

From: pamelaosgood@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Pamela Osgood](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, January 2, 2024 12:51:16 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Pamela Osgood
580 Capp St Apt 815 San Francisco, CA 94110-2561

From: [Edward Sing](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 10B on Jan 2, 2023 Alameda City Council Agenda: animal research prohibition resolution
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 4:10:25 PM

Alameda City Council:

I fully support this resolution and urge you to vote Yes!

Ed Sing
Alameda Resident for 27 Years

From: crsone@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Carol Strand](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 9:11:37 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Carol Strand
1733 Madera St Berkeley, CA 94707-2513

From: teri@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Teresa Goodman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 9:28:04 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Teresa Goodman
2209 Scott St San Francisco, CA 94115-1722

From: epincombe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Erin Pincombe](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 9:43:21 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Erin Pincombe
FILLMORE St San Francisco, CA 94115

From: ylan2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Lan Luc](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 10:20:02 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lan Luc
2028 Foothill Blvd # B Oakland, CA 94606-4670

From: jorge.becerril.b@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Jorge Becerril](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 11:44:42 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jorge Becerril
35 Alpine Ter San Francisco, CA 94117-3166

From: gnamgineh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Gail Henigman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 12:46:19 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Gail Henigman
101 Parnassus Ave Apt 1 San Francisco, CA 94117-4239

From: bah000224@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Francesca Rago](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 12:50:18 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Francesca Rago
111 Cleaveland Rd Apt 100 Pleasant Hill, CA 94523-3854

From: soohoo65@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Elanor Sue](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 1:05:53 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elanor Sue
255 8th Ave Apt 516 Oakland, CA 94606-5146

From: sue.klapholz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Sue Klapholz](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 1:56:29 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Sue Klapholz
76 Peter Coutts Cir Stanford, CA 94305-2511

From: lilacohen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [lila.cohen](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 2:07:41 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. lila.cohen
1218 Queens Rd Berkeley, CA 94708-2112

From: ticklebug@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Donna Turner](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 2:56:41 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Donna Turner
1154 Alemany Blvd San Francisco, CA 94112-1443

From: kellyberr@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Kelly Berry](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 3:03:42 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Kelly Berry
1036 Los Gamos Rd Apt B San Rafael, CA 94903-2579

From: kerry@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Kerry Boyd](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 3:54:48 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kerry Boyd
356 King St Redwood City, CA 94062-2039

From: joshuede@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Joshua Beth](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 4:26:15 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Joshua Beth
1484 76th Ave Oakland, CA 94621-2709

From: musicbytc@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Therese Brewitz](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 4:51:53 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Therese Brewitz
2362 Courtland Ave Oakland, CA 94601-4838

From: bbennigson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Barbara Bennigson](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 6:04:53 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Barbara Bennigson
2339 Ramona St Palo Alto, CA 94301-4132

From: anpeople@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Lydia Clifton](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 6:44:27 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lydia Clifton
3250 Hollis St Unit 211 Emeryville, CA 94608-4160

From: tterasoeveryactioncustom.com on behalf of [Trang Hoang](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 9:42:56 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Trang Hoang
2060 4th St Apt 412 Berkeley, CA 94710-1962

From: gwillows@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Gwen Willows](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 7:43:28 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Gwen Willows
3022 Tulare Ave Richmond, CA 94804-1150

From: crhellmuth@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Cynthia Hellmuth](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 10:37:42 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Cynthia Hellmuth
170 W G St Benicia, CA 94510-3142

From: oliviaccasino@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Judith Casino](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, January 2, 2024 9:08:58 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Judith Casino
21 Leeds Ct W Danville, CA 94526-4311

From: lynnh6608@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Lynn Husbands](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 9:10:17 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lynn Husbands
5396 Heavenly Ridge Ln El Sobrante, CA 94803-2627

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 5:19:11 PM

From: Kerry Boyd <kerry@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, January 1, 2024 3:54:41 PM
To: tspencer@alamedaca.gov <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property

Dear Councilmember Trish Spencer,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kerry Boyd
356 King St Redwood City, CA 94062-2039

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 5:17:03 PM

From: Therese Brewitz <musicbytc@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, January 1, 2024 4:51:51 PM
To: tspencer@alamedaca.gov <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property

Dear Councilmember Trish Spencer,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Ms. Therese Brewitz

2362 Courtland Ave Oakland, CA 94601-4838

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Fwd: Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 5:17:32 PM

From: Joshua Beth <joshtude@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, January 1, 2024 4:26:12 PM
To: tspencer@alamedaca.gov <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property

Dear Councilmember Trish Spencer,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Ms. Joshua Beth

1484 76th Ave Oakland, CA 94621-2709

From: [Debra Shapiro](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:54:47 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Debra Shapiro
1111 Marquita Ave Burlingame, CA 94010-3322

From: [Nikki Nafziger](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:39:55 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Nikki Nafziger
1101 Porter St Vallejo, CA 94590-7907

From: [Julie S](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:20:21 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Julie S
1082 Tilley Cir Concord, CA 94518-1829

From: [darrell Rolstone](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:18:26 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. darrell Rolstone
9 Orange Ave Larkspur, CA 94939-1925

From: [Ruth Robertson](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:18:02 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Ruth Robertson
126 Beaver St San Francisco, CA 94114-1517

From: [Utkarsh Nath](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:46:31 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Utkarsh Nath
34462 Alberta Ter Fremont, CA 94555-2907

From: [Agha Haider](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:45:10 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Agha Haider
10737 Inspiration Cir Dublin, CA 94568-5556

From: [Amita Pereira](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:33:09 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Amita Pereira
5800 Burlingame Ave Richmond, CA 94804-5210

From: [Dave Hall](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:30:17 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr Dave Hall
4800 Sorani Way Castro Valley, CA 94546-1350

From: [Leslie Harrop](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:20:27 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Leslie Harrop
17 El Paseo Half Moon Bay, CA 94019-2370

From: [AJ Cho](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:16:48 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mx. AJ Cho
159 Santa Teresa San Leandro, CA 94579-1963

From: [Suzanne Wood](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 8:35:18 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Suzanne Wood
2510 Russell St Apt 1 Berkeley, CA 94705-2158

From: [Sheila Gill](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 8:15:44 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Sheila Gill
PO Box 370592 Montara, CA 94037-0592

From: [Alice Polesky](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 8:12:43 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Alice Polesky
890 Kansas St Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94107-2664

From: [Hannah Cranch](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 8:07:45 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Hannah Cranch
2520 Emerson St Palo Alto, CA 94301-4222

From: [Kendra Knight](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 6:39:44 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Kendra Knight
1301 Sanchez Ave Burlingame, CA 94010-3643

From: [Elaine Huff](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 6:36:14 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Elaine Huff
1926 Anza St San Francisco, CA 94118-3657

From: [Giuliana Rinaldo](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 5:37:58 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Giuliana Rinaldo
1900 Trousdale Dr Burlingame, CA 94010-5387

From: [Elanor Sue](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 4:39:53 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elanor Sue
255 8th Ave Oakland, CA 94606-5146

From: [Greg Rosas](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 3:54:08 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Greg Rosas
4353 Edwards Ln Castro Valley, CA 94546-3653

From: [Tem Narvios](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 3:48:42 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tem Narvios
1425 Visitacion Ave San Francisco, CA 94134-2756

From: [R Daghighian](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 3:44:20 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. R Daghighian
1107 Emerald Bay Ln Foster City, CA 94404-4017

From: [Carol Taggart](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 3:17:04 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Carol Taggart
1705 Valparaiso Ave Menlo Park, CA 94025-5560

From: [Neale Miglani](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 3:14:30 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Neale Miglani
3 Macgregor Pl Danville, CA 94526-2918

From: [Antonia Moore](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 3:13:40 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Antonia Moore
1919 Alameda De Las Pulgas Apt 146 San Mateo, CA 94403-1256

From: [Beth Milton](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 3:13:23 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Miss Beth Milton
923 Olympia Ave NE Olympia, WA 98506-3937

From: [Elaine Parker](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 3:10:05 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elaine Parker
285 Fairlawn Dr Berkeley, CA 94708-2220

From: [Rocky Chau](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 2:41:18 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Rocky Chau
3811 Lakeside Dr Apt C212 Richmond, CA 94806-5755

From: [Ron E Ginsberg](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 2:29:06 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ron E Ginsberg
492 Grove St San Francisco, CA 94102-4303

From: [Christie Decker](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 2:21:33 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Christie Decker
786 Geary St San Francisco, CA 94109-7363

