

INTRODUCTION

When asked about why activists have targeted LAAS in recent years, cofounder

County of Los Angeles Animal Care and Control is not the focus of this paper, it should be noted that 18,000

various alternatives to space-saving euthanasia can be implemented in LAAS's six shelters.

CHAPTER I

The Players and Politics Behind the LAAS Controversy

THE NUMBERS

In FY2001-02, LAAS euthanized more than 39,000 animals. In FY2004-05, the Department reports that this number had decreased to 24,932.ⁱⁱⁱ This year, LAAS estimates that 55,000 animals will go through its six shelters. It expects that, of these, it will euthanize 26,000.^{iv} Former LAAS General Manager Guerdon Stuckey said 34,002 cats and dogs were killed in the city-shelters in 2003.^v While this forecasted 46% euthanasia rate is lower than in previous years, it is far-cry from the “No-kill” status former Mayor James Hahn had pledged to reach by 2008. The high euthanasia rates in LAAS has cause the Department to be under heat from local animal welfare and rights advocates since the advent of the “no-kill” movement in the late 1990’s.

THE LOS ANGELES ANIMAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

The Los Angeles Animal Services (LAAS) Department runs six shelters throughout Los Angeles. It is subject to California State laws as well as LA County and City laws on sheltering. The department is overseen by its General Manager who answers to the civilian run Board of Animal Services Commission. Ultimately, the Mayor oversees the Department, its GM and its Board of Commissioners. LAAS presently has an \$18.1 million budget.^{vi} In a recent interview, Stuckey revealed that the department was understaffed by 50-60 people due to high turn-over and difficulty in hiring.^{vii} He alluded to a low morale in the department due to protests against LAAS employees in recent years.

THE CONFLICT BETWEE

fee is intended to lower euthanasia rates at LAAS shelters, it actually serves to appease Stuckey. Councilman Jack Weiss said in an interview, ``This was a \$50,000 going-away memo. The people elected a new mayor last year and he is entitled to bring in his

Villiaragosa.^{xxvi} The NY department was headed by the city's health commissioner and included the commissioner of parks as well as a police commissioner. Of the NY agency he said, "When you have a board whose primary interest is not animal welfare but lowering the budget and meeting other goals, you have all these competing priorities. Animal welfare will always fall to the bottom of the list."^{xxvii}

Prior to New York, Boks headed the Maricopa County Animal Care and Control in Phoenix, where he is said to have had a similar success rate. Maricopa County is the largest adoption center in the U.S. There he developed *Friends of Animal Care and Control*, a Phoenix non-profit, to raise money for animal welfare programs at the shelter.^{xxviii} A similar agency in San Francisco raises funds for its animal control agency.

Despite an impressive resume in animal care, some members of the animal welfare community have expressed concerns that the new GM's euthanasia numbers in New York and Maricopa are not something to brag about. In Maricopa during the last year Boks was director (2003), roughly 57,000 animals were impounded and 27,000 were euthanized. During Boks's last year in NYCACC, 41,623 were impounded and 20,849 were euthanized.^{xxix} Critics have also contended that billionaire L.A.

C

campaigning against Stuckey's appointment since 2003, when it became apparent that Stuckey was a strong choice for LAAS general manager by then-Mayor James Hahn.^{xxxii} ADL-LA insists that LAAS is a mismanaged bureaucracy insufficient to deal with LA's animal overpopulation problem. The group blames the shelters' high kill rates on LAAS's ineffectiveness as a department.

ADL-LA has conducted a two-year "Stop the Killing" campaign against the city and LAAS entitled. Founder of ADL-LA describes the group as a grass-roots, all-volunteer, above-ground organization.^{xxxiii} Above-ground indicates that the group does not use any illegal protest tactics. ALF, on the other hand, is an under-ground organization made up of "clandestine" individuals. ALF has admitted to threatening and harassing LAAS employees, claiming responsibility for a bomb scare that forced the evacuation of a David Dilberto's street Larchmont Village in July and for the September smoke-bomb scare at the

atrocities.”^{xxxvi} Ferdin has been arrested several times in connection with various animal-rights demonstrations she insists were legally sound.^{xxxvii} In December of 2005, the group faced up to \$120,000 in fines after Los Angeles City Attorney Rocky Delgadillo filed 14 misdemeanor charges against them. Delgadillo accused the league of “trespassing, vandalism, violating noise ordinances, intimidating the child of a public employee and using threats” against David Dilberto. “What they're doing is criminal,” City Attorney Delgadillo said of the ADL-LA.^{xxxviii}

City officials say that the dramatic decrease in shelter euthanasia should discourage protests. According to Animal Services statistics, FY2004-05, the city euthanized 24,932 dogs, down from 39,086 in 2001-02. Animal activists dispute those numbers, arguing that LAAS is purposefully misleading the public.^{xxxix} From his new blog on the LAAS website, GM Boks contends that he’s made several efforts to communicate with ADL-LA. He said, “I truly believed the ADL had the best interests of the animals at heart. I believed they could set aside their focus on the past and negativity to work with the larger humane community to make the present and future better for all of LA’s animals.”^{xl}

