THE CLERK: The first thing on the agenda is the roll call.

Commissioner Riordan.

MS. RIORDAN: Here.

THE CLERK: Commissioner Khero.

MR. KHERO: Here.

THE CLERK: Commissioner Atake.

MS. ATAKE: Here.

THE CLERK: Commissioner Brunson. Commissioner Brunson is absent.

Commissioner Knaan.

MS. KNAAN: Here.

THE CLERK: We have a quorum. The first item on the agenda is the report of the general manager.

MR. STUCKEY: Commissioners, good morning. I just want to give you a quick update on the Katrina animal issue. As you know, we had three. Two of them have now gone back to Mississippi and the other animal is at the Bark Avenue location.

Secondly, I just want to mention that you have requested some information relative to the new shelter hours and how that is being presented. We have included that
information in your packets.

And lastly, I just want to mention we had wonderful participation in the Best Friends event weekend at Woodley Park. It was very successful. I got to see Commissioner Atake there in her booth in Good Work. She adopted some of our animals as well. We were very appreciative of that.

That concludes my report.

THE CLERK: There are no speaker cards on that.

The second is old business. The first item is a board report on the marketing plan by the general manager.

MS. RIORDAN: Commissioners have all had an opportunity to go over the report?

THE CLERK: Yes, uh-huh.

MS. RIORDAN: So we don't really need to go over the report point by point. We've all had an opportunity to review it. Though we did get it late Thursday night. I had requested it Tuesday so that didn't really give us ample time to comb through it. That said --

MR. STUCKEY: Well, one thing I would like to add is one of the things the commission had requested is that we have some outside entities take a look at the document. So we had communication with Department of Water and Power, the Department of Public Works, the Burbank Public Information Officer, the PIO for LAFD and the PIO from the LAPD as well as a Disney executive.
Because of that request and because of some of the concerns you laid out, we wanted to take an opportunity to take this document, have others review it, take a look at it, give us feedback, what did they think of it. From all of those entities I have mentioned, they said it was a very good internal document. The feedback was primarily positive and we thought this was good feedback from very high end folk.

I mean we looked at four of the largest departments within the city and all received positive information from them in relation to the document. So having said that, we are prepared to answer any questions that you may have.

MR. KHERO: With regard to that feedback, did they specifically -- I'm more interested in not whether the feedback was positive or negative, but what specific suggestions they may have had with regard to the marketing plan.

I guess my primary concern is that the marketing plan, similar to the plan that was submitted in September, while it has a lot of activity, it doesn't really have a cohesive theme to it. One of the things I know we were trying to integrate was integrating business practices into the marketing plan. I really very much want to do that.

I know that the general manager and others have considered a letter from Mr. Nathan Winograd because he has also reviewed the plan. Some of his concerns I think are shared by the commission.
MR. STUCKEY: I haven't read the letter so --

MR. KHERO: Oh, you haven't? My misunderstanding. I thought maybe you had.

MS. RIORDAN: Did you not get that?

MR. STUCKEY: Yeah, I just haven't read it. It's not that I didn't get it. I just haven't read it.

MR. KHERO: I think it would be important if you could read the letter and then maybe we can discuss the matter further later. As the president mentioned, we got the plan rather late. It is a very specific plan.

But my concern -- I think the commission's concern, generally, is how the plan is integrated, the theme overall. I know that visiting schools in communities is very important. I don't want to dismiss the importance of that. But I think there needs to be more here.

What I would like to do is get this plan more in line with Mr. Winograd's suggestions. Consistent with that suggestion, I would very much like the general manager to at least consider those suggestions and then maybe come back to us when we have more time to review this stuff in detail and see how we could harmonize the plan with those suggestions. That's my feedback right now.

MS. RIORDAN: I think Mr. Winograd's availed himself. He said that you are welcome to call him. He'll give a free-bee call so go ahead and feel free to consult if you have any
questions.

But I echo Tariq that if you had the letter on Thursday and you haven't read it, we got the plan Thursday evening and requested it by Tuesday. So while we all comb through it, I think I share Commissioner Khero's comments.

MR. STUCKEY: I guess what would be helpful to us is something specific, not just what Nathan Winograd wrote, but what you all want.

Just to give you some context again, when I work with employees that have MBA's from Wharton Business School, so we got to factor that in. This model is based upon what Mothers Against Drunk Driving did with anti-smoking efforts.

I was in Maryland when the first MADD issue took place because of a young girl -- the youngest quadriplegic in the nation at that time. She was five and-a-half months old. That's how all of that began.

It's -- marketing for us in this department is focused on the outreach effort to the community. Now, to me, that is integrating the business process, just doing that. We don't have people that are trained at a level that you would do at IBM or Dell or MCI because you would hire marketing folk, advertising folk, sales representatives, all of those things. We don't have a budget and so forth.

So what would be helpful for me is tell me what you're looking for specific to the document. Whatever that is,
and I will read thoroughly the Winograd document, try to get an opportunity to have some conversation with him because you have to work within the context of what we have. I mean, that's a very important factor and I keep stressing that because to give people what they can't do, they'll fail. And so let's look at what we have. Tell me what you want. I'll talk to Winograd or whomever. We have talked to a lot of people. But we keep getting from others that have looked at the document firmly think it is solid. It's very specific. It lays out a good context and so forth. So if you all -- I'm just asking you to just consider that and to give me any specific things that you are looking for in the document.

For example, if you want us to go to any particular place, if you want it linked to a particular theme, for example, something you had mentioned. Because I really -- because that's kind of new. Just help me to drill down then what it is that you want because we keep coming back but we seem to be missing the mark.

So we either need to have some smaller group of the commission to get together and talk about this thing or something that will allow us to meet your expectations. Because we keep coming back with something that others have reviewed that have no dog in this fight at all who say that the document is solid. Then when we present it to you, there is a missing of the mark of the expectation. We don't want to keep
doing that. We don't want to make you frustrated and we don't want to get frustrated either. We are just trying to solve the problem and meet your expectation.

MR. KHERO: I would agree. I'm completely sensitive to the limitations of the department. We have to work obviously within that context. We do need to pin this down better.

Again, the time constraint, this is a very significant thing. The marketing plan is the foundation for how people know us, how they understand us.

MR. STUCKEY: Uh-huh.

MR. KHERO: I started asking people weeks ago, people who I associate with, where in their lives do they encounter the Department of Animal Services? Where do they see information about it? Where do they interface with the Department of Animal Services? Most people say that they don't.

MR. STUCKEY: Uh-huh.

MR. KHERO: That is a real concern of mine. So I'm not sure if -- I know the approach we are taking right now isn't working. I really want to -- like you, I want to get into the details of this. The time constraints we had make that impossible today.

MR. STUCKEY: Uh-huh.

MR. KHERO: But it's very important, you're right, that we iron out every wrinkle of it. Because the status quo is really not acceptable, as you know that. We all know that. There has
to be a way to interface with the city or a city of three, four
million people. That’s not happening right now.

It's really discouraging to me when I ask people just
randomly where in their daily lives do they interface with the
department? Do they see information about the department?
Most of them tell me that they don't. These are people who
shop every day, go to gas stations every day, do everything
that we do every day. So I just want to be able to address it.
Like you, I want to be able to address it effectively and
specifically.

MS. RIORDAN: Right.

MR. KHERO: I will get on the ball with that. But we all
need time to review this and to make sure -- I'm glad that you
are coordinating with other people. But I would also like to
see what their specific response is, not that they've signed
off on it.

Specifically -- every plan could use some fine-
tuning. I think that this one also -- to just simply say we've
gotten the rubber stamp on this, this is okay, isn't really
sufficient for me. I really think, as you do, that people's
knowledge of the department, the knowledge that they can save
lives in a rather short time, that they can expand the love in
their lives and save animals at the same time shouldn't be
foreign to them. It should be something they should know.

Whether that means somehow -- I know our budget is
limited, if nonexistent, but we need advertising. We need some -- we need billboards on buses or bus stops or we need a billboard in town. We need links to our web-site. We need other web-sites, I think, that people interact with that are related to animals to be able to quickly link to our web-site. Little things like that.

Again, I'm not the Wharton School MBA either. I'm just expressing my concerns. Like you, I'm expressing my desire to iron this stuff out. I'm not a dog in this fight. I don't see this as a fight. I see this as a collaborative effort and I want it to be that way.

MS. RIORDAN: Yeah, I'm -- I do think there are some specifics I'd like to see, too. I’d like to see ICS going various places, but I don't see exactly what we are going to be addressing. I see us going to many schools. I don't think we have any formal education programs.

MR. STUCKEY: We do. We do.

MS. RIORDAN: We do?

MR. STUCKEY: We have that.

MS. RIORDAN: Well, I have not heard of any actual training for a formal education program. So I'd like to be acquainted with that. So I think to just be given a bit more -- as well as what resources we are using when going to these places.

And I'm not -- Mr. Winograd may have his credential,
but I know that the staff that he works with are not always the MBA's and perhaps maybe a high school diploma at that. So I wouldn't -- lack of resources is a given. I think lack of resources extends to other municipalities as well. That is the ongoing theme. So we all have to work with what we have or what we don't have. This is not a fight.

MR. STUCKEY: No, that was just an expression.

MR. KHERO: No, I understand.

MR. STUCKEY: It doesn't mean anything.

MR. KHERO: I just feel like sometimes we're caught in this -- I don’t know. We’re caught in this dynamic where somehow, I feel like we're at odds when we shouldn't be.

MS. RIORDAN: Well, and I think it’s the way -- again, I requested in writing to get this by Tuesday -- no later than Tuesday. We had three weeks -- this was a definite agenda item. We get it last minute Thursday night as well as the business plan and the budget. We didn't even get to Sam Simon until Sunday.

MR. STUCKEY: I think you were the only one commissioner that didn't get to Sam Simon. I think --

MS. RIORDAN: That's not correct.

MR. STUCKEY: So none of the commissioners received that?

Ross, can you address that, please?

THE CLERK: Did anybody else get it?

MR. KHERO: I didn't get it, no.
THE CLERK: Then apparently, they didn't.

MS. RIORDAN: So that doesn't give us ample time to prepare. Then we end up wasting commission time and public time. We need more time to prepare to have a conversation about this so it isn't an ambiguous conversation we have.

MR. STUCKEY: Okay.

MS. RIORDAN: We want to be able to give you specifics.

MR. STUCKEY: Okay.

MS. RIORDAN: Any other comments? We'll go ahead and move on to -- I'm going to try -- given the size of the crowd here today, I'm going to try something new with public comments. During our discussion when the commission is discussing, feel free to bring your comments up. But once we start public comment, we will no longer accept any cards. So there is no commenting on somebody's comments.

I think that will help because that's when they start trickling in and it turns into a 40 minute public comment session. So I'll give you maybe another couple of minutes this time since I have just announced it at this item to start bringing comments in. But let's --

MR. KHERO: Just to reiterate, we are strictly enforcing the time limitations. You know these meetings have gone on way too long and we're doing our best to be more disciplined here. We're not trying to discourage comment. We're trying to encourage it.
MS. RIORDAN: Absolutely.

MR. KHERO: But at the same time, all of us have to abide by these rules. Please don't take it personally if we're asking you to finish up because your time period has ended. Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: We do appreciate you contacting other corporations and running the marketing plan by them. That was very responsible and a good idea. I think we will need to revisit this at some point.

Let's go ahead. Let's take Phyllis Daugherty and then after that will be Melanie Pozez -- excuse me? Is something wrong?

MR. KHERO: No, no.

MS. RIORDAN: Go ahead. Come on up.

MS. DAUGHERTY: Phyllis Daugherty with Animal Issues.

I just want to comment on Mr. Khero's comments that, yeah, the average person in any city has no contact with Animal Services, nor do they desire it unless they lose an animal or they get attacked by an animal or they have some issue regarding an animal. It's just like how many encounters do you have with LAPD or LA Fire Department? It's even less with Animal Services because it's not in your face all the time and in the newspaper.

I think a more accurate report would be what -- when you have had some kind of contact with Animal Services, have
you been satisfied with it? That's what we need to know. The average person does not want to think about the animal shelter and so forth.

Mr. Winograd, with all due respect, he is a very nice man. He had some nice ideas. He was the head of some very affluent SPCA's. He was not limited by resources like any municipal department is. He took in 3,000 animals a year in Ithaca, New York and San Francisco's entire county has 775,000. We have 885,000 people just in east valley alone. So if we are going to have someone to help the department, we need to have someone that has comparable experience.

MS. RIORDAN: Melanie Pozez. Thank you.

MS. POZEZ: Melanie Pozez, Park Avenue Foundation.

I just want to support the fact that you all -- the commission is being more directive and supportive. And say thank you. It's very important for specifics.

One of the things that I see in every community that I'm involved in, which is the lower income, is that everybody -- the outreach has been amazing. The Sam Simon Foundation has been going to the neighborhood councils in collaboration with the city department. They have been going to the schools. They had a very successful event on Saturday. The special events have been not only inclusive but things that have never been done before.

As you know, the Van Nuys vaccination clinic that
happened about two months ago had over 1,000 people. These
things don't happen without incredible commitment and
direction, really, from the top down.

MS. RIORDAN: Scott Sorrentino. Thank you, Melanie.

MR. SORRENTINO: Scott Sorrentino, Rescue and Humane
Alliance.

Just responding. What Mr. Winograd did in Ithaca was
have articles in the newspaper and radio ads and television ads
pretty much every day relating to the shelter that people were
very aware of.

Just so you know in 2002, I think it was '01 and '02
when he was there, his budget for marketing and advertising was
zero. It's just about reaching out to the community and having
some great ideas and, you know, asking for people's support.

But first before you can ask for people's support,
you have to show them that you're making a commitment to saving
animals. Then I think you can go to the community and get
their support.

What I'm just concerned about is that these visits to
all of these schools and things of that nature really don't
address the core issue of how we're marketing the department.
So I really wish that we would put together some type of task
force.

THE CLERK: Time.

MR. SORRENTINO: And, you know, kind of have an
opportunity to talk and share ideas on that. Thanks.

Ms. Riordan: Thank you. Bill Dyer, I have -- it just says public comment but I don't know if it's for this item or for --

The Clerk: At the end.

Ms. Riordan: Okay. Way at the end. Okay. Then that's it with public comment on this item. We'll make an exception. Okay. We're -- we'll do it with this item. The next item, I'm going to cut off public comments as -- well, I said I'd give them a little grace period. All right. I'm making an exception but that doesn't mean I'm making an exception for the rest of the meeting.

Ms. Austin: Terry Austin, The Amanda Foundation.

I just wanted to add to the Van Nuys vaccination clinic which is actually in Pacoima and Karen was so helpful in organizing that. Because of her organization of it, the spay/neuter van, the Amanda van was able to do over 100 spay/neuter surgeries. Because of that day we ended up doing them the next day and the following Saturday because of the people who came to the vaccination clinic. So it was an excellent outreach opportunity.

Ms. Riordan: Thank you. All right.

The Clerk: Okay. There are no other Speaker cards.

Ms. Riordan: We can go to the next item.

The Clerk: Next item on the agenda is B.
MS. RIORDAN: Thank you, Karen.

THE CLERK: The board report for the Low Kill Plan by the general manager.

Let the record show Commissioner Brunson has joined the meeting.

MR. STUCKEY: The plan that I will present to you today is a framework that will allow Los Angeles to become a low kill city. The difference with this plan is that it has a focus that is rarely talked about when addressing the animal overpopulation issue. Even with that, we need to state more specifically that the primary area of concern is the dog and cat overpopulation.

The solutions that we seek should relate to the people part of the equation, both in the shelters and in the community. The shelters are the repositories that represent our society's throw-away mentality. The shelters are not the cause of the issue and therefore cannot be looked upon as the sole solution.

Having said that, the two critical areas of change that are often overlooked are, one, a department's culture and, two, the behavior of the citizens. Without addressing both of these issues, our efforts will not focus on the central problem and will not identify the long term strategies that are sustainable.

Therefore, the plan identifies five strategic areas
and includes critical -- a critical model in that the
individual shelters are required to develop a plan that
reflects their community's uniqueness, especially in its
demographic make-up. The importance of this is critical
because each of the shelter areas have distinctive differences.

