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Abstract

This thesis examines the extent and impact of companion animal (cat and dog) overpopulation on the Hawaiian island of O‘ahu. Companion animal overpopulation directly contributes to the mass euthanasia of animals in shelters. This thesis contains background information that explains the current problem in dealing with companion animal overpopulation, solutions that have been implemented or have been proposed to alleviate the problem, and also evaluates current policies that may affect the situation. The background information includes literature that currently exists about animal shelters both locally and in the U.S. and also looks into the possibility of Hawai‘i being part of the “no-kill movement,” which would require more limited-admission (or no-kill) shelters on O‘ahu. A high quality and compelling documentary was created with the data collected through research. The process of creating the documentary that covers all aspects of the current problem (animal overpopulation and euthanasia of healthy animals on O‘ahu) is included.
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Introduction

Millions of healthy companion animals are humanely euthanized in the United States every year and thousands are euthanized on O‘ahu alone. Companion animal overpopulation is a serious concern for both humans and animals on the island. Animal overpopulation not only causes a large number of stray animals that may become a neighborhood nuisance, but also directly contributes to the mass euthanasia of healthy animals in shelters. There are a number of animal welfare organizations on O‘ahu that are attempting to combat the problem, yet there is still a significant amount of companion animal overpopulation and it must be addressed.

This thesis contains background information that explains the current problem dealing with companion animal overpopulation, solutions that have been implemented or have been proposed to alleviate the problem and also evaluates current policies. The background information includes literature that currently exists about animal shelters both locally and in the U.S. and also looks into the possibility of Hawai‘i being part of the “no-kill movement,” which would require animal access laws to be passed, as well as more limited-admission (or no-kill) shelters to be opened on O‘ahu.

With all of the data collected through my research, I have created a documentary that covers all aspects of the animal overpopulation problem on O‘ahu. I display the current policy problems that are affecting animal overpopulation and animal shelters in Hawai‘i. Evaluating the current policy helps us to better understand the need for better legislation, enforcement of existing legislation, education of the public, animal sterilization, and the creation of a structured and organized network that connects the community, animal welfare organizations, and the Hawai‘i state legislature to work together to benefit companion animals.

With this documentary I have attempted to persuade public opinion and public action.
The documentary displays the extent of companion animal overpopulation on O‘ahu and the reasons behind the euthanization of healthy animals on O‘ahu. From my research, I hope to educate the people of Hawai‘i on companion animal overpopulation, from causes to prevention. By being informed with the facts, figures, and other information in the documentary, the public will be educated, which in turn should lead them to make decisions that will decrease companion animal overpopulation, and encourage them to promote more legislation and policies in support of animal welfare.
Background

There is not much research about animal shelters in general. It is challenging to find any articles that dealt with animal shelters or animal overpopulation in the U.S., but even more so when the search was narrowed down to Hawai‘i specifically. The scholarly literature is definitely lacking in relevant articles pertaining to animal shelters and animal overpopulation. The current scholarly literature on animal shelters is generally quantitative, and is primarily concerned with pet adoption from the perspective of pet owners or potential pet owners. The studies that do exist identify and examine the factors involved in an individual’s decision to relinquish animals to shelters, reasons why people obtain dogs, how animal behavior is impacted by admission to a shelter, the evaluation of a dog’s adoption potential, characteristics of pet adopters, factors influencing selection of animals, and problems that may be experienced post-adoption (McKay-Semmler, 2007, p.4). McKay-Semmler mentioned that a search of the existing scholarly literature on animal shelters shows that very little research exists concerning the individuals on the receiving end of animal abuse, abandonment, and relinquishment, although this does not imply that investigations have never been conducted (2007).

Current Problem:

According to the Humane Society of the United States (2004) an estimated six to eight million cats and dogs enter shelters every year, and three to four million are subsequently euthanized. An astounding 18,269 dogs and cats arrived as strays in 2013 and that represents about 65 percent of admissions at the Hawaiian Humane Society alone (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013, p.2). In 2013, 4,918 feral cats, 3,467 newborn kittens, and 105 newborn puppies, were euthanized, as well as 514 cats and 1,567 dogs that were euthanized for behavioral reasons.
These agencies have existed within Western societies as repositories or last resorts for unwanted and abandoned animals that, barring adoption, are regularly destroyed in order to provide space to accommodate a persistent influx of the rejected and abused (McKay-Semmler, 2007, p.3). Although animal control agencies were originally established with the welfare of both people and animals in mind, the meaning of the “humane” treatment of animals has gone from an initial concern for quick, and relatively painless and dignified euthanization of unwanted animals to more recent conceptualizations of the term as defined by animal rights groups and, to a large extent, by so-called “no-kill” shelters (McKay-Semmler, 2007). While they are starting to gain acceptance, the concept of a no-kill animal shelter still is considered an unknown area.

McKay-Semmler (2007) noted that the number of no-kill shelters have grown and are beginning to challenge more traditional animal control agencies, advocating that the humane treatment of animals extend beyond the “right not to suffer.” McKay-Semmler also stated that these organizations are fighting to change the concept of the “humane” termination of unwanted but otherwise healthy animals with a new concept of the “humane” that consists of the widespread availability of affordable spaying and neutering programs and the fostering and finding of new homes for abandoned or relinquished animals that already exist.