In December 2005, ADL-LA sent packages to the homes of seven City Council members. The packages contained a computer disk labeled "Recent Undercover Footage Inside LA Animal Services," with a video the group says was taken this year of dogs being killed at shelters. The letter to one City Council member began: "Animal Defense League Los Angeles is hoping that you will take 4 minutes out of your day to watch the undercover footage from the six city animal Death Camps we are enclosing with this letter. We want you to see with your own eyes what goes on behind those cinderblock

walls of your six city animal 'shelters.'^{xli} Councilwoman Jan Perry said she felt personally threatened when she received the DVD at home because it indicated the ADL-LA knew where she lived.^{xlii} Ferdin said the group sent the packages to Council Members' homes to ensure they would receive them.^{xliii}

Vlasik concedes that the direct-action taken by ADL-LA against LAAS employees has "blurred the line" between legal and illegal.^{xliiv} Ferdin were acquitted in 2005 of charges brought against her by City Attorney Delgadillo for protesting within 100 feet of then Mayor James Hahn's San Pedro home. In January, a judge dismissed the charges against Ferdin and ADLA-LA cofounder Jerry Vlasak for trespassing on Diliberto's property and protesting within 100 feet of his home. The group is now anticipating the 14-misdemeanor conspiracy charges. While Ferdin admits that a significant portion of the groups finances go to legal bill associations with suits made by the city, she argues that the legal fight was "brought the protest into the courtroom."^{xlv}

While Ferdin insists that "everything we do is legal", ADL-LA concedes that ALF's illegal actions have supplemented the above-ground group's cause. Ferdin admits that the direct-action taken by the group is on the "militant side".^{xlvi} While the ADL-LA claims not to know the identity of ALF members, both groups are part of the recently formed Nort American Animal Liberation Press Office. The office received communiqués from anonymous sources to publicize actions made by animal-rights groups. It also opens up lines of communications between animal rights groups.

SEIU LOCAL 347

SEIU Local 347, LAAS employees' uni

CHAPTER II

Methods

I decided to make policy recommendations to t

specifically to companion pets. I was able to find several dog behavior and evolution studies to explain why the interests of dogs are of particu

by what I had seen. It dawned on me that while I could leave the shelter the dogs scrambling for my attention remained. Once I recovered from what I'd seen, the equivalent to a children's death-row, the experience had strengthened my resolve.

I used San Francisco as a comparison case-study largely due to convenience. Those shelters had significant advantages to those of Los Angeles because of their extensive history and reputation in the city. The San Francisco SPCA was privately funded and in a partnership with the city municipal shelter, the San Francisco Animal Care and Control department. The city's comparatively low animal population also distinguishes these shelters from LAAS

y

The LAAS Department Manual, close to

CHAPTER III

Animal Shelters and the Companion-Pet Surplus

THE ORIGIN OF COMPANION ANIMALS (PETS)

In 2002, scientists at Sweden's Royal Institute of Technology presented strong evidence that dogs were first domesticated from the grey wolf in Eastern Asia about 15,000 y

dependent. As a result, humans have a specific responsibility to dogs as being the “creators a species dependent on humans”.^{lvi}

COMPANION ANIMAL OVERPOPULATION

Today, pet ownership is at its highest point in history. Cats and dogs are found in 60% of U.S. households.^{lvii} Americans have half a billion pets, including fish, birds, and rodents. Dogs can receive root canals and radiation treatment.

REASONS FOR COMPANION ANIMAL RELINQUISHMENT

Owner-relinquishment, or surrendering of a dog to a shel

s

revealed that dogs often react to adoption with abnormal behm

program socialize dogs through affection, physical activity in the shelter's exercise program, socialization with other dogs and people in uniform, and obedience training.^{lxxiii} Volunteers even work dogs classified as too dangerous to touch through the barrier using backscratchers for touching.

Misconceptions about Pet Ownership

General misconceptions about animals serve as another reason for owner-relinquishment. A study examining factors contributing to owner-relinquishment of animals in 12 shelters found that 12% of surrenderers believed there to be no difference between cat and dog breeds. It also found that nearly 60% of cat owners believed their animal's misbehavior was out of spite. A fourth of owners answered that they believed animals were better off producing a litter before being spayed.^{lxxiv} This indicates that adoption programs should include a assessment and education components to assess the adopter's level of ~~to~~ to d sn t h ev = s e dot s r

Euthanasia methods are much more humane than they were in the past. After Women's Pennsylvania SPCA stopped clubbing in Philadelphia, various methods were used including gas and electrocution. In the past, decompression and carbon monoxide chambers were hailed as humane alternatives to gunshots, drowning and strychnine. In the decompression chambers, animals die from lack of oxygen. They may also suffer acute panic, discomfort and even pain. For this reason many states have outlawed the use of decompression chambers.^{lxxvi} Carbon monoxide chambers have decreased in use.

