



BOARD OF ANIMAL SERVICES COMMISSIONERS
CITY OF LOS ANGELES

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Tuesday, August 23, 2016
10:00 A.M.

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

DAVID ZAFT
President

LARRY GROSS
Vice-President

OLIVIA E. GARCÍA
ROGER WOLFSON
(VACANT)

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) 482-9558.

Si requiere servicios de traducción, favor de hacer pedido con 24 horas de anticipo al (213) 482-9558.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS

1. Barking Dog Noise Case: BD 161127 WV

Respondent: Lillian Elsie Kestone Fazzi

West Valley Animal Care and Control: Lieutenant Lorna Esparza

Complaining Witness: Anatoly Aleksandrovich and Valerie Aleksandrovich

2. Dangerous Animal Case: DA 162139 WLA

Respondent: Donald Nathan Braun and Brenda Braun

West Los Angeles Animal Care and Control: Captain Wendell Bowers

Complaining Witness: Betty Yahr

II. 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. NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL COMMENTS** - (Discussion with Neighborhood Council representatives on Neighborhood Council Resolutions or Community Impact Statements filed with the City Clerk which relate to any agenda item listed or being considered on this agenda for the Board of Animal Services Commissioners.)

3. COMMISSION BUSINESS

- A.** Approval of the Minutes for the Meeting of August 9, 2016 (Action item; public comment limited to one minute per speaker).

- 4. ORAL REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER** (Public comment limited to one minute per speaker).

- 5. COMMISSIONERS' ORAL REPORTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS** (Public comment limited to one minute per speaker).

6. BOARD REPORTS

- A.** Staff Report Requesting Approval to use the Animal Welfare Trust Fund to purchase two kitty corrals from Companion Habitats, Inc. for the South Los Angeles Chesterfield Square Shelter (Action Item; public comment limited to two minutes per speaker.)
- B.** Staff Report Requesting Approval to use the Animal Welfare Trust Fund for "Capacity for Care" consultation including the purchase and installation of portals at South Los Angeles Chesterfield Square Shelter. (Action Item; public comment limited to two minutes per speaker.)
- C.** Staff Report Requesting Approval to amend the New Hope Policies to exclude New Hope Partners from participating in an auction. (Action Item; public comment limited to two minutes per speaker.)

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

8. ADJOURNMENT

Next Regular Meeting is scheduled for 7:00 p.m., September 13, 2016, at Best Friends Animal Society Shelter, 15321 Brand Boulevard, Mission Hills, California 91345.

AGENDAS - The Board of Animal Services Commissioners (Board) meets regularly every second (2nd) and fourth (4th) 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, 221 North Figueroa Street, 6th Floor, Suite 600, Los Angeles, CA 90012. Board Agendas may also be viewed on the 2nd 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 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

LARRY GROSS
VICE PRESIDENT

COMMISSIONERS

OLIVIA E. GARCÍA

ROGER WOLFSON

VACANT

City of Los Angeles
CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

**DEPARTMENT OF
ANIMAL SERVICES**
221 North Figueroa Street
6th Floor, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90012

(888) 452-7381
FAX (213) 482-9511

BRENDA F. BARNETTE
GENERAL MANAGER

DANA H. BROWN
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

DEREK BROWN
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

NOTIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL HEARINGS

To Be Held:
Tuesday, August 23, 2016, at 10:00 A.M.

City Hall
200 North Spring Street, 10th Floor, Room 1060
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(Entrance on Main Street)

This serves as formal notice pursuant to Section § 53.18(q) 4 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to the following parties and witnesses in the appeal(s) listed below:

1. **Barking Dog Noise Case: BD 161127 WV**
Respondent: Lillian Elsie Kestone Fazzi
West Valley Animal Care and Control: Lieutenant Lorna Esparza
Complaining Witness: Anatoly Aleksandrovich and Valerie Aleksandrovich
2. **Dangerous Animal Case: DA 162139 WLA**
Respondent: Donald Nathan Braun and Brenda Braun
West Los Angeles Animal Care and Control: Captain Wendell Bowers
Complaining Witness: Betty Yahr

These hearings will not be rescheduled, except for good cause.

As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and, upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services and activities. 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 additional information, please refer to the Board's "Rules and Procedures for Appeals", or contact the Department of Animal Services at (213) 482-9558, or visit the Department's website: <http://www.laanimalservices.com/>. Written statements are to be submitted to the Commission seven days prior and, if in excess of 50 pages, seven hard copies must be provided. You may submit your statement (50 pages or less) via email to: ani.commission@lacity.org.

Para información en español, llame al (213) 482-9558.



BOARD OF ANIMAL SERVICES COMMISSIONERS
CITY OF LOS ANGELES



MINUTES

TUESDAY, August 9, 2016 at 10:00 AM

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

Audio MP-3 Recording is available at www.laanimalservices.com

David Zaft, President
Larry Gross, Vice-President
Olivia E. García
Roger Wolfson
Alana Yañez

Meeting called to order at 10:09 a.m. Commissioners present were Zaft, Gross, García (arrived at 10:30 am), and Yañez. Also present from Los Angeles Animal Services (LAAS) General Manager (GM) Brenda Barnette, Assistant General Manager, (AGM) Derek Brown; and Assistant City Attorney (ACA) Dov Lesel.

Commissioner Zaft opened the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting agenda. **Commissioner Gross** discussed the appeal hearing process prior to conducting the hearings.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS

1. Barking Dog Revocation Case: BR 153036 SLA

Respondent: Andrea Jackson and Joseph Nathaniel Jackson
South Los Angeles Animal Care and Control: Lieutenant Jose Gonzalez
Complaining Witness: Carol Usher Edwards

The Respondents Andrea and Joseph Jackson appeared before the Commission. The Complaining Witness, Carol Usher Edwards, did not attend. The Respondent initially asserted that the dog license revocation was not justified because all of the terms and conditions imposed by LAAS were met. Mrs. Jackson also contested that her dog does not bark excessively. She requested that their dog license be restored and that their dogs be allowed to return home after a three month separation. Mr. Jackson testified that their neighbors, the Edwards, are picking on them. Mr. and Mrs. Jackson eventually acknowledged that their house dog Tummy didn't have a license or a rabies vaccination. **Commissioner Zaft** asked if the dogs were outside when they worked. Mr. Jackson acknowledged that the big dog was left outside. **Commissioner Gross** discussed the detail of the original issuance of the terms and conditions and the fact that the Jacksons only responded to the terms and conditions a few days prior to the second hearing. He questioned why the Jacksons initially ignored the terms and conditions. Mrs. Jackson claimed that she didn't realize that she had to meet the requirements within a certain time frame and that her husband had been in the hospital. She confessed that she that was in error and asked for the mercy of the Commission. **Commissioner García** asked which dates Mr. Jackson was in the hospital and how long she felt she had to respond to the terms and

conditions imposed by LAAS. She emphasized that the original terms were imposed in October 2015 but that the Jacksons didn't meet the terms and conditions until April 2016. She asked Mrs. Jackson why the Commission should believe that she will comply in the future. Mrs. Jackson admitted that it was her fault that she was late in complying due to finances, her ignorance and other issues. She claimed that she never received the letter listing the original terms and conditions. She, however, took full responsibility for her actions. **Commissioner Gross** mentioned that the Jacksons were slow in meeting the terms and conditions imposed by LAAS. Mrs. Jackson begged for the mercy of the Commission. Mr. Jackson also made an emotional appeal to the Commission explaining how much he loved his dog and tried to provide a proper home for the dog. **Commissioner Zaft** expressed sympathy regarding the Jackson's situation and explained that no one here wants to kill the dog. He emphasized that compliance is necessary. **Commissioner Gross** reiterated the concern of the Commission that non-compliance has already occurred several times in the past. **ACA Dov Lesel** commented that the Commission can uphold the General Manager's decision or choose to implement stricter terms and conditions.