From: [Paula Purvis](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 2:01:15 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Paula Purvis
33 SE 2ND St Hallandale, FL 33009

From: [Thefbiswatching Izskaminyu](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 1:57:58 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Prefix Thefbiswatching Izskaminyu
23 Av Oakland, CA 94606

From: [Judith Gottesman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 1:41:27 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Judith Gottesman
PO Box 5043 El Cerrito, CA 94530

From: [Anne Tuddenham](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:56:03 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Anne Tuddenham
1220 King Dr El Cerrito, CA 94530-2550

From: [SUSAN LOUIE](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:51:31 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
SUSAN LOUIE
PO Box 7605 Berkeley, CA 94707-0605

From: [Diane Arndt](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:49:41 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Diane Arndt
2841 Ptarmigan Dr Walnut Creek, CA 94595-3136

From: [Patricia Arthur](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:48:55 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Patricia Arthur
30 Reservoir Rd Atherton, CA 94027-6420

From: [Gary Cianciarulo](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:47:36 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gary Cianciarulo
2699 18th St San Francisco, CA 94110-2110

From: [Judy Schultz](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:44:05 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Judy Schultz
2741 Bush St San Francisco, CA 94115-2927

From: [Cassie King](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:45:27 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Cassie King
2239 10th St Berkeley, CA 94710-2325

From: [Alexandra Saunders](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:40:21 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Miss Alexandra Saunders
190 Camino Encanto Danville, CA 94526-2418

From: [Linda Riebel](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:34:21 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Linda Riebel
3350 Hermosa Way Lafayette, CA 94549-2101

From: [Valerie Haak](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:27:17 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Valerie Haak
1738 Stanley Dollar Dr Walnut Creek, CA 94595-7427

From: [Kerry Boyd](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:19:21 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kerry Boyd
356 King St Redwood City, CA 94062-2039

From: [Mike Evans](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:12:16 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Evans
HEARST Ave Berkeley, CA 94720-0001

From: [Anita Watkins](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:15:47 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Anita Watkins
6109 Westover Dr Oakland, CA 94611-2404

From: [Michael Ambrose](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 12:01:54 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Ambrose
360 Vallejo Dr Apt 107 Millbrae, CA 94030-2878

From: [Waltraud Buckland](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:58:36 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Waltraud Buckland
155 Avenida Dr Berkeley, CA 94708-2124

From: [Enoe Corado](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:55:46 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Enoe Corado
PO Box 410056 San Francisco, CA 94141-0056

From: [Andrew Mueckenberger](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:52:38 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Andrew Mueckenberger
2953 Southwood Dr Alameda, CA 94501-1751

From: [Barbara Sanchez](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:50:05 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Barbara Sanchez
3440 Little Ln Lafayette, CA 94549-4603

From: [John Ida](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:46:15 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Ida
2000 Post St Apt 360 San Francisco, CA 94115-3577

From: [Vira Confectioner](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:40:32 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Vira Confectioner
PO Box 374 Sunol, CA 94586-0374

From: [Eclipse Diamond](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:40:31 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Miss Eclipse Diamond
1201 S Main St Apt 235 Milpitas, CA 95035-8060

From: [David Perry](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:36:47 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
David Perry
513 Ashton Ave Palo Alto, CA 94306-3608

From: [Krista Alexander](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:36:10 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Krista Alexander
260 Grove St Half Moon Bay, CA 94019-2004

From: [Patricia Geary](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:32:26 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Patricia Geary
708 Reisling Ct Clayton, CA 94517-1417

From: [katrina child](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:28:39 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. katrina child
4019 24th St San Francisco, CA 94114-3715

From: [Judy Bertelsen](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:28:30 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Judy Bertelsen
PO Box 2774 Berkeley, CA 94702-0774

From: [Michael Tomczyszyn](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:16:44 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Tomczyszyn
243 Ramsell St San Francisco, CA 94132-3140

From: [Jill Harris](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:19:54 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jill Harris
823 Fulton St San Francisco, CA 94117-1709

From: [Mari Vlastos](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:57:35 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Mari Vlastos
1221 Queens Rd Berkeley, CA 94708-2111

From: [Laura Nardozza](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:54:58 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Laura Nardozza
741 S Norfolk St San Mateo, CA 94401-3105

From: [ferran puig](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:54:31 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. ferran puig
249 Yale Ave Kensington, CA 94708-1013

From: [Elizabeth Hook](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:53:55 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Elizabeth Hook
2127 Taylor St Apt C San Francisco, CA 94133-2200

From: [Fumi Lee](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:52:12 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Fumi Lee
N A San Francisco, CA 94102

From: [john Lloyd](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:45:52 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Lloyd
3300 Powell St Emeryville, CA 94608-1528

From: [Leslie Smith](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:42:48 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Leslie Smith
6046 Fairlane Dr Oakland, CA 94611-1806

From: [Melissa Davis](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:39:49 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Melissa Davis
8240 Locust Pl S Dublin, CA 94568-1250

From: [Jan norris](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:34:06 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jan norris
1422 Bellevue Ave Apt 403 Burlingame, CA 94010-3920

From: [Y.Yeh](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:27:36 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Y Yeh
4641 Margery Dr Fremont, CA 94538-2537

From: [Miranda Helly](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:27:04 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Miranda Helly
1570 Jackson St Oakland, CA 94612-4469

From: [Julia Earl](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:07:06 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Julia Earl
7 Sunrise Ln Larkspur, CA 94939-2188

From: [LII D](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:04:14 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms LII D
900 Madison St Albany, CA 94706-2025

From: [Kathleen Harriman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:00:21 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Kathleen Harriman
167 Marina Lakes Dr Richmond, CA 94804-7453

From: [Catherine Morgan](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:56:52 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Catherine Morgan
1024 Fair Oaks Ave Alameda, CA 94501-3922

From: [Linda Johnson](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:56:04 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Linda Johnson
1648 Lodi Ave San Mateo, CA 94401-3658

From: [David Wendt](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:55:37 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Wendt
430 N Civic Dr Apt 412 Walnut Creek, CA 94596-3384

From: [Cayla Coleman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:53:43 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs Cayla Coleman
205 Bayview Dr San Rafael, CA 94901-2560

From: [Cheryl Parkins](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:51:27 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Cheryl Parkins
4285 Gilbert St Oakland, CA 94611-5115

From: [Jan Jones](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:49:15 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jan Jones
2612 Tulare Ave El Cerrito, CA 94530-1437

From: [Cindi Goldberg](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:47:50 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Cindi Goldberg
1257 Hopkins St Berkeley, CA 94702-1144

From: [Maria Nowicki](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:46:57 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Maria Nowicki
2324 14th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2517

From: [Heather Curtis](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:46:30 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Miss Heather Curtis
553 Central Ave Alameda, CA 94501-3757

From: [Barbara Greenwood](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:46:29 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Barbara Greenwood
713 Rosewood Dr Walnut Creek, CA 94596-6127

From: [Divya Priyanath](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:41:15 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Miss Divya Priyanath
20107 Sapphire St Castro Valley, CA 94546-4727

From: [Patricia Rogers](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:39:57 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Patricia Rogers
317 Avenida Flores Pacheco, CA 94553-5258

From: [Patricia Banchik](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:40:11 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Patricia Banchik
5827 Dover St Oakland, CA 94609-1423

From: [Arin Weitzman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:37:51 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Miss Arin Weitzman
772 34th St Richmond, CA 94805-1771

From: [Ann Graves](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:33:17 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Ann Graves
1619 137th Ave San Leandro, CA 94578-1603

From: [MARISA Menéndez](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:32:45 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
MARISA Menéndez
1118 Delaware St Berkeley, CA 94702-1620

From: [Kim Bartlett](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:29:24 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kim Bartlett
3250 Hollis St Unit 211 Emeryville, CA 94608-4160

From: [Renee Snyder](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:26:37 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Renee Snyder
2045 Pine Knoll Dr Walnut Creek, CA 94595-4650

From: [Lisa Maker](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:25:53 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs Lisa Maker
5455 Kirkwood Dr Concord, CA 94521-1643

From: [leslie smith](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:25:40 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. leslie smith
1065 62nd St Oakland, CA 94608-2321

From: [Jorge Bellosó-Curiel](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:24:26 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jorge Bellosó-Curiel
431 Metro Walk Way Richmond, CA 94801-3236

From: [R.Zierikzee](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:18:50 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. R. Zierikzee
845 Euclid Ave Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94118-2520

From: [Dorothy Pasquinelli](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:22:52 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Dorothy Pasquinelli
PO Box 2827 El Granada, CA 94018-2827