Animal Shelters in the U.S.:

At this time, there is no central data-reporting agency for animal shelters, so numbers about how many animals enter U.S. shelters and euthanasia rates are estimates (Humane Society of the United States [HSUS], 2014). Low adoption rates are one factor driving the high number of animals in shelters, but every year, millions of dogs and cats are relinquished by their owners or rescued from the streets by animal control officers and private citizens and brought to animal shelters (HSUS, 2014). These circumstances leave shelters and rescue groups with a large
number of animals in need of homes.

**Euthanasia:**

The World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) recognizes humane euthanasia as a subject of ongoing debate among animal protectionists. There are different perspectives on when euthanasia should be used and there has been an ongoing debate about this issue. The challenge is to find when such compromises should be made and when principles of animal welfare should be upheld (WSPA, n.d.).

Humane euthanasia is defined as painless, rapid unconsciousness followed by cardiac and respiratory arrest, and ultimately death (WSPA, n.d. p.38). The WSPA believes that the killing of companion animals should only be done using humane euthanasia, which should only be done by trained professionals. WSPA believes that humane euthanasia is acceptable when an animal is experiencing a poor quality of life due to illness, injury or behavioral problems. Although it isn’t an ideal situation, the organization reluctantly accepts that humane euthanasia of healthy animals may at times be necessary in order to avoid compromising the welfare of themselves or other animals (WSPA, n.d.).

**No-Kill Shelters:**

In the last several years, shelters in numerous communities have comprehensively implemented a bold series of programs and services to reduce birthrates, increase adoptions and redemptions, and keep animals with their responsible caretakers (“The Animal Rescue Act,” n.d.). As a result, they are achieving unprecedented results, saving upwards of 99 percent of all impounded animals in open admission animal control facilities, reserving “euthanasia” for hopelessly ill or injured and irremediably suffering animals, and truly vicious dogs with a poor prognosis for rehabilitation (“The Animal Rescue Act,” n.d.). Not only are they saving lives, but
they are saving taxpayer money as well (“The Animal Rescue Act,” n.d.). The no-kill shelter’s defining position, that being anti-euthanization of unwanted animals. Many of the programs identified as key components of saving lives are more cost effective than impounding, warehousing, and then killing animals (“The Animal Rescue Act,” n.d.). Some rely on private philanthropy, as in the use of rescue groups, which shifts costs of care from public taxpayers to private individuals and groups. Others, such as the use of volunteers, augment paid human resources (“The Animal Rescue Act,” n.d.).

The No Kill Advocacy Center organization believe that in addition to being inhumane, it is irresponsible to kill animals in the face of cost-effective alternatives, nor does it make sense that taxpayers are spending money to kill animals, when non-profit organizations are willing and able to save them at private expense (“The Animal Rescue Act,” n.d.). Leadership is a defining factor of successful no-kill shelters, as is the commitment of shelter managers to implement a key series of necessary programs and services to modernize shelters (“The Animal Rescue Act,” n.d.). The “no-kill” shelter movement, which saves the lives of healthy and treatable dogs and cats (reserving euthanasia only for animals that can not be rehabilitated), is an attempt to derail that grim cycle. The no-kill movement is growing, and shelters have been opening up all over the country. There are no-kill outposts in San Francisco, Richmond, Virginia, Miami and Austin, Texas (Lucich, 2005, p.14).

Jim Mason is managing director of Two Mauds Foundation, which gives grants to grassroots animal-protection organizations (including no-kill shelters) (Lucich, 2005, p.14). Mason says that no-kill shelters can be successful because the people organizing them are “knowledgeable, dedicated and motivated” and that “transitioning to no-kill should be the goal for all shelters” (Lucich, 2005).
According to Maddies Fund, a nonprofit pet rescue foundation that offers financial support to no-kill shelters, “An adoption guarantee gives a community confidence that an animal shelter is truly a shelter, that is, a respite on the way to a new loving home” (Lucich, 2005, p.14). When this happens, the community becomes an active partner in saving lives” (Lucich, 2005). The goal is to end the popular notion of shelters as a last resort and likely terminal point for unwanted pets (Lucich, 2005).

In early 2005, Maddie’s Fund pledged $15.5 million over the next seven years to the Mayor’s Alliance for New York City Animals to help transition the city’s shelters to no-kill (Lucich, 2005, p.14). New York’s change in policy is likely to be extremely influential because of the huge media spotlight on the city, and supporters think it could be a catalyst to motivate other communities (Lucich, 2005). Maddie’s Fund President Rich Avanzino says, “If it happens in New York, then it can happen anywhere else” (Lucich, 2005). The city is working toward the no-kill goal through innovative programs designed to increase the adoption of homeless pets and the number of animals that are spayed or neutered (Lucich, 2005). Affordable spay/neuter programs play a vital role in the success of no-kill shelters by reducing the overpopulation of unplanned pets.