Commissioner Zaft moved to modify the General Manager's decision to revoke the Jacksons' dog license and instead issue terms and conditions. The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Yañez** and was approved by a vote of 4-0.

AGM Derek Brown reiterated to the Jackson family what an opportunity this is and that he hopes they take full advantage of it.

Dangerous Animal Case: DA 161129 WV

Respondent: Golise Natanian Aghaee and Benyamin Aghaee Benami
West Valley Animal Care and Control: Lieutenant Lorna Esparza
Complaining Witness: Sally Roberts

The Respondents Golise Natanian Aghaee and Benyamin Aghaee Benami along with their attorney Donald S. Sherwyn appeared before the Commission. The Complaining Witness, Sally Roberts, did not attend. **Commissioner Gross** mentioned that the dog had bit a number of people at a condominium complex. Attorney Donald S. Sherwyn stated that there were a few of the incidents that the Respondents didn't wish to contest. He stated that the Respondents wished to oppose the decision that the dog be euthanized. Instead he suggested that the dog be given permanently to a dog trainer in Santa Monica. Attorney Sherwyn asked for a two week grace period for the dog to remain in the custody of the Respondents while the dog trainer makes room for the dog at her facility. He stated that the additional precautions would be taken during the grace period. **Commissioner Gross** asked if the dog had been impounded and was informed that the dog was in the custody of the owners. Attorney Sherwyn requested an amendment in the

stipulation that the Respondents could not own a dog for three years. He asserted that his clients were not aware that their dog's breed is very protective by nature of their owners. He also admitted that his clients did not know that the dog needed to receive specific training to correct his behavior. **Commissioner Gross** questioned why the dog wasn't impounded initially. **GM Brenda Barnette** informed the Commission that it depends on the determination of the Hearing Officer at the time of the incident if the dog can be safely maintained at home or needs to be sheltered. **Commissioner Gross** expressed concern that this situation had been going on for three years and seven other biting incidents had occurred involving six other people according to the condo association. He stated that biting victims complained that the owners expressed no sympathy or concern after the incidents. Attorney Sherwyn attempted to refuse a few of the claims and claimed that there are negative feelings between the owners and their condo association. **Commissioner Zaft** contested that there is actual testimony from actual victims. **Commissioner Gross** asked for the owner's response to the incident on March 20, 2013. Attorney Sherwyn simply stated that it and another incident are not contested. He stated that his client accepted full responsibility for the actions of the dog in these instances. **Commissioner Yañez** asked if the Respondent's paid the medical bills of the victims of the incidents they acknowledge. Attorney Sherwyn stated that they were never asked to do so and contested that that the Respondents did offer aid. **Commissioner Zaft** clarified that owners are requesting that the dog be surrendered to a third party outside the city. He explained that the dog has been deemed dangerous and that he is not comfortable placing the dog in another jurisdiction. **Commissioner Gross** also expressed his concern about outsourcing a dangerous dog to another jurisdiction. **Commissioner García** asked to see the letter from the dog trainer. **Commissioner Zaft** commented on instances where dog can be relocated. **ACA Dov Lesel** asserted that since this dog has been deemed dangerous the only option would be to impound and euthanize the animal. **GM Brenda Barnette** stated that she would be willing to help the family find an appropriate dog.

Commissioner García moved to uphold the General Manager's determination that the dog is deemed a dangerous animal. **Commissioner Zaft** seconded the motion and was approved by a vote of 4-0.

II. REGULAR COMMISSION MEETING

1. PUBLIC COMMENT

Phyllis Daugherty: Mentioned that Officer Jordan left LAAS and went to the Port Police; commented on DFO's Salazar's action regarding an incident she mentioned at the last meeting.

Lejla Hadzimuratovic: Mentioned that she's from the Bunny World Foundation; commented on the 40 rabbits that she rescued from LAAS; complained about the medical issues of the rabbits that she received;

attributed the problem to the type of feed the rabbits are given; stated that people have nowhere to go to go to use vouchers for rabbits.

- 2. NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL COMMENTS** - (Discussion with Neighborhood Council representatives on Neighborhood Council Resolutions or Community Impact Statements filed with the City Clerk which relate to any agenda item listed or being considered on this agenda for the Board of Animal Services Commissioners.)

3. COMMISSION BUSINESS

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

Commissioner Gross nominated Commissioner Zaft to another term as President of the Commission. **Commissioner Zaft** thanked the Commission and accepted the nomination. **Commissioner García** seconded the motion. Approved 3-0.

Commissioner Zaft nominated Commissioner Gross for another term as Vice President of the Commission. **Commissioner Gross** accepted. **Commissioner García** seconded the motion motioned to approve the reelection of Commissioner Gross to another term as Vice President of the Commission. Approved 3-0.

Public Comment
None

- B. Approval of the Minutes for the Meeting of July 26, 2016** (Action item; public comment limited to one minute per speaker).

Commissioner Yañez motioned to approve the minutes and **Commissioner García** seconded the motion. Approved 3-0.

Public Comment
None

4. ORAL REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER

GM Barnette discussed the following:

- Best Friends donated thousands of general adoption awareness flyers; distributed 25,000 flyers to residents in a 2 mile radius of the South LA shelter.
- Discussed breakthrough on getting rabbits listed separately; we can now sort them out in the data base.
- Frederick Jordan transferred out; commented that he is a beloved

Please join us at our website: www.LAAnimalservices.com

- member of team and an outstanding officer.
- Mentioned strategic planning work Francisca Baxa is doing with the department
- Due to staffing shortages, we will be limiting the number of events in August and September.
- On July 22nd, the department was notified by the Emergency Management Department (EMD) of the developing Sand Fire. LAAS staff assisted in animal care and clean up.
- "Clear the Shelters" was a huge success; 417 adoptions occurred on July 23, 2016; 173 cats, 237 dogs, 3 rabbits and 4 others were adopted. SLA Shelter led the way with a total of 92 adoptions; the Sand Fire affected the numbers since local freeways were closed.
- On August 3, 2016, AGM reported to the Paw Committee on the department's current coyote management program and recommendations to enhance the program.
- August 15-20th, two panels will interview 34 applications for Animal Care Technician positions; an active list will be created so that we can fill vacancies.
- Four new Animal Control Officer candidates have tentatively been scheduled to start the academy on August 22nd.
- Chief Vet Jeremy Prupas and Animal Care Technician Supervisor Leslie Corea created a unique holding area for animals that have undergone various life saving surgeries at the South LA shelter; area allows public to view animals as they recover in order to increase their adoptability.
- Best Friends donated seven directional posters to help the community find the SLA shelters; posters will be on display this month and surround the vicinity of the shelter
- LAAS presented a board report to the Board of Commissioners regarding their approval to use Animal Welfare Trust Fund to purchase cages and equipment for rabbits housed at our North Central, Harbor and West Valley shelters; department has already purchased portable A/C units for our North Central and West Valley shelters which are expected to be delivered by Tuesday, August 9th.
- On August 27 and 28, 2016, the Kitten-Palooza will take place at all six city animal shelters; adoption for kittens four months and younger will be reduced by \$50 courtesy of The Pet Care Foundation.
- On August 28, 2016 our spay/neuter mobile partner, The Lucy Pet Foundation, and Angel Hanz for the Homeless will host a free spay/neuter event for homeless residents and their animal companions at North Hollywood Park from 1:00-5:00 p.m.
- On July 29, 2016, LAAS rescued a panicked kitten from the engine compartment of a car; the SMART team had to be summoned to complete the rescue; kitten was taken to the North Central Shelter for a medical evaluation.
- On July 29, 2016 SLA Shelter received a call from a citizen reporting

that two dogs were living in a complete filth inside a SUV; officers responded and called L.A.P.D. to assist and the dogs were removed from the vehicle.