From: [Heidi Byers](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:16:05 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Heidi Byers
10 Driftwood Trl Half Moon Bay, CA 94019-2349

From: [Maria Harrington](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:15:58 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Maria Harrington
118 Blossom Cir San Mateo, CA 94403-4604

From: [Janicedotherighting Greenberg](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:15:34 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Janicedotherighting Greenberg
1708 Golden Rain Rd Apt 3 Walnut Creek, CA 94595-2140

From: [Jennifer Klatt](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:14:41 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jennifer Klatt
6694 Liggett Dr Oakland, CA 94611-3252

From: johanna1115@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Johanna Abate](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:12:58 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Johanna Abate
1650 California St Apt 9 San Francisco, CA 94109-4633

From: sue_rd_badger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Susan Fischer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:12:44 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Susan Fischer
2735 Cherry Ln Walnut Creek, CA 94597-2176

From: [Helen Cameron](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:08:59 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Helen Cameron
842 Neilson St Berkeley, CA 94707-1816

From: [Sheila Dixon](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:08:28 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Sheila Dixon
1516 Silverleaf Ln Concord, CA 94521-3546

From: [Carole Brady-Duport](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:08:19 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Carole Brady-Duport
286 Holly Ave South San Francisco, CA 94080-1321

From: [Valerie Jo Ann Orner](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:06:17 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Valerie Jo Ann Orner
1630 Sugarloaf Dr San Mateo, CA 94403-3946

From: [Michael Ames](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:06:32 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Ames
17500 Kingston Way Castro Valley, CA 94546-1125

From: [Denise Garza](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:05:13 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Denise Garza
4659 Diaz Dr Fremont, CA 94536-5450

From: [Martin Horwitz](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:05:09 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Martin Horwitz
1326 23rd Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-1608

From: [Shelley Abbate](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:05:09 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Shelley Abbate
2630 Parkside Dr Union City, CA 94587-1714

From: [Erin Meadows](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:05:09 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Erin Meadows
1148 Grizzly Peak Blvd Berkeley, CA 94708-1741

From: [Johanna Abate](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:03:07 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Johanna Abate
1650 California St Apt 9 San Francisco, CA 94109-4633

From: [Meera P](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:02:59 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ma Meera P
43456 Ellsworth St Fremont, CA 94539-4201

From: [Jann Lee](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:02:59 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jann Lee
116 Arlene Dr Walnut Creek, CA 94595-1731

From: [Susan Fischer](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:02:47 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Susan Fischer
2735 Cherry Ln Walnut Creek, CA 94597-2176

From: [Ramona Williams](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:02:29 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Ramona Williams
675 Hartz Ave Danville, CA 94526-3838

From: [Carlene Visperas](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:02:35 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Carlene Visperas
5361 Meadow Wood Pl Concord, CA 94521-1502

From: [Patricia Blackwell-Marchant](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023 9:01:41 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Patricia Blackwell-Marchant
5737 Medallion Ct Castro Valley, CA 94552-1708

From: [Parvin Shambayati](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 1:00:40 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Parvin Shambayati
2000 W John St Champaign, IL 61821-3666

From: [Niloofar Shambayati](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 1:00:43 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Niloofar Shambayati
1901 Marin Ave Berkeley, CA 94707-2407

From: [Devin McCormick](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:33:04 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Devin McCormick
1701 Brandee Ln Santa Rosa, CA 95403-8674

From: [Alan Bent](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 5:21:40 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Alan Bent
280 Spear St Unit 8G San Francisco, CA 94105-6194

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: Thank you for proposed resolution re prohibition of Animal Testing
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 6:34:01 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Joanna Perez-Green <joannaperezgreen@gmail.com>
Date: Oct 31, 2023 12:37 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Thank you for proposed resolution re prohibition of Animal Testing
To: Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>
Cc:

Dear Councilmember Spencer,

I wanted to thank you for your proposed resolution, "Consider Directing Staff to Draft an Ordinance Prohibiting Animal Testing and Experimentation on Property Owned or Controlled by the City of Alameda," which i support.

Thank you,
Joanna
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Carolyn Beaman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 8:02:33 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Carolyn Beaman
534 Shorebird Cir Unit 17201 Redwood City, CA 94065-1050

From: [Myra Delzeit](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 8:40:45 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Myra Delzeit
1270 Windermere Way Concord, CA 94521-3344

From: [Linda Savage](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 8:46:05 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Linda Savage
1511 136th Ave San Leandro, CA 94578-1640

From: [Glenna Dowling](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 10:50:37 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Glenna Dowling
2741 Bush St San Francisco, CA 94115-2927

From: [Joslyn Baxter](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 10:53:41 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Joslyn Baxter
324 Sheffield Ave Mill Valley, CA 94941-3860

From: [Karen Kirschling](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 11:00:43 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Karen Kirschling
633 Oak St Apt 2 San Francisco, CA 94117-2655

From: [Urmila Padmanabhan](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 11:09:00 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Urmila Padmanabhan
42629 Queens Park Ct Fremont, CA 94538-3946

From: [Marilyn Gandy](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 11:37:53 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Marilyn Gandy
950 Grizzly Peak Blvd Berkeley, CA 94708-1549

From: [Nancy Paskowitz](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 4:53:52 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Nancy Paskowitz
579 57th St Oakland, CA 94609-1746

From: [Bianca Molgora](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 4:04:26 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Bianca Molgora
3976 Folsom St San Francisco, CA 94110-6138

From: [Hoffer, Naomi](#)
To: [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please vote in favor of 10-B!
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 11:43:16 AM
Importance: High

Dear Alameda City Leaders,

As an Alameda resident, I urge you to vote in favor of Item 10-B, prohibiting animal experiments on public land, during the Alameda City Council's November 7 meeting. Banning cruel and ineffective animal experiments on city land would be a win for both human patients and animals, showing that Alameda supports ethical, human-relevant, science-driven research. Ninety-five percent of new drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Researchers and pharmaceutical companies are increasingly moving toward modern, non-animal methods for testing drugs and developing treatments for humans. Superior, cutting-edge technologies—including organs-on-chips and three-dimensional organ models that use human organ and tissue cells—are readily available and effectively mimic human systems.

Thank you for your consideration of this important and merciful request.

Best,

Naomi Hoffer, Alameda City Resident

From: [Candi Ausman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 11:59:04 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Candi Ausman
35640 Fremont Blvd Unit 334 Fremont, CA 94536-3420

From: [Timothy Bickel](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 12:27:13 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Timothy Bickel
1608 Marina Ct San Mateo, CA 94403-5572

From: [nicole.kidd](#)
To: [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please vote in favor of 10-B - no animal experimentation on our island!>Nine Out of Ten Drugs That Appear Promising in Animal Studies Go on to Fail in Human Clinical Trials.
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 12:39:09 PM

- As an Alameda resident, I urge you to vote in favor of Item 10-B, prohibiting animal experiments on public land, during the Alameda City Council's November 7 meeting.
- Banning cruel and ineffective animal experiments on city land would be a win for both human patients and animals, showing that Alameda supports ethical, human-relevant, science-driven research.
- **Ninety-five percent of new drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials, according to** The National Institutes of Health (NIH) . Researchers and pharmaceutical companies are increasingly moving toward modern, non-animal methods for testing drugs and developing treatments for humans. Superior, cutting-edge technologies—including organs-on-chips and three-dimensional organ models that use human organ and tissue cells—are readily available and effectively mimic human systems.

Please SAY NO to ANIMAL TESTING ON ALAMEDA!!!

Thank you, Nicole Kidd

Nicole Kidd | 510-967-8295 | 

Analyst | Trend Scout | Moderator |

AUSD CTE INDUSTRY ADVISORY CHAIRPERSON

NEW: <https://NicoleKidd.com> #ArtisanNK #NKiddJewelry



From: [Dina Slobodnink](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 12:48:46 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Dina Slobodnink
510 41st St Oakland, CA 94609-2412

From: [JUDITH FRUGE](#)
To: jfruge@gmail.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 10-B
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 4:03:21 PM

- As an Alameda resident, I urge you to vote in favor of Item 10-B, prohibiting animal experiments on public land, during the Alameda City Council's November 7 meeting.
- Banning cruel and ineffective animal experiments on city land would be a win for both human patients and animals, showing that Alameda supports ethical, human-relevant, science-driven research.
- Ninety-five percent of new drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Researchers and pharmaceutical companies are increasingly moving toward modern, non-animal methods for testing drugs and developing treatments for humans. Superior, cutting-edge technologies—including organs-on-chips and three-dimensional organ models that use human organ and tissue cells—are readily available and effectively mimic human systems.
I strongly urge you to support 10-B.