Lucich (2005) noted that other cities are making headway also. Mobile, Alabama animal welfare groups and veterinarians will receive as much as $4.6 million through Maddie’s Fund to end the killing of healthy and treatable shelter dogs and cats within 10 years. No More Homeless Pets in Utah is a statewide coalition of 28 rescue groups, 55 animal control agencies, one traditional shelter and 89 private practice veterinary hospitals. In 1999, 45,909 cats and dogs were euthanized statewide in Utah (13,306 of them healthy) (Lucich, 2005).

Avanzino mentioned that the “key to building the no-kill movements success is to
challenge the status-quo, come up with new ideas, test results, capitalize on ideas and reject disappointments” (Lucich, 2005, p.14). Before going to work at Maddie’s Fund, Avanzino was president of the San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and a leader in the city’s transition to the country's first no-kill policy in 1989 (Lucich, 2005). He created a model pet shelter, which was inspired by changing attitudes toward the care and housing of homeless animals, which offered well-kept spacious living conditions with an abundance of toys, volunteers, and social interaction among the animals (Lucich, 2005).

Maddie’s Fund is working “toward a nationwide adoption guarantee for all healthy shelter cats and dogs” by controlling pet populations and raising the social acceptance of animal adoptions by taking business away from commercial “puppy mills” and other profit-making and sometimes unscrupulous enterprises (Lucich, 2005). Maureen D'Addio, a volunteer at Animal Haven, a no-kill shelter in North Haven, Connecticut, says the hardest obstacle to achieving a nationwide no-kill network is the organizations that refuse to work together in achieving the common goal (Lucich, 2005). He suggests that shelters around the country “should join together and stop the bash-and-trash in order to focus on how to do a better job” (Lucich, 2005). But the no-kill movement is growing, albeit more slowly than impatient supporters would like to see. “If the focus is kept on saving lives, miracles can happen,” Avanzino says (Lucich, 2005, p.16).

Why Is Overpopulation on O‘ahu a Problem?:

Stray animals can become a problem for a number of reasons. Stray animals can carry diseases that can be passed to humans and other animals, can cause road accidents, harass citizens, damage property, and also pollute the environment (WSPA, n.d. p.35). There are also concerns regarding the stray animals themselves, including: disease, hunger, aggression between animals, and persecution by humans in the form of cruelty, abuse and inhumane methods of
killing (WSPA, n.d. p.35). Overpopulation of animals also leads to overcrowding in animal shelters, which eventually leads to a large number of animals having to be humanely euthanized in order to “make room” for other animals.

Predation is a problem that feral cats create, as there is a growing concern that the large number of feral cats will soon result in a significant decrease in local birds. Hess, Hansen, Nelson, Swift, and Banko (2007) noted that cats are also the definitive host of toxoplasma gondii (which causes the disease toxoplasmosis) and may have a high seroprevalence even in populations of low density, where transmission between cats is restricted. Toxoplasmosis kills several animal species and may also cause miscarriages or fetal abnormalities in pregnant women and animals (Lohr, Cox, & Lepczyk, 2013, p.70). People are at a greater risk of being infected with toxoplasmosis if cat colonies exist in the urban environment because contact with contaminated soil is enough to contract the disease (Cook et al. 2000, as cited in Lohr, Cox, & Lepczyk, 2013, p.70).

*Overpopulation of Feral Cats on O‘ahu*

Lohr, Cox, and Lepczyk used Euler’s method, in which calculations are made at the beginning of each time interval, to calculate the approximate number of feral cats on O‘ahu per year (2013). They based the initial number of colony cats on O‘ahu at about 16,700 in 2013. Surveys indicated that each cat colony caretaker on O‘ahu manages approximately 13.9 cats (Zasloff & Hart, 1998). Lohr et al. (2013) wanted to determine whether it is more cost-effective to control feral cat abundance with trap-neuter-release programs or trap and euthanize programs for feral cats on O‘ahu.

Using STELLA 7, systems modeling software, Lohr et al. (2013) modeled changes over 30 years in abundance of cats in a feral colony in response to each management method and the
costs and benefits associated with each method. Their results suggested that the economic benefits of removing colony cats are much greater than the costs of trap-neuter-release programs (Lohr et al., 2013, p.64). Implementing trap and euthanize programs was considerably cheaper than implementing trap-neuter-release programs (trap-neuter-release to trap and euthanize cost ratio 2.5 with no abandonment and 2.1 with 10% abandonment (Lohr et al., 2013, p.70). Both trap-neuter-release and trap and euthanize programs were less costly and resulted in greater benefits for Wedge-tailed Shearwater seabirds when the percentage of abandoned cats was (Lohr et al., 2013). The researchers ultimately concluded that trap and euthanize programs are cheaper and reduce abundances of feral cats more quickly than trap-neuter-release programs, but did note that there is a social cost associated with euthanasia (Lohr, Cox, & Lepczyk, 2013).