In addition, you will find our approach of community
outreach as the key strategy for creating the change in the
community's behavior, much like the grass roots strategies of
Mothers Against Drunk Driving and our anti-smoking efforts.

Lastly, the plan was developed to be flexible. It
was not created as though the department was full of MBA
graduates from Wharton Business School, but one that reflects
their abilities and strengths. It was created to allow us the
greatest opportunity for success based upon the staff's
knowledge, skills and abilities. It is a plan that most of the
employees have embraced and I have the utmost faith in them and
their commitment to its success.

To give you some brief historical context, the
Department of Animal Regulation was established in 1947 by city
charter. Initially, established to help the control and spread
of rabies to humans, the name was changed to Animal Services in
2000 to reflect greater emphasis on total care of animals.

This change in our city's emphasis resulted in the
Proposition F campaign, which created $154 million in bond
funds to support the financing of our new shelter system. Next
slide, please.

Our current shelter system consists of locations at north central, south Los Angeles, east valley, west valley, west LA and the harbor. Our service area is the entire city with a population of almost four million with the square mileage area of 468. We currently have 68 animal control officers in the field. Next one.

Why do we have shelters? Sure, they do provide a safe haven for the animals in our city, to provide animal care and control, to address the issues of animal overpopulation, enforcement of our animal laws and provide education to the public on animal issues. Next slide.

The timeline for low kill is important because -- I share this with you because it demonstrates how much time has elapsed without a plan, for whatever reason. The diagram is not to blame, but to share an important fact that there were 15 months with no action. The second point is that the current plan was developed and implemented within four months, certainly no small effort. Next slide.

The mission statement of saving animal lives has focused us and it is one that employees have embraced and understand. We have a very good process with inputs from lots of staff and individuals in the rescue community. I also would add that this identified a significant shift in the way that we do our business in that the shelters now lead the organization.
Personnel, finance, budgeting, administration and all of the other support entities within our department are there to support our shelters, to help them to save animal's lives. Next slide, please.

Also within that process, we developed our core values of team work, compassion, accountability, communication, customer service, sense of urgency and strategic planning. These values represent who we are. They are the foundation for which we stand to forward our mission. These values are our daily test that focus us to ask ourselves, are we doing all we can to meet that mission? They have become our internal measure for our standards of behavior and shared beliefs. They, too, have become embraced by our staff.

Within the business plan, we have developed five strategic objectives: Integrate business practices with department management; improving customer service as a way of doing business; improve the marketing of our message programs and services; encourage volunteer utilization to meet our operational priorities; and to embrace the contributions of our partnerships. In the interest of time, the issues there I was going to identify, I will move to the next slide.

What have we accomplished? Next slide. When you look at our impound numbers -- and we'll go through the big three. We will talk about the impounds, our adoptions and our euthanasia rates. This is where the rubber hits the road. We
used the year 2000 because that's when the city initiated its pet overpopulation ordinance. Clearly, the impounds are going in the right direction. In 2000 and 2001, we had 68,915. At the end of this last fiscal year, we had a total of 57,924.

Next slide.

Our adoptions, using the same benchmark, we began with 15,317. Ending in June 30 of our fiscal year, 18,879. Clearly, we'd like to do a little better there. We have recognized the stability of the adoption within the last three years so certainly we have some opportunities. Next slide.

Euthanasia, for the community, this is the big number. How many animals do we kill in our shelters? Again, using our benchmark of 2000, we have 42,927. In the last fiscal year, 25,025, giving us a euthanasia rate of 43.2 percent, the lowest in the city's history.

I'll just skip that -- just go to the next one because of the time constraints.

Looking at our accomplishments. Increase in accountability, which is one of our core values. We have developed new medical guidelines for medical staff by increasing their rounds of service to the animals. We are requiring individuals to have two signed off for euthanasia rates of two ACT's that are specifically designated to handle investigations when we have major issues at a shelter. We handle that similar to the model used by LAPD of internal
affairs so that no one in that chain of command is involved in that process.

There are employee foster programs and unwean program. Last year in this program, we had animals fostered 485, which are now at the last fiscal year, 1,439. We had a participant shelter ordinance, which allowed us to waive fees and to allow entities outside the city to take animals from our shelter system.

We've revamped our volunteer program by having a high level of accountability there as well. Increased training, liaisons to our shelters, improving the relationship with the staff and the shelters, allowing us to also separate community service hours from our volunteer hours. We have increased the working relationship with the rescue communities, something we continue to work on. Increase the adoption partner cards from six to ten to allow a greater opportunity for adoption of animals. Our volunteer training programs, which we have now, south LA, east valley and the harbor.

Increasing our hours of operation on Tuesdays and Thursdays and also on Sundays. Web-site enhancements which allow us to search for animals by impound number, vastly improved photos of the animals. We have a special needs section. We have a link allowing individuals to provide these links to friends and so forth.

We have the e-mail notification process, where
individuals are looking for specific animals, if we can identify that for you, we e-mail you that information. Mobile pet adoption vans. We had 77 since March and have 777 adoptions. We have increased our spay and neuter vouchers by 4,764. Next slide.

We have increased our AFE's, our government acronym for Authorization For Expenditures. From last year spending 67,000 to this year spending 99,000. We have an e-mail blast of our euthanasia list. This is a daily information that we send out to newspapers, Yahoo groups, rescue communities, everyone that we can think of to give them an opportunity to save some animal's life. The waive of license fee for sick animals, something new and very exciting, and has helped us to get animals out of our shelters alive.

A five percent reduction in injuries on duty. The reduction was so significant that we received recognition from the city council -- (inaudible) -- and maintenance ordinance. We just got off that ground within the last 30 days.

Animal cruelty task force is a fabulous partnership with LAPD, which allows us to have our first felony conviction which resulted in a three year prison term for the individual that was cruel to their particular animal. We have a new public relations team. Translation of documents into Spanish. Next please.

We have a partnership with the San Pedro Post Office
to help us with -- to increase our licenses. It is a pilot program that we have in place that once successful, we will have all over the city where individuals that are delivering the mail will be providing us information relative to animals at those particular locations.

We have abated our investigations back log, which was hundreds of behind, which is now current. We have improved our inventory management system, especially as relates to the transfer policy of animals from shelter to shelter, again improving our accountability and communication.

The monitoring for compliance and adoption of non-sterilized animals. Kind of the downside of the unwean program in that we have about 1,500 or so animals that have not been sterilized. So we have a process in place where we are contacting all the rescue groups relative to the current status of their sterilization.

A captain is now required to visit shelters on the third shift in an effort to ensure our accountability and that everyone there is doing what they need to be doing.

Our process improvement -- two items to note, the investigation forms which have been extremely streamlined as well as our barking dog and humane investigation forms literally will save hundreds of hours of time and put us in the position to be much more effective when we go to court to prosecute these cases. Lastly, department newsletter. Next
One of the issues that we have had a lot of discussion about at our commission meetings is what are we doing in relation to individuals that want to adopt animals. And are we doing things in order to discourage adoptions. So what we did was we looked at how can we quantify some of this and help us to answer some of those customer service questions and those questions about the adoption process.

So we developed a scale from one to five, with five being the highest. Our call center was the entity that made 1,136 calls and we have 115 responders. With the first question, "Were you able to get prompt assistance?" The average score was 4.36 out of five.

The second question, "How would you rate the courtesy and friendliness of the employees?" The average score was 4.42.

"How would you rate the quality of answers given from questions you asked?" 4.17.

Next question, "Overall, how would you rate the assistance you received?" Received an average score of 4.35.

One of the key questions, "How likely would you recommend our adoption center to others?" A score of 4.51.

The big question for me, "How is your pet working out with your household?" A score of 4.64 out of five.

What this data demonstrates is that I think we're
doing something right and I think we're doing it at a very high level. I was pleased especially with the last two scores because they are strong indicators that the staff is doing something very positive at the adoption end.

In an open shelter system, I believe that the people who work in them every day are the true heroes. Their commitment and dedication to each other, the citizens and animals is amazing. Most don't complain, welcome me with a smile and seek only the gratification knowing they did a good job.

These two staff members represent typical staff members that just do their job. The gentleman on the right is -- (inaudible) -- in the ACO uniform. He was out on a call last week on an animal cruelty investigation. He happened to see a stray dog and noticed there was something on his leg. He got the dog and took it to the shelter. The dog had a severe hernia that had went down into the inside skin on his leg. It required significant medical treatment that was life-saving. And just doing his job on a daily basis as he does every day last week, he saved this stray animal's life.

MS. RIORDAN: Do you mind my cutting in here but -- and this is great. I love to see the progress. I think it's really important that we track our progress and see where we're improving and it shows an improvement and that's wonderful. But I think for the sake of time, we should probably just kind
of move on to discussing the actual low kill, if you don't mind.

Is there a way you can maybe -- we just need to move this a little faster. I would like to see this sometime as a progress report because I see it as that.

(Inaudible discussion.)

MS. RIORDAN: Okay. Fine. I just didn't see it as a Low Kill Plan. I saw it as a progress report. I think it is wonderful progress and I applaud the progress. But, okay.

MR. KHERO: We can put this on the agenda but this is not an agenda item, really.

MS. RIORDAN: Could you please help me?

MR. KHERO: Really, no disrespect.

(Inaudible discussion.)

MS. RIORDAN: It is positive. It's a wonderful positive thing and doesn't seem to --

(Inaudible discussion.)

MS. RIORDAN: It's a progress report. It's --

(Inaudible discussion.)

MS. RIORDAN: It's a progress report. We are happy to agendize a progress report. I love the progress report and it shows wonderful advances. We applaud that but it doesn't seem to be our Low Kill Plan and that's what I thought we were going to be seeing.

Commissioners, if you don't mind watching, that's
fine. But if you want to discuss low kill, we can do that.
I'm open.

MR. STUCKEY: That's fine.

THE CLERK: How much is there?

MR. STUCKEY: We'll stop. That's fine.

MS. RIORDAN: We can --

MR. STUCKEY: We'll stop. No, no, turn it off.

MS. RIORDAN: Please, speak up, please.

MR. STUCKEY: Be careful.

MS. RIORDAN: Oh, be careful. We don't bite.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Before we go into the discussion on
the business plan, is there anything you wanted to specifically
talk about on that issue before we open it up for discussion?

MR. STUCKEY: No. I'll just take your questions at this
time.

MS. RIORDAN: I would love to put this on the agenda. I
would love to see this again as a progress report. I do think
it is wonderful and I think it is something that should be
presented to the public as well. I think it's a great --

(Inaudible.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was not on the agenda.

MS. ATAKE: Can I ask a question? How much longer will
there be?

MS. RIORDAN: You could be -- yeah, give it another five
or ten minutes.
MR. STUCKEY: I would rather just go ahead and just answer your questions.

MS. ATAKE: But if there is not that much left, we can scan through at least and see what you have prepared?

MR. STUCKEY: It's okay.

MR. KHERO: You understand our concern? We've had -- these meetings have been going on until three and four o'clock. We are trying to get disciplined at these meetings.

I mean you know that as well as anybody. It's not that we don't want to hear this information. It's that we're trying to -- we're trying to --

(Inaudible discussion.)

THE CLERK: Can we have silence from the audience, please?

MR. KHERO: It's perfectly appropriate to agendize an item on the progress of the department. I'm happy to discuss all of that. But because the business plan is specifically on the agenda -- our agenda is heavy and we are really making a concerted effort to stick to the agenda. That's our only concern. It's not that we don't want to hear this information. It really isn't.

MR. STUCKEY: I understand.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay. And -- Commissioner Knaan, did you want to --

MS. KNAAN: Yeah.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay.
MS. KNAAN: This was on the agenda before; is that correct, Mr. Stuckey? I don't remember whether this is the first time that the business plan was presented. I think it's the second time; is that correct?

MR. STUCKEY: First time.

MS. KNAAN: First time? Okay. Well, let me start by saying that all of the strategic objectives that you put on your slide and were contained in the business plan are exactly, I think, the strategic objectives that we all want to see.

The one question that I have for you is where you talk about marketing of the services and all of that, I would assume that spay and neuter falls under that. Is that the strategic objective under which spay/neuter falls?

MR. STUCKEY: Certainly.

MS. KNAAN: Okay. For me, and I believe that this concern is shared by the rest of my fellow commissioners, what I believe is that there needs to be a comprehensive department-wide business plan as opposed to six individual ones.

Now, I read all six that were presented and I think that within each one of those six are some excellent ideas that need to be implemented department-wide. Two of the plans specifically had a lot more detail and I think that's what we're looking for.

The one by Captain -- is it Roache?

MR. STUCKEY: Roache.
MS. KNAAN: Roache and Solder. Actually, go into detail about -- it answers the questions who, what, when, where, how and why. And one of the most important things that's missing here is what will be budgeted for each of the ideas. But I do believe that in order to be successful, we need a department-wide comprehensive plan.

Now, referring back to Mr. Winograd's letter, most of it is devoted to addressing the business plan.

MR. STUCKEY: Uh-huh.

MS. KNAAN: I would say probably 70 to 75 percent of his letter addresses that. While what he has done -- he has been working in larger cities, so I would beg to differ with the audience member who said that Ithaca was a smaller venue but the ones he has been working with are larger.

Whether it's large or small, I think that the same principles can be applied. I think that he had some excellent ideas there on the type of things that we are looking for in the business plan. I think that a lot of those suggestions can be culled from the six individual plans that were presented by your district managers.

Mr. Winograd, as Commissioner Riordan pointed out, said that he is more than happy to speak with you if whatever is contained in his letter doesn't give you enough detail and direction. You know, it's relatively detailed, but it's certainly not going to give you what you probably really need.
So I would suggest that you take a look at his suggestions for the business plan.

Again, I think that a lot of what he is talking about can be taken out of the six individual plans. But in order for us to be successful, we need to have a comprehensive plan. He addresses that as well in his letter. Based on his experience, he feels that also was the most successful way to go in order to really make this department top notch, which is what we all want.

So what I'd like to know from you is how long it would take you to review his letter -- you don't have to talk to him. It's totally up to you after you read what he has to say. If you think what he says is of no value, whatsoever, don't speak to him. But in order to put together a comprehensive department-wide plan, how long do you think it would take you to do that?

MR. STUCKEY: Oh, I will have to get back with staff and let me see. I don't want to make a commitment on the time off the top of my head. I don't want to do that. I'll communicate to you by the end of the week what I think that time frame is.

MS. KNAAN: Okay. I mean do you think that -- because obviously, this is probably just as important, if not more, than the marketing plan.

Do you think that we can shoot for between six to eight weeks?
MR. STUCKEY: Well, again, I don't want to commit because
I'm going to -- I've got some other issues going on. I'm gonna
be gone. So I don't want to give you that time frame right
now.

MS. KNAAN: Okay.

MR. STUCKEY: I will communicate that to you at the end of
the week after I look at the other priorities and the other
things we have going on. That way, I won't give you a date
that I know that I can't meet.

MS. KNAAN: Okay. So once we get a date from you, then
we're going to ask Mr. Pool to agendize it.

MR. STUCKEY: Uh-huh.

MS. KNAAN: Did anybody else have anything that they --
MS. RIORDAN: I did like the demographics. I thought that
was very interesting, you know, to track the demographics and
culture of an area definitely tells you what you're targeting.
I think that's a wonderful approach.

I think that my concern was seeing the division. I
want to make sure -- my concern is of uniformity in
implementation of policy and programs. So of course there is a
concern that I have with the division of shelters that we don't
lose a consistency in the policies in place. That worries me.

But --

MR. STUCKEY: I hear that, commissioner, but I think it's
an important distinction to make. One of the reasons why LA
has struggled with this issue is because it has tried to make everything uniform. It has tried to make things so that everything fits everywhere.

Your problem here is of such a magnitude that as a city, you've never gotten your arms around it. You have been dealing with these issues for years and you have made progress but what this plan talks about is if we do not look at the specific issues within the shelter communities such that we know that in west LA, maybe the market effort there is to focus more on fund raising than spay and neuter. In south LA, the focus there is spay and neuter rather than fund raising. If we do not look at what the community provides you --

It's no different than if you're selling a car. I'm not going to go to the poorest neighborhood and market the Rolls Royce.