- On July 27, 2016, LAAS officers responded to an injured coyote call; the injured animal was actually a juvenile grey fox and was released to a wildlife rehabilitation organization.
- On July 22nd, SLA Shelter received a call from a citizen that was bitten on the finger by a raccoon while she walking her dog; an officer responded and a set a trap; the call information has been forwarded to the Department's Wildlife Officer.
- Mentioned call about a large tortoise blocking traffic

Public Comment

Phyllis Dougherty: Mentioned "The Clear the Shelters" event; wants to know how many animals are returned to the shelter; stated that there was a large park in Montebello closed because of coyote attacks.

5. COMMISSIONERS' ORAL REPORTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (Public comment limited to one minute per speaker).

Commissioner Yañez: Announced her resignation from the Board; stated that this would be her last meeting; very happy to see that vouchers will be printed at the doorsteps of low income residents; needs more time to focus on Pets 4 Life projects; wished LAAS continued success

Commissioner Zaft: Thanked Commissioner Yañez for her service and passion.

Commissioner Yañez: Mentioned the 2015 Pets for Life brochure that she distributed.

Commissioner García: Thanked Commissioner Yañez for her service.

Commissioner Gross: Echoed colleagues sentiments; stated Commissioner Yañez's shoes would be hard to fill; reported to Board about the tour of the West LA Shelter with West Hollywood officials last Friday; mentioned that volunteers suggest that people are embarrassed to admit why they are turning in their animals and that some incorrectly state the animal has behavior problems; complimented AGM Brown for acknowledging and praising volunteerers during their visit.

AGM Brown: Mentioned the spontaneity of the meeting at the West LA Shelter; expressed appreciation for Yanez's work with the Board.

Public Comment

Lejla Hadzimuratovic: Requested a report that will track bunnies including those who have been euthanized

Phyllis Dougherty: Commented that we cannot take over the care of the animals for West Hollywood when we don't have enough trucks; mentioned the lack of training and the lack of equipment; reiterated that bad behavior is the reason most people turn in their animals.

6. BOARD REPORTS

- A. Woofstat Report for June 2016 (Public comment limited to one minute per speaker)-**tabled until next meeting.**

Commissioner Zaft noted the report contained incorrect totals; requested that item be tabled until next meeting.

Public Comment

Lejla Hadzimuratovic: Requested more data for the rabbies; where they have been placed; desired list for spay/neuter vets for bunnies that will be available for partners and new bunny owners.

- B. Animal Welfare Trust and Sterilization Fund Balances for May and June 2016 (Public comment limited to one minute per speaker).

Commissioner Gross commented that we only spent one-third of the grant and that he wants to make sure that the money is spent. **Commissioner Zaft** requested clarification that monies paid to mobile clinics are for shelters LAAS animals to be spayed and neutered. **GM Brenda Barnette** commented that is not always the case although Lucy Pet Foundation helped LAAS by operating on our animals. She mentioned that we are now negotiating more purposefully with contract vendors. She answered affirmably to **Commissioner Zaft's** question regarding whether some vets running the mobile clinics are not supplying all the services that are due to LAAS. She said that some of the clinics present challenges whereas others are very cooperative. She mentioned that the Lucy van is going to be taken out to a homeless event at the end of the month.

Commissioner Gross requested clarification on the \$800 for the SMART team; deemed to be a donation. He also questioned the \$14,000 purchase of microchips. **GM Brenda Barnette** asserted that the purchase of the microchips occurred before the department started to use the ones donated by Found Animals.

Public Comment:

Lejla Hadzimuratovic: Recounted botched spay/neuter surgeries performed on rabbits and suggested other animal hospitals that are willing to work with

LAAS for an increased reimbursement.

- C. Staff Report Requesting Approval of the Proposed 2016-17 Fiscal Year Marketing/PR plan allocation \$25,000 from the Animal Welfare Trust Fund. (Action Item; public comment limited to two minutes per speaker.

Sara Ebrahimi, Public Relations Specialist, for LAAS reported about the plan for department marketing to encourage pet adoption, the spay/neuter program and improving the image of the department. **GM Brenda Barnette** mentioned that she already got an email from a volunteer wanting to perform outreach as the result of the report being posted; wants Sara to create a log and track which topics are covered. Commissioners asked various questions regarding the marketing plan and offered suggestions to make the marketing plan more effective.

Public Comment

Phyllis Dougherty: Requested specific itemization for the expenditures of monies from the Animal Welfare Trust Fund since these are donated funds.

Commissioner Yañez motioned to approve the Marketing/PR plan allocating \$25,000 from the Animal Welfare Trust Fund and **Commissioner Gross** seconded the motion. Approved 4-0.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Gross made a motion to adjourn. **Commissioner García** seconded motion in behalf of Commissioner Yañez's dedicated service. Motion passed 4 - 0.

Meeting ended at 12:23 a.m.

**BOARD OF
ANIMAL SERVICES
COMMISSIONERS**

DAVID ZAFT
PRESIDENT

LARRY GROSS
VICE PRESIDENT

COMMISSIONERS

OLIVIA E. GARCIA

ROGER WOLFSON

VACANT

**City of Los Angeles
CALIFORNIA**



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

**DEPARTMENT OF
ANIMAL SERVICES**
221 North Figueroa Street
Suite #600
Los Angeles, CA 90012

(888) 452-7381
FAX (213) 482-9511

BRENDA F. BARNETTE
GENERAL MANAGER

DANA H. BROWN
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

DEREK BROWN
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners

MEETING DATE: August 23, 2016

PREPARED BY: Louis Dedeaux

REPORT DATE: August 10, 2016

TITLE: Director of Field Operations

**SUBJECT: PROPOSAL TO PURCHASE TWO KITTY CORRALS FROM
COMPANION HABITATS, INC.**

BOARD ACTION RECOMMENDED:

1. APPROVE proposed request for use of \$10,000 from the Animal Welfare Trust Fund for necessary equipment to provide South Los Angeles Chesterfield Square Shelter with open cat keeping areas by purchasing two Kitty Corrals from Companion Habitats, Inc.

SUMMARY:

The current building design at our South Los Angeles Chesterfield Square facility does not have an open community cat keeping area. Over the last few months the Department has been in meetings with Bill Crowe, Founder of Pets 90210, General Services Department, and Bureau of Engineering to discuss modifications to the current building in hopes to add an Open Community Cat Keeping Area. In those meetings it has been determined that modifications necessary to meet this need would take years to complete and would require funding in excess of \$150,000 or more so the Department researched alternate solutions as the need for an Open Community Cat Keeping Area is necessary and will promote adoptions.

"Creating a Humane LA"

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

Visit our website at www.LAAnimalServices.com

In researching for alternate solutions, the Department found Companion Habitats, Inc. Companion Habitats provides various durable, healthy animal enclosures, one of which is designed for the temporary housing of cats called the Kitty Corral. *"The Kitty Corral is a fantastic way to instantly expand your space for cats and other pets. When not in use, the Corral collapses to about 13" deep. It's easy to clean and contains 4 adjustable shelves, 3 ramps and can be accessorized in almost any fashion. It's also designed to easily fold up for storage or to be moved for special events. The overall dimensions for this unit are 84 x 60 x 79 in."* Each unit costs \$3,849 plus freight which reduces the cost and construction timeline significantly in comparison to a full construction project.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact.