**Solutions to Animal Overpopulation:**

There have been a number of solutions proposed by animal welfare advocates and organizations, but the majority of suggestions related in one way or another towards education, legislation, and sterilization. Although each method has its benefits, the combination of the three appeared to produce the best results when dealing with the overpopulation of companion animals. To help reduce the number of homeless animals, many organizations work to promote responsible pet ownership and to reduce pet overpopulation through public education, legislation, and support for sterilization programs.

*Education*

Education is a long-term solution to stray animal control and should be aimed at adults, teens, and children. With the abundant resources we have available to us, there are many different ways of educating people, including printed material, the media, the Internet, schools and public lectures (WSPA, n.d.). Education aimed at reducing stray populations should, at a
minimum, touch upon the following: the biological and psychological needs of companion animals; the responsibility of owning an animal, including registration, identification, vaccination and supervision; responsibility for an animal lasts for its entire life and for the life of any offspring it produces, the problems and solutions of stray animals, including sterilization of both owned and stray animals and the rehoming of unwanted and stray animals.

Animal welfare organizations can play a vital role in educating the public about responsible animal ownership and the problems of and solutions to stray populations (WSPA, n.d. p.36). Investing in the next generation by educating children can be both rewarding and extremely effective in the long term (WSPA, n.d. p.36). The Hawaiian Humane Society stresses the importance of education in the community. They believe that helping families understand why they need to do certain things will flow down thru the generations and help alleviate a lot of the issues we face today (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013, p.2).

**Legislation**

Legislation includes both national or primary laws that set out the main principles of stray control and animal protection, and by-laws that provide detail and allow for local differences (WSPA, n.d. p.36). Although, without enforcement, legislation is useless, which is why all legislation should be followed up with both national and local enforcement. Ideally, legislation should require that all owned animals are registered and identified, as this enables lost animals to be reunited with their owners and also makes it possible for owners that persistently act irresponsibly to be fined (WSPA, n.d.). Registration can also be used to encourage neutering of owned animals by offering free or reduced registration of neutered animals (WSPA, n.d.). Particular legislation can require that all animals be vaccinated against zoonoses (diseases that can be spread between humans, potentially creating health risks for humans), create stricter laws
on animal abandonment, or strict requirements for breeding establishments and pet shops to ensure that animals are kept according to good welfare standards and that puppies and kittens are raised in conditions that are good for their health (WSPA, n.d.).

*Enforcement of Legislation*

Enforcement of legislation requires collaboration between police, legal representatives, members of the veterinary community and the public (WSPA, n.d. p.36). Animal welfare officers can be employed to enforce the legislation at ‘ground level’ (WSPA, n.d.). Legislation is the responsibility of governments and local authorities, but animal welfare organizations can lobby very effectively for changes in legislation and can play an important role in its development (WSPA, n.d.). Once legislation is in place, pressure and support from animal welfare organizations as well as community members can help ensure that it is enforced (WSPA, n.d.).

*Existing Laws: Rescue Access Laws*

Rescue access laws would make it illegal for a shelter to kill an animal when a qualified non-profit organization that specializes in adoptions is willing to save that animal (“The Animal Rescue Act,” n.d.). This reduces the number of animals that die and increase the number that live. In 1998, California made it illegal for public and private shelters to kill an animal when nonprofit animal rescue and adoption organizations were willing to save that animal’s life. As a result, the number of animals saved by nonprofit rescue organizations, rather than killed, increased from 12,526 before the law went into effect to 58,939 in 2010—an increase of over 370%, and a potential cost savings of $1,856,520 statewide for killing and disposal (“The Animal Rescue Act,” n.d.).

An analysis of the rescue access law in California found that sending animals to non-profit animal rescue organizations saved the City and County of San Francisco $486,480
annually in publicly funded animal control costs (“The Animal Rescue Act,” n.d.). Rescue access laws save taxpayer money by mandating public-private partnerships that not only reduces expenses associated with having to care for, then kill and dispose of an animal, but transfer expenses from taxpayers to private philanthropy (“The Animal Rescue Act,” n.d.). Under rescue access laws, shelters can also charge those groups the cost of adoption, which brings in revenue and eliminates any costs associated with implementation.

Rescue access laws reduce costs for killing, bring in revenue through adoption fees, and transfers costs from taxpayers to private organizations, funded through philanthropic dollars. While rescue access laws require shelters to notify non-profit organizations of animals they are going to kill, this can be accomplished through computer programs that do this automatically which are available at no cost to shelters (“The Animal Rescue Act,” n.d.). The state of Delaware also recently passed similar legislation. The bill, mandating collaboration between shelters and rescue organizations, passed both houses of the Delaware Legislature unanimously (“The Animal Rescue Act,” n.d.).

Applicability of Rescue Access Laws in Other States:

Wang (2011) evaluated the impacts of the rescue access provision of the Hayden Law, whether it would be a useful law in other states, and possible hurdles to its enactment elsewhere. The report is based largely on firsthand accounts told by members of the animal rescue and shelter community (Wang, 2011). An analysis of these firsthand accounts shows that over the last decade, the rescue access provision has had both direct and indirect positive impacts. Direct positive impacts include imposing legal obligations on shelters to work with rescues and officially recognizing that all species of animals are worthy of humane treatment (Wang, 2011, p.4). Wang also stated that indirect positive impacts include improved cooperation between
shelters and rescue groups, a more professional, vibrant rescue community, and increased public awareness and media attention, which in turn reinforce compliance with the law.