MS. RIORDAN: I'm not talking --

MR. STUCKEY: And so within that context, this plan is driven to drive home that particular point.

MS. RIORDAN: And you know you have a good point. But here is what you are confusing here. I think you are confusing the marketing plan with the business plan. I agree with you that there will be a different marketing niche maybe in each of the different communities.

MR. KHERO: Absolutely.

MS. RIORDAN: That, I'll agree with you on. Then you can
fine tune the overall marketing plan to address whatever issues, west valley has versus south LA. But when we're talking about a business plan. That's the plan that needs to be comprehensive because otherwise, you don't have any benchmark. You don't have any ways by which you can compare success or find out what's failing.

That's the thing -- I mean, for example, Wal-Mart doesn't have a different business plan for Los Angeles than it does in Topeka, Kansas. They may do their marketing --

MR. STUCKEY: Yes, it does.

MS. RIORDAN: Their marketing -- their marketing may be different but the way that they do business, their business plan, is identical. So let's not confuse the two issues. What we're talking about now is just the business plan.

MR. STUCKEY: Okay.

MS. RIORDAN: You mentioned that you're going out of town. Do you mind telling me when you're back?

MR. STUCKEY: I'll talk to you that off line.

MS. RIORDAN: Because I -- again, I know people want to see.

MR. STUCKEY: That is a personal issue.

MS. RIORDAN: I know people want to see this slide show and for the sake of time, I nixed it and I'd like to schedule it again when you're back. Hopefully, it's a wonderful thing to see. We'll make time for it. I just want people to know
that. So I think it's great. I just wanted to move on to the actual plan.

I understand your point about different areas. You're going to have to approach different things, fund raising, marketing. But I'm talking about the policies and the laws. Because a speed limit is a speed limit regardless of where you're at regardless of the demographics.

So my concern is seeing a consistency in our ordinances, our policies and the like. And I think that in time, over time, the main complaint that I’ve heard before you were here, not -- this isn't you. This isn't individual shelters. It has been a lack of consistency in perhaps the communication of what the actual policy means, what it is.

I think our unwear program right now is an example of that, where one shelter knows to promote the T&R of the mother where others don't seem to know. I think that's the part that I'm worried about. In terms of addressing demographics, by all means, you need to do that. Absolutely.

Any other questions or comments? All right.

We'll --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And, no, we won’t be accepting any more speaker cards now.

MS. RIORDAN: I know. All right. Melanie Pozez and then after that will be Zsuza Blakely.

MS. POZEZ: Melanie Pozez, Park Avenue Foundation.
If the commissioners want to be supportive and directive, let the general manager have the floor so that he can show you what the rest of his presentation was.

How do you have the opportunity to tie people's hands behind their back? The staff has been -- this is not the first time that people have been attacked by your asking for information and time frames and the opportunities will be there if you will support and hand hold and encourage instead of being divisive and dangerously attacking.

I'm sorry. I'm emotional about it because I go into the shelters every day. The new commissioner and the -- the new commissioners were at the Best Friend's event both days. Where were you?

MS. BLAKELY: Zsuza Blakely. While I appreciate Mr. Stuckey's presentation, it's a commercial. It's a fine commercial and I do appreciate that there has been some progress. However, it is by far not enough. It does not address the core issue, which is the fact that the pound continues to kill. You can't blame it on the public. You can't -- Winograd stopped the killing by stopping the killing, cold turkey, so to speak.

Most people -- most of the real decent adopters will never set foot in a slaughter house. The people that you get at the pounds will not adopt the dogs. You must have educational programs that will get people to want the animals
in the pound. The pound needs to stop the killing and needs to get the education that — to train the people to show them what the animals are really like.

Because they go in there and they are afraid and all they want is the little baby puppies and small dogs and stuff. There is no accountability from the pounds and it does not address the killing. Killing is not a solution.

By the way, Mr. Stuckey's presentation did show what I've been telling people all along that they don't want to believe that the population keeps going down.

THE CLERK: Time.

THE SPEAKER: And that's why the killing is less because the population has gone down.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Quiet.

MS. BLAKELY: Shut up, please.

MS. RIORDAN: Excuse me. Your time is up. Laura Beth Heisen.

MS. HEISEN: Good morning. Laura Beth Heisen.

First, I want to point out that the commissioners did the proper thing. They followed The Brown Act. That is California law as far as not allowing things to be heard at a commission meeting that are not agendized. The general manager does have the opportunity to say things if it is on the agenda, but this was not. So you did follow the laws. I thank you for that.
I want to point out something about the statistics that have been -- some people have trouble getting them, but they've been floating around. I want to hand something in. Maybe it can be included in the minutes. I'll give it to Mr. Pool.

Concerning the statistics, the problem we have, even though we can talk about progress and great reductions in numbers is that there are over 10,000 animals lost from the records every year. That's 18 percent of our inventory, 18 percent of living inventory is lost from the records.

When you take away adoptions and owner redemptions and euthanasias from the number impounded, you are missing 10,000 out of the number impounded. When you count those as euthanasia, what you have is a seven percent increase in euthanasia over the past year, which I think is abominable. If you don't count them as --

THE CLERK: Time.

MS. HEISEN: -- euthanasias, you have a serious problem with record-keeping.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you. Quiet. Lisa Edmondson. After that is Teri Austin.

MS. EDMUNDSON: I'm Lisa Edmundson. I'd like to speak on behalf of the others that are impounded by the department.

Mr. Stuckey said that the shelters are a safe haven for the animals that are impounded. But I wonder whether that
is true for all of the rabbits.

He also mentioned the culture of the centers. And a quick footnote, the people that work with the south central shelter are wonderful and they’re very cooperative and kind to me. I have no problem with them at all.

But at our September 26 meeting, Mr. Stuckey told us he has an internal investigation going to see who was responsible for releasing dozens and dozens of free rabbits to fictitious rescuers and the rabbits going on to some egg farms.

Now, if we include these kinds of statistics, then the euthanasia rate looks good. I'm very concerned that we not confuse the end and the means. Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you. Teri Austin.

MS. AUSTIN: Teri Austin, The Amanda Foundation.

I just want to take a quick look at the people that are here because a lot of them I know and have known them for a long time, workers in the shelter. A lot of them I consider friends. A lot of them have my home number. For good reasons, for adoption reasons.

I, on a regular basis, see an excellent effort from the people in the shelter and that's why I want to work with them and continue to work with them. I am a little afraid that some of the people attending who don't regularly attend get a wrong impression of what's coming out of here.

I think what the workers need is the good business
plan that everybody can follow so they can -- every shelter can 
work in harmony with the other. There has been sort of a lack 
of communication sometimes. It certainly isn't the 
individual's faults at all. That's why I was interested to 
hear the business plan.

I think that's what you were getting to. I fully 
support them. The people in the shelter work hard. I see it 
on a daily basis. I think they could use some more cohesive 
help from -- now Figueroa Street. I was going to say Spring 
Street.

THE CLERK: Time.

MS. AUSTIN: That's it. Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you. Scott Sorrentino.

MR. SORRENTINO: Scott Sorrentino, Rescue Human Alliance.

Obviously, there is a little lack of cooperation and 
part of that is misinformation and part of it is just lack of 
communication. The Rescue and Humane Alliance has been a 
leader in trying to get communication to a better place since 
it was founded. I just don't see it. I don't see the 
communication.

Because of that, a lot of rescuers are starting to 
turn to the county of Los Angeles instead of working with the 
city. Part of that is because it is so much easier. If you 
ask them, I think to a -- almost to a one, they would agree 
that it is easier to work with the county than the city.
So it's not necessarily about the amount of animals that are killed in terms of whether the rescuers want to work with LAAS. Because as we know, the county kills more animals than the city does. What we need is to be working together more cooperatively. That has just not happened. It certainly wasn't for lack of effort by the rescue community.

THE CLERK: Time.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you.

MR. SORRENTINO: Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: All right. That concludes public comment.

I want to make a comment because of the tone in here and I want to just say that there is a lot of people in here that I speak very highly of. I'm very proud of our staff and I think our staff is excellent. I think the staff that I know that I communicate with, there is a lot of people in here that I hear groaning that have never met a commissioner, that have never talked. A gag order has been lifted. You may come and talk to us, get to know us.

Know that we do care. We are not here biting. We are here trying to make business happen. We are trying to abide by The Brown Act, move a meeting through. That's what we're doing. This is not an attack on you. This is following protocol and procedure.

But get to know us. We do care and we do support you. On that note, we can go to --
MR. KHERO: Before we get to the next item, can I quickly go back to the first item?

MS. RIORDAN: Sure.

MR. KHERO: I believe that -- my mistake, one of the things we were talking about was shoring this up, the marketing plan. I kind of left it dangling. What I'd like to do if possible is set a date certain. We can bring it back. I know we discussed that November is a difficult month for both of us. I don't know if 60 days is enough and I know that you might not be able to commit to a date certain. But I'd like to do that.

I'd also like maybe to in between that next date certain, meet with you or meet with members of your staff, maybe with another commission member, a sub-committee as it were, and talk about the details so that the next time it comes around, everyone's on the same page.

MR. STUCKEY: Sure.

MR. KHERO: It was my mistake for not finishing our discussion like that. Hopefully, we can do that. So I'm not sure if you're comfortable setting a date certain today or not. If not, we can discuss -- I'm talking about being back in the commission.

MR. STUCKEY: Uh-huh.

MR. KHERO: We need two dates, bringing it back and a date that we can meet prior to bringing it back.
MR. STUCKEY: Well, I think what may be helpful is to have a -- sorry -- smaller group to meet with a senior staff and talk about this.

MR. KHERO: I think so, too.

MR. STUCKEY: Well, let's do both things. My suggestion would be the marketing plan and the business plan because they are related.

I think part of the problem here is that we have maybe two different philosophies or two different views, but that doesn't mean the goals shouldn't be the same.

MR. KHERO: I agree.

MR. STUCKEY: So what we have to get past here is to get this public perception about this division so this is an opportunity to now lessen the schism. It's not that the department doesn't agree with many of the issues that are being brought forth. I think sometimes it's just -- as my grandfather would say, how the message is delivered.

So I think if we use the sub-committee process like congress, like council, it will help us to have discussions outside of the public view where we can maybe be a little more candid, a little more open and a little more specific about how we want to proceed. So I think we'll -- I'll have Erica to schedule that quickly. We can see what commission members -- you're right, it can only be two, to see how we can improve this so that when we come back, it is a unified plan. I think
that's what I'm trying to drive at now.

I got to be candid with you. I'm just going to go ahead and say this. We all have to take responsibility for what has gone on in the last year. That's all I can speak to is the last 12 months. Something happened. I don't know what it was. But something happened to cause this divide between us. I don't know why. I can't put my finger on it. I just -- I don't know what that was.

But when we had that meeting, commissioner, that's the first thing we have to talk about. Why is there this perception that hypothetically, the commission feels that Guerdon is incompetent or doesn't know what he's doing. I'm just saying that hypothetically. Because if we don't talk about that, then we got to talk about either that's true or not true, why or why not.

That's the primary issue before we move to the business plan and to the marketing plan. Because if there is no trust between us, if there is no open communication, if we're not being candid, then we are just wasting each other's time. We can be candid about some of the department's feelings about the commission. I think someone talked about that as well. That's why I am articulating to this body where we need to start.

MR. KHERO: I couldn't agree with you more. I think that as we forge our way into these issues, more importantly, we
open channels of communication.

MR. STUCKEY: Uh-huh.

MR. KHERO: That's a foundation for a working relationship. I think for example, what happened today, it just continues this -- the miscommunication and the misperceptions continue. I think our objectives are really right on and how we get there is where we have our differences. But that can be worked out.

MR. STUCKEY: Correct.

MR. KHERO: The last thing I want to come away with is more dysfunction. It really serves no one's purpose.

MR. STUCKEY: Exactly.

MR. KHERO: It makes the city look bad. It makes all of us look bad. We care deeply about the department, its employees and its objectives. I think we want to reach this goal together. I do.

MR. STUCKEY: I think that's a shared vision. I mean I work with these folks every day. They are some of the best group of people I've ever worked with in my career. I was going to talk about some of that in my remarks. But we have got to get past this perception issue and some of the things that we are struggling with as a group. You know, I talked about teamwork as a core value. So we have to make that a core value for the general manager and the commission as well. Those values would apply to us.
The one thing, if I had to back this truck all the way up to 12 months ago, I would say the strategic mistake that we made was not sitting down as a group and deciding what's important, what's priority, how are we going to get there and what resources it requires to do that. Because what we do now is an issue comes up and we address it. Not necessarily to link this to something. It's sort of the flavor of the day. So with this sort of unified effort of doing this together, we can move past all of that.

I mean, we do not want to present to this community that there is a division between us. It just doesn't serve any purpose. Whether there is or not, that's what I hear a lot in the world. You all hear it, too.

It's funny how this turned out today. We are now beginning to make lemonade out of lemons. I think that's the goal here and that's what I'm trying to put on the table is to extend this olive branch for what you just articulated to how can we improve this relationship so that we can make a unified front in presenting to this community how we are going to address this issue.

MS. RIORDAN: I agree.

MS. BRUNSON: I think this is lovely. Maybe we could start with a date for the marketing plan.

MR. STUCKEY: Well, again we're too soon, commissioner. We need to do the first thing first.
MS. RIORDAN: I think this is something we should address and -- I don't know if it's an agenda item or a closed session or what. You know, there is definitely --

MR. STUCKEY: Maybe coffee at my house.

MR. KHERO: Yeah, I think so.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. RIORDAN: I mean, when I see people here that I've considered family, when I look at Wendel and David and I see family and I see total strangers growling at us, my question is what's communicated to them? So we need to communicate, but I need to know what's also communicated to them. I think that there is more happening here than I'm aware of.

I think this isn't necessarily the item for us to discuss it in. That's why I say is this a closed session. But I for one do take offense by it and I'm deeply hurt. I think that the gag order now lifted should allow people not to be -- we don't -- we want to know you. We want to know what's going on. We want to know what your issues are. That's what we're here for. We represent the department. We want to be able to accurately represent not only the needs of the community but the needs -- you know, what's the staff encountering? How can we help? So I think it extends beyond us to them.

So, you know, you and I will discuss how we can make that an item, how we go about that. Do we -- you said Christmas parties. Do I have to start having Christmas parties
again? I don't know. So anyway, we'll move on.

MR. KHERO: Let's commit to that and move on.

MS. RIORDAN: Move on, yeah, because we've got to get going.

MR. KHERO: Adhere to the agenda.

MS. RIORDAN: We are on to Sam Simon. But thank you, Gordon.

MR. STUCKEY: Uh-huh, sure.

THE CLERK: Next item is Item C, an update on the Sam Simon contract.

MR. BRILL: Good morning. From the last board meeting, you all wanted some -- e-mailed me some questions you wanted answered. There is 19 questions that were e-mailed to me and you wanted some additional information. That has been provided to you. If there are any other additional questions?

MS. RIORDAN: Yeah, actually. First of all, Number Ten and Number 11 of Ms. Brunson's questions. While personally, I don't really care who the evaluators are and it is public information and that can be known. We can probably have the city attorney confirm that. But I think our main question first of all was what was the end --

MS. BRUNSON: Why can't we go down the list of the questions?

MS. RIORDAN: Would you like to go through the list of the questions?
MS. BRUNSON: Absolutely.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay. All right. Well, I don't want to spend too much time on each question. I don't want to get in a debate, but we can go ahead and -- we're doing this because we got this Sunday night so we have not had an opportunity to review the questions. If we get beyond, let's say ten -- give it like half an hour, then we'll need to move on to another. This is because we got it last minute.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. RIORDAN: Excuse me. You can fill out a card. All right.

Yes, it has to do with the vans. So Ms. Brunson, did you want to ask? You wanted me to go ahead? I'll go ahead. I don't have the one, two, three in front of me that's why I'm going --

MS. BRUNSON: I'll give you one --

MS. RIORDAN: All right. You give me Number One. I have my list of questions, but -- let me just start it the way I was going to do it.