Thank you,
Judith Fruge

From: [Susan Dunn](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [CityCouncil-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item #10B... please support this resolution
Date: Sunday, November 5, 2023 4:30:01 PM

Dear Honorable Mayor Ashcraft and City Council Members.

I urge you to support and vote for the resolution coming before you 11/7/23

Agenda

10B

regarding an resolution for drafting an ordinance which declares that there be no animal experimentation

or animal research permitted at City owned buildings, or land or property controlled by the City.

Please support and vote for this resolution; It is clear from the many emails you have received and are receiving that

a majority of Alamedans want and desire this resolution to be passed by you.

And please recall there is a long history in Alameda of residents being critical of animal research and the way it is conducted. Additionally Alamedans want to preserve the City's good image and we believe that widespread animal research particularly on/at our City owned properties will tarnish this good image.

If the City wants to encourage Life Sciences companies to settle in Alameda, that is well and good.

However under the category of Life Sciences are many many types of companies

that do not use animals in their research. We Alamedans ask that the City formulate a policy of encouraging those types of companies to settle here.

Thank you,

Susan and Jeff Dunn

Susan Dunn
36 Sunny Cove Circle
Alameda, CA 94502
510-337-1354 (home)
510-759-9771 (cell)

From: [Geraldyn Gulseth](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Sunday, November 5, 2023 11:59:27 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Miss Geraldyn Gulseth
110 Lagunaria Ln Alameda, CA 94502-6701

From: [Allison Jones](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Sunday, November 5, 2023 11:34:47 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Allison Jones
621 18th St Oakland, CA 94612-1324

From: [Laura Mani](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Sunday, November 5, 2023 9:36:14 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Laura Mani
1007 Erica Rd Mill Valley, CA 94941-3749

From: [MARIE SARRICA](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Saturday, November 4, 2023 3:53:31 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. MARIE SARRICA
25853 Westview Way Hayward, CA 94542-1939

From: [Midori Nakayama](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Friday, November 3, 2023 10:35:43 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Midori Nakayama
220 Cardenas Ave San Francisco, CA 94132-2420

From: [Valerie Jo Ann Orner](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:31:26 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Valerie Jo Ann Orner
1630 Sugarloaf Dr San Mateo, CA 94403-3946

From: [Harry Garrison](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:32:07 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Harry Garrison
1229 Oregon St Berkeley, CA 94702-2246

From: [Renee Snyder](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:32:36 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Renee Snyder
2045 Pine Knoll Dr Walnut Creek, CA 94595-4650

From: [Valerie Haak](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:32:40 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Valerie Haak
1738 Stanley Dollar Dr Apt 1B Walnut Creek, CA 94595-2858

From: [Lisa Maker](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:32:59 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs Lisa Maker
5455 Kirkwood Dr Concord, CA 94521-1643

From: [Patricia Jones](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:34:00 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Patricia Jones
98 Stratford Rd Kensington, CA 94707-1246

From: [Maria Nowicki](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:34:01 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Maria Nowicki
2324 14th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2517

From: [Natalie Khitrov](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:34:08 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Natalie Khitrov
2600 San Leandro Blvd Apt 1308 San Leandro, CA 94578-5045

From: [Martin Horwitz](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:35:34 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Martin Horwitz
1326 23rd Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-1608

From: [Joslyn Baxter](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:36:30 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Joslyn Baxter
324 Sheffield Ave Mill Valley, CA 94941-3860

From: [josephine ramos](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:36:36 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. josephine ramos
1161 Kearny St San Francisco, CA 94133-4055

From: [Diana Bohn](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:37:01 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Diana Bohn
618 San Luis Rd Berkeley, CA 94707-1726

From: [Christopher Evans](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:37:55 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Christopher Evans
HEARST Ave Berkeley, CA 94720-0001

From: [John Ida](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:38:24 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Ida
2000 Post St Apt 360 San Francisco, CA 94115-3577

From: [Michael Ames](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:38:25 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Ames
17500 Kingston Way Castro Valley, CA 94546-1125

From: [R.Zierikzee](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:38:25 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. R. Zierikzee
845 Euclid Ave Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94118-2520

From: [Crystal Heath](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:38:34 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Crystal Heath
3015 San Pablo Ave Berkeley, CA 94702-2430

From: [David Balsam](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:39:24 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Balsam
6239 College Ave Oakland, CA 94618-1329

From: [Patricia Banchik](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:39:37 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Patricia Banchik
5827 Dover St Oakland, CA 94609-1423

From: [Linda Johnson](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:40:38 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Linda Johnson
1648 Lodi Ave San Mateo, CA 94401-3658

From: [Michelle Santy](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:40:40 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Michelle Santy
PO Box 203 Moss Beach, CA 94038-0203

From: [Youching Yeh](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:41:28 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Youching Yeh
4641 Margery Dr Fremont, CA 94538-2537

From: [Terry Zwigoff](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:41:28 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Terry Zwigoff
290 Mullen Ave San Francisco, CA 94110-5332

From: [Johanna Abate](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:42:38 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Johanna Abate
1650 California St Apt 9 San Francisco, CA 94109-4633

From: [Elizabeth Ryan](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:42:59 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elizabeth Ryan
1413 7th St Berkeley, CA 94710-1411

From: [Jill Fraser](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:43:36 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jill Fraser
80 Eddystone Ct Redwood City, CA 94065-1234

From: [Kristin Womack](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:44:23 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kristin Womack
396 San Francisco Blvd San Anselmo, CA 94960-1639

From: [Jason Scharnagel](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:44:32 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jason Scharnagel
1636 Clayton Rd Apt 7 Concord, CA 94520-3314

From: [Melissa Davis](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:46:22 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Melissa Davis
8240 Locust Pl S Dublin, CA 94568-1250

From: [Anita Watkins](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:46:54 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Anita Watkins
6109 Westover Dr Oakland, CA 94611-2404

From: [Nikki Nafziger](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:47:30 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Nikki Nafziger
1101 Porter St Vallejo, CA 94590-7907

From: [Ramona Williams](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:48:23 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Ramona Williams
675 Hartz Ave Danville, CA 94526-3838

From: [R Daghighian](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:48:39 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. R Daghighian
1107 Emerald Bay Ln Foster City, CA 94404-4017

From: [Kim Bartlett](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:51:20 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kim Bartlett
3250 Hollis St Unit 211 Oakland, CA 94608-4160

From: [Patricia Rogers](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:53:40 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Patricia Rogers
317 Avenida Flores Pacheco, CA 94553-5258

From: [Stefany Reich-Silber](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:54:47 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
MS. Stefany Reich-Silber
1801 California St Berkeley, CA 94703-1207

From: [Michael Tomczyszyn](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:55:51 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Tomczyszyn
243 Ramsell St San Francisco, CA 94132-3140

From: [Erika Tunick](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:55:57 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Erika Tunick
15 Hoffman Ave San Francisco, CA 94114-3123

From: [Cyndi Sood-Parker](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:57:34 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Cyndi Sood-Parker
4927 Seaview Ave Castro Valley, CA 94546-2346

From: [Elaine Huff](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:00:02 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Elaine Huff
1926 Anza St San Francisco, CA 94118-3657

From: [Earl West](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:00:45 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Earl West
7 Rice St Apt 3 Daly City, CA 94014-1036

From: [Dianne Morrison](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:04:03 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Dianne Morrison
20 Curtis Ave San Rafael, CA 94901-2007

From: [Elizabeth Watts](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:05:14 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elizabeth Watts
2030 Santa Clara St Richmond, CA 94804-5236

From: [Leah Anton](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:05:35 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Leah Anton
PO Box 342 Ross, CA 94957-0342

From: [Jack Zelter](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:06:45 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Jack Zelter
146 Ardmore Rd Kensington, CA 94707-1336

From: [Elanor Sue](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:09:31 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elanor Sue
255 8th Ave Oakland, CA 94606-5146

From: [Kim Brink](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:09:59 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kim Brink
4177 Sora Cmn Fremont, CA 94555-3033

From: [Ann Graves](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:10:55 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Ann Graves
1619 137th Ave San Leandro, CA 94578-1603

From: [Jan norris](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:13:36 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jan norris
1422 Bellevue Ave Apt 403 Burlingame, CA 94010-3920

From: [john Lloyd](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:14:09 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Lloyd
3300 Powell St Emeryville, CA 94608-1528

From: [Ron E Ginsberg](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:14:47 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ron E Ginsberg
492 Grove St San Francisco, CA 94102-4303

