

## Summary of Comments from Community Workshop March 6, 2024

Summary of feedback obtain from individuals who attended the March 6, 2024, community workshop on the proposed animal testing ban, in response to the 4 questions posed by City staff:

### **Question 1: Do you support or oppose a local ban on animal testing activities taking place on City-owned land or controlled properties?**

- Yes – support a ban. Personal experience from primate lab work for 2 yrs. PTSD and trauma from her experience. Big impact on those who work in the field. Wants it to change on a federal level.
- Lots of “animal testing” that is not necessary. Or particularly cruel – for example, behavioral health testing about anxiety where anxiety is induced in subjects.
- A lot of regulations look good on paper but industry skirts intent of regulations.
- Believes we do not have a right to another being’s body.
- Recognize that not all products/testing make it to market. There is testing that does not result in a lifesaving medication or device.
- Life science businesses will be impacted by this. Some will be deterred. Impacts the receptivity of the community.
- Participant believed the ordinance contradicted the FDA Modernization Act 2.0.
- Business will look elsewhere where the regulations are not as strict.
- Businesses look for aid from schools/universities that have animal testing for support.
- Concerned that there will be too many businesses on Alameda Point doing animal testing.
- Participant Strongly opposed to animal testing but supports ordinance banning testing on City-controlled land:
- Concern that AWF lacks teeth, and not satisfied with existing oversight (for example if you don’t house dogs on site, but acquire, run a test and immediately euthanize that it can get around AWF regulations which focus on housing conditions)
- Concern that human health not served by animal testing because of genetic variabilities etc.
- Points to overarching issues with human health being caused by lack of access to clean water, anti-diarrheal meds, and that animal testing is for flashy medications that have less overall good and are a financial drain that is unneeded – if we made less carcinogenic chemicals etc. then we wouldn’t need to find cancer cures.
- Thinks human-relevant modeling would be better than animal testing
- Participant Supports animal testing
- Participant had no comments

- All four participants supported a local ban. In addition, they wanted to expand the ordinance to encourage 1) alternative methods of testing and 2) businesses designating themselves as non-live testing facilities.
- They said that the City could encourage this through tax incentives and other forms of financial relief; City's promotional abilities to market these companies; the City branding itself as the "City of compassion," "City of the future," or something else along these lines; and consider other City options ("what is in the City's toolbox") to encourage taking the next steps beyond a ban.
- Some group members were supportive of a modified ban. Perhaps no primate testing. Or no animal testing on site.
- 4 out of 5 group members supported the ban.

**Question 2:** Do you support an alternative to banning animal testing on City owned or controlled property?

- Pour all efforts into developing non-animal testing methods of developing medication and medical devices.
- Support companies that remain life science companies but develop breakthrough research via alternative methods.
- Modify language to ban specific types of testing like behavioral testing.
- Difficult to affect change at a local level about a federal issue.
- Momentum of a ban may pressure federal change but will negatively impact the life science community here and now.
- Often times, companies will just outsource the testing. Is this really solving the issue?
- Humans who volunteer for testing. There are many who are willing to do it if they get paid for it.
- Questioned, what will happen to those who are already here?
- Using AI. (i.e. computer modeling, use human cellular tissue) however this way is limited.
- Difficult to affect change at a local level about a federal issue.
- Organoids
- Participant expressed interest in a ban that was more expansive than City-controlled land
- Participant suggested to open to a dialog to find some alternative, if possible, that could address concerns re: conditions or lack of oversight.
- Concerned that outright ban will encourage the use of third parties for testing or other outsourcing that will remove additional oversight
- The group expressed that there is nothing compassionate about animal testing. Implementing a ban is a [moral] obligation to animals.
- The four people were in complete agreement in support of a ban. One non-Alameda resident said it is the "anvil." He said that the issue is unresolved without a ban and puts the City and its residents at risk of potential lawsuits.

**Question 3:** Do you believe prohibiting animal testing will affect the City's reputation in either positive or negative ways?

- For residents:
- Yes, positive impact knowing that the City you live in is not allowing companies to harm animals. Be part of the modernization.
- Difficult for 12% of residents who work in this field.
- For retaining/attracting businesses
- Met with Life Sci businesses. They are afraid it will impact them negatively. Fear for future decisions regarding existing leases.
- Attracting/retaining other types of businesses – no responses.
- Alameda's reputation in region/state/federal
- Positive impact. Alameda can lead the change.
- Discourage life science presence
- For residents:
- Yes, 3 positive impact (residents) ; 1 positive (non-residents); 1 mixed feeling
- For retaining/attracting businesses
- Yes, 3 positive impact (residents) ; 1 positive (non-residents); 1 more proactive/progressive Life Science companies do not engage in animal testing
- Attracting/retaining other types of businesses – no responses.
- Alameda's reputation in region/state/federal
- Animal testing ban will reflect the progressive nature of the community and would be positive for Alameda's reputation for residents and with the broader communities. It would be positive to attract and retain other types of businesses. There are plenty of non-animal testing life sciences companies in the City and the for-profit businesses that require animal testing are not something she's interested in the City having a good reputation with.
- Participant did not speak to this issue.
- The group thought that a ban would reflect positively on Alameda. They said that people may change their views and be supportive when presented with alternatives. Otherwise, people may not come to Alameda if there is no ban.
- Alameda can gain a reputation as a favorable business location and a cluster for alternative testing and working with new methods. The ban can be a marketing tool to attract more companies to Alameda.

**Question 4: Is there anything else you would like the City to know before considering this Ordinance?**

- Would a less extreme ban be accepted by City Council. Better received by the public?
- Residents of any City want to know that any testing that's done is ethical.

- NIH spends 21 billion per year into research. She wishes this money could go to something else, like supporting unhoused people.
- They would like the FDA modernization Act 2.0 to be considered. It is not black and white. There are a lot of gray areas unanswered.
- Participant stated that being against animal testing is not anti-science – a science-based position would be in support of banning animal testing because the science does not show that animal testing is necessary or effective, and other methods exist.
- Participant stated that the Ban could move testing to 3<sup>rd</sup> party labs with less oversight. Life Sciences industry as a whole is attempting to move away from animal testing, it is not something anyone *wants* to do. Animal testing continues to be something that needs to happen before human trials to prevent serious harm and liability.
- The City can promote its compassion and gain national attention. This is the way of the future. The future is leaning towards alternative methods, such as organ-on-a-chip.