First of all, I wanted to know, my understanding -- this has to do with the contract. This has to do with the van, the bid, the whole picture. What we have been trying to get for the last three months has been a synopsis of the evaluations, which we have not been provided, which have disappeared. Then, the questions asked, who did the evaluators
pick? What was the tally of what the evaluations did?

Now, you did not feel comfortable apparently answering that question. So I'm going to turn to our city attorney right now to get verification that that can actually be public information. Not which evaluator picked what, not tying the evaluation. But we want to know what the outcome of the evaluation. What was the grading of the evaluation? Who did they pick?

MR. BRILL: Those have been provided. I mean those are the four evaluation sheets that were provided to you minus who the evaluators were.

MS. RIORDAN: I did not get the evaluations. So you can just answer here.

MR. BRILL: There is four evaluators. Okay. The four evaluators have the same criteria to evaluate the proposals by. I’m sorry -- the submittals of the proposals. There was -- I’m sorry. There are five evaluators --

MS. BRUNSON: Wasn’t there five evaluators?

MR. BRILL: Excuse me. Yes. I was going to correct myself. There were five evaluators. Four of the evaluations have been located. The fifth one -- what I explained, it was not located --

MS. BRUNSON: Which one was not located?

MR. BRILL: I cannot say at this time unless the city attorney asks me.
MS. BRUNSON: Well, the evaluators were --

MR. BRILL: There is four evaluation --

MS. BRUNSON: I would like to know who they are.

MR. BRILL: There were four evaluations -- yes, I do know who all five of the evaluators are.

MS. BRUNSON: You don't know which one is missing?

MR. BRILL: I do know.

MS. BRUNSON: Then why can't you tell us? I will tell you who the evaluators were.

MR. BRILL: I cannot do that in public session.

MS. RIORDAN: Mr. Lesel?

MR. LESEL: The evaluations are public record and I believe that four out of the five have been presented to the board, albeit, perhaps late.

Mr. Brill, could give you the names of the five evaluators but I have instructed the department not to tie any one of the evaluations with the name of the evaluator. So unfortunately, if he gives you the name of the evaluator whose sheet is missing, that would give you a better idea of tying the others together. So one of them is missing.

MS. BRUNSON: (Inaudible.)

MR. LESEL: He can give you a list of the five people who were on the evaluation committee, however.

MS. ATAKE: But we cannot tell who wrote these four?

MR. LESEL: Right. What we tend to do in the city is
redact the individual names of the evaluators to their
evaluations so that when people make their evaluations, they
are seen as a committee and that there is no chilling effect on
any of them for filling out their forms so that they know that
when that form becomes public, their name is not attached to
this.

MS. ATAKE: At least, do we know the background of the
evaluators?

MS. BRUNSON: Yeah, one was the vet --

MR. LESEL: Yes, if you want to give them the names.

MS. BRUNSON: One is Dave Diliberto --

MS. RIORDAN: Excuse me, Erica.

MR. BRILL: The five names are Commander Diliberto, Dr.
Smith, Mr. Stuckey. The fourth one is Brenda Van Den Bosch,
who is part of the staff on -- with the Animal Services, who
had been tied in with the spay and neuters in the vans for many
years.

MS. RIORDAN: Uh-huh.

MR. BRILL: The fifth one was the general manager of the
zoo department. I don't have his name. I can pull his name
out from the records, but he is the fifth evaluator.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay.

MR. BRILL: Okay. So all five have qualifications.

MS. BRUNSON: And the one missing is Brenda Van Den Bosch,
I guarantee you.
MR. BRILL: Excuse me. I think the city attorney has addressed that and said we are not allowed to divulge that information.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you. So --

MR. STUCKEY: Maybe -- I just need to correct Jeff. I did not do one of the physical evaluations. It was Ross Pool.

MR. BRILL: Ross Pool.

MS. BRUNSON: Ross Pool. We know that, too.

MR. BRILL: Okay.

MS. RIORDAN: I think rather than doing a questioning and a jousting here to get to the answer. I'm going to say that I know that the outcome of the evaluators was that Ms. Austin scored higher than Sam Simon. So my question is at this point, why was that, one, not communicated in the department report and, two, what was it that made you decide to go with Sam Simon over the competitor?

MR. STUCKEY: Well, you look at it --

MS. RIORDAN: You have the right to overrule. So let me preface it with that.

MR. STUCKEY: Well, one, I didn't overrule anyone. Let me be clear about that. And so you can understand the process.

MS. RIORDAN: Uh-huh.

MR. STUCKEY: I had no contact with any of the individuals that provided the RFP's by design.

MS. RIORDAN: Uh-huh.
MR. STUCKEY: I wanted to make absolutely certain under this environment that we were under the pay-per-play thing that we would not have any issues with that.

Second, none of the evaluators met or discussed their evaluations. That never occurred. All of them did their evaluations independent of each other. Three, there was no meeting of the group of evaluators at any time to provide me any information as a group --

MS. RIORDAN: We're not even questioning that.

MR. STUCKEY: I understand, but I'm just going through the process.

MS. BRUNSON: That's not the question.

MS. RIORDAN: Correct.

MR. STUCKEY: So that you can understand what happened, because your question to me was how did I get to my answer?

MS. RIORDAN: Well, my understanding is that there's a synopsis. You look at the synopsis --

MR. STUCKEY: The synopsis, commissioner, is the form that you have. That's the synopsis. There is no other information that I have received from anyone other than the evaluation rating sheet, okay? So in looking at it, I'm looking at three things, the evaluation report --

MS. RIORDAN: Uh-huh.

MR. STUCKEY: -- the fee, the cost and the number of surgeries. Now, what you want to communicate to the public is
that the Amanda Foundation in their hour fee, indicated they
would provide a cost of $85 per dog and cat for their
sterilizations. The Sam Simon Foundation indicated their cost
would be $80 per dog and $60 per cat. That in and of itself is
a significant distinction because my primary responsibility to
this community is to get the best bang for the buck.

So it would be irresponsible on my part to say, okay,
gosh, because of these other issues and we have a higher cost,
let's get this RFP to the person now that has submitted the
highest price born.

MS. BRUNSON: Excuse me. According to my tabulation, you
lost $1,170,000 on the table over a three year period for the
disadvantaged, the homeless animals in the city of Los Angeles,
for south central for the poor communities, $1,170,000.

MR. STUCKEY: Thank you for your feedback.

MS. BRUNSON: If you want to know how I arrive at this
figure, I can tell you that $510,000 came from my organization
and 660 over the three year period from Sam Simon. That makes
$1,170,000 that the city is out in services.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay. We're at --

MR. STUCKEY: Do you want me to continue?

MS. RIORDAN: With this point onto the --

MS. BRUNSON: We should go by the questions that were
asked to Mr. Brill.

MR. STUCKEY: Well, I didn't get to finish the answer to
your question.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you.

MR. STUCKEY: So you have the scores. You have the price point. And the third distinction is the number of sterilizations that you are going to provide to the community.

So Sam Simon Foundation indicated that they would do at a minimum 7,000. The Amanda Foundation RFP, the minimum was 6,000.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay. So --

MR. STUCKEY: So you have -- So you have your score, which is the information provided on the evaluation sheet. You have your price point issue and you have your number of sterilizations.

When you factor those three things together, the Sam Simon Foundation was my recommendation for --

MS. RIORDAN: So while The Amanda Foundation --

MS. BRUNSON: Excuse me. Was there any -- was there any research done on 7,000 sterilizations with one mobile hospital?

MR. STUCKEY: That was not --

MS. BRUNSON: They could have said 15,000 and you could have agreed.

MR. STUCKEY: That was not part -- commissioner, my responsibility was to take the information that they provided and to make a decision.

MS. BRUNSON: They could have said 15,000. You could have
accepted it also. If there was no research done, if 7,000 are possible, obviously 7,000 are not possible because they did half that number in the first month.

MR. STUCKEY: Madam president?

MS. RIORDAN: Okay. I want to ask my -- we do need to move to that end, and then also like I said for the sake of time if we have to revisit it, we will. But I hope to be done with it when we revisit it.

The question I had mostly was Ms. Austin, The Amanda Foundation, was scored higher in the evaluations. Why was that not disclosed to the commission at the time when the department made their report?

MR. STUCKEY: Well, there was no -- I would have conveyed all three. I mean -- the score was the score.

Look at the criteria, commissioner. If you look at the numbers, they are all very close. It's not like the Sam Simon Foundation got 35 and The Amanda Foundation scored 90. They were all very close. So the issue comes to the responsible bid. That's the issue. It's not just the score. Because one of the --

MS. RIORDAN: Isn’t that --

MR. STUCKEY: Let me finish, please.

One of the issues within the evaluation mechanism was what prior relationship or something to that effect. If you remove that, that one factor, the scores are almost the same.
MS. RIORDAN: Okay.

MR. STUCKEY: So you can look at the scores and see that there is not a lot of difference between the two in terms of how they were perceived by the evaluators. The difference is in the price point.

MS. RIORDAN: And in the numbers.

MR. STUCKEY: And in the number of sterilizations. That is -- those are two critical factors because --

MS. RIORDAN: I hear you.

MR. STUCKEY: -- my responsibility --

MS. BRUNSON: Excuse me. There is --

MR. STUCKEY: Let me finish, commissioner.

MS. BRUNSON: -- a much bigger difference --

MR. STUCKEY: Let me finish, please.

MS. RIORDAN: Please.

MR. STUCKEY: Because my responsibility is to get the lowest responsible bid that provides the best service at the lowest price point.

MS. RIORDAN: Now, when we were making the RFP up, there was debate of taking 5,000, going down to 3,500 and going up to 4,500. So there seemed to be an acknowledgment by the department of the difficulty in meeting a certain quota with one van.

I had done my research to see what vans out there in the United States had actually done 7,000 surgeries because I
can promise pie in the sky, but you want to see if that's at all possible. You need to do a little homework to see if that's possible. So the only van out there that did 7,000 surgeries was one van in Connecticut. They did 7,600 a year. They did only cats and they did six days a week, seven days a week, six days, so they alternated. Other than that, it was normally at 5,000.

So now given that, it was a close tie as you were saying. The evaluator Austin won but then you took other things into evaluation as it became close, which leads to the second question now. The second question being if it was that close, I would think that the person that added whatever to sweeten the deal, to get that little edge, you would hold them to the things that they promised.

One of the things they promised, while not required -- an RFP can include whatever is offered. It just can't go less. So when it's offered at two-for-one, eight days a week, whatever, why was that not included? Because at this point, looking at just the last two months, I don’t think we’re going to -- it doesn't appear like we are going to make that 7,000 quota. So --

MR. STUCKEY: Well -- I’m sorry. Let me let you finish.

Well, Commissioner, you asked me to do multiple things here that are not my responsibility. It's not my responsibility to anticipate what may or may not happen. My
responsibility is to look at the RFP and ask the question, is it responsible? Does it meet the scope of the RFQ? If it meets that, we evaluate it. We make a recommendation and we make a decision.

MS. BRUNSON: Excuse me. Sam Simon offered to run two clinics. You and I met at the Bel Air Hotel and had lunch and talked about it for one hour that they cannot do it without running two vans. Sam Simon ran three days with their van for free. That was free services. By giving the contract to Sam Simon, you are virtually saying never mind the three free days. We don't want them. Just run one more day, four days and we'll pay you up to $500,000.

MR. STUCKEY: Let me go back to your question. So the issue again was the number of sterilizations, the calls and the evaluation. That was my responsibility.

MS. RIORDAN: What was not -- I hear your answer. What I'm mostly concerned about is in the report at the day of the meeting, this information was not disclosed and I think the commission -- it should have been disclosed. We were only given that, yeah, you picked Sam Simon, but I think we should have been also given who the evaluators, what the sum total with the evaluations. I think there was additional information that should have been disclosed.

That's what I -- now, I realize pay-for-play and all of the evolving ethical rules in the year has everyone cautious
and what can I say and what can I not say. But it does seem
that some information was withheld that I'm saying I think we
should have been told. I think we should have been told.

MR. STUCKEY: Well, I --

MS. RIORDAN: And add to that, the question is if it was
so close, you've got an offer that added a little bit extra, a
two-for-one, eight days a week. That was a deal sweetener. I
would think that when it's that close, you are going to
definitely make sure you are going to take that little extra
that they offered because that was the point. That's why they
won. So why weren't they held to that in your contract?

MS. BRUNSON: That is exactly the question.

MR. STUCKEY: They won, not because of a deal sweetener.

They one --

MS. RIORDAN: They offered 7,000 --

MR. STUCKEY: But that wasn't --

MS. RIORDAN: -- and you said that was what led you to the
decision.

MR. STUCKEY: That wasn't the deal sweetener,
commissioner. It was part of the proposal. That wasn't a deal
sweetener.

MS. RIORDAN: That's the thing --

MS. BRUNSON: They proposed two vans and 7,000 and you let
them get away with four days and one van.

MR. STUCKEY: And so, but again --
MS. RIORDAN: I'm calling it deal sweetener, but what I'm saying is you picked them because of 7,000 surgeries.

MR. STUCKEY: No. I picked them because of the 7,000 surgeries and the lowest price point. We keep losing the money component here.

MS. BRUNSON: The money is $1,170,000 that you left on the table, I wouldn't talk about the $5 difference.

MR. STUCKEY: All right. Well, you have three issues and I'm going to keep going back to that because that was my responsibility, to analyze the evaluation, the price and the number of sterilizations. There were no other issues.

MS. BRUNSON: Yes. It was your responsibility. Sam Simon offered two vans and to run the two vans and do 7,000 surgeries. That was their offer to the city. The city did not take them up on that offer and left $1,170,000 on the table for services for poor people in disadvantaged districts that really need it. And the council is upset about that as well.

MS. RIORDAN: What I'm --

MS. BRUNSON: We're not that rich that we can -- your whole budget is 12 million or 14 million. You can't leave $1,170,000 just like that. We don't care about it.

MS. RIORDAN: This is in no way -- this is nothing against Sam Simon, mind you. I'm -- I'm dealing --

MS. BRUNSON: It has nothing to do with Sam Simon, awarding the contract to Sam Simon. It's perfectly fine. The
screw-up of not holding them to what they offered. They offered that. That's not fine.

MS. RIORDAN: Right. Those were the two issues, you know, holding them to what they offered. The other one is various issues that I have which I'll be asking on what I felt was lack of disclosure that I feel that that should have been disclosed.

I have the department report and the department report talks about we tallied the evaluations and yet the department chose this. But there was never -- I think we should have known who the evaluators picked. I think we should have been pointed out, this is who they picked. This is who scored the highest. This is why we are taking this instead. You're explaining it now. So, good.

MR. STUCKEY: So do we want to go through your questions and have Mr. Brill answer those? Maybe that will be helpful.

MS. BRUNSON: Yes, absolutely. You have the questions so just go down the line.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you.

MR. BRILL: Are there any questions in regards to specific questions? Or do you want me to go down the whole line of all 19 questions?

MS. BRUNSON: Go down the line and as we have questions, we'll ask them.

MS. RIORDAN: Go ahead. Go ahead.

MS. KNAAN: We had asked for it today, I didn't see it in
my book and maybe I just missed it, what Sam Simon had done for
the month of October.

MR. BRILL: We have not received the month of October yet.

MS. KNAAN: Weren't they going to deliver that on Friday?

MR. LESEL: It was not delivered and when we left this
morning, it still hadn't been delivered.

MS. BRUNSON: I wonder why.

MS. RIORDAN: Well, we're in November 14th and they are to
deliver monthly reports.

MR. LESEL: By the 10th.

MS. BRUNSON: It's the middle of November last time I
looked.

MR. LESEL: We called them several times on Friday and
they were called again this morning. They indicated they would
have them to us today. But when we left at 8:00 o'clock --

MR. BRILL: When we get those figures in, we'll e-mail
them to you.

MS. RIORDAN: What's the quarterly report --

MS. BRUNSON: We needed them today, not by e-mail
tomorrow.

MR. BRILL: The quarterly report is three months. So
after -- probably within the fourth month of the contract is
when the quarterly report is due.