APPROVED:

Brenda F. Barnette

Brenda F. Barnette, General Manager

BOARD ACTION:

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

**BOARD OF
ANIMAL SERVICES
COMMISSIONERS**

DAVID ZAFT
PRESIDENT

LARRY GROSS
VICE PRESIDENT

COMMISSIONERS

OLIVIA E. GARCIA

ROGER WOLFSON

VACANT

City of Los Angeles
CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

**DEPARTMENT OF
ANIMAL SERVICES**
221 North Figueroa Street
Suite #600
Los Angeles, CA 90012

(888) 452-7381
FAX (213) 482-9511

BRENDA F. BARNETTE
GENERAL MANAGER

DANA H. BROWN
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

DEREK BROWN
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners

MEETING DATE: August 23, 2016

PREPARED BY: Brenda Barnette

REPORT DATE: August 17, 2016

TITLE: General Manager

**SUBJECT: APPROVE "CAPACITY FOR CARE" CONSULTATION INCLUDING
PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF PORTALS AT SOUTH LA
CHESTERFIELD SQUARE**

BOARD ACTION RECOMMENDED:

1. **APPROVE** "Capacity for Care" (C4C) consultation including purchase and installation of portals at South LA Chesterfield Square for \$30,500 to be funded from the Animal Welfare Trust Fund.

BACKGROUND:

Capacity for Care is the umbrella term used by the UC Davis Shelter Medicine Program for the combination of providing housing that meets the guidelines for standards of care (and used correctly dramatically decreases cat stress, disease risk, and staff workload), and population/length of stay management practices that will make the housing work to maintain current or better outcomes with fewer housing units available.

South LA Chesterfield Square shelter has been struggling with an inordinate influx of cats and kittens infected with life threatening virus infections known as Feline panleukopenia virus, also known as Feline infectious enteritis, Feline parvoviral enteritis, feline ataxia, feline distemper, or cat plague.

As a result, our veterinary staff has implemented cat quarantine at South LA Chesterfield Square. This locked door quarantine has made it difficult for rescues and the public to see and adopt cats and kittens. We have never had so many complaints

"Creating a Humane LA"

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

Visit our website at www.LAAnimalServices.com

against one shelter from the public and even our staff is expressing grave concern that the practices implemented are ineffective and they are concerned that we are killing healthy cats for space while sick or possibly sick cats are taking up life-saving space in quarantine and/or medical areas.

Knowing that shelter management in the face of contagious disease is one of her specialties, we contacted Kate Hurley, DVM, MPVM, Koret Shelter Medicine Program, UC Davis Center for Companion Animal Health (www.sheltermedicine.com) and asked for assistance.

Dr. Hurley's recommendation is attached along with the Capacity for Care (C4C) Case Studies 2016 update. It involves initial preparation, site visit by three veterinary consultants, installation of 70 portals (in cat cages), and follow up.

The portals connect two cat cages and can be open to create a pass through so cats do not need to be moved for cleaning reducing the possible contamination. By dramatically reducing disease spread, strict quarantine procedures can be eliminated or greatly reduced, allowing greater public contact with cats. They can also be closed if the population is higher and two cages are needed. Part of the consultation will be to guide staff in accessing which option is best or which cats can be in the smaller one cage and which cats should be in the pass through for disease and contamination prevention.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None. Based on what other shelters have experienced, we believe that the staff time to properly care for cats will be reduced as well as the likelihood of spreading disease by holding a cat and moving him/her from cage to cage for cleaning. Staff injuries, cat escapes, disease levels and medical care costs are likely to be reduced.

Approved:

Brenda F. Barnette

Brenda F. Barnette, General Manager

Attachments

BOARD ACTION:

_____ Passed

Disapproved _____

_____ Passed with noted modifications

Continued _____

_____ Tabled

New Date _____

Capacity for Care (C4C) Case Studies

2016 Update



CFHS PILOT SHELTERS:
Guelph Humane Society,
PEI Humane Society,
Kitchener-Waterloo
Humane Society and
Montreal SPCA

Introduction

Capacity for Care (C4C) is a management model that helps shelters better meet the needs of the animals in their facilities. It creates the conditions necessary to provide shelter animals with five essential freedoms thereby improving the welfare of individual animals. The Five Freedoms are Freedom from Hunger and Thirst, Freedom from Discomfort, Freedom from Fear and Distress, Freedom from Pain, Injury or Disease and Freedom to Express Normal Behaviour.

A fundamental premise of C4C is improving the flow of cats through the shelter in order to reduce their length of stay and get them more quickly into adoptive homes or other locations where their welfare may be better met than in the shelter. Reducing their length of stay prevents them from contracting illnesses that could result in their eventual euthanasia. C4C is also about optimizing the number of cats who are in the shelter at any one time so that these individual cats have better conditions and outcomes and the overall number of cats that can be helped is greater. Provision of high quality housing while the cats are in the shelter is another key element of meeting cats' needs. When the shelter animal population rises above its capacity, housing quality is likely to be compromised.



Cat enjoying a portal at Guelph Humane Society

In 2014, thanks to a generous grant from the Summerlee Foundation, the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies (CFHS) brought together the C4C Expert Team, consisting of Drs. Kate Hurley, Cynthia Karsten and Denae Wagner from the UC Davis Koret Shelter Medicine Program, with CFHS member organizations, Prince Edward Island Humane Society and Guelph Humane Society, to pilot the implementation of C4C in their shelters. Following the great success of these two pilot programs, another two shelters were chosen as pilots for 2015: Kitchener-Waterloo Humane Society and Montreal SPCA.

The pilot shelters met with the C4C Expert team in the first half of their pilot year. The C4C team conducted a site visit with each organization and discussed with staff how to implement the C4C concepts in the context of their shelter and community. After the site visit, the shelters determined how to fully implement C4C. The courage of staff at these shelters in rethinking and transforming their operations has provided the opportunity to test and document the impact of the new sheltering model. The case studies that follow describe the experience of each pilot shelter in putting in place the new model. Statistics regarding the cats taken in to each shelter and their outcomes prior to and post-implementation of C4C are also included.

While specific recommendations were implemented by each individual shelter in the context of their existing procedures, in general the pilot shelters implemented the following practices:

- "Portalization" of cages, where a portal is created between two adjacent cages so that a single cat is allocated the space of two cages. This allows eating and sleeping quarters to be separated from the litter box, while also providing the cat some choice of where to spend time. This type of housing is essential to providing each cat with the Five Freedoms.

- Fast-tracking the most adoptable cats to the adoption floor in as soon as one day, while using additional avenues to promote other cats. Fast-tracking included not waiting until after expiry of the stray-hold period before moving cats to the adoption floor and providing health examinations and treatments, as well as completing all vaccinations, micro-chipping and de-worming as soon as possible.
- Regularly holding adoption specials to prevent cat inventory from exceeding capacity. Monthly campaigns may be used to promote and move out the most adoptable cats to keep a smooth flow of cats through the shelter and to ensure the length of stay remains low.
- Setting up different categories and pricing to promote less “desirable” cats.
- Instituting customer-friendly adoption application procedures with fewer restrictions, including for example, using shorter application forms and having a conversation, rather than requiring a checklist.
- Changes to medical and sanitation protocols, for example: regularly spot cleaning rather than doing extensive cleaning of cat cages, when appropriate; re-evaluating treatment of upper respiratory infections (URI); allowing staff to identify health issues early and address them right away; releasing animals with health issues back to their guardians as soon as possible; and providing post-operative medication to adopters after spay/neuter surgery so pets can be taken home right away.
- Scheduling intake appointments, if this was not already integrated in procedures (see page 4).