The least painful method used for euthanasia is the injection of sodium pentobarbital. The animal experiences drowsiness and is then "put to sleep". This type of intravenous injection is preferred for calm, friendly animals. Frightened animals however, may need additional tranquilizers or alternative euthanasia methods such as carbon dioxide inhalation. Large numbers of animals being euthanized, such in a city-wide shelter, often requires the use of decompression of carbon monoxide chambers.

The AVMA panel divides methods of euthanasia into three categories: those that directly destroy the conscious centers of the brain, those that interrupt the supply of blood or oxygen to the brain, those that anesthetize the brain.^{lxxvii} The drug succinylcholine paralyzes animals' muscles before the collapse of the respiratory muscles cause death. It is considered stressful and painful and condemned by the AVMA panel.

TODAY'S SHELTERS

The terms "humane society" and "SPCA" does not require an affiliation and can be used by any organization. Therefore, organizations with these names vary dramatically in range and quality of services. Two organizations, HSUS and the American Humane

Association (AHA) offer guidelines for shelters. Local agencies and private organizations, however, are under no obligation to follow these recommendations.^{lxxviii}

While recommendations can be made for proper shelter policy and practices, animal shelters are only accountable to state, city and county laws.

HSUS suggests that responsible shelters invest energy into three areas: (1) preventing cruelty and/or suffering (2) enforcing animal-protection laws (3) and instilling humane principles in society. The latter can be achieved through community outreach and educational campaigns. Human education is particularly effective among youth. Guidelines for shelters include accepting very animal brought in maintaining a clean, comfortable, safe, and healthy environment holding strays for at least five days screening adopters using sodium pentobarbital, administered by well-trained individuals, for euthanasia and ensuring that all adopted animals are sterilized.^{lxxix}

Humane Society of the United States (HSUS)

HSUS was founded in 1954 to promote humane treatment of animals and foster compassion for all animals. HSUS has grown into the largest animal-protection organization with over 200 full-time staff and a constituency of 3.5 million people. It is funded by membership dues, contributions, and gifts. HSUS is one of the best funded animal welfare organizations in the country.

From 1974-1984, it worked to upgrade the standards of animal shelters as well as zoos and launched a major campaign exposing the cruelty of puppy-mills. Since 1984, HSUS has conducted the “Be a P.A.L. – Prevent a Litter” campaign to promote the importance of spaying and neutering. It has a diversity of interests with special sections

that coordinate efforts in areas of animal research, companion animals, farm animals, state and federal legislation. There are nine regional offices and is supported by an umbrella of organizations underneath.^{lxxx}

THE “NO-KILL” MOVEMENT

The “no-kill” movement emerged in the 1990’s in response to the country’s number of companion animals being euthanized as a result of persisting overpopulation. The movement is committed to “eliminating the practice of euthanizing healthy and treatable animals altogether.”^{lxxxix} The proper usage and definition of the term “no-kill” has raised considerable debate in the animal sheltering community. Guerdon Stuckey questioned the nature of being a no-kill shelter claiming that they get to “cherry-pick their animals”, refusing those that may be less desirable than others.^{lxxxii} Like LAAS, the San Francisco Animal Care and Control is an *open-admission* or *open-door* shelter. This means that the municipal shelters, as dictated by state law, must accept each and every animal brought to the shelter. Much of their euthanasia takes place in order to make room for every additional animal brought into the shelter.

PETA advocates open-admission shelters over no-kill, limited-admission shelters. PETA argues that the only way to save companion animals from euthanasia is through implement spay/neutering programs.^{lxxxiii} No-kill shelters that refuse non-desirable or adoptable companion animals give the dirty work to open-door shelters. They argue that shelters which are “no-kill” use the term deceptively and waste funding on sheltering animals for longer periods of time. They estimate that no-kill shelters spent \$9 million

could have spayed/neutered 6 to 8 million dogs and cats. They estimate such an investment would prevent the births of 67,000 dom

THE LOS ANGELES ANIMAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Los Angeles's former Mayor James Hahn, proclaimed during his term (1997-2001) that the six shelters under the Los Angeles Animal Services (LAAS) Department would be no-kill by 2008. The high euthanasia rates of the shelters, as well as their relatively poor conditions, have been a source of protest for the animal rights community for decades. In 1997, private citizens brought a lawsuit against the LAAS Department ordering it to comply with the legal standards of animal care. Affidavits described conditions within the department's six shelters as grave enough to deviate from law. Following the lawsuit, then California State Senator Tom Hayden proposed SB 17851, or the Hayden Bill. While it applied to all state shelters, the law, ten pages in its entirety, responded to conditions specifically in LAAS shelters.^{lxxxvi}

