

Communication from Public

Name: Gloria Lai

Date Submitted: 11/04/2020 02:03 PM

Council File No: 20-1177

Comments for Public Posting: Brenda Barnette is corrupt and incompetent in her position as General Manager of LA Animal Services. She needs to be terminated immediately. I oppose the use of donations from the Animal Welfare Fund to pay for marketing and a new website. Barnette wants to steal \$1.5 million from this fund to pay The Glue LLC, just as she is trying to steal the taxpayer funded West Valley Shelter to give away to her friends. There needs to be oversight and transparency, something that Barnette seems to be incapable of. She has completely bungled and mismanaged LA Animal Services, and the ones suffering the most are the voiceless animals that she is supposed to shelter and care for. Healthy animals that have gone into the shelter system end up in worse shape than they come in, thanks to her heartless policies and callous attitude. Now she is trying to steal money from public donations and taxpayers. FIRE HER.

Communication from Public

Name: Sergio Davila

Date Submitted: 11/04/2020 01:03 PM

Council File No: 20-1177

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose the use of donations for marketing and creating a new website, and demand accountability on fundraising components..

Communication from Public

Name: Michelle Cornelius

Date Submitted: 11/04/2020 02:16 AM

Council File No: 20-1177

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose using donations from the Animal Welfare Trust Fund to pay The Glue for marketing and a new website. I have not been presented with a persuasive argument as to why donations should be used for marketing purposes. Per Brenda Barnette, LA Animal Services currently has a marketing director, a public information officer, and a part-time assistant. What have they done so far and what were the results? If the \$155,445 is approved for marketing services, how will this benefit LAAS and how will success be measured? Does the City pay for the marketing budget of other departments? If so, why doesn't the City fund marketing for LAAS like it does for other departments? LAAS does need a new website. With that said, a website is one of the main ways City departments provide services to the public and as such it should be funded using City revenue; it is completely inappropriate to use donations from the Animal Welfare Trust Fund for this purpose. As for the fundraising component of the proposal, a key metric here is fundraising efficiency which is defined by Charity Navigator as the amount spent to raise \$1. A charity which scores a 10/10 in this category cannot spend more than \$0.10 to raise \$1. What is the expected fundraising efficiency, taking into account both the \$524,720 for the contract over 3 years and LAAS staff time associated with fundraising? Furthermore, what will the donated funds be used for? Food and medicine for foster volunteers? Spay and neuter? Education for the public? Shelter maintenance? Advertising? Training for employees? Lastly, what oversight mechanisms would be put in place to better ensure transparency and accountability?