MS. RIORDAN: All right. One thing I would love to see in
the quarterly report, which you'll have to compile of course,
is the number of dogs and cats. I'd like to see a division of
large dogs and small dogs, too. So if that's --

MR. BRILL: We will go back and ask them for that.

Normally, they are divided. We get the intake and the --

MS. BRUNSON: I am sorry -- they are on the intake sheet.

Every animal has an intake sheet. I can show you one if you'd
like to have one that stipulates the weight of the animal, the
sex, the size, the breed, everything.

MS. RIORDAN: Now, while the intake sheet, I realize is --

MR. BRILL: Let me finish. When we get the invoices, we
get them all in one-lump piles. We have to have time to
separate them out and then verify everything that everything is
done.

MS. BRUNSON: You can ask Sam Simon to separate them out.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay. Erica. Let -- I’m going --
definitely you asked some questions. Let's let Mr. Brill --

MR. BRILL: Thank you. What we can do then is we can
separate them out that way as well. Currently, what we are
doing was we’re separating them between male/female cats and
male/female dogs for purposes in regards to verification for
invoices.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay.

MR. BRILL: We can take it one step further and we can
separate them out large and small dogs.

MS. RIORDAN: Correct.
MR. BRILL: Okay.

MS. KNAAN: The reason we need to do that is because it's much harder -- we've had a problem with SNAP in the past. The allegation was that they were turning away or discouraging large dog spay/neuters --

MR. BRILL: Correct. I --

MS. KNAAN: -- because they cost more money --

MS. BRUNSON: They take more time.

MR. BRILL: I asked about the history -- I asked about the history before. I know some of the history. We'll make sure that's included in the next batch if you'd like.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay. I'd like to see that. Thank you.

MS. KNAAN: Okay. Do us a favor. Press them because they were supposed to have done it by the 10th. Now, they clearly have a problem. They only did 312 last month, as you know. They are supposed to do an average of 583 in order to meet these 7,000. So please ask them today to send you those reports. I don't know whether they're --

MR. BRILL: Just so you know, we have been asking for them since last week because we knew this was coming up.

MS. KNAAN: It's not your fault.

MR. BRILL: Through the end of last week and even this morning, we actually placed a call to them again for them as well. So as soon as we get them, we'll know. Remember, September was -- I'm not justifying the 312 or -- actually it
might be more than 312.

MS. RIORDAN: It's 312.

MR. BRILL: But it is -- it was a shortened month so you do have to take that into consideration. We have now one full month of service. We'll track it and we'll keep on tracking and monitoring it.

MS. BRUNSON: They will be compared to the Amanda Foundation who did at least almost twice as much, right?

MS. RIORDAN: Go ahead.

MR. BRILL: I don't have those. I don't have the Amanda figures in front of me. I'm sorry.

MS. BRUNSON: I do.

MS. RIORDAN: All right.

MS. BRUNSON: And I think you should have them since you're paying for it.

MS. RIORDAN: All right. Let's continue with the --

MR. BRILL: Do you want go through the first -- if you want --

MS. RIORDAN: Yeah, if we can go quickly through them.

MR. BRILL: Okay. The first -- basically, the first four questions, so we don't have to -- they all have to do with legality of who can -- is the city attorney involved in writing the contract? Are they involved in reviewing the RFP's and that types of issues. Those are the first four questions.

Normally in the city departments you don't need --
for a city department, especially if there is one contract or if there is a contract that sits in the past and it's been used or it's a fairly good contract, staff will take the contract and rewrite the contract based on whatever the scope of work it is. The basic contract of the city is a lot of boilerplate and then what's inputted in is whatever the scope of work which is needed for that specific project.

Then that contract or that proposal is then submitted to the city attorney for review. The city attorney -- Deborah will correct me if I'm wrong -- will review it for legality and for form. Okay.

MS. BRUNSON: How can the city attorney review anything if he does not have the RFP or the response to the RFP?

MR. BRILL: City attorney saw the RFP before it went out. The city attorney did not see the RFP after the fact.

MS. BRUNSON: You mean the response? Obviously --

MR. BRILL: The response. Actually, that's right. The submittal, correct.

MS. RIORDAN: Yes. All right.

MR. BRILL: So that's -- so any -- any --

MS. BRUNSON: So still my question is how can the city attorney review anything if he doesn't have the information?

MR. BRILL: And I've answered that question. When the city attorney reviewed the RFP prior to it going out on the street, prior staff did not submit the submittal to the city
attorney for review.

    MS. BRUNSON: Yeah, my question is still how can the city attorney review a contract with a vendor if he does not have the response -- what the vendor offers?

    MR. BRILL: That is -- whoever --

    MS. BRUNSON: Can only review the legality but not what is in it.

    MR. BRILL: It is -- it is the -- go ahead.

    MR. LESEL: Since I was the city attorney that did the review -- what I did was I reviewed the contract that was submitted to me by staff. I was familiar -- all too familiar with the RFP. I compared what staff had put into the contract with the directions given and the authorizations for the contract by this board and by the city council.

That's the standard that we use, not what's in the proposal. That's something for staff to analyze when they negotiate the contract. But then once they move it forward to the authorizing authorities, what our office looks at is the contract in keeping with the authorization and the material upon which the contract was authorized.

    In this case, it was because the only thing -- the only material thing in the authorizations, both by the board and by the city council, was that there be a minimum of 7,000 surgeries at a cost of $60 per cat, $80 per dog. In fact, the contract did reflect that.
MS. BRUNSON: So it goes back again to the department.

MS. RIORDAN: Well, the board was not aware of all that was offered. The board was just given a report on who they picked. The board never saw the contractor's bid until well after the contract was signed.

MR. LESEL: So I understand. Yes.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay.

MS. BRUNSON: I'm sure the same is true of city council.

MR. LESEL: Yes.

MS. RIORDAN: Yes, that's -- that is the case actually. I think in the future when we address this, I think -- you know, we are looking at what was done wrong. I think what we can do is also see how can we improve this for the future. So probably best to check with the city attorney to ensure that we can disclose this information to the commission. I think that the most that you can disclose, you should disclose.

I think there was a lot we weren't privy to and that is why we're taking issue here. We're trying to get the most bang for our buck, too. We see that there is extra -- so now --

MS. BRUNSON: Let's go to Question Five.

MS. RIORDAN: Very quickly, go.

MR. BRILL: Okay. Number Five is on what basis was the 7,000 surgeries based on? And reviewing the submittal that was submitted by the Sam Simon Foundation, I did the quick
calculations on what they had put into theirs. That's how I figured out how they came up with the 7,000.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay.

MS. BRUNSON: Excuse me. I have some questions.

If there are 30,000 spay and neuter hospitals running in the U.S. approximately. I assume that none of their numbers were reviewed. Did you review your previous vendor and see that -- that ran your spay and neuter van for three years, did you see what the maximum surgeries were that they did in those three years? You had to only go to your --

MR. BRILL: Excuse me, Commissioner. What I was asked to do from this board was to answer the 19 questions based on the contract and the RFP that the department has. This is the answers to the questions that was part of that proposal and the submittals that were given to the department. Plain and simple.

MS. BRUNSON: Excuse me. I think the question --

MS. RIORDAN: Erica --

MS. BRUNSON: I think the question is on what basis was the number of 7,000 surgeries --

MR. BRILL: Commissioner Brunson, I have answered that question.

In the --

MS. BRUNSON: On what basis?

MR. BRILL: In the submittal, in the Sam Simon submittal,
they submitted that 25 to 30 spay and neuters per day could be done at five days a week with one of those days being double intake. If you take that off the submittal that they did for contract, it equals out between 6,500 and 7,760 spay and neuters they could do through the year. That's in the submittal. That's how they came up with the 7,000 number.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay.

MS. BRUNSON: Question Six.

MR. BRILL: What research had been done? Research by whom? The city? City staff doesn't do the research.

MS. BRUNSON: If you accept 7,000 spay and neuters, you have to base it on something. Your previous vendor who ran three years never exceeded 3,600. So what are you basing the 7,000 on?

MR. BRILL: That may be true. In the RFP that was put out, they were -- the RFP was put out to 4,000 to 4,500 per year. Both proposals came back with Sam Simon doing a maximum of 7,000 based on the calculations that were answered in Number Five.

MS. BRUNSON: That's not the question. What research has been done was the question.

MR. BRILL: Research was done by the prior staff in putting out the proposal was to ask for a minimum of 4,000 to a maximum of 4,500 based on the previous contracts of this RFP going out.
MS. BRUNSON: The previous contractor, the maximum he did on a yearly basis was 3,600.

MS. RIORDAN: All right. All right.

MR. BRILL: I cannot speak for prior staff. But prior staff based that and then came up with the 4,000 --

MS. BRUNSON: Prior staff is sitting right here.

MS. RIORDAN: Let's tone this down.

MS. BRUNSON: So no research was done?

MS. RIORDAN: This is the research they did and this is why you picked -- this is what they said they do. This is why you picked it. I think that kind of addresses Number Seven.

If we could move to Number Eight now.

MR. BRILL: Thank you. What was the highest number of surgeries Rachel Popp and her staff ever achieved? I think approximately 3,500 were done. Okay.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay. All right. Thank you. Number Nine.

MS. BRUNSON: So then you assume 7,000 can be done if the highest was 3,500 in your previous experience?

MS. RIORDAN: That's what they're saying. Number Nine.

MS. BRUNSON: Okay.

MR. BRILL: What is the loss to the city of three days of free spay and neuter in dollar amounts?

The city only pays based off of the intakes. And not based off of what spay and neuter is done by private entities, if there is no invoices that are submitted or no intakes are
submitted, how could the city lose dollars?

MS. RIORDAN: I think it’s more --

MS. BRUNSON: That's not the question.

MR. BRILL: That's what the question --

MS. BRUNSON: That is not at all the question. What is the loss to the city of three days of free spay and neuter in dollar amounts?

MS. RIORDAN: What does that add up to?

MS. KNAAN: What she is asking, Mr. Brill, and again, this is really unfair to you, just like the last time when you had to answer the questions on licensing because you weren't even here when the RFP went out, when the contract was signed. You had nothing to do with this. So unfortunately, you are put in a position of having to answer questions that you can't.

MR. BRILL: That's why -- given that question, what we can do is we can do the three days. I mean, down the road I can come back with a three-day calculation if you'd like.

MS. BRUNSON: I can tell you exactly what it is. It's $660,000 over a three-year period. That's the loss to the city.

MS. KNAAN: Erica -- I think what she's asking is the fact that it was not taken from the proposal, the offer to run the van for three days for free. The fact that that wasn't taken into consideration, how much has that loss of three days caused the city?
MR. BRILL: Again, I can go back and we can calculate it and provide it to you via e-mail.

MS. BRUNSON: You don't have to. We know the answer.

MR. BRILL: I'd like to verify the numbers based on the calculations. Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: Right. Now, we have already touched on a number of the questions here already. I am looking at the questions now and I see we can move down to Number 15.

MS. BRUNSON: No, we can't.

MS. RIORDAN: Erica, we already discussed these back and forth. The other ones have been discussed in the beginning.

MR. BRILL: And I think --

MS. RIORDAN: We're not going to come to resolution. We are getting answers. Whether we agree with the answers, whether we like the answers, that we can't change at this time. We're getting the answers.

MS. BRUNSON: Okay.

MS. RIORDAN: We will take that all into consideration.

MR. BRILL: I think Number 15 has been answered as well by Mr. Stuckey in regards to that. That was what we referred to as part of that deal.

MS. RIORDAN: Yo' Dawg posters?

MR. BRILL: That was Number -- you're on Number 16, correct?

MS. RIORDAN: Yeah.
MS. BRUNSON: No, no. What about 15?

MS. RIORDAN: He said that he believes Guerden answered that.

We can review --

MS. BRUNSON: What was the answer?

MR. BRILL: Okay. I can answer that. It's actually outreach and promotions. Okay. It's not part of the RFP that was signed. It's not part of the signed contract.

The extra outreach and promotional offers on Sam Simon's submittal and on their discretion as benefits and -- (inaudible) -- to the departments if they were awarded the contract. It has nothing to do with the signed contract or with the submittal.


MS. KNAAN: What the city's upset about is the fact that the things that were offered in the proposal didn't make their way into the contract. Because, as you know, once something is not incorporated into a contract and is not part of the signed contract, it's lost forever. We can't hold them to anything. That's, I think, what she's asking.

MR. BRILL: You're absolutely correct. And again, you refer it back to, yes, I wasn't here prior.

In reviewing the contracts, I have reviewed contracts and I have put together a contract for the city for many years. So in reviewing the contract, maybe as a non-biased -- not
being here for that long of a time, I looked at the substance
of the RFP and of the contract that was submitted -- actually
on both of proposals that were submitted, okay?

What I saw in the documents was that this specific
question, although it was submitted with the RFP as part of the
RFP, was added as a benefit and an extra and not part of the
proposal.

MS. BRUNSON: Why not?

MR. BRILL: Not part of the proposal -- not incorporated
because -- it was not specific towards that part of the
contract. It was added more to the contract, if they were to
get the contract, we have the discretion of doing this.

MS. KNAAN: But we have the obligation to do it. I think
that's again what they are saying --

MR. BRILL: Huh-uh. We don't have the obligation. It's
part of the negotiation.

Now, whoever didn't negotiate and say, hey, you know
what, you've offered this. We want it now part of the
contract, then it's a negotiation thing. If they didn't -- if
whoever negotiated --

MS. BRUNSON: Well, we know who negotiated, Mr. Brill. If
you can't answer -- the person that negotiated it is sitting on
your right.

MR. BRILL: I'm answering the question to the
commissioner.
MS. BRUNSON: You can't answer the question.

MR. BRILL: Yes, I can answer the question. You know, part of the negotiation, if that's not included in the contract, there is -- you're right, that can't be done. We can't go back and say it. It should have been done at the negotiation part. It wasn't done at the negotiation part. But when it was -- when it was submitted by Sam Simon, Sam Simon adhered to what was submitted as -- for their submittal based on the RFP.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay.

MS. KNAAN: We can't defend it. We blew it. That's the bottom line.

MR. BRILL: We blew -- yeah. Hindsight, we can't go back. We blew it. It should have been part of the negotiations. I agree with you it should have been part of the negotiations. Was it? No. But in the future if it goes back out again, yeah.

Anything we see, it's open to negotiation -- it's like buying a house. You know, you see something you like, you're going to negotiate for it, plain and simple. If you don't, you're done.

MS. RIORDAN: Well, I mean that's the whole thing. You know, Page 20 of the RFP mentions that, "The proposer to whom the contract is awarded shall be required to enter into a written contract with the city of Los Angeles in the form
approved by the city attorney. This RFP and the proposal or any part thereof may be incorporated into." In other words, you can add the extras in.

MR. BRILL: Correct. You can add the extras in.

The point where that -- Mr. Lesel has already mentioned he viewed the contract before it came to him. At that point where he -- it's a lack of follow-through in regards to how the contract process was done. Okay. He could have, at that point, saw the contract and said, whoa, we're forgetting this. Let's add that back in. He can throw the contract back to the department for further negotiations.

MS. KNAAN: Right. But the only way we could have done that, Mr. Brill, is if he would had the proposal in front of him and he didn't.

MR. BRILL: Correct. Correct. Again, hindsight, you cannot go back. You've got to move forward. Again, I'm going to refer back to I've come from a large department where I've run a contracts group. I've been through how the contract process works. I ran a contracts group for that department. Okay. I know how it works. I know how contracts work. I know what to negotiate for and what not to negotiate for.

We are trying to institute those type of contracting practices, which are city-standard contracting processes into the group -- into my group in the contract.

(Inaudible conversation.)
THE CLERK: If I may, madam chair, we need to end this and perhaps continue it to another meeting since there is a recusal issue that is on the table. So this needs to be ended and if necessary continued at a future meeting.

MR. BRILL: Can I make one last comment? If there are any additional questions --

MS. RIORDAN: I have one more question.

MR. BRILL: -- that is not part of the 19, then that's fine. If there are any that come up, e-mail and I'll take care of them.