From: [Elaine Parker](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:16:19 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elaine Parker
285 Fairlawn Dr Berkeley, CA 94708-2220

From: [Shari Riffe](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:17:04 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Shari Riffe
391 Camino Las Juntas Pleasant Hill, CA 94523-2108

From: [Jann Lee](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:18:16 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jann Lee
116 Arlene Dr Walnut Creek, CA 94595-1731

From: [Jan Jones](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:18:29 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jan Jones
2612 Tulare Ave El Cerrito, CA 94530-1437

From: [Laura Nardozza](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:23:34 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Laura Nardozza
741 S Norfolk St San Mateo, CA 94401-3105

From: [Ann Myers](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:28:20 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Ann Myers
WEBSTER St Berkeley, CA 94705

From: [Dorie Gallinatti](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:28:47 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Dorie Gallinatti
1716 B Saint Charles St Alameda, CA 94501-2234

From: [Debra Shapiro](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:29:05 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Debra Shapiro
1111 Marquita Ave Burlingame, CA 94010-3322

From: [Arin Weitzman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:29:38 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Miss Arin Weitzman
772 34th St Richmond, CA 94805-1771

From: [Gary Cianciarulo](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:31:58 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gary Cianciarulo
2699 18th St San Francisco, CA 94110-2110

From: [Meera P](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:34:45 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ma Meera P
43456 Ellsworth St Fremont, CA 94539-4201

From: [Sandi Covell](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:36:10 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Sandi Covell
1183 Alemany Blvd San Francisco, CA 94112-1401

From: [Josephine Bellacomo](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:36:18 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Josephine Bellacomo
1649 Treat Ave San Francisco, CA 94110-5235

From: [Kim Shaw](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:36:52 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kim Shaw
10 Easton Ct Orinda, CA 94563-3609

From: [Jennifer Klatt](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:37:02 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jennifer Klatt
6694 Liggett Dr Oakland, CA 94611-3252

From: [Leland Toy](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:37:36 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr Leland Toy
8235 Moller Ranch Dr Pleasanton, CA 94588-9671

From: [Marilyn Gandy](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:38:44 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Marilyn Gandy
950 Grizzly Peak Blvd Berkeley, CA 94708-1549

From: [Manasvi Khullar](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:40:25 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Manasvi Khullar
11740 San Pablo Ave El Cerrito, CA 94530-1769

From: [Miranda Helly](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:45:46 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Miranda Helly
1570 Jackson St Oakland, CA 94612-4469

From: [Roberta Parrish](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:51:35 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Roberta Parrish
9025 N Clover Way Tucson, AZ 85743-5108

From: [Sean San José](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:55:01 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mx. Sean San José
566 Lisbon St San Francisco, CA 94112-3543

From: [Daniel Slade](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:55:29 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Daniel Slade
5758 Geary Blvd # 127 San Francisco, CA 94121-2112

From: [Laura Ford](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:56:28 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Laura Ford
1601 Broadway Apt 1 Alameda, CA 94501-3050

From: [Rondi Saslow](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:56:41 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Rondi Saslow
PO Box 5595 Berkeley, CA 94705-0595

From: [Cayla Coleman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:58:40 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs Cayla Coleman
205 Bayview Dr San Rafael, CA 94901-2560

From: [jorge belloso curiel](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:06:42 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. jorge belloso curiel
431 Metro Walk Way Richmond, CA 94801-3236

From: [Ruth Stoner Muzzin](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:11:46 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Ruth Stoner Muzzin
PO Box 370761 Montara, CA 94037-0761

From: [Vira Confectioner](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:18:52 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Vira Confectioner
PO Box 374 Sunol, CA 94586-0374

From: [Cindi Goldberg](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:21:57 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Cindi Goldberg
1257 Hopkins St Berkeley, CA 94702-1144

From: [Maria Rivero](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:22:00 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr Maria Rivero
4150 Folsom St San Francisco, CA 94110-6120

From: [Judy Bertelsen](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:22:03 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Judy Bertelsen
PO Box 2774 Berkeley, CA 94702-0774

From: [Janicedotherighting Greenberg](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:26:04 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Janicedotherighting Greenberg
3051 Wheeler St Berkeley, CA 94705-1826

From: [Anne Barker](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:34:33 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Anne Barker
567 Heather Way San Rafael, CA 94903-2446

From: [Julia Earl](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:40:24 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Julia Earl
7 Sunrise Ln Larkspur, CA 94939-2188

From: [Urmila Padmanabhan](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:48:06 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Urmila Padmanabhan
42629 Queens Park Ct Fremont, CA 94538-3946

From: [Renee Yates](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:48:41 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Renee Yates
607 Congo St # 94131 San Francisco, CA 94131-2807

From: [Alma Schiefer](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:51:53 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Alma Schiefer
161 Wilkie Dr Walnut Creek, CA 94598-4913

From: [Yolanda Calderon](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:51:54 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Yolanda Calderon
476 41st St Oakland, CA 94609-2520

From: [Diane Arndt](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 11:54:44 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Diane Arndt
2841 Ptarmigan Dr Walnut Creek, CA 94595-3136

From: [David Perry](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:04:15 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
David Perry
513 Ashton Ave Palo Alto, CA 94306-3608

From: [Robert Lawrence](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:05:40 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Robert Lawrence
107 9th Ave San Francisco, CA 94118-1222

From: [John Tetzlaff](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:10:08 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. John Tetzlaff
2131 5th Ave San Rafael, CA 94901-1081

From: [Fumi Lee](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:14:57 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Fumi Lee
N A San Francisco, CA 94102

From: [Bonnie Carlson](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:16:13 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Bonnie Carlson
1018 4th Ave Apt 117 Oakland, CA 94606-2370

From: [Sheila Gill](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:19:04 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Sheila Gill
PO Box 370592 Montara, CA 94037-0592

From: [Mike Evans](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:19:32 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike Evans
HEARST Ave Berkeley, CA 94720-0001

From: [Ray Staar](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:22:12 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ray Staar
1441 Clay St Apt 5 San Francisco, CA 94109-0209

From: [Sue Hall](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:25:54 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs Sue Hall
4800 Sorani Way Castro Valley, CA 94546-1350

From: [Waltraud Buckland](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:27:21 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Waltraud Buckland
155 Avenida Dr Berkeley, CA 94708-2124

From: [Christie Decker](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:32:11 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Christie Decker
786 Geary St Apt 401 San Francisco, CA 94109-7341

From: [Linda Riebel](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:37:39 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Linda Riebel
3350 Hermosa Way Lafayette, CA 94549-2101

From: [Stephan Silen](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:45:15 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Stephan Silen
832 Fawn Dr San Anselmo, CA 94960-1134

From: [Andrew Mueckenberger](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:45:28 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Andrew Mueckenberger
2953 Southwood Dr Alameda, CA 94501-1751

From: [Joseph Cloren](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] thank you
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:45:29 PM

Dear Honorable Mayor Ashcraft and City Council Members.

I urge you to support and vote for the resolution coming before you 11/7/23 Agenda # 10B

regarding an resolution for drafting an ordinance which declares that there be no animal experimentation or animal research permitted at City owned buildings, or land or property controlled by the City.

Please support and vote for this resolution; It is clear from the many emails you are receiving that this is what

a majority of Alamedans want and desire. And there is a long history in Alameda of residents being critical of animal research and the way it is conducted.

Additionally Alamedans want to preserve the City's good image and we believe that widespread animal research particularly on/at our City owned properties will tarnish this good image.

If the City wants to encourage Life Sciences companies to settle in Alameda, that is well and good.

However under the category of Life Sciences are many many types of companies that do not use animals in their research. We Alamedans ask that the City formulate a policy of encouraging those types of companies to settle here.