In 2000, the city of Los Angeles hired consultants to investigate conditions at LAAS shelters in order to determine flaws and solutions to the city's high euthanasia rates and rampant crowding. The Summary Report of the *Master Facilities Study of Animal Care Facilities* also included several other shelters to determine the practices and policies contributing to lower euthanasia and higher adoption rates. The report was designed to determine "what is possible" and presented three alternatives to department status quo including the ideal. In the study's assessment, it suggested that three of the six city shelters needed to be replaced. It also estimated that LAAS shelters had less than one-third of the kennels provided in the best Not-for-Profit shelters and half as many as the average Southern California Agencies. This led to an average of 3-4 dogs per kennel. It also determined the current shelters as understaffed having only half the number of

veterinarians and animal care technicia

CHAPTER IV

The Animal Welfare and Liberation Philosophy

THE ANIMAL LIBERATION/WELFARE MOVEMENT

Animal rights activists use the term “companion animals” when they refer to their pets. This implies a relationship based more on friendship than dominion.^{lxxxviii} They believe that their animals, like children, are vulnerable and unable to demand their own rights and thus must be protected. The English word “pet” dates only back to the 15th century. By 1700, there’s record of upper-class people in the Western world were naming their pets.^{lxxxix} But before the 19th century, very few people wrote about the issue of animal protection o=

he

o

conducted daily drowning of caged dogs on the East River while onlookers watched. The heir to a wealthy shipbuilding family, Henry Bergh, was in Saint Petersburg when the mistreatment of a work horse ignited his interest in animal protection.

On his wa

...restore lost animals to their owners, find good homes for other which are valuable, and to mercifully kill by carbonic acid gas and chloroform such as are worthless.

Nonprofit shelters proliferated as municipal animal control services' primary goal was to catch and dispose of strays. A rift began between these types of agencies in their services, operations, and missions.^{xcv} Today's shelters fall under three categories: (1) municipal animal control agencies, run by governmental entities in cities and towns (2) private, nonprofit agencies governed by a board of directors and (3) private, nonprofit agencies with a governmental contract to provide animal care and control services. In his essay, "Care or Control?", Ed Boks explains that two schools of thought within the industry of animal sheltering and emerged. He distinguishes these "distinct methodologies" as animal/humane care and animal control.^{xcvi} Boks argues that an "animosity" has developed between the two types of establishments.

The animal welfare movement expanded in the U.S. during the 1950's, the decade in which the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and other organizations began. Many of these groups focused on the issues of pets such as overpopulation, shelter issues and cruelty.^{xcvii} Organizations such as HSUS also sought to create a connection between municipal and county animal shelters and private humane societies and shelters. Philosopher Peter Singer's 1975 book, *Animal Liberation*, laid the philosophical framework for the movement during its reignition in the 1970's. The movement retained its emphasis on animal "sentience" but added the language of "rights" to underscore the movement.^{xcviii} In this way, the contemporary movement largely took after the feminism and civil rights movements that preceded it. In Singer's *Animal Liberation*, he coins the

phrase “specieism” as a prejudice similar in nature to racism. Activists were inspired by Singer’s “unsentimental, rational, and defensible” basis for animal rights.^{xcix} Since the advent of the modern movement, various forms of animal welfare schools of thought have emerged.

Authors of the book *Animal Rights Crusade* categorize animal welfare organizations into three groups: welfarist, pragmatist, and fundamentalist. Examples of welfarist groups include the ASPCA and HSUS. These organizations’ formations preceded the modern movement and remains one of the wealthiest and largest animal protection groups. Welfarist groups accept most animal use but seek to minimize suffering, and remain the most powerful animal welfare groups in the country. Fundamentalists thinkers, those who tolerate no animal treatment whatsoever, emerged as fringe groups in the 1970’s, with the inspiration of Singer’s book. These groups include the Animal Liberation Front (ALF), the group currently involved in the protests of the Los Angeles Animals Services (LAAS) Department. Such groups, “want nothing short of a moral revolution” concerning animals.^c

THE ANIMAL LIBERATION PHILOSOPHY

Singer’s *Animal Liberation*, described as the “Bible” of the new movement, added the new language of right to the animal welfare movement. It also insisted that animals were sentient or capable of both pleasure and pain. The book was rooted in progressive movements that preceded it such as feminism, the civil rights movement, and environmentalism. Like the feminists and civil rights advocates preceding Singer’s book, his philosophy emphasized the basic principle of equality, arguing that it does not require

than utilitarianism.^{cii} In his book, Regan presents similarities between mammals and humans, further justifying anthropomorphism. Like Singer, Regan rejects instrumentalism. This alternative attitude contests that animals are resources to be exploited. It argues that not only are animals not sentient and thus not deserving of rights, they are in fact inanimate machines, incapable of feeling pain. Rene Decartes first verbalized animals as unfeeling machines in the 17th century. Regan claimed that Cartesian

THE SF/ACC AND SF/SCPCA ADOPTION AGREEMENT

San Francisco has fundamentally reversed the pattern that prevails in many communities, where healthy, adoptable shelter dogs and cats are routinely killed to make room for incoming animals.