California requires public and private shelters to release animals who are not “irremediably suffering” to nonprofit animal rescue and adoption groups with Internal Revenue Code 501(c)(3) status, as long as those groups request the animals “prior to [the animal’s] scheduled killing” (Wang, 2011, p.2). This “rescue access provision” is part of the Hayden Law (also known as Chapter 752, Statutes of 1998), which first went into effect on July 1, 1999 (Wang, 2011). Wang (2011) concluded that in over ten years of implementation, the Hayden Law has led to many concrete, positive changes for shelter animals and the rescue groups committed to saving them. The law made it the official “policy of the state that no adoptable animal should be euthanized if it can be adopted into a suitable home and that no treatable animal should be euthanized” (Wang, 2011, p.2). The law mandated, among other things, that shelters work with rescue groups, provide prompt and necessary veterinary care, expanded the minimum impound time [from 72 hours] to 4 or 6 business days in order to give owners sufficient time to reclaim lost animals and to give animals a chance of being adopted (Wang, 2011).

In particular, the “rescue access” provision of the Hayden Law has empowered nonprofit groups to save more animals’ lives and to lower killing rates in our shelters. As attorney Kate Neiswender, Chief Consultant to California State Senator and author of the Hayden Bill, Tom Hayden, explained, nonprofits not only “find homes for the most difficult animals and take the time to work on temperament,” but they also save the state money because, “The more animals you euthanize the higher your costs are going to go . . . it costs about $70 to hold [animals], kill [them], and then have the body removed” (Wang, 2011, p.3).
Many shelters became more cooperative because they knew that they had a legal obligation to follow the Hayden Law. Another non-profit rescue group comments that, “Pressure from the community didn't work,” but the Hayden Law “did open doors, and over the years it's become much easier (Wang, 2011, p.10). “Cooperation is much better” Brad Jensen, a shelter investigator who founded ShelterTrak and independently tracks and publishes statistics on public shelters, notes that the number of cats and dogs rescued at Kern County immediately started to increase from zero before Hayden was implemented to over 1200 cats and 2500 dogs annually (Wang, 2011).

Also before, the Hayden Law, if a shelter deemed an animal “unadoptable,” then the animal was euthanized. Now, “because of the mandatory holding period and rescue provisions, if you ask they have to give the animal up” (Wang, 2011, p.11). The Hayden Law basically guarantees that animal welfare organizations have access to shelter animals regardless of how cooperative another shelter’s staff are.

The rescue access provision has successfully accomplished its objective of empowering rescue groups and increasing the number of lives saved among California's shelter population (Wang, 2011, p.20). The law represents a statement by the people of California that the lives of animals are important and worth protecting (Wang, 2011). Although there continue to be opportunities to improve the effectiveness of the law, the general consensus is that the conditions of the animals in shelters and the relationships between shelters and rescue groups are substantially better than they were twelve years ago, prior to the Hayden's Law’s enactment (Wang, 2011).

In 2012, City Council Member Tom Berg introduced Bill 57, which would have essentially been a “rescue access law” for the state of Hawai‘i. Bill 57 basically stated that an
animal control contractor would create and maintain a registry of animal welfare organizations and animals could not be destroyed (euthanized) until the animal control contractor had notified, or made a reasonable attempt to notify, all organizations on the registry. This way, animals would not be euthanized until the animal control contractor has notified other organizations so that they may consider adopting or rescuing the animal consistent with the animal control contractor’s adoption or transfer protocols. This bill was not passed, but that does not mean that animal access laws will not be implemented in Hawai‘i in the future.

In states with no equivalent of the rescue access provision of the Hayden Law, rescuers have a much more difficult time trying to save lives and improve shelters (Wang, 2011, p.20). Without any legal mechanism to require that shelters work with rescue groups, rescuers are fearful of the shelters' unchecked power to retaliate against them (Wang, 2011). The result is that animals who are neglected and even abused in shelters are more likely not to be helped, and animals who would otherwise be rescued end up being killed (Wang, 2011). The pervasive problem of shelters refusing to release animals to rescue groups as well as high profile cases of this conduct in New York state led to the introduction of a statewide bill to mandate nonprofit rescue access (Wang, 2011). The statewide bill would have established the equivalent of the “rescue access” provision of the Hayden Law in New York to ban shelters from killing sheltered animals if a qualified IRC 501(c)(3) rescue group was willing to save them (Wang, 2011).

Overall, the past ten years of experience with rescue access law in California reveal that rescue groups can significantly increase the number of animals saved and significantly decrease shelter killing rates and expenditures due to the rescue access law (Wang, 2011, p.31). Although there continues to be resistant shelter managers, there have been many improvements as a result of the Hayden Law (Wang, 2011). Thus, California's success story should serve as an inspiration
to animal advocates, voters, and politicians in other states to rally together to guarantee the right of rescue groups to save shelter animals by enacting rescue access provisions like the Hayden Law (Wang, 2011).

