may not be able to give an accurate description of the animal they have found. Read [here](#).*

NOT POLICY, BUT A CHANGE TO THE LA MUNICIPAL CODE (WITHOUT REGARD FOR STATE LAW)

Here's Barnette's description of a proposed **contractual agreement with unvetted strangers** under her "Finders, Keepers" plan to the Mayor and City Council in a letter dated February 13, 2018 ([CF 18-0130](#).) The City will enter this agreement **without knowledge** of whether this "private citizen" has a history of animal

abuse, has unvaccinated/unaltered animals at the home, has a securely fenced yard or the means to properly care for someone's lost pet.

The plan also purports that, after 30 days, the individual has a legal ownership right and may keep it. That is not contained in State law. Her "guideline" states, "After 30 days, the person providing home care must either decide to keep the animal and get him/her vaccinated, altered and licensed (dog) OR they must surrender the animal to one of our six LA City animal shelters.

"We propose to allow private citizens to provide home care for a dog or cat on the loose who is not wearing a license tag under certain guidelines. This home care shall be for up to 30 days unless the Department makes a demand for the animal in the event that the owner is located and then the animal must be brought to the Department so the owner can identify the pet or determine that it is not his/her pet."

If the animal is pregnant when found, or becomes pregnant during the 30 days, her September 22, 2017, report details those "guidelines," which include that the "offspring will be the property of the Department" -- after the "private citizen/resident" cares for them until weaned. (Read more details in original report on file in CF 18-0130.)

PROPOSED PURPOSE OF THE NEW ORDINANCE (AMENDED LAMC)

- Give lost animals home care, and medical care if appropriate.
- **Keep animals out of the shelter.**
- Work with residents who are concerned or refuse to turn animals in to the shelter for fear the animal will not be claimed or placed; and . . .
- Expand the Department's foster program and increase community involvement in helping find animal's owners, and meanwhile, allowing animals to be held in less stressful environments. (That is not guaranteed--many homes are hell for animals.)

Barnette states that, "There is no fiscal impact to the General Fund to adopt the changes recommended in this report." However, this change will decrease revenue from redemptions and increase costs because LAAS will have to pay for any injury, lack of veterinary care or lawsuits brought because of the City entering into contracts regarding owned private property, plus the myriad problems resulting from divulging identity of the private party, who will want to recover any costs.

Also, Brenda states in her first report that after 30 days, the person has a legal right to the animal and can have it vaccinated, altered and licensed or surrender it to one of our six LA city shelters. This requires legal ownership.

HERE'S THE STATE LAW THAT IS BEING IGNORED

The "keeper" does not automatically become the "owner" after 30 days. A CA shelter expert explained that, the City or other public agency must impound the lost animal according to law and make it available for the legal "hold" period so that the owner has the opportunity to claim it in order for the requirements of Cal. Civil Code § 2080.3 and 2080.5 to be met and ownership to be legally transferred to the agency. At that time the animal can be sold/adopted with clear title to a new owner.

"Not impounding the pet in a shelter removes the key method by which the pet could be located by its owner -- one of the primary mandates of the law -- and, does not automatically allow legal transfer of title to the finder," he advised.

"This is a safeguard in State law to assure this 30-day window cannot be used to hide and essentially "steal" an animal. After that 30 days, the governmental agency must still impound the pet for the legal "hold" period in order to obtain ownership and the right to transfer title."

The following [statutory section](#) comprises California's lost-property laws: West's Ann. Cal. Civ. Code § 2080 - 2082. § 2080.3. Advertisement; payment of cost; vesting of title in finder; and § 2080.5. Authority to sell.

The proposal also applies to cats. This is especially problematic and unveiled theft because it authorizes people to scoop up a "loose" cat, for which even the government does not have impound authority, and permanently take it from the true owner who had violated no laws

BRENDA BARNETTE'S RESEARCH FOR COUNCIL

Brenda responded to my written concerns about this ill-advised attempt to empty the city shelters at the cost of having no control over the animals' welfare. She wrote, "Now with the *NextDoor* app we are learning this is a fairly common practice in many parts of the City. **I am also observing it to be a common practice in Aqua Dulce and Acton.**" (Emph added) These are two cities in Los Angeles County.

Demographics/economic statistics for Brenda's city models for "Finders, Keepers" program.

