



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
35.		Oppose	Amber Kasel	<p>Members of the Board, I oppose Item 35 because the County is being asked to approve additional resources for the Department of Animal Care and Control without addressing ongoing failures in due process and lawful detention practices. Animal Care and Control exercises extraordinary power over living beings and private property. That power requires strict accountability. Yet animals are being held for weeks without court orders, investigative holds are continued after clearance, owners are charged inflated “care” fees unrelated to actual medical treatment, and forfeiture or euthanasia is threatened without judicial authorization. Approving new equipment without first reviewing these practices rewards misconduct instead of correcting it. Nothing in this item discloses how often animals are detained without court oversight, how fees are calculated, or how many cases involve delayed or refused release despite compliance. The Board cannot responsibly approve expanded resources while these unresolved issues persist. I am not opposing public safety tools. I am opposing the County expanding capacity without transparency, oversight, or corrective action. At minimum, this item should be conditioned on reporting and reform. Approving funding while due process violations remain unaddressed erodes public trust and exposes the County to unnecessary liability.</p> <p>oppose this item because the County is approving additional resources for the Department of Animal Care and Control without addressing documented failures in due process, transparency, and lawful animal detention practices.</p> <p>1. Funding Without Accountability The Board is being asked to approve new equipment for Animal Care and Control without any accompanying review of the Department’s recent conduct, including: Prolonged animal detention without court orders Continued holds after investigative clearance Fee inflation unrelated to actual medical care Failure to provide timely notice to owners Approving new resources without oversight rewards misconduct instead of correcting it.</p> <p>2. Due Process Has Been Repeatedly Undermined Animal Care and Control exercises extraordinary powers over property and living beings. Those powers require strict adherence to due process. Yet in practice, the Department has: Retained animals despite no emergency findings Threatened forfeiture and euthanasia absent judicial authorization Used administrative holds in place of lawful court process Providing additional operational resources while these practices persist</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	<p>increases the risk of further constitutional violations.</p> <p>3. Misallocation of County Priorities The County claims limited resources, yet: Owners are being charged excessive "care" fees not tied to actual veterinary treatment Animals are warehoused while release is delayed Preventable harm and stress to animals continues Before funding new equipment, the Board should require: A review of detention practices Clear release protocols once investigative authority ends Transparent accounting of recoverable versus non-recoverable costs</p> <p>4. Lack of Transparency to the Board and the Public Nothing in this agenda item discloses: How often animals are held without court orders How many cases involve inflated or disputed fees How many animals are threatened with forfeiture despite compliance attempts The Board cannot responsibly approve new assets without first receiving this data.</p> <p>5. Public Trust Is Being Eroded Animal Care and Control operates at the intersection of public safety and individual rights. When the Department acts outside lawful bounds, public trust collapses. Approving this item without conditions signals to the public that: Compliance with the law is optional Oversight is secondary to convenience Harm to animals and owners is an acceptable cost of operations That message is unacceptable.</p>
Amber Kasel	<p>oppose this item because the County is approving additional resources for the Department of Animal Care and Control without addressing documented failures in due process, transparency, and lawful animal detention practices.</p> <p>1. Funding Without Accountability The Board is being asked to approve new equipment for Animal Care and Control without any accompanying review of the Department's recent conduct, including: Prolonged animal detention without court orders Continued holds after investigative clearance Fee inflation unrelated to actual medical care Failure to provide timely notice to owners Approving new resources without oversight rewards misconduct instead of correcting it.</p> <p>2. Due Process Has Been Repeatedly Undermined Animal Care and Control exercises extraordinary powers over property and living beings. Those powers require strict adherence to due process. Yet in practice, the Department has: Retained animals despite no emergency findings Threatened forfeiture and euthanasia absent judicial authorization Used administrative holds in place of lawful court process</p>

			<p>Providing additional operational resources while these practices persist increases the risk of further constitutional violations.</p> <p>3. Misallocation of County Priorities The County claims limited resources, yet: Owners are being charged excessive "care" fees not tied to actual veterinary treatment Animals are warehoused while release is delayed Preventable harm and stress to animals continues Before funding new equipment, the Board should require: A review of detention practices Clear release protocols once investigative authority ends Transparent accounting of recoverable versus non-recoverable costs</p> <p>4. Lack of Transparency to the Board and the Public Nothing in this agenda item discloses: How often animals are held without court orders How many cases involve inflated or disputed fees How many animals are threatened with forfeiture despite compliance attempts The Board cannot responsibly approve new assets without first receiving this data.</p> <p>5. Public Trust Is Being Eroded Animal Care and Control operates at the intersection of public safety and individual rights. When the Department acts outside lawful bounds, public trust collapses. Approving this item without conditions signals to the public that: Compliance with the law is optional Oversight is secondary to convenience Harm to animals and owners is an acceptable cost of operations That message is unacceptable.</p>
		Item Total	2
Grand Total			2