*Sterilization:*

Neutering animals prevents the problem of unwanted puppies and kittens that may become part of the stray population and also helps the health of the individual animal by reducing the incidence of several diseases (such as pyometra and mammary tumors) (WSPA, n.d. p.37). Sterilization removes the energy costs of breeding and reduces metabolic rate so animals gain and maintain weight more efficiently and can reduce roaming in castrated males (WSPA, n.d.). Spay and neuter saves lives by preventing an excess of animals from being born in the first place.

Animal welfare organizations can alleviate the animal overpopulation issue by educating the public about the importance and benefits of sterilization (WSPA, n.d. p.37). Setting up a veterinary clinic that offers free or reduced price spay/neutering and veterinary services to owners can be a very practical way of helping owners that couldn’t otherwise afford to treat or sterilize their animals (WSPA, n.d.). Providing transport and a donation towards the cost of the neutering at a private veterinary clinic can also be very effective. Shelters run by animal protection organizations should also only re-home dogs and cats that are sterilized (WSPA, n.d.).

The WSPA also stated that animals that are not spayed/neutered may breed uncontrollably, leading to the problem of abandonment or over-capacity of re-homing centers. If domestic cats are not sterilized, a surplus number of kittens may be on the market. Basic economic theory states that an increase in supply reduces price, making pet cats highly replaceable and potentially reducing the value of the average cat (Lohr et al., 2013, p. 71).
Altering pet-ownership policies to create incentives to sterilize cats may reduce the abandonment rate for pet cats (Lohr et al., 2013). Also, breeding of owned pets within the stray population can produce the next generation of stray animals. Puppy mills and breeders can also lead to a surplus of companion animals, which is worse if the conditions in which the animals are raised are poor, as the puppies and kittens may be sick and poorly socialized, making them unsuitable pets and more likely to be abandoned (WSPA, n.d. p.37). In Hawai‘i, there is a law that attempts to deal with the unnecessary influx of puppies that that are sold by breeders and puppy mills. The law states that no one household may have more than ten dogs (ages four months of age or older) at one time. It is unknown how strictly this law is enforced and what requirements must be made by law enforcement before any charges can be made against offenders.

*Trap-Neuter-Release*

Capture-neuter-release (CNR) goes by a couple of different names, including Trap, Neuter and Release (TNR), and Animal Birth Control (ABC). It essentially involves catching stray animals, sterilizing them, vaccinating them, and then releasing them back to the place they were initially caught. The benefits of such an approach include: reduction in zoonoses transmission, sterilizing stray animals can improve their health by taking away the energy costs of breeding and reduces the risks of injury and disease transmission of breeding, sterilizing a stray animal ensures that it will no longer give birth to offspring that would be likely to suffer and die at a young age; returning a sterilized animal to its original territory reduces migration of other stray animals into that area; stray populations can continue to function as biological control of rodents (WSPA, n.d. p.38).

CNR can essentially lead to a stable and healthy population of animals, if the sterilization rate is maintained at a high enough level (WSPA, n.d. p.38). The percentage of animals that will
need to be sterilized will depend upon reproduction rate and survival in the particular population of animals, but CNR alone will not address the stray animal problem in the long term, as there are many people that let their pets wander outdoors freely, but do not get them sterilized. These animals are not accessible to the catching teams and therefore cannot be neutered/spayed. Hence, CNR on its own will not lead to a significant reduction in population size, but instead should be seen as a temporary method that stabilizes the current stray population whilst the sources of stray animals are also addressed for the long-term (WSPA, n.d.).

In Hawai‘i, cats are typically managed in one of two ways, either through trap and euthanasia performed by wildlife professionals or through the Trap-Neuter-Return-Manage (TNRM) program supported by the Hawaiian Humane Society on O‘ahu (Lohr, Cox, & Lepczyk, 2013, p.66). The Hawaiian Humane Society supports responsible TNRM, a humane and effective strategy to reduce the number of feral cats at large and improve their quality of life.

When people trap, neuter and then return cats to their colonies, the population stabilizes and then decreases as cats live out their natural lives without reproducing (“Feral Cat Sterilizations,” 2014). As a result, millions of kittens have been spared from life on the streets. Trap, Neuter, Return & Manage is a strategy that allows cats to live out their natural lives without reproducing and reduces euthanasia. Colony caregivers work independently from the Hawaiian Humane Society to ensure cats are fed and taken care of. The Humane Society provides low-cost sterilizations and helps to create partnerships between businesses and cat caregivers who want to work towards a humane solution to reduce cat overpopulation (“Feral Cat Sterilizations,” 2014). Cats that have been “TNRed” have their left ear tipped, meaning that the tip of one ear is clipped while the cat is under anesthesia. A tipped ear identifies a cat as part of a managed TNR program, and will safeguard him if ever re-trapped (“What is TNR?” 2014). TNR
is not about rescuing and rehoming cats. It is about population control, and permanently reducing the number of feral cats in an area. It is about lowering the intake and euthanasia rates in shelters, and creating better, less hostile environments for cats (“What is TNR?” 2014).