From the SF/ACC and SF/SPCA 2002/2003 annual report

In 1994, the privately funded San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SF/SPCA) and the city municipal agency, the San Francisco Animal Care and Control (SF/ACC) Department, joined forces to make San Francisco a “no-kill” city. The two entities signed an agreement, the “Adoption Pact”, formalizing the relationship between the open-door SF/ACC and the limited-intake, non-profit SF/SPCA. The Pact guaranteed a home for every *adoptable* dog and cat entering the San Francisco shelter system.

The agreement defined three classifications of animals entering the shelters: *adoptable*, *treatable* and *non-rehabilitatable*. The Agreement prohibits either shelter from euthanizing animals deemed *adoptable*. The category includes any cats or dog older than 8 weeks of age that have no behavioral defect posing a “health or safety risk” to people. Adoptable animals have no sign of illness or injury that would adversely affect these animals in the future. The pact guarantees that *treatable* cats and dogs would receive treatment from the SF/SPCA and/or the SF/ACC to order to become adoptable. The pact defines treatable animals as animals that could become adoptable with “reasonable” efforts. Finally, the *non-rehabilitatable* category includes those animals for

whom it is not possible to find a home.

Additionally, the Adoption Pact directs both the SF/ACC and SF/SPCA publishes complete and accurate information rega

Maddie's Pet Adoption Center

Maddie's Pet Adoption Center, the SF/SPCA's newest facility, opened in

water bowls, and multi-level “climbing trees”. Like the dog enclosures, glass encloses the cat quarters allowing visitors full view of each animal. The size of the dog and cat rooms allows interested visitors to enter and socialize with the animals. The dog enclosures have “sniff holes” through which visitors can introduce themselves by way of their fingers before entering the enclosure. Walls separate each dog dwelling, they cannot see their neighbors. Each of the rooms faces an interior courtyard. This space is used to introduce possible roommates, and holding space during room cleaning, and as an apparatus to change the dogs’ scenery.

The adoption center believes that, “a trained dog is a retained dog”. In order to prevent the relinquishment of an already adopted dog, the Center implements training and socialization prior to adoption. Maddie’s Center makes sure that each of its animals has substantial stimulation through daily human interaction

r

H

H

FG

V

winning dog behavior author Jean Donaldson, oversees the training staff. She also heads the center's Academy for Dog Trainers. The six-week program educates prospective dog trainers for \$4,500 in positive-reinforcement dog training.

To discourage relinquishment, the SF/SPCA conducts rigorous screening prior to adoption. Potential adopters receive counseling from a staff member of the SF/SPCA to determine that their desired animal will enter a home that is both permanent as well as appropriate to their demeanor, age, breed, etc. Separate questionnaires for cats and dogs require the adopter to divulge information that could signify a possible bad match or subsequent relinquishment. Among other things, adopters must be able to demonstrate that they can keep pets in their homes as well as the willingness to spend sufficient money and time on their adopted animal. With questions looking at how much play and exercise time a potential adopter is willing to spend, trainers can steer people to a particular cat or dog. (how to include this questionnaire?) For potential dog owners, questions include, "What type of *daily* activities will you dog get?", "What times of the day will your dog be alone?", "How long to you plan to provide a home for this dog?" and "Who will take care of the dog in your absence?" Possible cat owners are asked to provide the primary reason for wanting a cat, the number of children and adults in their household, the other types of animals living in their household (age and breed) as well as the general noise level, and what type of experience the individual has had with cats. Both questionnaires ask about the potential cost for a pet and whether or not the adopter will allow SF/SCP

d s

The SF/SPCA Special Programs

The Foster Care Program provides animals with needed rehabilitation and care outside of the shelter. In 2004-2005, 155 volunteer foster parents cared for 980 cats and kittens, 20 dogs and 8 puppies. The program is intended for very young kittens and puppies as well as animals that require health and behavior related rehabilitation exceeding the capacity within SF/SPCA. Prospective foster parents attend a two-hour Foster Care Class to prepare them for their fostering experience. The SF/SPC

neutered prior to placement. Months of training teach the dogs to alert owners to a knock at the door, a doorbell ring, and telephone, alarm clock, a smoke alarm,

the dogs in basic training. Volunteers can also assist in the SF/SPCA's Adoption Outreach when the adoption mobile units go into the community. Last year, the 885 volunteers could assist in virtually every area of the SF/SPCA including the Humane Education Program, the Hearing Dog Program as well as in the Animal hospital.