The shelters also implemented Shelter-Neuter-Return, also known as Return-to-Field, and Barn Cat programs. With Return-to-Field programs, healthy, outdoor, unowned cats who are brought to the shelter but are not adoptable are sterilized, vaccinated and returned to their home location, while providing education to the community that this is the best practice to maintain the welfare of both the returned cats and those in the shelter. Where there may be threats or sensitive wildlife in the areas from which the cats were brought to the shelter, the cat may be released to a farm setting in a Barn Cat program. Cats in these programs fare much better than they would in the shelter and no longer contribute to an increasing cat population.

Implementation of the C4C approach eventually results in a decrease in shelter inventory, a decrease in the number of sick animals, an increase in the adoption rate, a decrease in the euthanasia rate and a decrease in length of stay. Intake could be expected to increase, as long as demand is consistent, or decrease if the shelter is implementing intake diversion and educating the community that some animals fare better by not coming into the shelter.

Montreal SPCA found they needed time after the site visit to plan the roll-out of their C4C recommendations, therefore quantitative data about the cats going through their shelter is not yet available. Data is available from Guelph Humane Society, PEI Humane Society and Kitchener-Waterloo Humane Society and described in greater detail in Figures 1 to 3 in the case studies.

The results of putting C4C into practice in their shelters are inspiring: the three organizations that fully implemented C4C witnessed a remarkable decrease in the number of sick cats at their shelter, by 40% to 87%, depending on the shelter. As well, the total inventory of cats at the shelter decreased by 35% to 63%. Length of stay at the shelter went down by 29% and 51% at PEI Humane Society and KW Humane Society, respectively. Euthanasia decreased by 29% and 63% at KW Humane Society and Guelph Humane Society, respectively. These glowing statistics demonstrate the great success of the Capacity for Care model in improving outcomes for cats in shelters.

What is scheduled intake?

Scheduled intake, a component of “managed intake” or intake coordination, is a key element of C4C that allows a shelter to prevent the number of cats in care from overtaking the shelter’s capacity to house them in the conditions that meet their Five Freedoms. Rather than accepting any surrendered cat at any time, appointments are scheduled to take in the cat when the shelter’s capacity permits it. This prevents cats from having to be sheltered with inadequate space, which would impact their welfare. It also helps maintain the number of cats available for adoption at a level that allows the cats to move through quickly. Here is how the pilot shelters are managing their cat intake.

Guelph Humane Society: If we are close to capacity we ask that the finder of a stray animal hold onto them for a couple of days so we can make room for them. We accept owner surrenders by appointment only. Our intake coordinator offers alternative solutions to surrendering. We ask owners to provide as much information as possible about the cat to help us determine if there are any issues that need to be addressed and to allow us to put the cat into adoption as soon as possible. We also ask for veterinary information so we can determine if there are any medical issues that may not have been volunteered by the owner.

PEI Humane Society: We try to keep the number of cats in the communal cat rooms to a maximum of 3 (down from 4). We now make every effort to schedule cat intake Monday to Thursday so the cats can be fast-tracked to the adoption floor with the shelter veterinarian. This has greatly helped our population management. More information is now provided on the PEI Humane Society web site about lost pets, feral cats, animal control and surrendering pets to give people options other than bringing them into the shelter.

Kitchener-Waterloo Humane Society: We changed our communication with the public, created a waiting list for surrender, provided alternative solutions to owners who are having issues with their animals and created a behaviour health line. We assist the public free of charge with behaviour problems in the hopes they will keep their animals. We also advise the public to leave healthy outdoor cats alone and refer them to a partner rescue organization who talks to them about TNR programs.

Key lessons and recommendations from the pilot shelters

- ▶ Consider what C4C approaches are not yet being implemented at the shelter, reflect on the shelter's capabilities and resources and work with the entire staff to make improvements at a manageable pace.
- ▶ Ensure that everyone at the shelter is in the loop; communication is the key to success.
- ▶ Implementing the new approach may seem intimidating at first, but have faith in the program: it has been proven to work at many shelters.
- ▶ Critical elements for the success of the program are:
 - The portalization of cages;
 - Fast-tracking cats to the adoption floor;
 - Controlling cat intake and managing the cat population in the shelter. The C4C program will not be successful if projected intake and adoption targets are not adhered to every month.
- ▶ Remove tight restrictions and shorten application requirements for adoption.
- ▶ Remember that when there are fewer cats on the adoption floor, the public is more apt to adopt them than if the shelter is crowded because the cats are displayed better, the public is not overwhelmed and each cat has better odds of being adopted.



Happy cat at Guelph Humane Society

Guelph Humane Society

Guelph Humane Society collected data regarding the cats in their care before and after implementing C4C (Figure 1). The two periods correspond to August 2013 to July 2014 and August 2014 to July 2015.

FIGURE 1. Comparison of key animal statistics before and after implementing C4C at Guelph Humane Society.

	Before C4C	After C4C	Difference
Inventory of cats in shelter *	41	27	- 34%
Intake	81	73	- 10%
Number of cats in sick bay	24	† 14	- 40%
Adoption	‡ 46	53	+ 14%
Euthanasia	§ 25	9	- 63%
Length of stay (days)	5.1	6.8	+ 31%

* all statistics are monthly averages for a 12-month period before or after implementing C4C, respectively

† numbers in sick bay were artificially high in the first month of this period because sick bay was being used to temporarily house healthy cats while portalizing cages in other areas of shelter

‡ in one month of this period adoptions were underestimated due to the tracking codes used

§ particularly high euthanasia rate in one month of this period due to seizure from a hoarding situation of a large number of cats who had to be humanely euthanized

After putting in place the Capacity for Care recommendations, Guelph Humane Society observed a decrease in the inventory of cats in the shelter, a decrease in intake, a decrease in the number of sick cats, an increase in adoptions and a strong decrease in euthanasia. Interestingly, a small increase was observed in the length of stay; however, the average length of stay at Guelph Humane Society prior to implementing C4C was already relatively short.

Staff from Guelph Humane Society responded to the following questions after the first six months of implementing C4C:

What were your biggest concerns before implementing Capacity for Care?

Our biggest concerns before implementing C4C were:

- How we would manage the same number of cats coming into the shelter with only half the number of cages to hold them.
- We were unsure if we would be able to implement the recommendations as our shelter is so small and we have limited space to accommodate some of the recommendations pertaining to creating separate spaces.
- We had a difficult time getting templates for the portals and outdoor holding area.

How did that work out?

Once we started installing the portals and moving forward with C4C, things just seemed to fall into place. We were unable to complete some of the recommendations, but we will certainly incorporate them as we plan our new shelter space.

What surprised you about implementing Capacity for Care?

The impact it made on the cats and the staff was remarkable.

What costs were associated with implementing Capacity for Care in your shelter? Have you seen any savings?

We were able to keep our costs for implanting C4C to a minimum. Our biggest expense was the actual purchase of the portals which was roughly \$700. We had wonderful volunteers install the portals; our only installation cost was the rental fee for the plasma cutter which was \$100 over 2 weekends. Our “curtains” — curtains that curtail cat stress! — were made by a neighbor who works in a fabric store, so our only cost was for notions. We used bed sheets that we already had for the material. Total cost for curtains was \$15. In total it cost us less than \$1000 to implement C4C.

What has been the public response to Capacity for Care? What has been the internal response? The cats’ response?

The public response has been very positive. They really like the fact that the cats have a lot more space to walk around and they are not sleeping next to their litter boxes. The internal response is also very positive. The staff time to clean cages has been reduced drastically, leaving staff with more time to spend socializing with the cats. The cats are all very happy with the new program. They have more space to move around, they can “hide” if they are shy or just not feeling up to being handled. They love the Kuranda beds as it gives them a chance to see more of the room. The cats are happier and healthier, and by giving the public fewer cats to choose from, they are getting into homes much more quickly.