MS. RIORDAN: I'd like to ask one more question, but I need you to --

MS. BRUNSON: Just ask me a question that I would like to answer before I recuse myself. You ask who at Latham and Watkins negotiated the contract between Sam Simon and the coalitions for pets and public safety. It was Dean Steinbeck, Steven Janowski and Russell Wheeler. Here is the file.

MR. BRILL: Fine.

MS. BRUNSON: We negotiated from April until September. Once the contract was signed with the city, they told us we don't want to run the second van.

MS. RIORDAN: All right. We will wait for a second. One more question and then --

MR. BRILL: Okay. Can I make one comment?

MS. RIORDAN: Sure. I didn't know it was a conflict --
THE CLERK: If the record could reflect that Commissioner Brunson recused herself.

MS. RIORDAN: I think maybe the record needs to also know that I don't think any of us saw it as a conflict given that it's a done deal and it's an after the fact. So in her defense. All right.

MR. BRILL: The last comment is something she touched on. We'll go back to Question Number Nine for a second.

Question Number Nine, my answer to that was basically this: From a contracting point of view, I wanted to address it and maybe they'd come across like that is that contract had nothing to do with the city. It was a contract between the two separate parties and the city -- and it is not -- it's not the city involved in that contract. So that's the only point I wanted to make on that.

MS. RIORDAN: I understand. But I think you can also have an additional contract made.

I realize it says pursuant to separate --

MR. BRILL: Pursuant to separate agreements made.

MS. RIORDAN: But I think they could also -- they could still be included in the city contract.

MR. BRILL: The city can observe and take a look at it if they like based on if the city attorney approves it. But if not, it's not a contract with the city.

MS. RIORDAN: So really what's happening is we're
acknowledging -- we're noting that, one, the commission was not completely informed. The commission would have certainly pushed certain offers made that you would hold them to it because when you get so close to making a decision, when they're so close in a tie and they're one penny over here, you're going to hold them to that penny. We're seeing that didn't happen and we are objecting to that.

Now, the other thing that I'm worried about in disclosure, because this is out there and I have to ask this question. It has come to my attention that the present vendor, his brother who is the executive director for the vendor -- his brother is an employee of Los Angeles Animal Services. Why was that not disclosed to us?

MR. STUCKEY: Let me answer that question. First of all, commissioner, the question is an issue that you are inferring that there is some integrity issue here.

MS. RIORDAN: Yes.

MR. STUCKEY: That troubles me at a very high level, at a very high level.

MR. KHERO: It's the appearance of it.

MR. STUCKEY: Let me finish. Let me finish, though.

MS. RIORDAN: It's the appearance of it. It’s not a (inaudible) it’s just an appearance issue.

MR. STUCKEY: Well, because the critical issue here is that at the time that this person was on board, there was no
relationship between the contract and this person's hiring.

This person was not on board with Sam Simon when we were doing this contract negotiation.

So in terms of the facts that were provided to you, that fact should have been made available to you as well.

That's why I'm concerned. It is raised here after the contract is done, now you raise the issue about integrity on the part of someone as though there was some inferrance, some sweetheart deal or some inappropriate relationship or something going on here --

MS. RIORDAN: I think there needs to be disclosure even if --

MR. STUCKEY: But commissioner, that -- see, here again, my point is whoever conveyed that to you didn't convey the truth. That's all I'm saying. That they didn't tell you that the person was not on board when the contract negotiations were going on. There is nothing for the department to win no matter where a (inaudible) or family member may be working. There is no benefit to us in that.

But when you raise it in that way, you infer that there is something wrong, that there was something inappropriate. That is absolutely not true.

MS. RIORDAN: But what becomes inappropriate is when it is withheld. Even if there is nothing wrong with it given the timing of it --
MR. STUCKEY: What was withheld?

MS. RIORDAN: The information disclosing it -- the lack of it.

MR. STUCKEY: Disclosing what?

MS. RIORDAN: Saying, you know, letting us know that there is a member of LA Animal Services and around the same time -- as I understand, it was close to the time of the --

MR. STUCKEY: He was not an employee at the time of the negotiations, commissioner.

MS. RIORDAN: What was the date of the employment?

MR. STUCKEY: I don't know what time -- I mean, that's not my business of when he became employed with Sam Simon Foundation. That has nothing to do with my department.

MS. RIORDAN: Then -- that's fine. That's fine. That clears the air.

MR. STUCKEY: I mean, it just troubles me --

MS. RIORDAN: It's better to clear the air here. You said what you needed to say and I appreciate that.

Mr. Stuckey, as you say, you don't like untruths to be circulated. If we didn't discuss it here and disclose it here, do you know what is circulating out there? I would much rather clear the air here, set the record straight, which has been done. I am satisfied with what you said. I would hate to see something different written in the paper and we have to do damage control. Now it's on the record. Now we know
everything's fine. So that's why the question was asked.

I do respect and appreciate your answer. I do. So, now, I'm done with my questions.

Does anyone have any other questions?

MR. BRILL: Any additional questions, please e-mail and then hopefully this is put to rest and we can move on.

MS. RIORDAN: Yeah. And I think, you know --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We learn from our mistakes.

MS. RIORDAN: I'm going to say one thing as we wrap this up.

I think that, you know, when this contract was happening, there were all sorts of ethical issues circulating out there and the press was latching onto everything.

I understand the concern the department may have felt uncomfortable sharing some information, disclosing. I think we're going to have to just take a different approach, discuss with the city attorney so that lack of information that can be shared, is shared, and that there is no concern that you are doing any breach of ethics by sharing the information. We need to approach this differently and more openly the next time.

MR. BRILL: I think it goes back to what Mr. Stuckey said is hold -- either a couple of board members or in closed session, what he said is meet with you and sit down. We already started off on the wrong foot, get back on the right foot. I think this is another one you need to add on there as
well. Hopefully, we put this one to rest.

MS. RIORDAN: Absolutely. I sure hope so.

MR. BRILL: Thank you.

MR. KHERO: Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you, very much.

MR. BRILL: You're welcome. I'm not going anywhere. I think the next one is --

MS. RIORDAN: Okay. Public comment --

MS. KNAAN: Actually -- okay.

MS. RIORDAN: Please, we're going to table everything else. Please wait until we are done.

Let's take public comment right now.

MR. BRILL: Hold on. Before you do that. On the thing you just said about the budget, if you give me five minutes to give you a recap, I can recap the whole thing in five minutes.

MS. KNAAN: Well, no, it's not you. It's the questions and unfortunately Mr. Khero and I have to leave at a quarter to one. We have a lot -- I don't know how many people turned in public comments, but we're not going to make it.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay. Let's get going.

THE CLERK: Before we go on, Commissioner Brunson will --

MS. RIORDAN: Yes, Sam Simon, public comment. Thanks.

MR. BRILL: I'll stay up here just in case.

MS. RIORDAN: Yeah, that's fine.

MR. BRILL: Thank you.
MS. RIORDAN: Jane Garcia and then Laura Beth Heisen.

MS. GARCIA: Hi, I'm Jane Garcia.

I'm sure I'm stating something obvious here. But if the Sam Simon Foundation isn't fulfilling the terms of its signed contract by not performing the number of spay and neuters it's supposed to, I think maybe the city should look into how long it has to go before it can terminate the contract. I don't know whether the city is mandated to give it an entire year before it can do that.

Presumably, at the rate it is going, it is going to fall so far behind, it's never going to catch up to the 7,000 promised. So that was just my two cents worth.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you.

MS. HEISEN: Hello. Laura Beth Heisen. I want to make sure I say that I have nothing against Sam Simon at all. I have a problem with the contract, of course.

Mr. Stuckey said it's not his responsibility to anticipate what may or may not happen. But Mr. Stuckey, you do have a responsibility to be aware that 7,000 is a completely unrealistic number to expect from one van in one year. Look anywhere and you will become educated to find out 7,000 cannot be done in one year by one van, not and have the animals leave alive.

Also, I think you have a responsibility as the general manager, the buck does stop with you. Your name is on
the contract. You did sign on behalf of the city for services that you chose based on additional services that were not in the contract. So if anyone knew that the contract was deficient in the services provided to the city, it was you.

When Mr. Brill, with all due respect, says there is no loss to the city, actually by paying more money and receiving fewer spay/neuter services -- spay/neuter is the most important thing to our reducing the kill. So we have a financial loss and we have a loss in terms of lives.

THE CLERK: Time.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you, very much. Melanie Pozez, then Teri Austin.

MS. POZEZ: I'm really shocked with the two lawyers sitting on the commission that you would not have had Ms. Brunson recuse herself. She is no longer a commissioner as of today. But she has been able to be very divisive.

Do we not have a new commissioner coming on after he is confirmed?

MS. RIORDAN: Uh-huh.

MS. POZEZ: On Tuesday. So my opinion is that you have pushed away very deep pockets. You have pushed away Petsmart and their ability to bring tremendous things, not just the rescue wagon but other things.

Ms. Atake is not part of this. I am really talking to you Ms. Riordan because your ability to stir the pot a
little bit without providing solutions and without supporting
your team -- your team is sitting out here, the department.
The general manager and you all have done nothing but continue
to push away people who could help them.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you.

MS. AUSTIN: Teri Austin, The Amanda Foundation.

There is a lot of information at the back of the room
today that I'm seeing for the first time. I'm not going to try
to address all of it right now because I didn't see the
evaluator's report. I just want to read into the record that
on the first page of the Sam Simon proposal, it said, "Two-for-
one pursuant to a separate agreement, a separate program. The
Sam Simon Foundation will be operating the mobile clinic
belonging to the Coalition of Pets and Public Safety currently
being used with the interim contractor to provide an additional
four days of free spay/neuter services in greater Los Angeles.
The city can announce to its constituents that the two clinics
offering free spay/neuter service are available eight days a
week."

The bottom line about a contract, any contract at
all -- I entered into a sealed bid legal contract on behalf of
the company I represent. It is a non-profit company but it is
a company and a business. I had every anticipation that I was
being dealt with in a completely an above-board manner.

My head is swimming from what I have heard today. I
need to review all of this. However, when two of the
evaluations -- I was told there were four back there. I only
see three. Two of the evaluators say, yes, 7,000, although
difficult to verify from data provided --

THE CLERK: Time.

MS. AUSTIN: And the other one says --

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you.

MS. AUSTIN: Sorry. Anyway, they both say that they can't
be done.

MS. RIORDAN: All right. Thank you. That concludes that.

This is all so we could move forward and address
things better and improve in the future and in regard to --
we're going to move on to -- in regard to stirring the pot,
actually, this is the first time I've been asking questions
about it. So I appreciate getting the answers.

I think the questions have been circulating out
there. I have seen them in different press and I think it's
best that rather than have the press do their own
interpretation of what's going on, I think it's very important
that we get the facts out in the open here which is what we did
today. And I thought that was what was important. We did it,
as distasteful as it seems, no one can misinterpret it now.

Thank you very much. And we'll move on. Next item.

THE CLERK: Next item is commission business approval of
the minutes for October 24th.
MS. RIORDAN: Oh, wait. You know what? I think we have
to get Ms. Brunson back in.

THE CLERK: I think Doug went after her.

(End of Tape 1.)

THE CLERK: Commissioner Brunson has re-joined the
meeting.

Next item on the agenda is 3-A, approval of the
minutes for October 24th, 2005.

MS. KNAAN: Anyone want to make a motion?

MS. BRUNSON: Motion to approve.

MS. RIORDAN: All in favor.

MS. KNAAN: I have to abstain. I apologize. I didn't get
a chance to -- I know you sent them to me a second time, but --
there will be approval, I'm sure, without me.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay.

MS. BRUNSON: We can do it next time.

MR. KHERO: I'll second it.

MS. RIORDAN: Then all in favor.

MS. BRUNSON: Aye.

MR. KHERO: Aye.

MS. ATAKE: Aye.

MS. RIORDAN: Aye. One abstention. Motion passed.

Meetings, events or do we --

THE CLERK: Next item in the meeting, events attended by
the commissioners.
MS. ATAKE: Well, I volunteered at dog adoptions on October 29th and November 5th and I also attended a Low Kill seminar on November 5th. I also ran a booth at Best Friends event on November 12th and 13th.

MS. BRUNSON: I think we all attended the Low Kill seminar.

MS. RIORDAN: Uh-huh. I attended the Low Kill seminar.

MS. BRUNSON: All of us.

MR. KHERO: I have nothing to report.

MS. RIORDAN: Debbie?

MS. KNAAN: I attended the Saturday Low Kill conference.

MS. RIORDAN: All right. Next item.

THE CLERK: Next item in discussion, the budget submittal.

MS. KNAAN: I am going to make a motion at this point to table it. I understand -- actually, there are a couple -- I'm torn.

There is one thing we discussed off line, Mr. Pool. That's regarding the $5. Do we have time to go over this or not? Is that too close in?

MS. RIORDAN: We've got around 30 minutes for public comments.

MR. BRILL: Do you just want a quick recap of where we're going?

MR. STUCKEY: Do you want us to get you the answer to --

MS. KNAAN: No, no. I just -- I'm going to make a motion
to table that.

But the one thing I do have to point out really quickly is something that actually Mr. Bickart from the mayor's office pointed out and that is not reflected in the budget is the $5 increase on the altered animal, which, thanks to Councilman Garcetti, is supposed to go directly into the department coffers.

So that's something, while I'm making a motion to table it, it's something that cannot wait until Friday because that needs to be in there.

The other thing that is missing is the off-budget funds, 859, the Animal Welfare fund is not listed there. So that, Mr. Pool pointed out to me.

MR. BRILL: Hold on.

MS. KNAAN: So those are the only two things that can't wait until --

MR. BRILL: Actually, it is.

MS. KNAAN: Well, no, it's not on this page. This is the most important page.

MR. BRILL: You're correct. We'll make sure it's included in. That's fine. Then I'll get with Mr. Bickart in regards to where the motion is right now. We want to make sure we're tracking it through.

MS. KNAAN: Okay. So with that, I would make a motion to table this until the next meeting.
MS. RIORDAN: Second.

MS. ATAKE: I second it.

MS. RIORDAN: All right. Motion passed. So moved.

MS. KNAAN: Unless there is something -- Mr. Brill, is there something we need to know right now? Because after Friday, I know it's going to be submitted. So I don't want to --

MR. BRILL: Actually, after -- basically from here, my staff and I are going back to the office and we are finalizing the budget. We have a good four solid days of clean-up and wrap-up to do and to verify all the numbers before we submit. Now is our -- kind of our drop-dead point of what we have to do with it. Okay.

MS. KNAAN: So just those two things we cannot afford to --

MR. BRILL: I know. And I will meet with Ross in regards to that and I'll e-mail Mr. Bickart in regards to that fund. We'll add that fund back in as well. I didn't know exactly where that money was going to go into.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MR. BRILL: Okay. Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: Public comment.

THE CLERK: Item Five, next item is public comment period. Each person will have three minutes to speak.

MS. RIORDAN: Right. Phyllis Daugherty.
MS. DAUGHERTY: Phyllis Daugherty and I'm speaking as a former city employee for 16 years, and as a former commission secretary for three years and as someone who worked in the mayor's office.

The commission meetings used to be events of dignity, stability and pride in the staff, encouraging the staff. Maybe you haven't met them. This is your staff. These are the -- this is your Low Kill Plan. You didn't recognize it either. You were too anxious to rush past them. You've never been anxious to rush past the critics.

As a matter of fact, there was plenty of time even after the non-violence resolution, which I doubt that many of the employees got to see because there was so much discussion afterwards about how the protests must continue. There has really never been any mention of the employees's safety, how the employees feel.

No one thanked them for coming today. Some of them work nights. They got up early to be here today to hear you, to hear you encourage them, to hear your vision for their future. These are the professionals that risk their lives every day for us, for every person in this city and for every animal that comes in contact with them. They slide down muddy slopes. They climb through barbed wire. They enter kennels that are slick from the waste of animals to save the animals that may be fighting each other to death.
No one mentioned any of that today. No one even recognized that they're here. The commission president says she is hurt because they growled at her. Well, you growled at them. You cut them off. They had their one chance for you to look at them and what they do on a daily basis and you didn't have time for them. So you are lucky they only growled at you.