Thank you,
Joseph cloren

From: [Elaine Chung](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:45:32 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elaine Chung
2122 Ocaso Camino Fremont, CA 94539-5646

From: [Howard Lazar](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:47:32 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Howard Lazar
60 Meadow Dr San Rafael, CA 94903-2859

From: [Candi Ausman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:49:02 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Candi Ausman
35640 Fremont Blvd Unit 334 Fremont, CA 94536-3420

From: [Deborah Temple](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:49:08 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Deborah Temple
1821 5th Ave San Rafael, CA 94901-1787

From: [Karen Kirschling](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:50:19 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Karen Kirschling
633 Oak St Apt 2 San Francisco, CA 94117-2655

From: howarddlazar@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Howard Lazar](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 12:52:04 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Howard Lazar
60 Meadow Dr San Rafael, CA 94903-2859

From: [Amy Shepard](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 1:00:40 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Amy Shepard
11 Curtis Ave San Rafael, CA 94901-2006

From: [Thefbiswatching Izskaminyu](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 1:07:33 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Prefix Thefbiswatching Izskaminyu
23 Av Oakland, CA 94606

From: [Giuliana Rinaldo](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 1:09:16 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Giuliana Rinaldo
1900 Trousdale Dr Burlingame, CA 94010-5387

From: [James Lynch](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 1:25:52 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Lynch
622 W Poplar Ave San Mateo, CA 94402-1136

From: [Elizabeth Hook](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 1:46:12 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Elizabeth Hook
2127 Taylor St Apt C San Francisco, CA 94133-2200

From: [Carlene Visperas](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 2:05:10 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Carlene Visperas
5361 Meadow Wood Pl Concord, CA 94521-1502

From: [Janet Bindas](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 2:13:44 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Janet Bindas
2973 MI Elana Cir Walnut Creek, CA 94598-3844

From: [Melvin Thrash](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 2:21:09 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Melvin Thrash
2023 Fairmont Dr San Mateo, CA 94402-3925

From: [Timothy Bickel](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 2:21:50 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Timothy Bickel
1608 Marina Ct San Mateo, CA 94403-5572

From: [Jordan Briskin](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 2:44:51 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jordan Briskin
2850 Middlefield Rd Palo Alto, CA 94306-2512

From: [Christina Gill](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 2:47:51 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Christina Gill
297 Lombardi Cir Walnut Creek, CA 94598-4906

From: [M. Masek](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 2:50:11 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. M Masek
225 Town And Country Dr Danville, CA 94526-3739

From: [Vasu Murti](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 3:24:30 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Vasu Murti
30 Villanova Ln Oakland, CA 94611-1166

From: [Charles Wieland](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 3:30:46 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr Charles Wieland
206 Compton Cir Apt A San Ramon, CA 94583-1683

From: [Patricia Blackwell-Marchant](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 3:54:36 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Patricia Blackwell-Marchant
5737 Medallion Ct Castro Valley, CA 94552-1708

From: [Jennifer Merino](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please do not support animal testing in Alameda
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 4:09:22 PM

Please vote against animal testing in Alameda tomorrow.

From: [Bianca Molgora](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 4:25:09 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Bianca Molgora
3976 Folsom St San Francisco, CA 94110-6138

From: [Greg Rosas](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 4:29:56 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Greg Rosas
4353 Edwards Ln Castro Valley, CA 94546-3653

From: [Nancy Paskowitz](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 4:36:23 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Nancy Paskowitz
579 57th St Oakland, CA 94609-1746

From: [Shelley Abbate](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 4:56:09 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Shelley Abbate
2630 Parkside Dr Union City, CA 94587-1714

From: [Carol Taggart](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 5:06:43 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Carol Taggart
1705 Valparaiso Ave Menlo Park, CA 94025-5560

From: [darrell Rolstone](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 5:33:49 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. darrell Rolstone
9 Orange Ave Larkspur, CA 94939-1925

From: [Patricia Geary](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 6:27:15 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Patricia Geary
708 Reisling Ct Clayton, CA 94517-1417

From: [Sheila Dixon](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 6:27:24 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
ms. Sheila Dixon
1516 Silverleaf Ln Concord, CA 94521-3546

From: [George Ruiz](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 6:28:23 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. George Ruiz
1321 Hull Dr San Carlos, CA 94070-2220

From: [Jacqueline Barden](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 6:34:01 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jacqueline Barden
1182 Park Ave Apt A Alameda, CA 94501-5256

From: [Caephren McKenna](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 6:56:38 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Caephren McKenna
392 44th St Oakland, CA 94609-2225

From: [Alison Raleigh](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 7:11:40 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Alison Raleigh
762 La Para Ave Palo Alto, CA 94306-3157

From: [Catherine Loudis](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 7:21:56 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Catherine Loudis
219 Butterfield Rd San Anselmo, CA 94960-1242

From: [Patricia Santos](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 7:35:26 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Patricia Santos
361 Leo Ave San Leandro, CA 94577-2720

From: [Jess Hernandez](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 7:36:22 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Jess Hernandez
1684 Matheson Rd CA94521 Concord, CA 94521-2135

From: [Alice Polesky](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 7:52:55 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Alice Polesky
890 Kansas St Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94107-2664

From: [Barbara Greenwood](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 8:01:25 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Barbara Greenwood
713 Rosewood Dr Walnut Creek, CA 94596-6127

From: [rina Place](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 8:14:12 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. rina Place
2100 Miramonte Ave San Leandro, CA 94578-1563

From: [Jess Hernandez](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 8:16:03 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Jess Hernandez
1684 Matheson Rd CA94521 Concord, CA 94521-2135

From: [Ruth Robertson](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 8:32:32 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Ruth Robertson
126 Beaver St San Francisco, CA 94114-1517

From: [Julie S](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:19:49 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Julie S
1082 Tilley Cir Concord, CA 94518-1829

From: [Marie Sparr](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:34:50 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Marie Sparr
2057 Bayporte Way San Ramon, CA 94582-5722

From: [AJ Cho](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:37:35 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mx. AJ Cho
159 Santa Teresa San Leandro, CA 94579-1963

From: [Agha Haider](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:51:50 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Agha Haider
10737 Inspiration Cir Dublin, CA 94568-5556

From: [Tatyana Shats](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:56:46 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Tatyana Shats
1521 Sutter St Apt 405 San Francisco, CA 94109-5390

From: [Petra McClinton](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 9:57:13 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Petra McClinton
PO Box 4134 San Rafael, CA 94913-4134

From: [Utkarsh Nath](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 6, 2023 10:02:56 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Utkarsh Nath
34462 Alberta Ter Fremont, CA 94555-2907

From: [Lorien Smyer](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 12:00:44 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lorien Smyer
5923 Tehama Ave Richmond, CA 94804-5047

From: [Tem Narvios](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 12:27:26 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Tem Narvios
1425 Visitacion Ave San Francisco, CA 94134-2756

From: [Esther Roberts](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 1:27:00 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Esther Roberts
1543 Seaver Ct Hayward, CA 94545-2553

From: [Raquel Narvios](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 1:34:12 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Raquel Narvios
1425 Visitacion Ave San Francisco, CA 94134-2756

From: [Benjamin Young](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 2:54:36 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Benjamin Young
240 41st St Oakland, CA 94611-5608

From: [Liliane Morin](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 6:57:31 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Liliane Morin
6400 Shellmound St Emeryville, CA 94608-1018

From: [SUSAN LOUIE](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 7:54:50 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
SUSAN LOUIE
PO Box 7605 Berkeley, CA 94707-0605

From: [Tank Conner](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 7:58:56 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Tank Conner
1516 Yuba Ave San Pablo, CA 94806-4058

From: [Linda Savage](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 8:21:33 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Linda Savage
1511 136th Ave San Leandro, CA 94578-1640

From: [Dorothy Pasquinelli](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 10:25:45 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Dorothy Pasquinelli
PO Box 2827 El Granada, CA 94018-2827

From: [Elisse De Sio](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 10:45:24 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elisse De Sio
1176 Laurel St San Carlos, CA 94070-5009

From: [Colleena Brazen](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 11:58:44 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Colleena Brazen
3241 Sugarberry Ln Walnut Creek, CA 94598-1728

From: [Reyla Graber](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Agenda item 10B--Do vote for this Resolution.
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 11:59:08 AM

Dear Honorable Mayor and Council Member,

I urge you to pass the "no animal research on/at City property etc" resolution before you tonight, Agenda item #10B. This really is a logical step forward from the CC vote that was taken on 10/17 regarding Science Corp. From the hundreds of emails you have received both for the 10/17 vote, and likely also for tonight's vote, it seems clear that a majority of Alamedans do not want or desire animal experimentation on at City property.

Under the umbrella called the "Life Sciences" are many businesses that do not utilize animal research/experimentation. We encourage the City to have a policy that encourages those types of companies/Life Sciences companies to locate here.

Sincerely,

Reyla Graber

From: [Heidi Dietz](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 12:15:18 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Heidi Dietz
310 Westline Dr Apt B309 Alameda, CA 94501-5910

From: [Joyce Saad](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 12:51:49 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Joyce Saad
1519 Chestnut St Alameda, CA 94501-2728

From: [Laura Mani](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 8, 2023 5:51:11 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Laura Mani
1007 Erica Rd Mill Valley, CA 94941-3749

Ashley Zieba

From: kcdknight@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kendra Knight
<kcdknight@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 8, 2023 4:53 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Kendra Knight
1301 Sanchez Ave Burlingame, CA 94010-3643

From: [Gale](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Animal testing in Alameda
Date: Friday, November 10, 2023 9:03:20 AM

Please consider banning future leases for businesses that do animal testing. Further, please review and consider not renewing current leases for these businesses.

