



BOARD OF ANIMAL SERVICES COMMISSIONERS  
CITY OF LOS ANGELES

**REGULAR MEETING AGENDA**  
**Tuesday, July 14, 2015**  
**10:00 AM**

LOS ANGELES CITY HALL, ROOM 1060  
200 NORTH SPRING STREET  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

---

DAVID ZAFT  
President

ALANA YAÑEZ  
Vice-President

JENNIFER BRENT  
LARRY GROSS  
ROGER WOLFSON

Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, you are advised to make your request at least 72 hours prior to the meeting you wish to attend. For information please call (213) 482-9597.

Si requiere servicios de traducción, favor de notificar a la oficina con 24 horas de anticipo.

**REGULAR COMMISSION MEETING**

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD** - (Comments from the public on items of public interest within the Board's subject matter jurisdiction that are not on the Agenda; two minutes per speaker).

**Public Comments:** The Brown Act prohibits the Board and staff from responding to the speakers' comments. Some of the matters raised in public comment may appear on a future agenda.

2. **COMMISSION BUSINESS**

- A. Election of Board Officers (Action Item; public comment limited to one minute per speaker).

- B. Board Recognition of LAASEE Award Recipients (Action Item; Public comment limited to one minute per speaker):**
    - a. Dr. Rolando Vasquez (Posthumous), Veterinarian, North Figueroa Animal Hospital
  - C. Approval of the Minutes for the Meeting of May 26, 2015 (Action Item; public comment limited to one minute per speaker).**
  - D. Approval of the Minutes for the Meeting of June 9, 2015 (Action Item; public comment limited to one minute per speaker).**
  - E. Approval of the Minutes for the Meeting of June 23, 2015 (Action Item; public comment limited to one minute per speaker).**
- 3. ORAL REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER (Public comment limited to one minute per speaker).**
- 4. COMMISSIONERS' ORAL REPORTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (Public comment limited to one minute per speaker).**
- 5. BOARD REPORTS**
  - A. Board Report to Request Approval of Recommended Changes to the New Hope Program Policy (Action Item tabled from June 9, 2015 meeting. Public comment limited to two minutes per speaker)**
  - B. Board Report to Establish Time Limits for the Submission of Appeal Hearing Documentation (Action item. Public comment limited to two minutes per speaker)**
- 6. ADJOURNMENT**

Next Commission Meeting is scheduled for 7:00 p.m., July 28, 2015, at the South Los Angeles Animal Shelter, 1850 West 60<sup>th</sup> Street, Los Angeles, California 90047.

**AGENDAS** - The Board of Animal Services Commissioners (Board) meets regularly every second (2<sup>nd</sup>) and fourth (4<sup>th</sup>) Tuesday of each month at 10:00 A.M. Regular Meetings are held at City Hall, 200 North Spring Street, Room 1060, in Los Angeles, CA 90012. Evening Meetings are held in various locations throughout the City, from 7:00 to approximately 9:30 P.M. The agendas for Board meetings contain a brief general description of those items to be considered at the meetings. Board Agendas are available at the Department of Animal Services (Department), Administrative Division, 200 North Spring Street, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90012. Board Agendas may also be viewed on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Public Bulletin Board in City Hall East, 200 North Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. Internet users may also access copies of present and prior agenda items, copies of the Board Calendar, MP-3 audio files of meetings as well as electronic copies of approved minutes on the Department's World Wide Web Home Page site at <http://www.laanimalservices.com/CommissionAgendas.htm>

Three (3) members of the Board constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Some items on the Agenda may be approved without any discussion.

The Board Secretary will announce the items to be considered by the Board. The Board will hear the presentation on the topic and gather additional information from Department Staff. Once presentations have finished, the Board President will ask if any Board Member or member of the public wishes to speak on one or more of these items. Each speaker called before the Commission will have one (1) minute to express their comments and concerns on matters placed on the agenda. (For certain agenda items, speakers will have two (2) minutes.)

**PUBLIC INPUT AT BOARD MEETINGS** – **Public Participation on Agenda Items.** Members of the public will have an opportunity to address the Board on agenda items after the item is called and before the Board takes action on the item, unless the opportunity for public participation on the item was previously provided to all interested members of the public at a public meeting of a Committee of the Board and the item has not substantially changed since the Committee heard the item. When speaking to an agenda item other than during Public Comment (see Public Comment below), the speaker shall limit his or her comments to the specific item under consideration (California Government Code, Section 54954.3).

**Public Comment.** The Board will provide an opportunity for public comment at every regular meeting of the Board. Members of the public may address the Board on any items within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board as part of Public Comment.