Founded in 1924, the SF/SPCA's Community Veterinary Hospital is open six days a week from 8 am to 6 pm and 8 am to 8 pm. The hospital is open to the public and treats more than 20,000 animals a year^{cxvii}. The full-service veterinary facility resides in the old wing of the SF/SPCA and is attached to Maddie's Center. The hospital has the capacity for complete medical and surgical care, dental services, day tim

THE SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL CARE AND CONTROL
(SF/ACC)

In 1989, under the influence of Carl Friedman, now Director of the SF/ACC, the city of San Francisco opened its municipal shelter, San Francisco Animal Care and Control (SF/ACC), supplementing the work done by the SPCA. It effectively took over all animal welfare enforcement and control. Financed by the City and County of San Francisco, its primary

vet exam. The SF/ACC alters rats and male guinea pigs before they go home. The cost of all small animals, birds and reptiles also comes with a vet exam.^{cxxi}

The SF/ACC had a \$3.2 million budget last year. In 2004-2005, 11,200 animals came through the shelter. The SF/ACC estimates its life-release rate, the percentage of animals that leave the shelter alive from the total amount of animals cared for, has reached 80%. SF/ACC is overseen by Director Carl Freidman. Under him, Deputy Director Kathleen Brown oversees SF/ACC operations. The tasks of SF/ACC are divided into five divisions each overseen by a Supervisor: Field Services, Animal C

to its foster care program, SF/ACC depends on its partnerships with various Bay Area rescue groups to lessen the amount of animals housed in the shelter and to make room for new arrivals. Give-Me-Shelter-Cat-Rescue

redeemed (45.02%), and 94 were euthanized (34.69%) GADAB admits that the animal care division's duties do not allow enough time for more than environmental basics of food, water, and kennel cleanliness for custody dogs. The organization seeks to supplement the work of SF/A

training pilot project produced by Donna Duford, a nationally recognized expert in dog training an behavior.^{cxxiv}

Policies and Procedures

In accordance with state law under the Hayden Bill, all stray animals are held four full working days, not including the day of the animal's arrival. An owner-relinquished animal may be available for adoption the day after the animal's arrival. The only exception to this i

for describing the reason why these animals have been deemed dangerous or viscous in detail enough to assist the Animal Care and Veterinary Medical staff.

Cages and runs are cleaned every day. The animals are removed during cleaning. Cleaning areas must be cleaned by 12 pm. The stainless steel food and water bowls and cat litter trays cannot never be reused unless they are completely disinfected.

iguanas. Additionally, if “ at any time, an employee may

CHAPTER VI

A Policy Analysis of the Los Angeles Animal Services Department

\$5,085,888 for Field Operations and the \$10,487,509 for Shelter Operations. In contrast, the budget for Training and Humane Education, under the Information and Education category, increased by just \$608 to a total of \$113,819.^{xxxxv} Two employees work under Training and Humane Education.

Proposed Cost of New Facilities

In 2000, voter-approved Proposition F, *Bonds for Paramedic, Emergency Helicopter and Animal Shelter Facilities*, allotted LAAS \$154.1 million for the construction of 5 new shelters and the improvement of 3 existing facilities. A summary written by the city's Chief Legislative Analyst concluded that, "Animal shelters lack fire protection systems and are too small to keep the number of lost, abandoned and stray animals collected each year. Overcrowding in shelters results in a very high rate of euthanasia, increased illness and inj

LAAS is broken into six branches of operation. This includes the Field Operations, Shelter Operations, Licensing & Permitting Operations, Pet Sterilization, Information and Education, and General Administration and Support.

Field Operations

Field Operations “provides for the enforcement of all laws relative to the care, treatment, and impoundment of animals and for the prevention of cruelty to same”.^{cxxxix} It also enforces all animal related ordinances in LA.^{cxl} The Field Operations includes the Enforcement Division. Under the Director of Field Operations are the Animal Control Officers that include a Captain, Lieutenant, District Manager, Field Supervisor, Hearing Examiner and Animal Control Officers.^{cxli}

In FY 2004/05, LAAS estimates that the branch picked up 9,500 animals upon request and caught 6,500.^{cxlii} It estimates that Field Operations officers conducted 60,000 investigations in the city. Field Operation personnel issued 13,000 enforcement notices and conducted 170 pertaining to barking dogs complaints and potentially dangerous animal cases.^{cxliii}

Shelter Operations

Shelter Operations includes the task of caring for the animals within the shelters. It also “euthanizes sick, injured, or unwanted animals” and received the fees established by the Municipal Code for adopted animals or those animals returned to their owners.^{cxliv} The Shelter Operations staff includes the Chief Veterinarian, veterinary assistants, an animal care technician supervisor and an animal care technician.

Coupons are offered for people adopting dogs over 60 pounds. These coupons have a value of \$50. The Sterilization branch includes a pilot in-house program to spay and neuter animals within the she

The following selections are pieces of information taken from the LAAS Department Manual dating back to 2000 and 2002.

Department Duties and Responsibilities

As listed in the City Charter Provisions, the powers and duties of LAAS include the folloL

only when the animal has bitten somebody in the last 15 days, indicating possible rabies infection.^{clxvii}

CHAPTER VII

Recommendations

My recommendat

B) TRAINING AND BEHAVIOR DEPARTMENT

“Comparative psychologists, psychobiologists, ethologists, and other experts in animal behavior have much to offer agencies.”