You have been here seven years, Mrs. Riordan, and you don't know their needs. You don't know what they do. They should call you on the phone and tell you. You don't have time for them. You didn't have time to look at this -- at the officer that was implementing your Low Kill Plan by saving an animal's life.

What do you think the Low Kill plan is? This is it. These are the people that will bring this about, not the rescuers that take them after they have saved them. I think you all should ask for -- you should apologize to them and ask them to accept your apology.

You talked about the interaction with the department. We just saw the interaction with the department, Mr. Khero.

You didn't have time for them. So if you're going to criticize -- there is a saying, I think Mark Twain says, he who has the right -- he has the right to criticize who has the heart to help.

THE CLERK: Time.

MS. RIORDAN: All right. Thank you.
MS. BRUNSON: Why don't we ask all of the people from the department that are here to stand.

We had no idea you were here. I thank you -- that's very nice. We thank you for coming.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you very much for coming.

MS. BRUNSON: Thank you very much. And I wish you would come more often. I'm sure you are doing great work.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you very much. Absolutely. Thank you.

Zsuza Blakely.

MS. BLAKELY: Boy, I have to shake my head at this appalling commercial.

You know, the animals are completely left out. The animals are never rescued. The animals are brought in kicking and screaming, bleeding, crying, shaking in terror because they are being taken to a slaughter house. Their freedom, their very lives being deprived from them. That is what LA Animal Services is about. That is what they do.

You know, everything is talked about, you know, except for the elephant in the living room, which is the mass murder of all the animals at LAAS. The reason that the number of animals killed has gone down is because the number of animals born has gone down.

Spay/neuter is working and there are very few -- there are fewer animals for them to kill. There is no change,
basically, in the kill rate of LAAS. That is the problem. You know, you either stop the killing or you continue killing. There is really no other way.

People will not come in -- the majority of people who are quality adopters will never come into the pound as long as it is a slaughter house. That is a fact. You know, basically you have to stop the killing and then you will get the adoptions. It doesn't go the other way around. You think you can slip and slide and inch your way into low kill. It doesn't happen.

You know, people need to be educated to want the animals that are in the pound. You're not going to get them adopted. Also, the mobile pet adoptions -- all this coughing, they're trying to shut me up. Very rude.

Anyway, they don't -- the truth is stifled, unfortunately. I want to say that it's terrible that we are losing Ms. Brunson. We cannot afford -- the animals cannot afford to lose Ms. Brunson. And Ms. Riordan, not Mrs. Riordan, I don't think. She -- well, I mean he is your father.

Anyway, she is a master negotiator. I really appreciate the way that you try to blend everyone together. Although I wish you would at least not try so hard with some of the people that give you a bad time. But anyway, the -- you know, you have to stop the killing, period.

The mobile pet adoptions, unfortunately, suck since
we had Cunningham, which lost us all of our wonderful venues.
I worked the mobile pet adoptions for five years straight every
single Sunday.

Anyway, the problem is that there is really no
accountability on the part of the LAAS. I mean the problem is
that they just continue to kill. It's never addressed. There
are the same roadblocks to getting animals out alive. There
are the same -- you know, even LAAS people will tell you that
the number of animals that they have has nothing whatever to do
with the killing. It doesn't matter how few animals they have.
They will continue to kill. And --

THE CLERK: Time.

MS. BLAKELY: All right.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you. Scott Sorrentino and then Julie
Butcher.

MR. SORRENTINO: Scott Sorrentino, Rescue Humane Alliance.

I'm very upset about the politicizing of animals that
I have seen happen today. The Rescue and Humane Alliance isn't
a political organization or a collaborative organization. We
have tried to collaborate both within the humane community and
with various different agencies, including LAAS and including
this commission.

This administration, the current administration, got
off on a very bad foot when it had a secret meeting at the
beginning of its administration. Fortunately, the Rescue and
Humane Alliance was allowed to participate in that meeting, but very few other people were. We were told essentially that we may not always agree, but that we would be allowed at least to voice our concerns.

We have tried to do that. Although a lot of people in the community have been silenced. We were told that this administration was about getting to "yes" and unfortunately, "yes" means "yes" in terms of what is already pre-established. So the "yes" that we can get to is only the "yes" that's already been determined what it would be. We've had so many promises unkept in our various meetings, so many good ideas not acknowledged and not pursued.

For example, the Rescue and Humane Alliance suggested that the general manager make a communication bi-weekly to the rescue and humane community. This was considered to be a good idea at the time. It's never happened. What we now have is reliance on blaming the public and rescue groups for all of the things that are not right with our humane community. This is not how we get to yes, believe me. It's not -- and it's not how we go low kill.

There was very little sensitivity to a wounded community. The past is the past. That's true. But we had a wounded community and that wounded community needed to be healed and it wasn't.

We have a resource in Nathan Winograd, who is someone
who goes across all different boundaries of the rescue
community, rescue and humane community, from the extremes all
the way to the very moderate. He is the only person in America
who has ever created a no kill community around an open door
shelter and yet the only people who seem to be interested in
what he has to say are rescue and humane groups and fortunately
members of this commission.

Why is it that we are not willing to embrace these
ideas which have worked and been successful elsewhere, I just
don't understand it. When the Rescue and Humane Alliance
participated in the Participant Shelter Task Force last summer,
we came up with a very good -- a lot of good revisions to the
rescue community's agreement with the city. A lot of those
things were presented in Mr. Stuckey's report as
accomplishments.

Let me tell you that a lot of those were very hard-
fought battles that are hugely resisted by the department
originally.

THE CLERK: Time.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you, Scott.

MS. BRUNSON: Thank you, Scott.

MS. RIORDAN: Julie Butcher. After that is Teri Austin.

MS. BUTCHER: Good morning. Julie Butcher, SEIU Local
347, General Manager.

I want to thank you for reaching out to the workers.
I think you missed an opportunity today to hear the rest of the story. The Brown Act allows for general comment -- general report on an agenda. What was agendized was a general manager's report. So to -- so narrowly cut off -- well, actually it didn't say low kill either. But the fact is that at the point at which --

MS. RIORDAN: (Inaudible.)

MS. BUTCHER: At the point in which -- you've asked the city attorney for lots of advice on lots of things. That would have been a key point. But nonetheless, the point at which the discussion was about the workers in the room, you cut off that opportunity.

Now, if what you really want is to have a conversation for how we do better, that's probably not the best way to have that conversation. The workers want what you all want. We want to kill as few animals as is humanly and reasonably possible. Workers expect to also be safe. They expect to be treated with respect.

Now, frankly, I don't know if this is the guy but you got to give him a chance. I overheard a worker explain it to somebody else. They said, you know, I hadn't seen general manager before. And this guy came out in the middle of the night on Christmas with his wife -- I don't know.

By the time the lower gets -- the fact is these are workers who work every day in an incredibly difficult situation
and need at least to be acknowledged, to be respected, to be encouraged. The city should not contract out that work because it is obviously incapable of contracting out work.

So working within the parameters of the law, the administrative ineptness to be able to keep two sets of books, to be able to kind of bureaucratically keep track of contracts such as the one that you've been discussing all morning -- I read a press report that there are bureaucratic obstacles to everything.

Well, there is three copies and there is more if you'd like of 393 ideas submitted by city workers citywide. Many of them apply to this department. There are ways of getting things done in the city, creatively, legally, innovatively. These are the folks that have these ideas. Somehow, we need to figure out how to make that happen.

The workers are not opposed to change. We expect change to happen in a reasonable way and we expect to have the voices of the folks that do the work every day heard. That's why we will be here and we'll be back.

So we've left you with a whole bunch of written communication as well because I don't want to be cut off by this time thing here. But whoever it was that said that quality adopters won't go into the shelters, I hope that nobody tells my dogs that because that's simply not the case. I want to thank you on behalf of the -- (inaudible.)
MS. AUSTIN: Teri Austin, The Amanda Foundation.

I want to use this three minutes to kind of clear up some stuff.

First of all, for the people out there from the union who don't know me, I was on the ADL web-site as well as soon as I started doing a program with the city. They wanted to embarrass me so they put a picture of an old show ad where I was topless and they thought that was going to embarrass me.

I thought, these guys don't understand the mind of an actress. Number one, if they're going to print a picture, I hope it's 20 years old. And second of all, I didn't get in front of the camera because I thought I looked bad. But having said that, I'm in big support of Local 347. I've been targeted by those people as well.

However, I have to go back to the contract thing because I have a fiduciary duty as the president of the Amanda Foundation to look into what happened with this contract because we did put in a sealed bid. In the RFP that was submitted, I read out that there were two vans offered. It also -- the report given that day by the general manager said an unbiased analysis and decision based exclusively on the proposals and the recommendations provided by the evaluation committee.

Then today, I learned that I won every evaluation and that in one evaluation it actually said -- two evaluations, it
states that -- two of the three that are out there, it states
that the 7,000 is unrealistic. And one of the evaluators wrote
referring to the Sam Simon director of community programs,
Rachel Popp -- and this is public record that was put out here
for public consumption.

This individual with SNAPS program manager was
actively responsible for maintaining the conditions of the
contract. Under her supervision, the van frequently operated
far below its capacity.

The department discovered she was in violation of the
contract and had committed fraud. After investigation by the
pet sterilization manager, she was found to have allowed
rescuers to bring in animals to the van. Feral cat
sterilizations were performed. Documents had been altered and
falsified. Addresses and sterilized animals for non-city
residents utilizing addresses of city residents. She was --
she then submitted these invoices to the department for
payment. Though the department did not file charges against
her. We did request her removal from position of director.

This is a person that you chose to give the contract
to. My heart's broken because in September of this year --
October of this year, we were supposed to have three vans on
the ground, two run by Sam Simon and one run by myself. Now we
have two and one of them is severely under-performing. Just
for your information, my October numbers are in. Our September
numbers were over 400. Our October numbers were over 400 and the numbers submitted to the city that we do for reimbursement is only what we are qualified to.

We do some non-city residences that The Amanda Foundation absorbs because of the people who work in the field can tell you the dog doesn't know if he lives in Watts or Compton. And we don't turn away the pit bulls and we do a lot of large -- a lot of large breed animals.

I am forced to look into this farther. It's unpleasant for me and it's very hurtful. But as president of The Amanda Foundation, we submitted a bid and I'm going to have to look into it further. So you'll be hearing about it again.

MS. RIORDAN: I don't want to stir the pot anymore.

Robert Perino. And after that --

MR. PERINO: My name is Robert Perino. I'm the head of systems with the Department of Animal Services.

First of all, I would like to make it perfectly clear that I'm here on my own volition and at the urging of no one else.

I've come to speak on behalf of Guerdon Stuckey. Although I have no particular affection for the man, I do admire and respect his work. For the record, he has no idea what I'm going to say.

I've been with the city for 25 years. I was with DWP for 15 and later promoted to the airport, then personnel and
now I'm with this department. I've been with this department for about six years. I've worked for four different general managers since I've been in this department.

Before the department moved to its new location on Figueroa Street, my office was located right adjacent to the commission room. As many of you may know, Ms. Riordan, because she's been around for quite awhile, there is a gap up by the ceiling and we in our office could hear every word of every commission meeting.

In the last five, six years, commissioners have come and gone and general managers the same. For whatever reason, the mood and the attitude of the commission has become very hostile and aggressive lately. I don't think it's a coincidence that this has happened just since Guerdon Stuckey was appointed general manager. It seems to be routine for him to be under attack and to be berated at almost every meeting.

Apparently, the commission is not happy with Mr. Stuckey being in this position because none of the past general managers seemed to receive this level of unrelenting attack and humiliation. Normally, someone under attack like this has left a trail of blunders and shortcomings behind them.

I always make it a point not to get too personal and chummy with people I work for. But since I interact with him on an ongoing basis, I do closely get a chance to observe his work habits and ethics. I see his level of dedication and see
what he has done so far. This man has an impressive trail of positive accomplishments in the short time he's been here as far as I'm concerned.

No other general manager's gone out into the shelters to really get down to the heart of issues and problems the way he has. This is the first GM with this department I have seen that really has made a concerted effort to implement procedures and programs designed specifically to improve situations.

I think in that report he was trying to present, it was pretty evident from some of the statistics that this backs up the point I'm making right here. The one thing I don't understand about all --

THE CLERK: Time.

MR. PERINO: Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: Lisa Edmundson and then Michelle Roache.

MS. EDMUNDSON: I'm Lisa Edmundson. I feel like I should bring the bunny that I adopted from south central shelter with me.

Your rabbits are very, very important and I urge you to put an update of the rabbit sterilization program on an upcoming meeting agenda soon because there are problems with the program. The budget that has been tabled, you know, if you look at the working copy of the budget, please, please be sure that the rabbits are not left out.

I want to get back to the meeting that -- when Mr.
Stuckey said that there was an internal investigation regarding the rabbits. Now, that was on September the 26th and I'm asking rhetorically, have you seen a report of what that investigation showed and have you seen conclusions? If you haven't, perhaps you should ask Mr. Stuckey.

Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you. Michelle and then Derek Brown.

MS. ROACHE: Lieutenant Michelle Roache, Harbor Animal Shelter District Manager.

I remember a day back in 1996 when I first started with this department. I was so excited to become a hero for the animals. This department was quite different then. My goals of rescuing and saving animals were often crushed and destroyed when I saw animals that I took so much love and care to rescue from the streets were then killed by the very organization that I worked for.

Why did I continue with this department when there are so many other jobs in the city of Los Angeles that I could have taken? I stayed because I love animals. Even if I can only save one animal a day, it was worth it for me to continue the fight.

I continued the fight for the next nine years without much support from this department. But then I believed in my heart that I was in the right place. Then one day while it appeared a normal day working at West Los Angeles animal
shelter, something quite different occurred. A new mission statement was then posted on all the walls, saving animals’ lives. Could this be true?

It was from this point on that I noticed the Department of Animal Services -- no longer the animals I cared about were being killed for no reason at all by the city. It was true. At last someone cared enough to change the department to be a voice for the helpless animals.

I realize that it may not be perfect and it may never be perfect, but every day I'm amazed by significant strides towards a better future for the animals of Los Angeles. I smile knowing that I made the right choice to continue fighting for the animals.

There will always be positive and negative of everything we do. But it is unfortunate that lately we are criticized for all of the negative, causing all of the positive to be overlooked. How could anybody find fault in the fact that more animals were saved this year than ever before? Certainly, anybody that really cares and loves animals can cherish and appreciate all the positive changes that will one day lead this department to be the best in the nation.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Hi. I'm Captain Derek Brown, District Manager for the West Los Angeles shelter.

I'd like to say that I think Phyllis hit on a very
important part, which is that we are in fact the biggest
resource of this department; yet we are probably the most over-
looked portion of it.

    What Mr. Stuckey basically has done is he began with
the employees. What he did is something that no general
manager has ever done. I've been in this department over 20
years, okay? It all started with the training of the district
managers. He sat down with us and worked with us. He changed
the way we thought, our attitudes. He opened our minds. He
educated us is what he did.

    He's also supported the staff. He showed up at my
shelter, I think it was 4:30 in the morning. You know, he's
met all of our staff. Most general managers many people have
never even met, let alone talked to and interacted with.

    So the things I would like to do is publicly thank
you for -- I wish you guys could just see him after hours or
behind the scenes. Because he's nothing like this. I'm
serious. He holds us accountable. He teaches us. He trains
us. He demands perfection.

    Yeah, you see a calm man sitting up here. But you
know, all the abuse and everything that he has taken and he
still believes in us. He still cares about us. He had to
fight us to change us. That was his biggest thing he had to
do. That's where it all began. We are the department. All of
you sitting out here, you up here and you there, we are
collectively -- we have to work together. To do that, we start here. That's the theme of the day.

I do have hope in the future and confidence in this department and in you as our general manager and thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: Bill Dyer, sorry. And then Dana McPhall.

MR. DYER: I'm Bill Dyer with In Defense of Animals.

Where do we begin? My God. God help us all. I wish we could all work together.

I have friends with the department and with the staff. I've worked with David in the past and Captain Brown, I admire so much. I just wish that guy, what's his name, we could all work together. The things I don't -- I don't know everything, but what I don't understand is why we can't open all the spay/neuter clinics and all the different shelters.