**Speaker Cards.** Members of the public wishing to speak are to fill out one speaker card for each agenda item on which they wish to speak and present it to the Board secretary **before** the item is called.

**Time Limit for Speakers.** Speakers addressing the Board will be limited to one (1) minute of speaking time for each agenda item except during general public comment period which is limited to two (2) minutes per speaker. (For certain agenda items, speakers will have two (2) minutes each.). The Chairperson, with the approval of a majority of the Board, may for good cause extend any speaker's time by increments of up to one (1) minute.

**Brown Act.** These rules shall be interpreted in a manner that is consistent with the Ralph M. Brown Act, California Government Code Section § 54950 et seq.

**STANDARDS OF CONDUCT.** Speakers are expected to behave in an orderly manner and to refrain from personal attacks or use of profanity or language that may incite violence.

All persons present at Board meetings are expected to behave in an orderly manner and to refrain from disrupting the meeting, interfering with the rights of others to address the Board and/or interfering with the conduct of business by the Board.

In the event that any speaker does not comply with the foregoing requirements, or if a speaker does not address the specific item under consideration, the speaker may be ruled out of order, their speaking time forfeited and the Chairperson may call upon the next speaker.

The Board, by majority vote, may order the removal from the meeting of any speaker or audience member continuing to behave in a disruptive manner after being warned by the Chairperson regarding their behavior. Section 403 of the California Penal Code states as follows: "Every person who, without authority of law, willfully disturbs or breaks up any assembly or meeting that is not unlawful in its character, other than an assembly or meeting referred to in Section 302 of the Penal Code or Section 18340 of the Elections Code, is guilty of a misdemeanor."

**VOTING AND DISPOSITION OF ITEMS** – Most items require a majority vote of the entire membership of

**Please join us at our website: [www.LAAnimalservices.com](http://www.LAAnimalservices.com)**

the Board (3 members). When debate on an item is completed, the Board President will instruct the Secretary to "call the roll". Every member present must vote for or against each item; abstentions are not permitted unless there is a Conflict of Interest for which the Board member is obliged to abstain from voting. The Secretary will announce the votes on each item. Any member of the Board may move to "reconsider" any vote on any item on the agenda, except to adjourn, suspend the Rules, or where an intervening event has deprived the Board of jurisdiction, providing that said member originally voted on the prevailing side of the item. The motion to "reconsider" shall only be in order once during the meeting, and once during the next regular meeting. The member requesting reconsideration shall identify for all members present the Agenda number and subject matter previously voted upon. A motion to reconsider is not debatable and shall require an affirmative vote of three members of the Board.

When the Board has failed by sufficient votes to approve or reject an item, and has not lost jurisdiction over the matter, or has not caused it to be continued beyond the next regular meeting, the issue is again placed on the next agenda for the following meeting for the purpose of allowing the Board to again vote on the matter.

**BOARD OF  
ANIMAL SERVICES  
COMMISSIONERS**

DAVID ZAFT  
PRESIDENT

ALANA YAÑEZ  
VICE PRESIDENT

**COMMISSIONERS**

JENNIFER BRENT

LARRY GROSS

ROGER WOLFSON

**City of Los Angeles**  
CALIFORNIA



**ERIC GARCETTI**  
MAYOR

**DEPARTMENT OF  
ANIMAL SERVICES**

City Hall  
200 North Spring Street  
19<sup>th</sup> Floor, Room 1913  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
(888) 452-7381  
FAX (213) 482-9511

**BRENDA F. BARNETTE**  
GENERAL MANAGER

**DR. JEREMY PRUPAS**  
CHIEF VETERINARIAN

---

**Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners**

**Brenda Barnette, General Manager**

---

**COMMISSION MEETING DATE:** July 14, 2015

**REPORT BY:** Jan Selder

**REPORT DATE:** June 1, 2015

**TITLE:** Director of Field Operations

**SUBJECT: REQUEST TO APPROVE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE NEW  
HOPE PROGRAM POLICY**

---

**BOARD ACTIONS RECOMMENDED:**

- **APPROVE** the proposed changes to the New Hope program's policies as follow:
  - Eliminate advanced reporting requirements for transports, and the second and third party follow up requirements; and
  - Add a requirement that all new applicants will be limited to five members who will have adoption privileges.

**SUMMARY**

On June 9, 2015, the Board of Animal Services Commissioners (Board) heard the staff report requesting changes to the New Hope Program policy. At that time, the Board requested more time to review the report and recommended changes, specifically regarding transports, and requested that the item come back for action by the Board at the first meeting in July.