Adoption services should initially be executed by trained staff mem

facing one another in order, decreasing barking. Each shelter should have its own spay and neuter center as well as administrative offices for the LAAS GM and top staff.

- A) Facilities should be located in highly populated area with access to parks for volunteers to exercise animals
- B) Spay/neuter clinics in each
- C) Should mimic “adoption” centers with welcoming visitor area
- D) Kennels should be designed in house-like style
- E) Facility should be visible and on the street
- F) Animal exercise areas separate from getting-to-know-you space

5) INCREASED EMPLOYEES REQUIREMENTS

Changes will require renegotiation in SEIU 347 contract. Staff accountability is essential to the quality of LAAS services. Base salaries should be maintained. The high-pay will ensure interested parties. The “care” component of animal care and control must be emphasized in services and training at all LAAS shelters.

- A) Bi-yearly assessments

motive behind Departmental changes is to create a cause attractive to volunteers. The increased budget will financially jump-start the LAAS transformation. The increased budget should provide all services I've listed below until enough volunteer support has been secured to support extra shelter services. Increased emphasis on public information campaigns will also encourage monetary gifts. These gifts, theoretically, will help fill in the holes of program funding, further relieving the burden on the city.

Partnerships with community rescue and welfare groups are essential to the success of LAAS in alleviating the city's companion pet overpopulation. My recommendations seek to create an environment conducive to the Los Angeles animal welfare community's burgeoning partnership with LAAS. These partnerships can also provide services generally out-of-reach in the budget. Partnerships in Los Angeles can only be created through increased trust from potential partners and the perceived integrity of LAAS. My recommendations seek to foster

CONCLUSION

This report is titled “Approaching No-Kill” because it is hopeful that LAAS is beginning the process of significant reform. The Department has had the unfortunate luck of being targeted by a loud group of local animal activists for their deplorable, but common, euthanasia rates. While the conflict between activists and LAAS staff has put a temporary stigma on the Department, the subsequent media has ultimately expedited the possibility of Los Angeles becoming a “no-kill” city.

This is a hugely daunting task. A recent article in The Los Angeles Magazine estimated that LAAS, the county and 24 smaller municipalities killed 104,841 animals last year, more than any other metropolitan area in the country.

BIBLIOGRAHY

Balcom, Sara, *Legislating a Solution to Animal Shelter Euthanasia: A Case Study of California*. Journal of Human-Animal Studies, volume 8, number 2, 2000.

Basta Ya! News for & about LA's Animal Services workers from SEIU 347 Local 347, Oct., 05.

Bekoff, Marc, The Encyclopedia of Animal Rights and Animal Welfare. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1998.

Blankstein, Andrew and Hymon, Steve, *Animal Activists Toughen Tactics*, Los Angeles Times, Sep., 2005.

Boks, Ed, *The Blog of Ed Boks*, Los Angeles Animal Services website, March 15, 2006, <www.animalservices.com>.

Boks, Ed, *Care of Control?* Maddie's Fund website, March 22, 2006, <http://www.maddiesfund.org/nokill/nokill_articles_boks.html>.

Brill, Jeff, LAAS Senior Management Analyst II, Personal communication

Freidman, Carl, *The 'Kill versus No kill' Animal Shelter Controversy*, The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Manual, 2005.

Give-A-Dog-A-Bone, Mar 26, 2006, <<http://www.gadab.org/happy.h>

Ofgang, Kenneth, C.A. *Overturms restraining orders against animal rights activists*, Metropolitan News, Jan 10, 2006.

Orlov, Rick. *At-home security OK'd for City Workers* The Daily News, Oct 20 2005.

Orlov, Rick, *Can animal activists be tamed? New agency boss hopes for cooler heads*, The Daily News, Dec 26 2005.

Orlov, Rick, *The Mayor's Problem Euthanasia reduction too Slow for Activists*, The Daily News, Nov 8 2005.

Orlov, Rick. *Proposal would give*

San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, *SF/SPCA Feral Cat Assistance*, 2004/05.

San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, *Hearing Dog Program*, 2004/05.

San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, *Humane Education Program*, 2004/05.

San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, *Partnerships for Life, Saving Homeless Dogs and Cats in San Francisco*, 2004/05.

San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, *Spay/Neuter Clinic*, 2004/05.

Singer, Robert, *Animal Liberation*, Random House, Inc. New York, New York, 1990.

Stark, Annette, *Animal Planet: After Stuckey is fired from Animal Services, New Chief Boks steps into a department knee-deep in a court fight with activists*, *LA City Beat*, Jan 2006.

Stark, Annette. *The Art of the Deal*, *LA City Beat*, Feb 23, 2005.

Stark, Annette. 'Not Afraid At All' L.A. Animal Services manager Guerdon Stuckey is smoke-bombed by the Animal Liberation Front, *LA City Beat*, Sep 22, 2005.

Topal, J. and Gácsi, M., *Attachment to Animals: A Comparative Study on Hand-reared wolves and differently socialized puppies*, *Animal Behaviour Volume 70, Issue 6* , December 2005, Pages 1367-1375.