Acton covers 39.28 square miles and has a population of 7,596.

Median income per worker in 2015 was \$75,714, with an \$84,375 median for men, and \$54,384 for women. Only 6.9% of the population lives in poverty, with 1% of households using some form of public assistance. There are 2,814 housing units of which 2,386 (89.7%) are owner-occupied, and 274 (10.3%) are rented.

Agua Dulce is 22.86 square miles in size. Population: 3,567. Median income at \$99,638 and the median home listing price last month of \$927,000.

92% of houses are owner-occupied.

Compared to Los Angeles:

Los Angeles covers about 469 square miles and the 2016 population was 3,976,322. The 2010 United States Census reported that Los Angeles had a median household income of \$49,497, with 22.0% of the population living below the federal poverty line. (Author's note: This may have increased with the recent rise in homelessness.) Of 1,413,995 housing units, 61.8% were rented.

BRENDA'S QUESTIONNAIRE (All responding agencies are outside of CA.)

Please see all in [CF 18-0130](#) (Found Dogs and Cats / Home Care by Private Citizens / Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) / Amendment)

DISCLAIMER: Please review these carefully for yourself as they were apparently e-mail responses and were without letterhead. I attempted to extract the most pertinent parts for this issue. The answers were not in any particular order. It appears these were selected by Brenda Barnette as documentation, but NONE indicates that a law/ordinance was changed to enable such a program or that any of these programs match the "Finders, Keepers" program for LA. You decide.

See: [Attachment](#) to Council File report.

From the file, it appears GM Barnette sent out a series of questions to seek input from various agencies (none included in the file are California animal control or humane societies.)

1. The **Charlottesville-Albemarle SPCA (Virginia)** flyer, which includes "I Have Found a Pet." States, "After you file a found report with the SPCA, place a Craigslist ad in the lost and found section or post found dog/cat posters in your neighborhood."

2. (NON-LETTERHEAD) FROM **Fairfax County Humane Society (Virginia)**

"We can scanned [sic] here, but it is easier to take any animal to the shelter or a vet." "Nothing has changed. We rely on the lost/found email system and the Fairfax County Animal Shelter.

Kerry Bitterman Office Coordinator 4057 Chain Bridge Road, Fairfax (humane society list address--not a shelter.)

3. (NON-LETTERHEAD) response from Jose Ocana, **Puma County Animal Services (Arizona)**, who writes, "PACC files a "found" report and we let them know our call center is available seven days a week to help guide them through this process." " Pima [sic] County seems different from LA where we don't require actual policies for our practices and programs."
4. (NON-LETTERHEAD) response from **HumaneRescue Alliance of Washington DC**- Site states, "We encourage guardians of lost pets to visit the DC Animal Care and Control facility on New York Avenue to positively identify your pet, as information via phone may not be sufficient. Bringing a current photo will help with identification. Your visit could help expedite a reunion with your pet, as animals may lose their collars and tags." "If your pet is at the Humane Rescue Alliance/DC Animal Care and Control, he or she will be held for five days. After five days, the animal becomes the property of the Humane Rescue Alliance."

5. **Humane Society of Pikes Peak Region, Colorado.**

We also advise that the pet will never legally be theirs and rightful pet owner can take legal action. If a pet owner comes forward and lets us know that finder will not return pet we advise them to file stolen property report with Police and that it is a civil situation as we are not in custody of the pet. This does not happen often.

Humane Society of Pikes Peak Region, CO.

6. **Washoe County Regional Animal Services, Nevada**

In Nevada pets are considered property, therefore we always tell a finder they need to bring the pet into the shelter if owner isn't located. If they are interested in adopting we give animal id number, just in case it becomes available after 5-day stray period.

Shyanne Schull Director Washoe County Regional Animal Services 2825A Longley Lane Reno, NV 89502
775.328.2142 Office 775.322.3647

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

Has GM Brenda Barnette, as a City manager, provided adequate supportive research and validated data that her proposed "Finders, Keepers" proposal will get more lost animals home than impounding them in our six LA city shelters, where the experts say owners first search? If your pet is lost, do you want it taken in by someone in that area (other than a trusted neighbor) -- or wherever it may have traveled or been transported? What is the first thing you would do to find *your* lost pet?