The Hawaiian Humane Society stated that in the last five years, they have helped more than 12,000 feral cats at a cost of over $250,000 for needed sterilizations with their feral cat sterilization service, which is funded entirely by charitable gifts (“Feral Cat Sterilizations,” 2014). Under the TNRM program, cat colony caretakers, members of the general public, register for the program by signing an agreement stating that they will provide basic care and management for each cat (“Feral Cat Sterilizations,” 2014). Basic care and management includes sterilizing all colony members, removing kittens or socialized cats, providing necessary food, veterinary care, and microchip identification (“Feral Cat Sterilizations,” 2014). Cats are trapped using special cage traps. In, Hawai‘i, caretakers of cat colonies are required to provide food and veterinary care, however, the funds are provided by the individual caretakers rather than an organization (Lohr et al., 2013, p.66). The Hawaiian Humane Society charges caretakers a subsidized fee of $25 per cat sterilized under the trap-neuter-return-manage program (Lohr et al., 2013).

**Hawaiian Humane Society**

*Information Provided By Hawaiian Humane Society*

The Hawaiian Humane Society (HHS) is the largest animal welfare and protection charitable organization in Hawai‘i and they accept all animals brought in to their organization, regardless of their health, age, behavior, or species. Since such a large percentage of companion animals on O‘ahu are in their care at one point or another, it is important to understand the way their organization operates, how they deal with animal overpopulation and their efforts to prevent
it. They are also O‘ahu’s only open-admissions shelter that welcomes all animals in any
condition (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013, p.1). As O‘ahu’s only open admissions shelter,
HHS handles the vast majority of animals in the community – 27,994 in 2013 (“Awareness to
Help Animals,” 2013, p.2).

In the last few years, significant changes have helped them make more animals available
for adoption. They have expanded their medical and behavioral foster care programs—increasing
the number of cats and dogs from 731 in 2008 to more than 1,800 in 2013 (“Awareness to Help
Animals,” 2013, p.2). More than 100 animals are in foster care at any given time and they have
expanded their support network to include nearly 400 people. With more than 300 animals in
their care daily, they also place animals in foster care for space reasons. HHS has prevention
programs that focus on education, outreach, volunteer activism and advocacy. They also
participate in youth education and community outreach programs that specifically target
underserved communities where families are most at-risk of not being able to care for animals
adequately.

The HHS is an open-admissions shelter, which means that they do not have a “no-kill”
policy at their organization. The organization stated that it is much more challenging for
Hawaii’s shelters to comply with no-kill shelter practices because of the tropical climate (more
daylight than most states that encourages year-round breeding of cats, coupled with a lack of
predators). Also, Hawai‘i is a transient human population, where people are always coming and
going, and often abandoning their animals in the process of leaving (“Awareness to Help
Animals,” 2013, p.1). They believe that the environmental factors present too many challenges to
be a no-kill shelter. There are only two kinds of shelters, limited admission and open-admission
shelters. High-volume, open-admission shelters, such as the HHS, are designed to save as many
healthy, adoptable animals possible. The HHS has 30 programs and services targeted at prevention, education, intervention, outreach and advocacy (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013). The HHS believes that limited-admissions organizations (no-kill) are so full that many have to close their doors until they can find homes for the animals in their care. The HHS is aware that pet overpopulation is indeed a reality and state that it includes a wide spectrum of animals from the sick to the healthy (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013).

Marketing, promotions, discounts, and community mobilization efforts resulted in more than 8,100 adoptions for HHS in a year’s time. HHS stated that a shelter’s progress over time is a reflection of the success of the community’s overall education, intervention and outreach initiatives (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013, p.3). Ending euthanasia of animals that arrive at the HHS as healthy, adoptable animals has been difficult for the organization, but the number of stray animals that arrive in admissions every day makes it a challenge. Their goal is to continue to make an ever-increasing number of animals with treatable medical and behavioral problems rehabilitated and available for adoption (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013). They suggest that the first step to reduce euthanasia is to recognize that it is a community issue and not a shelter failure. The collective impact of individual choices affect O’ahu’s euthanasia rate (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013).

Animals that are healthy, adoptable and treatable present the greatest potential for HHS to save lives. Truly healthy, adoptable animals are those who may need vaccinations, sterilization, and a loving home, while treatable animals are those with a medical or behavioral issue that’s neither too complex nor expensive (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013, p.4). HHS make all healthy, adoptable companion animals available for adoption and they also make an ever-increasing number of treatable animals available too. Treatable animals represent more than 20
percent of all cats and dogs adopted. That’s more than 1,800 animals in 2013 that were helped by care that may have included advanced medical and behavioral services, outsourced veterinary care and foster care. Cats and dogs with medical or behavioral conditions that would not likely or reasonably be addressed by any owner/guardian or any organization are likely to be euthanized at HHS. As previously noted, 18,269 dogs and cats arrived as strays in 2013 and that represents about 65 percent of admissions at the Hawaiian Humane Society alone (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013). Some of those may have been lost animals and if they had identification, it would have impacted resources tremendously. In 2013, 4,918 feral cats, 3,467 newborn kittens, and 105 newborn puppies, were euthanized. 1,462 cats and 1,347 dogs were euthanized in 2013 for medical/health reasons such as life-threatening diseases and traumatic injuries (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013). 514 cats and 1,567 dogs were euthanized for behavioral reasons of which the most common is aggression (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013).