Thank you.

Gale Mitchell

From: [Debra Wills](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Friday, November 10, 2023 1:42:52 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Debra Wills
659 Boulevard Way Piedmont, CA 94610-1642

From: [Eddie Bruce](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Sunday, November 12, 2023 10:30:08 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 7 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 7 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Eddie Bruce
1116 King Dr El Cerrito, CA 94530-2512

From: [Patricia Santos](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 8:17:05 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Patricia Santos
361 Leo Ave San Leandro, CA 94577-2720

From: [Pat Lakner](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 8:19:42 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Pat Lakner
2514 Mar East St Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920-1204

From: [Richard Schwartz](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 8:22:45 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Schwartz
1676 Tacoma Ave Berkeley, CA 94707-1827

From: [Cayla Coleman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 8:25:34 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs Cayla Coleman
205 Bayview Dr San Rafael, CA 94901-2560

From: [Sara Winslow](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 8:39:34 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Sara Winslow
538 Peralta Ave San Francisco, CA 94110-5339

From: [Teresa Moore](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 8:58:59 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Miss Teresa Moore
1731 15th St Apt 312 San Francisco, CA 94103-3325

From: [Debra Kaihani](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 9:05:49 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Debra Kaihani
375 Hill Way San Carlos, CA 94070-4410

From: [Valerie Jo Ann Orner](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 9:09:20 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Valerie Jo Ann Orner
1630 Sugarloaf Dr San Mateo, CA 94403-3946

From: [Inge Breuer](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 9:22:20 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Inge Breuer
302 4th St Apt 327 San Rafael, CA 94901-3471

From: [Lynn Armstrong](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 9:23:31 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lynn Armstrong
408 Seaview Dr El Cerrito, CA 94530-3349

From: [Linda Tabor-Beck](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 9:29:35 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Linda Tabor-Beck
2712 Harrison St San Francisco, CA 94110-3320

From: [Kathy Morey](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 9:33:33 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Kathy Morey
249 Clifton Ave San Carlos, CA 94070-1752

From: [Ashley Lorden](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 10:27:34 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Ashley Lorden
2232 Clinton Ave Alameda, CA 94501-4967

From: [Kathleen Hart](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 10:36:22 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kathleen Hart
765 Rose Dr Benicia, CA 94510-3732

From: [Kim Bartlett](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 10:38:55 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kim Bartlett
3250 Hollis St Unit 211 Oakland, CA 94608-4160

From: [Robert Powell](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 11:47:27 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Powell
960 Kern St Richmond, CA 94805-1121

From: [Robert Powell](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 11:47:27 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert Powell
960 Kern St Richmond, CA 94805-1121

From: [Sarah Koenig](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 1:52:34 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Sarah Koenig
24 Royal Ct San Rafael, CA 94901-4221

From: [Jann Lee](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 6:38:21 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jann Lee
116 Arlene Dr Walnut Creek, CA 94595-1731

From: [Elizabeth Marshall](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 9:26:01 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Elizabeth Marshall
6059 Shelter Bay Ave Mill Valley, CA 94941-3053

From: [jon berg](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 12:35:54 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. jon berg
2132 Walnut Creek, CA 94596

From: [Alameda Citizens Task Force](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tracy Jensen](#)
Cc: [Manager Manager](#); [City Clerk](#); [Yibin Shen](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Correspondence, 11/21/23 City Council Agenda, Item 10-B, Animal Testing
Date: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 12:51:23 PM
Attachments: [ACT Letter 11_15_2023_Item_10B_Animal_Testing.pdf](#)

Dear Mayor and City Council members,

Please see attached correspondence for the 11/21/23 City Council Meeting, Item 10-B, Animal Testing.

Thank you.

ACT

ACT
Alameda Citizens Task Force
Vigilance, Truth, Civility

November 15, 2023

Dear Mayor and City Council members,

Re: 11/21/23, Agenda Item 10-B

We support the ordinance to prohibit animal testing and experimentation on City-owned properties. The trend in recent legislation at the state level has been to further restrict animal testing. Recently-implemented SB-879 is one such example. Given the private ownership of these tenants, the City may be limited in its ability to learn what is actually occurring on its property, potentially exposing the City to additional liability.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

ACT Board

From: [Joy Kosobayashi](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 2:32:54 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Joy Kosobayashi
949 Continental Dr Menlo Park, CA 94025-6622

From: [nicole.kidd](#)
To: [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please protect animals - VOTE IN FAVOR of 10B, prohibiting animal experiments!!!
Date: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 4:18:28 PM
Importance: High



As an Alameda resident, I urge you to vote in favor of Item 10-B, prohibiting animal experiments on public land, during the Alameda City Council's November 21 meeting.

- Banning cruel and ineffective animal experiments on city land would be a win for both human patients and animals, showing that Alameda supports ethical, human-relevant, science-driven research.
- Ninety-five percent of new drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Researchers and pharmaceutical companies are increasingly moving toward modern, non-animal methods for testing drugs and developing treatments for humans. Superior, cutting-edge technologies—including organs-on-chips and three-dimensional organ models that use human organ and tissue cells—are readily available and effectively mimic human systems.

Thank you for your ongoing dedication to protecting animals.

Nicole Kidd | 510-967-8295 | 
Analyst | Trend Scout | Moderator |
AUSD [CTE](#) INDUSTRY ADVISORY CHAIRPERSON
NEW: <https://NicoleKidd.com> #ArtisanNK #NKiddJewelry



From: [Cathy Yee](#)
To: [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support of Item 10-B
Date: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 8:37:53 PM

- As an Alameda resident, I urge you to vote in favor of Item 10-B, prohibiting animal experiments on public land, during the Alameda City Council's November 7 meeting (rescheduled for November 21)
- Banning cruel and ineffective animal experiments on city land would be a win for both human patients and animals, showing that Alameda supports ethical, human-relevant, science-driven research.
- Ninety-five percent of new drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Researchers and pharmaceutical companies are increasingly moving toward modern, non-animal methods for testing drugs and developing treatments for humans. Superior, cutting-edge technologies—including organs-on-chips and three-dimensional organ models that use human organ and tissue cells—are readily available and effectively mimic human systems.

Thank you in advance for your support to protect animals.

Warm regards,

Cathy

From: [Heidi Dietz](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 9:57:38 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Heidi Dietz
310 Westline Dr Apt B309 Alameda, CA 94501-5910

From: [Roberta Stern](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Thursday, November 16, 2023 12:00:47 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Roberta Stern
5665 Ocean View Dr Oakland, CA 94618-1532

From: [Rosanne Fissore](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Thursday, November 16, 2023 5:11:36 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Rosanne Fissore
6 Lychee Ct San Ramon, CA 94583-3424

From: [Judith Gottesman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Thursday, November 16, 2023 8:31:16 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Judith Gottesman
PO Box 5043 El Cerrito, CA 94530

From: [Dina Slobodnink](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Friday, November 17, 2023 10:51:02 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Dina Slobodnink
510 41st St Oakland, CA 94609-2412

From: [Charmaine Hinman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Friday, November 17, 2023 11:25:40 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Charmaine Hinman
60 Maywood Way San Rafael, CA 94901-1173

From: [M.G](#)
To: [CityCouncil-List](#); [City Clerk](#); [M.G](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item 10B
Date: Friday, November 17, 2023 2:31:23 PM

Dear City Council Members,

We do not want anyone experimenting on live animals in Alameda.

Thank you,

Dr. Les Hilger

Sharon Gardner

Mary Elena Goodan

From: gokevin@aol.com
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Ryan Leong](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Malia Vella](#)
Cc: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 11/21/23 Agenda Item 10-B
Date: Monday, November 20, 2023 11:19:59 AM

I wish to voice my opinion AGAINST any proposed animal research facilities to be established on City of Alameda controlled property.