**What are the next challenges that you feel you will face in implementing Capacity for Care?**

Our next challenges will be to implement the portions of the program in our new shelter that we were unable to implement in our current shelter and to keep up the standards we have now.

What worked? What did not work? What do you think were the most important elements implemented?

What worked well was the portalization of the cages, the curtains and the implementation of the “fast track” for animals that are more readily adopted. The Barn Cat program has also been a big success. We have placed 12 cats in the Barn Cat program who would otherwise have been euthanized. We now have a waiting list for cats to be admitted.

Unfortunately, due to space and the structure of our cage banks, we were unable to implement space for cats to be out of cage.

The most important element implemented were the portals. They have made the biggest impact on the whole procedure.

What lessons learned would you contribute to a case study for other shelters who are interested in participating in the Capacity for Care program?

I would recommend this program to any shelter who wishes to improve the well-being of their cats. It may look intimidating in the beginning, but have faith in the program. It really works. The Guelph Humane Society thanks everyone involved in helping us improve the lives of our cats!

Guelph Humane Society staff members were still very enthusiastic one year after implementing their changes and had this to share:

"Participating in the pilot of C4C has been so rewarding for the staff, volunteers and mostly the cats at the Guelph Humane Society. When we were first asked to participate in the C4C, we were a little skeptical about how we would be able to house the same amount of cats with half the cages. It just goes to show that you never know what you are capable of doing until you have to do it. We can't stress enough the impact that C4C has had on the cats here at the shelter. Last fall and into the winter, we actually had empty cages! Our cats are happier and healthier in body, mind and spirit. Our isolation room is now being used more as extra space than for sick cats.

Our costs for medications have decreased, also. Our chubbier cats use the portals as exercise equipment, getting in their daily workouts. The members of the public have commented on how content the cats seem to be, considering they are in cages. With the extra space, all our cats have been able to have Kuranda beds, which were all lovingly donated by the generous people in our community. We have relocated our small animals to the hallway close to the front desk which has given us more room in the adoption room to redecorate and put in comfy chairs for people to sit and cuddle with our furry feline friends.

*We have been able to build up a strong support system in our foster homes, which has allowed us to place cats that have been surrendered for behaviour issues so we can see what they are truly like in a home and not just assume they are not adoptable. We have also started a Barn Cat program which has allowed us to rehome more and euthanize many fewer cats. C4C has been a huge success for everyone involved at GHS. We highly recommend any shelter who is considering it to go ahead and jump right in. **You won't regret it!"***



PEI Humane Society

PEI Humane Society collected data regarding the cats in their care before and after implementing C4C (Figure 2). The two periods correspond to August 2013 to July 2014 and August 2014 to July 2015.

Figure 2. Comparison of key animal statistics before and after implementing C4C at PEI Humane Society.

	Before C4C	After C4C	Difference
Inventory of cats in shelter *	47	31	- 35%
Intake	78	76	- 2%
Number of cats in sick bay	26	14	- 45%
Adoption	52	53	+ 2%
Euthanasia	17	† 17	+ 3%
Length of stay (days)	20.6	14.6	- 29%

* all statistics are monthly averages for a 12-month period before or after implementing C4C, respectively

† particularly high euthanasia rate in one month of this period due to admission of a large number of diseased feral cats who had to be humanely euthanized

After putting in place the Capacity for Care recommendations, PEI Humane Society witnessed a decrease in the inventory of cats in the shelter and a decrease in the number of sick cats. Interestingly, intake, adoption rate and euthanasia rate did not change significantly after implementing C4C. Staff members at PEI Humane Society reflected that even if some of their statistics didn't appear to have drastically changed, the feeling at the shelter is far more comfortable and healthy for both the people and the cats. The population is much better managed, and there are now empty cages at times. Individual medical cases are also better managed. Staff members feel comfortable that the best euthanasia decisions are being made for the right reasons.

Staff from PEI Humane Society responded to the following questions after the first six months of implementing C4C:

What were the biggest concerns before implementing Capacity for Care?

Change in general can be difficult for anyone, let alone a humane society with a large number of staff and volunteers. Our cats had always been housed in Cat Receiving for at least three days prior to conducting medical and behavioral assessments and before placing them on our Adoption Floor. The ability of the C4C program to reduce length of stay, decrease upper respiratory infections (URI) and fast-track cats through the adoption process were all areas of concern, as well as the time and energy needed to implement these changes.

How did that work out?

Many of these goals were realized quickly with the ease of implementing the C4C program. This gave everyone confidence in the program and the desire to continue with the C4C program.

What surprised you about implementing Capacity for Care?

We were surprised at how easily and quickly the program was up and running. The teleconference meetings with the C4C Expert team prior to implementation were very helpful in this regard. The C4C results were immediate: we saw positive behaviour changes in the cats right away and enthusiasm for the C4C program from both the staff and volunteers.

It is usually beneficial for any organization to have input from experts outside of their own organization to bring in new ideas. This was especially true with the C4C Expert Team. We were able to see many new and exciting possibilities for our facility through their input, research and experience. Their advice regarding current veterinary treatment protocols and recommendations for shelters was exceptionally helpful and effective.

What costs were associated with implementing Capacity for Care in your shelter? Have you seen any savings?

Some money was spent to purchase the raw materials needed to portalize cat kennels prior to the June, 2014, site visit. Many of our cat kennels were already portalized so the money spent for the raw materials was minimal. The portalization of the kennels was completed by Dr. Wagner and some of our wonderful volunteers, so the only cost was for the raw materials.

We believe that we have saved a significant amount of money due to the decreased incidence of URI and other illnesses as well as the decreased length of stay in the shelter. Unfortunately, these cost savings are difficult to calculate



Example of "curtain" in use at PEI Humane Society

What has been the public response to Capacity for Care? What has been the internal response? The cats' response?

The weekend of the C4C launch there was a stakeholder meeting arranged with the C4C Expert Team. The stakeholders' response was positive and enthusiastic. Although there were press releases regarding the C4C program at the PEI Humane Society, the response of the public in general is difficult to determine.

Overall, both the staff and volunteers have been very enthusiastic. The general feeling is that we are now "working smarter". While some of the recommendations were easy to implement, other recommendations were more difficult. Fast-tracking the cats onto the adoption floor in one day was one of the more difficult recommendations to implement.

The cats seem physically and mentally happier, less stressed and healthier with the portalized kennels. Because the cats are fast-tracked, healthier and happier, they have a reduced length of stay, which benefits all of the shelter animals.

What are the next challenges that you feel you will face in implementing Capacity for Care?

To run the Shelter-Neuter-Release (SNR) program in 2015. Public education regarding the theory behind returning these stray cats to the neighbourhoods in which they were found will be critical to the success of this program.

We have informally begun a Working Cats Adoption program and have adopted several cats to barns since June, 2014. We have created Adoption forms specific for the Working Cat Program. The funds ear-marked for the PEI Humane Society spay/neuter surgeries for barn cats will be a tremendous help to boost this program in 2015.

What worked? What did not work? What do you think were the most important elements implemented?

What worked:

- Portalizing kennels for happier and healthier cats.
- Fast-tracking the cats from intake to the treatment room for medical and behavioral assessments and to the adoption floor in the same day.
- Completing all vaccinations, micro-chipping and de-worming as soon as possible.
- Changing treatment protocols including: Baycox treatment for Coccidia, discontinued Lysine and a new protocol for URI treatment.
- Scheduling intake appointments for stray cats and kittens to help manage the shelter's cat population.
- Shorter Adoption applications (from five to two pages).
- Shorter Adoption bios (from 1-2 paragraphs to 1-3 sentences).
- A fast-track scoring sheet customized for our shelter has been helpful.
- Managing the shelter's cat population so that over-crowding is not an issue.