As previously stated, the current New Hope Policies and Procedures were last revised in February of 2014. (Policies and Procedures were previously provided). This report is a follow up on how the program is working based on survey results and the impact of prior changes on the program and staff. The new recommended changes are expected to help increase the number of New Hope partners, which saw a reduction after the implementation of the prior approved changes, and increase the manageability of the program for the partners and staff.

"Creating a Humane LA"

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

Visit our website at [www.LAAnimalCare.org](http://www.LAAnimalCare.org)

---

## BACKGROUND

The Board of Commissioners heard several reports over the course of several months, including February, March and April of 2013 regarding the needs of our New Hope program. Several changes were proposed and were passed on May 14, 2013. Changes included;

- Access to shelters 24/7
- Eligibility requirements
- Animal Availability
- Fees
- Reporting Requirements

The Department issued a notice to all 231 New Hope Partners advising them of the changes and requiring them to fill out a new application agreeing to the new requirements by June 1, 2013. The fee changes took several months to go through the approval process, but all of the other changes were implemented upon Commission approval and the policies and procedures, including the fee changes were updated last on February 21, 2014.

To gain the perspective of our New Hope partners, in November of 2014 the Department sent out a survey asking for their opinion and concerns, if any, on the program (survey analysis attached). Sixty-three (63) of the then 198 partners responded to the survey. Overall, the participants liked the New Hope Program and felt it was working well as a whole. Two complaints that appeared on responses several times were the time consuming amount of paperwork and follow up reporting now required, and the fact that only two shelters had a New Hope Coordinator.

Since the addition of the extra reporting requirements, our New Hope Program memberships has dropped from 231 groups to 210 as several groups declined to sign up when the changes were made. At the time of the changes, there was a concern that dogs transported out of state were falling into the wrong hands. However, the stringent reporting requirements have not stopped the transports; they have stopped many of our rescues from adopting from LAAS due to the increased requirements that are almost impossible to meet.

The added reporting requirements have also been a problem for the Department. The New Hope Program Manager must now keep track of not only spay and neuter compliance but also all transports prior to the actual transport and track first, second and third party adoptions, depending on the adoption circumstances. The amount of paperwork and follow up is unmanageable and far beyond what any other California agency is currently requiring. (See attached spreadsheet on what other local agencies require for rescue adoption).

In an effort to increase the number of New Hope Partners and increase the number of New Hope adoptions, the Department feels it is important to make the process as smooth and easy as possible. The Department already has a very thorough list of eligibility requirements a New Hope Partner must comply with when applying. Based on

---

those requirements, the Department believes the follow-up post-adoption requirements should be minimal making adoption easy and keeping track less complicated.

### **PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE NEW HOPE PROGRAM POLICES**

In order to better manage the program, the Department recommends the elimination of advanced reporting requirements for transports, and the second and third party follow up requirements (page 8 of the current New Hope policies). The New Hope Partner will still need to report on where the animal went once the animal left their care (e.g. adopted, sent to another rescue group or another agency, etc.) and all of the information will still need to be provided in the regular monthly reports.

To make tracking easier for both New Hope Partners and our program manager, the Department would like to limit the number of members allowed to adopt for each New Hope Partner. This would apply to *all new applications* only. Current approved New Hope Partners would not have to reduce the number of members allowed to adopt to five.

In response to the complaint of having only two dedicated New Hope Coordinators; the Department would like to increase the number of New Hope Coordinators from the two currently in place, to six, one for each shelter. However, there is insufficient staffing at this time. As more ACT's are hired, the Department can then look at increasing the number of staff dedicated to New Hope and add staff as necessary.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

There is no fiscal impact.

### **APPROVED:**

Brenda F. Barnette  
Brenda F. Barnette, General Manager

Attachments

---

### **BOARD ACTION:**

_____ Passed	_____ Tabled
_____ Disapproved	_____ New Date
_____ Passed with noted modifications	



**BOARD OF  
ANIMAL SERVICES  
COMMISSIONERS**

DAVID ZAFT  
PRESIDENT

ALANA YAÑEZ  
VICE PRESIDENT

COMMISSIONERS

JENNIFER BRENT

LARRY GROSS

ROGER WOLFSON

**City of Los Angeles**  
CALIFORNIA



**ERIC GARCETTI**  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF  
**ANIMAL SERVICES**  
221 North Figueroa Street  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
(888) 452-7381  
FAX (213) 482-9511

**BRENDA F. BARNETTE**  
GENERAL MANAGER

---

**Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners**

**Brenda F. Barnette, General Manager**

---

**COMMISSION MEETING DATE:** July 14, 2014

**PREPARED BY:** Rita Moreno

**REPORT DATE:** July 9, 2015

**TITLE:** Management Analyst

**SUBJECT: ESTABLISHMENT OF TIME LIMITS FOR THE SUBMISSION OF  
APPEAL HEARING DOCUMENTATION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. APPROVE the establishment of the time limit of seven days prior to a scheduled appeal hearing by when documentation supporting or opposing the appeal is to be submitted to the Department and Commissioners; and
2. APPROVE the requirement that seven hard copies of the documentation supporting or opposing the appeal be provided by the Respondent or Witness when it exceeds 50 pages.