I don't understand why we kill animals when there's cage space available. I just don't understand those things.

But, you know, let's not make Winograd the villain. Let's not make Mr. Stuckey the villain. I think what Mr. Winograd says in his low kill solutions are things that we've talked about for years. They are not a mystery. It's not a mystery what he's saying. It's not a secret. We know all of these things.

What we haven't been doing is implementing them and getting people to be in charge of each item to really fulfill the goals for each of those different items. I think that's what we have to do. And I think a combination of what we got
and what Mr. Winograd has, let's all work together and make this happen.

I'm really here today about a different issue that I hope you can put on the agenda, it has guardian issue. It's about changing the word owner in the municipal code to that of owner/guardian. There is a lady here today that will address that in her time, so I'll give my time to her. Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: Dana, are you the lady?

MS. MCPHALL: Yes, I am.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay. I know you. Hi. After that will be Kimberly Fross.

MS. MCPHALL: My name is Dana McPhall and I'm a resident of Los Angeles. I'm a lawyer and have been a consultant for two national animal groups. I am also a former prosecutor with the LA City Attorney's Office, where I handled many animal cruelty cases. I have also worked with some local animal rescue groups.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today. As someone who has devoted my career to the protection of animals, I believe that to the extent we can encourage people to act in the best interests of companion animals as their guardians, the more likely people would dedicate a full lifetime of respect, responsibility and compassion to these animals as family members.

Therefore, I respectfully request that the LA Animal
Commission place on a future agenda the following proposal: To recommend that the LA City Council amend the municipal code and any other city or department documents to replace the word owner with the term "owner/guardian" in all provisions relating to animal licensing and regulation.

As a result of this important change in terminology, we can begin to shift people's perspectives away from thinking about animals as mere property, objects and things without needs, feelings and interests of their own. I believe that as we begin to spread the guardian ethic throughout our community, people will be more likely to adopt animal companions rather than purchasing them. I believe this would also help to end the abandonment and deaths of tens of thousands of animals in our local shelters every year.

Furthermore, people would be less likely to abuse or neglect their animal companions and local officials will be encouraged to enforce and strengthen animal cruelty laws.

Now, I know several years ago a similar proposal was brought before the commission. During its consideration, apparently, one of the concerns expressed was that such a change to the municipal code would lead to confusion over an owner's relationship to their animals. I believe that the proposed change would not alter one's legal rights, responsibilities and/or liabilities.

In fact, in the past several years, many localities
across the United States such as San Francisco, Berkeley, Albany, West Hollywood and the county of Marin here in California as well as St. Louis and the state of Rhode Island have successfully amended their codes to reflect the word "guardian." I believe that it is again time for Los Angeles to make this change to better reflect the nature of our relationships with our companion animals.

In closing, I provided the secretary with packets of materials containing some background information on this proposal for distribution to the commission members and the general manager.

Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you, very much.

MR. KHERO: Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: And Jane Garcia.

MS. FROSS: Hello. My name is Kimberly Fross.

I strongly support the city adopting guardian/owner language as well. I'm a resident of Los Angeles and I'm an attorney in private practice. I'm a long time supporter of animal protection issues.

One widespread problem in our city is the number of abandoned animals in shelters. Countless are euthanized every day. As a community, it is our responsibility to take steps toward alleviating such problems.

One simple and practically cost-free step that we can
do to change our -- is change our city code from owner to owner/guardian. I believe that when more people begin to think of themselves as guardians rather than as owners, more people will understand the importance of responsibility that comes along with caring for an animal. By supporting such responsibility, we can begin to alleviate some of the costly problems our city faces with animal issues, such as housing abandoned animals.

That is why many groups, including LA Lawyers for Animals, support and request that the LA Animal Commission support this proposition by recommending it to the city council.

Thank you for your time.

MR. KHERO: Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you. Is Jane here? Oh, there you are.

MS. GARCIA: Hello, again. I'm Jane Garcia. I'm a volunteer at LA Animal Services. I actually wanted to raise the issue of the e-mail blast, the euthanasia list that goes out every day. It comes out and it's very helpful in terms of seeing which animals are scheduled for euthanasia. It is a very plain, black and white document which just lists their numbers, the shelter they're at, their age or if they're sick or the reason for euthanasia, if there is one.

The thing is, I was wondering if it would be possible
to post it with photos every day in the shelters. It would
actually require a mixture of what Zsuza sends every day.
Zsuza actually takes the disc and goes through. For all the
dogs, she matches their photos from the web-site with the
animal's numbers that are on the list.

If we could -- that could be printed out every day,
with perhaps -- with all due respect, Zsuza, with some of
the -- a bit less of the hyperbole that you include about each
animal. I just think it would be very helpful so people can
see the faces of these animals. And it would just require -- I
mean, it would require somebody to go through it, I suppose,
and match them all up and then print them out on a regular
office printer. It's not a big poster thing and post them
around the shelters.

Just because I think -- it would also bring home too
the fact to the public how many animals are being euthanized.
It would give them a face. They don't just become black and
white numbers, faceless animals. So it's just a suggestion
that I would like Mr. Stuckey to consider doing that in all the
shelters.

MS. RIORDAN: All right.

MS. GARCIA: Thank you.

MR. KHERO: Thank you.

MS. RIORDAN: Once again, one more time. Before we
adjourn, and I'm taking the liberty because I think I'm allowed
to do this at this point. First of all, like I said, there was
a gag order at one time where staff could not talk to us. When
I did talk to staff, they were afraid of losing their job to
talk to me. That was the hurt.

But I want to say, Michelle Roache, I love what you
said. I batted for you at the city attorney's office when you
filed that -- submitted that case and your case was not being
considered. I fought to have that case because I did not
want -- I thought you had a great message out there. I was
proud of what you submitted -- I know you have to go --

MR. KHERO: No, no.

MS. RIORDAN: I was proud of what you submitted and I
fought for that because I thought it deserved the attention
because I was very proud of the work that you did.

The -- our wildlife officers -- when there was an
entire humane community against you being wildlife officers, I
fought for you to be there. I thought we needed you and I
valued your knowledge. So while everyone else called me as
what a horrible person I was to back it, I knew it was
something good. It became something wonderful and I heard only
wonderful feedback.

We had two officers that were mauled by dogs and it
wasn't being prosecuted as an assault with a deadly weapon.
And I fought because I thought our staff needs that sort of
support that they can't be treated like -- in my opinion,
second class citizens because somehow they're just workers. They were mauled on the job. That person should have been prosecuted. I'm not an attorney. I don't know what was done wrong so no attacks on the city attorney.

What I'm saying is I do know these people. So when I say, get to know us, call us, my number's probably on bathroom walls at city hall. Just go take a look.

But I'm saying, these people here, when I say it, I'm speaking for all of us. These are new commissioners. Mr. Glen Brown is sitting with us today. Get to know us because we do care. We really do care. We do support you.

If you don't hear it here because we crack down, we expect a lot. We know that you have that potential. We know your heart is in it. We crack down hard. We're going to get tough here at the meeting but we really, really do care and we really, really do want to get to know you. We are not attacking you. Oh, gosh, my mother would say, I wouldn't be yelling at you if I didn't love you so much.

So we do care and I want to thank you guys all for coming today. I look forward to hearing that progress report. I'm sorry I didn't allow it to be part of the Low Kill Plan but I think we should hear it. I personally think it should be great during the holidays but I think you're gone. So maybe when you get back.

Okay. That came last, but -- where are you? We'll
let you come. Then we'll adjourn even though I'm breaking the rule. I broke it with somebody else.

MR. KHERO: No. I think we missed it.

MR. DILIBERTO: That is correct. I turned it in about an hour ago, at least.

MS. KNAAN: I'm sorry. I have a meeting in --

MR. DILIBERTO: It's not unexpected.

MS. KNAAN: It's nothing personal.

MR. DILIBERTO: What I just wanted to mention -- Commander David Diliberto, Director of Field Operations.

I just find it interesting that the commission as a body is concerned about -- they're worried that the staff will feel that they're not supported by you guys. The way I look at it is your actions speak for themselves.

You have been attacking us. You can say you haven't, but you have been for months and months and months, publicly. As far as I'm concerned, those attacks directly devolve into other things that end up at people's houses, okay?

But you've been attacking us. And the one time that we're going to come in here and say something positive and you let people come in -- and I find it interesting that Commissioner Knaan had to leave. But the one time that we're going to show you something positive, something good about the department, you completely blow it off. You completely make it seem unimportant.
So if you think those people are walking away with an impression that you are supporting us, even with that nice little speech that you made at the end, I'm sorry, but you're wrong.

MS. RIORDAN: Okay.

MR. DILIBERTO: Okay. I want to know where this resolution is. I want to know where the signed copy is. I know where this resolution came from. It didn't come from the commission, I can tell you that. This is the -- this is the resolution about violence against the employees.

Where -- have you signed it? I know you can't answer that question. But this is important enough to every employee in this department that this should have been signed immediately.

MS. BRUNSON: Excuse me. I think I read it into the record.

MR. DILIBERTO: I understand that. But I want a signed copy to be able to post up at the shelters showing people that hey you put your money where your mouth is. This is what you're saying.

MS. BRUNSON: It's, again, the department that didn't give it to us to sign. We would have signed it.

MS. RIORDAN: Erica, Erica.

MR. DILIBERTO: When we have a commissioner who says at the meeting that she not only supports but encourages protests
at people's houses. I have it -- you can play the tape. It's right there. Okay. And -- and -- and you have the same commissioner who just happens to be absent for this, says that she equates our euthanasia of animals to violence against animals when we have people out there who say if you're violent against an animal, you should be dead. If you watched 60 Minutes last night, you saw it.

MS. RIORDAN: Uh-huh.

MR. DILIBERTO: So again, where is this? We feel that we don't support you. We do support our general manager and we need you to support us.

I love the idea of us working together. I think that's a fantastic idea. I like that. But again, your actions in my mind don't speak to that. So if you want to start acting like you support us and you care for us, let's do it.

Hey, I think every person in this room would sit down with you and talk to you. But then don't come in and attack us over and over again, you know? Whether you want to seem like it, it comes across as being personal or not, that's the way it does come across.

MS. BRUNSON: Don't link the employees together with the general manager and yourself. We love the employees. The employees are --

(Inaudible conversation.)

MS. RIORDAN: All right. We -- some commissioners have
also been ADLA targets and we are very against what they are
doing. I need you to know we are against them. We have spoken
against it. So I understand, though. You are wanting to hear
it more here. I hear you. I do hear you and I thank you.

MR. DILIBERTO: Right. But the reality is that you have
included the employees separate from -- because the people come
up in line and --

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you, Dave. Thank you. All right.

I'm sorry. I missed yours. Do you want to still come up? All
right.

MS. GORDON: Linda Gordon, Senior Management Analyst II.

Presently, I'm working as the Facilities Management Coordinator
building our new facilities. However, I've been with this
department for 28 years.

I started as an animal control officer. My first job
was cleaning out the refrigerator where the dead animals had
been placed after being killed. I am an educated person and
I'm as educated as anybody in this room. It wasn't that I
couldn't get another job. I have plenty of jobs. I do
consulting work on the side, et cetera. I stayed here because
I believed I could make a difference.

In every job that I've had in this department from
being an animal control officer working the streets to the
present position, I've been -- I've cleaned kennels. I've
cleaned the dead animal refrigerator. I've been acting general
manager in the absence of the general manager. I believe I
could make a difference. And I continue to believe that I can
make a difference every day I come to work. I believe that I
can make a contact that somebody is going to say this is a good
thing. That what I do I can make a difference.

But what I really want to say is that before you cut
the general manager off today for his presentation -- because I
did have an opportunity to assist in that presentation as well
as have input into it -- what you asked for was there. You
asked for a business plan that integrates Nathan Winograd's
suggestions for this department into the business plan.

A, staff accountability, it's a core value. It was
the number one thing that was on the accomplishment list. B,
high volume low cost spay and neuter, done. C, foster care,
done. D, comprehensive adoption programs, done. Medical
behavior rehabilitation programs, done. These were the things
that were in the general manager's presentation that was cut
off, okay? There is nothing in Mr. Winograd's communication to
the president of this commission that is not being done in this
department.

Now, this is a new time. It's a new day. It's a new
general manager. I've been through every general manager since
Robert Rush. Somebody the other day was saying, well, this
is -- it's only been, you know, three years or something. I
said we've been through four general managers in three years.
This department has continued to be under attack, under-funded and it's attacked by -- internally. It's kept in a state of chaos by continually having this parade of general managers come back and forth and not giving the staff, the professional staff, people like me -- I know what I'm doing.

I am just as able to go out and get any job on the street as anybody else, probably more than most. But I stayed here because I know we can make a difference. This is a big change. This man has made a commitment here to this staff and to this city to make it better. Listen to him. He had everything that you asked for in this presentation. Everything that you asked that you didn't allow him to finish was there. You go right down the list. A through M, it was all in the presentation. Thank you.

THE CLERK: Time.

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you. We did say at the Winograd event, by the way, the programs that he was presenting we already have. So I did say our staff -- you were there, Heidi, you heard me say that. I said, by the way, all of those programs he presented we already came up with. Just so you know.

Meeting's adjourned.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I put in -- (inaudible.)

MS. RIORDAN: All right. Hold on. Meeting not adjourned.

MR. KHERO: I'm sorry. I announced earlier that I had to
go at quarter to one. I'm sorry.

MS. RIORDAN: He has to go. We had to push it --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sorry. I --

MR. KHERO: No, no. You --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- (inaudible) about the issues of safety and what the ADLA and others --

MS. RIORDAN: Melanie, I have a two -- hold on, hold on.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. No problem.

MS. RIORDIN: Melanie, let me -- fill out another card and come. Just fill out another card.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. RIORDAN: All right. I would have called your name if it was there, I promise.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's okay. I know that.

MS. RIORDAN: See you, Tariq -- wait a second. Can we still have --

(Inaudible conversation.)

MS. RIORDAN: It's not -- you can turn the tape off (inaudible) --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, no, no. We need to have the tape on because the mayor needs to hear. Please keep it on. It's very important.

(Inaudible conversation.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I want to suggest that it is the commission's duty to the people of the city of Los Angeles to
make certain that the big issues are addressed.

When you have people picketing outside of people's homes, when you have people smoke bombing the general manager's apartment, when you have people putting up this kind of drivel, trying to cause chaos and make sure that they keep the pot stirred in order that you all take your eye off the ball. And I think that's what you've done.

In all due respect, Kathy, I believe that your ability to stop much of this -- I'm suggesting that if you take a stand and link arms with the general manager in your department -- you've been here years. Why is it today that these issues haven't been discussed until a year ago, until today? Why is it that it's taken so much of your time --

MS. RIORDAN: We've renounced the ADLA throughout the meeting. Erica was here earlier before we did that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, no, no. I'm suggesting -- I'm suggesting you have to do more. I'm putting you on notice that I feel that you have not been -- I feel that you have not been supportive. I feel Ms. Knaan and Mr. Khero have not been supportive of all of our safety. I am terrified of speaking out because I know that I am a target too.

Anybody here who stands up and supports the right thing to do, which is to keep your eye on the ball, which is taking care of your team, you have a team. Please pay attention and be the captain, if that's what you are.
MS. RIORDAN: Do you realize that I had a number of the people in the humane community write the mayor and separate themselves from ADLA for that reason?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And you know what, I don't need that. I need people standing in front of the press. For Scott to say the wounded community needed to heal. What about the animals, Scott? What about the things that need to be done instead of positioning? And he says that we're politicizing? Please.

I think it's critical that you all link arms with the mayor and your general manager and say we're not going to take this. If there were pickets outside of Chatsworth, outside of your gated community --

MS. RIORDAN: (Inaudible) they had talked about it --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If you would have pickets in Beverly Hills, you can be sure the LAPD would have been there and taken care of it.

When the JDL, the Jewish Defense League -- and I'm Jewish so I can speak to this, does things that are illegal or threatening, they're dealt with. Why aren't they?

MS. RIORDAN: Thank you. All right. Now we're adjourned.

(Conclusion of Recorded Material.)
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