What didn't work:

- Fast-tracking too many cats at once. Staff in the Treatment Room could not input the information into Pet Point quickly enough to process all of the cats.
- Cats waited in carriers in the Treatment Room to be processed because we wanted to process them from intake to the adoption floor in one day.
- Neutering cats within 24 hours of intake did not work because the cats didn't recover well after surgery.
- Spaying cats less than two pounds didn't work well either. In general, these cats did not recover well after surgery either.
- Reducing the adoption fees for cats that are not being adopted did help to get them adopted, but the financial impact on a non-profit shelter is difficult to determine.

The most important elements:

- Fast-tracking cats in one day to the adoption floor.
- Using the new URI protocols.
- Shorter Adoption applications.
- Portalized kennels.
- Tracking our C4C shelter statistics to help manage the intakes and cat population.
- Supply and Demand; it does seem that when we have fewer cats on the adoption floor, the public is more apt to adopt them faster than if the shelter was overcrowded with cats on the adoption floor.

What lessons learned would you contribute to a case study for other shelters who are interested in participating in the Capacity for Care program?

Once you get the C4C information, take a step back, reflect and organize your thoughts around your own shelter's capabilities and resources. Next, work with staff and change things slowly, one step at a time, so that the change is manageable. Ensure that everyone in the shelter is in the loop; communication is the key to success.

Removing tight restrictions on adoptions, such as twenty four hour holds and making everyone in the family meet the animal. We now have same day adoptions and that has worked out well.

Controlling the cat intake and managing the cat population in the shelter is of utmost importance. The C4C program will not be successful if we don't adhere to our projected intake and adoption statistics every month.



Portalized cages in use at Guelph Humane Society

Booking appointments for the intake of stray cats to help manage the intake of cats and not overwhelm the fast-tracking process and staff within the shelter.

Overall, the Capacity for Care model has been extremely successful at the PEI Humane Society. The program has enabled us to manage our cat population more efficiently, our cats are happier and healthier, the cats' length of stay has decreased and the staff agrees that we are "working smarter".

Twelve months after rolling out Capacity for Care in their shelter, PEI Humane Society staff members reflected on the results. They explained that even if some of their statistics didn't appear to have changed radically after applying C4C, the feeling at the shelter is far more comfortable and healthy. Through managing intake and length of stay, the population is much better managed, which has made a tremendous difference in the health of the cats and, therefore, the feeling in the shelter. Even though similar numbers of animals are coming in and being adopted out, there are now empty cages at times. The staff feels comfortable that the right euthanasia decisions are being made. In addition, cats are not coming in healthy and then getting sick. Individual medical cases can be better managed.

Furthermore, PEI Humane Society staff members indicated that there have been other areas of improvement: it is not only much easier on the shelter staff, but also on the relationships with other groups in the community. For example, a local spay / neuter group now sees that its efforts are having a better effect. Witnessing the differences at the shelter and in the community has promoted community groups working more closely together. Notably, PEI Humane Society staff members feel they are serving more cats overall, since they are helping in ways other than sheltering.

Kitchener-Waterloo Humane Society

Kitchener-Waterloo Humane Society started putting in place some of the C4C principles right away, in particular, working with the concept of ideal capacity. Waiting lists and alternate solutions to relinquishment, including a behaviour help line, were already in place in 2014. The use of curtailments was implemented immediately and resulted in calmer cats. They are believed to have contributed to the low upper respiratory infection (URI) rate. A "TLC" program for cats that are scared, stressed and under-socialized was created to provide social and environmental enrichment and consistent handlers to facilitate the cats' adjustment to their surroundings and to promote mental well-being.

Kitchener-Waterloo Humane Society collected data regarding the cats in their care before and after implementing C4C (Figure 3). Data from the same 6-month period of the year was compared (corresponding to July to December, 2014, and July to December, 2015) to avoid seasonal differences.

Figure 3. Comparison of key animal statistics before and after implementing C4C at Kitchener-Waterloo Humane Society.

	Before C4C	After C4C	Difference
Inventory of cats in shelter *	222	83	- 63%
Intake	264	179	- 32%
Number of cats in sick bay	21	3	- 87%
Adoption	190	155	- 18%
Euthanasia	31	22	- 29%
Length of stay (days)	49.7	24.3	- 51%

* all statistics are monthly averages for a 12-month period before or after implementing C4C, respectively

The initial data from the 6-month comparison before and after implementing C4C at Kitchener-Waterloo Humane Society show sizeable decreases in the inventory of cats in the shelter, the number of sick animals, the length of stay and the euthanasia rate. It is interesting to note an 18% decrease in the number of adoptions, which is likely due to the decrease in the number of animals taken in.

What were your biggest concerns before implementing Capacity for Care?

We didn't think of them as concerns; they were more like expectations. We had decided we were going to do whatever it took to implement C4C and were fully committed to the process. We were hesitant to hope that it would be successful.

How did that work out?

It's one of the best things we've ever done here! It had the biggest impact we have seen in such a short time with the best results. We definitely didn't expect to see results as soon as we did. We expected to see some changes over a 2-year period, not within months. An 82% decrease in URI, 32% decrease in intake and \$40,000 labour costs saving are huge and were realized that summer.

What surprised you about implementing Capacity for Care?

The immediate return of our efforts. We noticed changes almost immediately in our intake numbers and reduced illness. It was amazing to see and made everything worth it. Our experiences over the last 25 years made us skeptical that intake would slow, especially considering we were responsible for animal control. We had also struggled to control URI throughout the year.

What costs were associated with implementing Capacity for Care in your shelter? Have you seen any savings?

There were no costs, thanks to the grant! Portals cost about \$50 each. Many of the C4C changes involved changing our communication strategies with the public.

An 84% decrease in URI meant the savings on medication were considerable. We have also saved almost \$40,000 in labour costs due to the decrease in intake numbers.

What has been the public response to Capacity for Care? What has been the internal response? The cats' response?

The response of the public is very positive. When receiving calls for stray cats, we advise the public to leave the cats alone if they appear healthy, as they are 13 times more likely to go home than if they are brought to the shelter.

Internally, the staff have never been happier. They enjoy what they do because many of the stresses (such as overpopulation) no longer exist in the shelter.

Cats are happier and healthier! Fewer cats in the shelter equals less stress, and there are many fewer upper respiratory infections.

What are the next challenges that you feel you will face in implementing Capacity for Care?

Return-to-Field (RTF) and Barn Cat programs. These continue to be a challenge and we are struggling with how to make these viable programs.

The Return-to-Field is a challenge due to current bylaws that do not allow cats to run free. As we are also the enforcement agency, this approach poses difficulties. We have been asking the person dropping off the free roaming cat whether they would feel comfortable picking it back up after spay/neuter surgery and returning it where they found it. There has been some positive response and assistance but not as much as we had hoped. Our intention is to work with the City on bylaws that will make RTF easier and more effective.

The Barn Cat program has not had much success. Some discussion with farmers indicated they already have too many cats due to cats being abandoned in rural areas. The farmers are also not concerned about spay/neuter and vaccination.

Another next step is to look at dogs. Dogs have never been an issue in terms of overpopulation; however, they do deserve our attention in terms of their length of stay, etc. This is our goal for the 2016 year.

What worked? What did not work? What do you think were the most important elements implemented?

What worked?