**BACKGROUND**

Respondents and witnesses may submit documentation that supports or opposes the grounds for an appeal of the General Manager's determination in a case of a dangerous animal or barking dog. In order to prepare for a hearing of an appeal, sufficient time must be provided to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners to review the case file and grounds for the appeal.

In the past, attorneys for the Respondent have submitted an inordinate amount of documents 24 hours or less prior to the scheduled appeal hearing. This makes it difficult for the Commissioners to review all the documents prior to the appeal hearing and may result in the need to reschedule the hearing. In addition, it can drain Department resources as multiple copies need to be made and prepared for the hearing.



---

## FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact is dependent on the number of requests for appeal hearings received and granted, and the subsequent submission of documents for Board consideration.

## APPROVED:

Brenda F. Barnette  
Brenda F. Barnette, General Manager

---

## BOARD ACTION:

<input type="checkbox"/> Passed	<input type="checkbox"/> Tabled
<input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved	<input type="checkbox"/> New Date
<input type="checkbox"/> Passed with noted modifications	

## **DRAFT REPORT ON TRANSPORTING ANIMALS FROM LA ANIMAL SERVICES SHELTERS**

### **Concerns about transporting animals have been raised by public:**

1. Animals being transported out of Los Angeles may not be safe, it is claimed. There is concern that animals may be killed in receiving shelters or may end up in hording situations.
2. Formerly well-run receiving organizations may lose leadership or funding or for other reasons may no longer be suitable to receive animals from LAAS shelters. Recent reported cases of the poor conditions at Olympic Animal Sanctuary and Willamette Animal Rescue, which both have received transported animals from out-of-state public shelters, have increased concerns that LAAS animals could end up in similar situations.

### **Current Policies:**

1. Department relies on transporters to evaluate receiving agencies. According to the recently approved changes to the New Hope policies, the New Hope partner will be expected to provide the following:
  - a) Date of "transport."
  - b) Method of "transport," (air or ground) and name of driver, if applicable.
  - c) Name, address, phone number and contact person of the receiving agency.
  - d) A signed agreement between the New Hope partner and the receiving group, stating the receiving agency will not kill to make space, will give the pet an adoption guarantee, will provide adopter contact information, and will consult the Department if the animal becomes seriously ill or faces a life-threatening problem.  
(From Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners - Transport Activities - October 8, 2013).
2. Best Friends transports animals to receiving agencies that they have vetted themselves. Many are taken by Best Friends workers directly to receiving agencies, so Best Friends employees/volunteers can continually monitor facilities.
3. Pup My Ride is Best Friends program for transporting animals. The receiving organizations may change over time. There have been discrepancies between receiving agencies listed on the Pup My Ride website and the ones listed by Marc Peralta in recent conversation. This he explained is due to periodic changes being made in the program.
4. Per Marc Peralta, Best Friends will accept the return or any animal from the receiving agencies. One of Best Friends' receiving agencies does kill for reasons of space, but reportedly will not kill any animal for reasons of space for animals coming from Best Friends.



**Recommendations:**

That Department modify current policies to assure:

1. Initial vetting may be the responsibility of transporting organization but must be standardized by the Department. The requirements for all adopter/transporters are to be the same as LAAS requires for its own adoptions.
2. Reporting required by Department of NPHs that transport animals out of LA should be available to public.
3. Receiving agency must be 501(c)(3) or equivalent.
4. Receiving agency must report whether they have been investigated or cited for mistreatment of animals, failure to maintain appropriate facilities, etc.
5. Receiving agency must report to Department the name of the local Animal Control authority that have oversight of their organization.
6. Department and/or transporter must communicate with Animal Control authority in the community of the receiving agency to determine if the receiving agency is operating in good standing. The Department must record and maintain this information.
7. May wish to ask local Animal Control if transportation of animals from LA affects their efforts to find homes for their animals (are we just shifting the problem to someone else?).
8. Receiving agencies must be re-credentialed every two years.
9. Receiving agencies must report citations for infractions, loss of nonprofit status, and change in no-kill policies to LAAS immediately.
10. Department must assure that transported animals are microchipped and spayed or neutered with the same standards as LAAS requires for its own adoptions..