The Disturbing Facts about "No-Kill" Shelters, *Peta's Animals Times*, fall 2005.

Tuber, D., Miller, D., Caris, K., Halter, R., Linden, F. Hennessy, M., *Dogs in Animal Shelters:* ,

-
- ^{vii} Golden, Lori. *LA Department of Animal Services*, The Pet Press
- ^{viii} Annette Stark, *Animal Planet: After Stuckey is fired from Animal Services, new chief Boks steps into a department knee-deep in a court fight with activists*, LA City Beat, Jan 2006.
- ^{ix} McGreevy, Patrick. The Los Angeles Times, *Animal Services Chief Fired*, Dec 2005.
- ^x Andrew Blankstein and Steve Hymon, Los Angeles Times, *Animal Activists Toughen Tactics*, Sept 2005.
- ^{xi} Ofgang, Kenneth. *Overtums Restraining Orders against Animal Rights Activists Petition to Enjoin Workplace Violence is Subject to Anti-slap motion, Justices Rule*, Metropolitan News-Enterprise, Jan 2006.
- ^{xii} Orlov, Rick. The Daily News, *At-home security OK'd for City Workers*, Oct 2005.
- ^{xiii} Pierson, David. The Los Angeles Times, *Prosecutor Charge*

-
- lxi Frank, Joshua. *An Interactive Model of Human and Companions Animal Dynamics*, 2004.
- lxii Frank, Joshua. *An Interactive Model of Human and Companions Animal Dynamics*, 2004.
- lxiii⁴ "The Disturbing Facts about "No-Kill" Shelters, Peta's Animals Times, fall 2005.
- lxiv Frank, Joshua. *An Interactive Model of Human and Companions Animal Dynamics*, 2004.
- lxv Fournier, A., Geller, E., *Behavior Analysis of Companion-Animal Overpopulation*, 2004.
- lxvi Ibid.
- lxvii Salmon, New. *Human and Animal Factors Related to the Relinquishment of Dogs and Cats*, 1998.
- lxviii Tuber, Miller. *Dogs in Animal Shelters: Problems, Suggestions, and Needed Expertise*.
- lxix Ibid.
- lxx Tuber, Miller. *Dogs in Animal Shelters: Problems, Suggestions, and Needed Expertise*.
- lxxi <http://www.gadab.org/happy.html>, viewed 3/26
- lxxii Ibid.
- lxxiii Ibid.
- lxxiv Salmon, New. *Human and Animal Factors Related to the Relinquishment of Dogs and Cats*, 1998.
- lxxv Bekoff, Marc. The Encyclopedia of Animal Rights and Animal Welfare.
- lxxvi Curtis, Patricia. The Animal Shelter.
- lxxvii Bekoff, Marc. The Encyclopedia of Animal Rights and Animal Welfare.
- lxxviii Ibid.
- lxxix Ibid.
- lxxx Ibid.
- lxxxi Frank, Joshua. *Trends and Results of Major Efforts to Reach a "No-Kill" Nation*.
- lxxxii Horn, Katherine. *What Movement?, March on Stuckey, and The Power Seller Within*, LA City Beat, Oct 2005.
- lxxxiii "The Disturbing Facts about "No-Kill" Shelters, Peta's Animals Times, Fall 2005.
- lxxxiv Ibid.
- lxxxv Freidman, C. The 'Kill versus No kill' Animal Shelter Controversy, from the SF/ACC Manual, 2005.
- lxxxvi Balcom, Sarah. *Legislating a Solution to Animal Shelter Euthanasia*, 2000.
- lxxxvii Orlov, Rick. The Daily News. *The Mayor's Problem Euthanasia reduction too Slow for Activists*, Nov 2005.
- lxxxviii Nelkin, Jasper. "The Animal Rights Crusade". 1992
- lxxxix Ibid.
- xc Ibid.
- lxxxi Poytner, Margaret, Too Few Happy Endings, 1981.
- xcii Ibid.
- xciii Ibid..
- xciv Nelkin, Jasper. "The Animal Rights Crusade", 1992.
- xcv Poytner, Margaret, Too Few Happy Endings, 1981.
- xcvi Boks, Ed. "Care of Control?", Mar 2006, http://www.maddiesfund.org/nokill/nokill_articles_boks.html.
- xcvii Nelkin, Jasper. The Animal Rights Crusade, 1992.
- xcviii Ibid.
- xcix Ibid.
- c Ibid.
- ci Ibid.
- cii Ibid.
- ciii Regan, Tom. The Case for Animal Rights, 1981.
- civ Ibid.
- cv Nelkin, Jasper. The Animal Rights Crusade, 1992.
- cvii Ibid.
- cviii Ibid.
- cix Regan, Tom. The Case for Animal Rights, 1981.
- cx Singer, Robert. *Animal Liberation* 6An

^{cxxix} Ibid.
^{cxxx} SF/SPCA