Thank you,

Kevin Leong
48 Kara Road
Alameda, CA

From: [Petra McClinton](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 9:03:27 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Petra McClinton
PO Box 4134 San Rafael, CA 94913-4134

From: [G.Conroy](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 9:05:42 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. G. Conroy
1358 8th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-2408

From: [Kim Bartlett](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 9:13:02 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kim Bartlett
3250 Hollis St Unit 211 Oakland, CA 94608-4160

From: [bonnie Kohleriter](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 9:55:08 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. bonnie Kohleriter
82 Partridge Ct Alamo, CA 94507-2829

From: [Steven Keena](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 10:13:35 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steven Keena
636 Hyde St San Francisco, CA 94109-7285

From: [Steven Keena](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 10:13:35 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steven Keena
636 Hyde St San Francisco, CA 94109-7285

From: [rina Place](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 10:33:33 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. rina Place
2100 Miramonte Ave San Leandro, CA 94578-1563

From: [Jenny Tuffnell](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 10:37:24 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jenny Tuffnell
292 Dartford St Hercules, CA 94547-3641

From: [Lori Dawson](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 11:19:09 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lori Dawson
5216 Forrestgreen Ct Concord, CA 94521-3749

From: [Vivien Dennis](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 12:15:03 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Vivien Dennis
35170 Garcia St Union City, CA 94587-5206

From: [Susannah Bruder](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 1:46:19 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Susannah Bruder
193 Gambier St San Francisco, CA 94134-1022

From: [Monique Hopkins](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 1:51:54 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Monique Hopkins
3850 San Pablo Ave Apt 318 Emeryville, CA 94608-3857

From: [Nancy Joachim](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 1:57:11 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Nancy Joachim
2342 Shattuck Ave # 376 Berkeley, CA 94704-1517

From: [Patty Garcia](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 2:53:46 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Patty Garcia
970 Vermont St Oakland, CA 94610-1665

From: [Patricia Santos](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 7:08:42 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms Patricia Santos
361 Leo Ave San Leandro, CA 94577-2720

From: [Laura Mani](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 22, 2023 12:15:49 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Laura Mani
1007 Erica Rd Mill Valley, CA 94941-3749

From: [Jess Hernandez](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Wednesday, November 22, 2023 8:10:35 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Dr. Jess Hernandez
1684 Matheson Rd CA94521 Concord, CA 94521-2135

From: [Midori Nakayama](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, November 27, 2023 7:04:54 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Midori Nakayama
220 Cardenas Ave San Francisco, CA 94132-2420

From: [jon berg](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Thursday, December 7, 2023 6:59:47 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. jon berg
2132 Walnut Creek, CA 94596

From: [Helen Lahoda](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Friday, December 8, 2023 2:36:53 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Miss Helen Lahoda
1080 Jones St Berkeley, CA 94710-1547

From: [Jennifer Sellers](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Friday, December 15, 2023 3:33:42 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Nov. 21 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research—not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Jennifer Sellers
3901 Clayton Rd Apt 66 Concord, CA 94521-2531

From: [Carol Strand](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 9:11:38 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Carol Strand
1733 Madera St Berkeley, CA 94707-2513

From: [Teresa Goodman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 9:28:10 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Teresa Goodman
2209 Scott St San Francisco, CA 94115-1722

From: [Jorge Becerril](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 11:44:44 AM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jorge Becerril
35 Alpine Ter San Francisco, CA 94117-3166

From: [Gwen Willows](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Monday, January 1, 2024 7:43:36 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Gwen Willows
3022 Tulare Ave Richmond, CA 94804-1150

From: [Elizabeth Rust](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please stand for patients - prohibit animal experiments on city property
Date: Tuesday, January 2, 2024 4:54:28 PM

Dear City Clerk Lara Weisiger,

As a local resident, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of item 10-B during the Alameda City Council's Jan. 2 meeting. Neither city residents nor locals who frequently visit Alameda want animal experiments conducted in their backyard. Patients need human-relevant research – not cruel, crude animal testing.

An ordinance that prohibits animal experiments on public land would show that Alameda supports ethical, science-driven research. An enormous body of scientific evidence raises serious concerns with the continued use of animals. And researchers are increasingly moving away from animals for testing drugs and developing treatments.

Today, 95 percent of drugs that pass animal tests fail in human trials. Instead, devices called tissue chips, which use cells from human organs and tissues, are proving to effectively mimic the responses found in the human body. Pharmaceutical companies are quickly expanding their use of these modern, human-derived methods.

In disease research, the use of animals is also failing to develop suitable treatments. In 2012, Dr. John Ioannidis of Stanford University wrote that it is “nearly impossible to rely on most animal data to predict whether or not an intervention will have a favourable clinical benefit-risk ratio in human subjects.”

In addition, federal rules related to the welfare of animals in laboratories are weak and poorly enforced. Despite its name, the federal Animal Welfare Act allows all forms of animal experiments—including those that inflict pain. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is supposed to enforce the law, has been repeatedly cited by its own inspector general for unnecessarily closing investigations and significantly reducing fines for violators.

The U.S. National Institutes of Health has its own rules related to the conduct of animal experiments, but they are mostly recommendations and never appear to result in fines or other punishments—even in cases of animal deaths or severe negligence. NIH's method of “enforcement” is written correspondence between a violating institution and the agency. NIH does not conduct animal welfare inspections.

Allowing animal experiments on public property would endorse a poorly regulated, scientifically antiquated system. In contrast, prohibiting such experiments on city land would be a win for patients and animals.

Please support item 10-B during your Jan. 2 meeting.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elizabeth Rust
1906 B Second Ave Walnut Creek, CA 94597

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: 10B
Date: Wednesday, January 3, 2024 8:53:47 PM
Attachments: [Alameda City Council Members.docx](#)

From: Bonnie Kohleriter <bkohlerite@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 3, 2024 8:26:17 PM
To: citycouncil-list@Alamedaca.gov

Dear Council Members, I was disappointed you were unable to hear 10B this past evening as you and our community were involved in considering the mayor's letter regarding Gaza.

I have been concerned as well with the people of Israel and Gaza, but I am also concerned about the many animals, about which most of us don't know, who are being tortured behind closed doors in universities, laboratories, and private for profit facilities in this country. Science has developed some amazing tools recently which we can use to research new cures for humans so that we don't need animals for testing. Science Corp wants to lease land in Alameda for animal testing but we can and we need to move away from this kind of research without compromising our future health. Please vote to have staff draft an ordinance wherein animal research is prohibited on Alameda city owned or controlled property. Please read the attachment giving reasons for this prohibition. Thank you Bonnie Kohleriter, retired science teacher and advocate for animals

TO: Alameda City Council Members

FROM: Bonnie Kohleriter

RE: Have Staff Draft an Ordinance to Prohibit Animal Research on Alameda City Property

DATE: January 3, 2024

As a former science teacher and advocate for the health and safety of animals I would like to share with you why I want you to vote to have staff draft an ordinance to prohibit animal research on property owned or controlled by the City of Alameda. This prohibition would affect Science Corp who wants to lease property in the City to do animal testing.

- 1) The United States is spending \$45 Billion dollars to do animal testing yearly of which approximately \$ 20 billion is for primates, dogs, cats, and farm animals.
- 2) We have seven primate centers around the country whose conditions and research are being questioned constantly. Numerous organizations are trying to shut them down. Do we need more facilities?
- 3) We have recently passed the Modernization Act in which drug research no longer needs to be done using animals as we now have perfected new tools that are arguably superior to the use of animals.
- 4) Recent studies show 90-95 % of research done using animals doesn't translate to or hold up in human trials as animals are different than humans.
- 5) As a retired science teacher much of the ongoing research using animals I have read is frankly bizarre (of questionable use) and the variables cannot be controlled so you cannot conclude causal outcomes.
- 6) A lot of the research is not transparent. It is done in secrecy behind closed doors. A lot of the research done also does not have accountability required of it.
- 7) Repeatedly primates are ripped from their homes and social structures (families), flown long distances in small cages without food and water, isolated in small barren cages to live out their lives, only to be taken out to be cut open, cut apart, burned, shocked, poisoned, starved, restrained, made addicted to drugs, brain damaged, and more, and in the end, killed.
- 8) 99% of what is done to the animals is excluded under the Animal Welfare Act. Yet the animals are forced to endure immeasurable pain.
- 9) We talk about liberty and justice for all. We are upset when one group of humans delivers genocide to another group of humans. But we citizens of the United States don't apply this thinking to the estimated 110 million voiceless animals each year who don't have to be tortured and killed because of the modern day tools and procedures we have developed to do research.

10) I urge you Council Members to vote for staff to draft an ordinance that would disallow Science Corp to lease land owned or controlled by the City of Alameda. Animal testing is increasingly not needed to develop cures for humans but it is difficult for researchers at this moment to give up the old ways for the new. The Council does not need to aid and abet Science Corp.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Bonnie Kohleriter