Changing our communication with the public. Advising the public to leave healthy cats alone and partnering with an area rescue organization, K-W Community Cats. We refer the public to their organization to talk about outdoor cats that need spay/neuter, and they arrange to have the cat fixed in our TNR program that is sponsored by a donor. The portals were also successful in lowering our URI rate.

What did not work?

Only one element did not work: opening the adoption area to public traffic without staff supervision. This resulted in numerous cat scratches and bites that required the cat to be quarantined for 10 days, as per health department procedures. This severely affected the length of stay.

What do you think were the most important elements implemented?

The most important element was communication with the public: we decided right away this had to change. We didn't anticipate what a huge difference it would make for intake but have been very pleasantly surprised at the outcome. We put some of the onus on the public, as they are a big factor in how many cats came to the shelter with regard to stray drop off and owner relinquishment.

The public has been fantastic. The city has not been receiving complaints. We expected more push back from the people who wanted us to take in a stray cat. We thought they would argue more but they were surprisingly understanding and willing to take our advice.

This approach resulted in a 34% decrease in intake numbers, which has alleviated the cat overpopulation we typically see in the summer months. It also resulted in lower labour costs and less stress on staff.

What lessons learned would you contribute to a case study for other shelters who are interested in participating in the Capacity for Care program?

We would say you have to have an "all-in" mentality. You have to fully commit to all aspects of the C4C recommendations. You will never achieve significant results if you don't give it your all.



Montreal SPCA

Montreal SPCA is one of Canada's largest shelters, serving a population size of 3 million people. Over 15,000 animals come through the shelter annually. The organization has offered services to the public 24 hours/day, 7 days/week. The shelter has operated at its current location since 1955 and is in need of expanded facilities. Therefore a renovation project has recently begun. Montreal SPCA has municipal contracts for animal control services for 14 municipalities. All these contracts stipulate that the municipalities need to be advised of significant changes 3 months in advance.

As a result, Montreal SPCA, found they needed time after the site visit to plan the roll-out of the C4C recommendations. This included preparing communication plans for staff, municipalities and the community. Montreal SPCA decided to use the time in 2015 to prepare for implementing C4C at the beginning of 2016.



What were the biggest concerns and challenges before implementing Capacity for Care?

- Time is always an issue in sheltering.
- Portalizing the cages while we have animals in the building. At the same time we are renovating the building.
- In May and June we took on two more municipal animal control contracts.
- Finding time to prepare our external communications plan for municipalities and our internal communications plan for staff and volunteers.
- Fast-tracking was easy to understand for operational employees but harder for the Inspections Department that may need to hold animals for a long period of time to get all the evidence they need.

What advice would you give to other shelters who are interested in starting Capacity for Care in their facilities?

Communication is the key; people need to be involved at all the steps.

Introducing some elements in a stepwise approach was important, rather than introducing everything at the same time. For example:

- We started at the beginning of January to let the community know our new opening hours
- At the same time we started asking callers why they want to surrender their animals, and we sent protocols for common issues as well as tips on rehoming, so that callers could resolve their issues themselves before coming to our shelter. We are trying not to be the default, easy solution.
- We will be installing the portals in early February
- In the spring, we will do a Return-to-Field pilot with the 1 municipality that agreed to the program.
- In spring, we will also meet with the city of Montreal, to discuss changing the stray hold period from 72 hours, as stipulated in the bylaws, to 24 hours.

Capacity for Care Consultation – Overview Cost Estimate Los Angeles Animal Services, South LA branch

Capacity for Care (C4C) Review : The Process

Preparation for the C4C consultation begins with data collection, review and analysis of three years of shelter data. This is followed by an initial phone consultation (~90 minutes). The introductory phone meeting is intended to provide us with some background information on the shelter's mission and goals, operations and management and to answer any of shelter teams' questions in regards to the C4C consultation and upcoming site visit. The site visit will consist of observations, meetings and staff interviews/discussions to assess operations with considerations prioritized for animal health and welfare. Areas for review include population management protocols, length of stay parameters and evaluation of animal housing types and number. If necessary and helpful, meetings with community stakeholders can be held as well. A wrap up of the site visit is generally provided at the end of visit while on site or shortly thereafter.

A Capacity for Care (C4C) report will be prepared post visit with recommendations and additional resources. Follow-up phone calls can be facilitated if the shelter would find them useful.

Deliverables

- Preparation
 - Initial phone meeting, data collection, data analysis
 - Capacity for care optimal population calculation
- On site visit (three veterinarians)
- Installation of 70 portals
- Other on site meetings as planned
- Follow up
 - Capacity for care report
 - Capacity for care calculator and instruction for use
 - Phone meetings – up to three (60 minutes each)

Cost Estimate

Prep work (phone meetings, data collection, analysis and population calculations)	\$ 6,500
Three day C4C site visit- 3 veterinarians	\$15,000
Travel costs (approximate)	\$ 3,000
Follow up (phone meetings, report, capacity calculator use)	\$ 2,500
SUBTOTAL	\$ 27,000
Portals 70 (to order separately @ 50.00 each)	\$ 3,500
Total Cost:	\$30,500

For additional information, please contact:

Dr. Cindy Karsten, ckarsten@ucdavis.edu

Our recommendations are intended to meet or exceed the Association of Shelter Veterinarians [Guidelines for Standards of Care in Animal Shelters](#)

The UC Davis Koret Shelter Medicine program is a privately funded program and operates solely on generous donations and services provided

**BOARD OF
ANIMAL SERVICES
COMMISSIONERS**

DAVID ZAFT
PRESIDENT

LARRY GROSS
VICE PRESIDENT

COMMISSIONERS

OLIVIA E. GARCIA

ROGER WOLFSON

VACANT

City of Los Angeles
CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

**DEPARTMENT OF
ANIMAL SERVICES**
221 North Figueroa Street
Suite #600
Los Angeles, CA 90012

(888) 452-7381
FAX (213) 482-9511

BRENDA F. BARNETTE
GENERAL MANAGER

DANA H. BROWN
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

DEREK BROWN
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners

MEETING DATE: August 23, 2016

PREPARED BY: Jan Selder

REPORT DATE: August 18, 2016

TITLE: Director of Field Operations

**SUBJECT: AMEND THE NEW HOPE POLICIES TO EXCLUDE NEW HOPE
PARTNERS FROM PARTICIPATING IN AN AUCTION**

BOARD ACTION RECOMMENDED:

1. **APPROVE** an amendment to the New Hope Policies to exclude New Hope Rescue Partners from participating in the auction procedure when adopting an animal from our shelters.

SUMMARY:

The current New Hope Policies state, "When a member of the public and a New Hope Rescue Partner are present to adopt at the same time, the private citizen will have the right of first refusal". All New Hope Rescue Partners are given a Personal Identification number or "P" number which they use to adopt animals; many have more than one "P" number, either for different rescues or for their own personal use, not attached to their rescue. The policy does not clearly identify that a New Hope Rescue Partner may or may not participate in an auction if they choose to say they are not acting on behalf of their rescue. We would like to amend the current policy to add clear language that a New Hope Rescue Partner may not participate in the auction procedure regardless of what Personal ID number they use. The new language would state, "When a member of the public and a New Hope Rescue Partner are present to adopt at the same time and both are interested in adopting the pet, the New Hope Rescue Partner will back out of

"Creating a Humane LA"

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

Visit our website at www.LAAnimalServices.com

the adoption and allow the member of the public to adopt. Under no circumstances will a New Hope Rescue Partner participate in an auction, whether they are representing their rescue or themselves." In addition New Hope Rescue Partners will not ask others to participate in an auction on their behalf.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact.

APPROVED:

Brenda F. Barnette

Brenda F. Barnette, General Manager

BOARD ACTION:

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