As a result of HHS’s collective efforts, from 1993 to 2013, there has been a 34 percent decrease in euthanasia of cats and dogs at the Hawaiian Humane Society and an increase in adoptions due to partnerships and aggressive marketing efforts and foster care services (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013, p.5). HHS’s goal is to continue to support the community in positive trends to improve the lives of O‘ahu’s animals (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013).

A law was passed in 1995 that required outdoor cats to have identification. This law increased the number of cats that were able to be reunited with their owners. In a 2009 study, the nationwide return-to-owner rate was 1.8 percent for cats. On O‘ahu in 2013, the rate of return for cats was 6.1 percent (“Awareness to Help Animals,” 2013).

**Criticisms of HHS**

Since the Hawaiian Humane Society deals with the vast majority of animals in the
community, they are often faced with tough decisions (humane euthanasia of healthy animals) because of the high number of both cats and dogs in their care. The organization has been scrutinized by many people in the community about their practices. A visit to the organization’s Facebook page showed both positive and negative feedback from people that have had an experience working with the Hawaiian Humane Society, but there was an alarmingly high amount of “horror stories” and disgruntled customers that disapproved of the organization’s practices.

An article by the Hawai‘i Reporter stated that an “estimated 10,000 cats and a “few thousand” dogs are euthanized each year at the Hawaiian Humane Society on O‘ahu (2012). This number was significantly high and shocked many local animal rescue advocates. In response to the high rates of euthanasia at HHS, Council Member Tom Berg introduced Bill 57, a measure that aims to “give homeless cats and dogs an opportunity to stay alive” (Hawai‘i Reporter, 2012). The article mentioned that the Hawaiian Humane Society opposes the measure because the organization claims the bill would cause overcrowding and force sick animals to be housed with well ones, which is a valid concern, but the bill would reduce the number of healthy animals that are humanely euthanized every year in Hawai‘i.

Criticism about the euthanasia practices of HHS came from a number of people that felt that the organization was wrong for euthanizing healthy animals seemingly for lack of space. Supporters of Bill 57 include Linda Nunn and Paul Johnson of the Animal Re-homing group in Auckland, New Zealand, who stated they oppose the way Hawai‘i’s homeless animal population is being managed (Hawai‘i Reporter, 2012). “The current system with the Hawaiian Humane Society taking responsibility for homeless animals is not working. Literally thousands of animals are being killed at this facility for want of loving caregivers,” they said (Hawai‘i
In a letter to the city council, they urged them to investigate the killing methods used by the HHS. They noted that lethal injection into a body cavity (and methods used to place the needle into such cavity) are questionable and can result in a 15 minute dying period and in misplaced injections. “Surely the animals can instead be sedated and a lethal injection placed directly into a vein for an immediate death?” (Hawai‘i Reporter, 2012).

In 2012, the council passed Berg’s bill on the first of three required readings. Nunn and Johnson as well as organizations that help rescue animals on O‘ahu want the other local animal rescue operations to have more power, funding and reach (Hawai‘i Reporter, 2012). They stated that with so many animals in HHS’s care, it is understandable that HHS is unable to make adoption the necessary priority of its workload, but that Bill 57 would open the door for way for smaller rescue groups, like their own, to use their skill, their fosterers, their animal-friendly databases and other resources to assist in the placement of many of these animals that would otherwise be put to sleep (Hawai‘i Reporter, 2012).

Burns said the Hawaiian Human Society is open to partnerships:

As the Humane Society moves towards devoting more resources to spay/neuter, lost and found, adoptions, education, prevention and outreach, we welcome partnerships to help animals that come to us in need. Our work is the collective success of your contributions. Everyone can do something, large or small, to help make Hawai‘i a better place for the animals and people we serve. We will continue to provide solutions to the fullest extent of our resources, as we have since 1883 (Hawai‘i Reporter, 2012).

**Documentary Use in Education**

The purpose of a documentary is to depict actual events, stories, or information. Since each documentary maker has a different purpose for creating film, the films can be used for a
number of purposes, including to inform, entertain, educate, defend or attack a certain perspective, document a story, or display a person’s life experiences. Their powerful audio and visual format and their ability to reach a wide audience are what make documentaries uniquely engaging (Marcus, 2009, p.284). Documentary films have the ability to engage emotions and intellect, change preconceived ideas, and foster understanding about different problems that they may or may not be associated with. Media allows documentary filmmakers to be creative with their storytelling and use different elements to their advantage. For example, infographics are often used in educational documentaries as a way to help viewers understand the situation in a more visual way. Rather than just having viewers read facts and figures, viewers are entertained by the use of media combined with the learning material. These visual figures help viewers not only understand the learning material, but retain the information longer.

The art of filmmaking in general allows for documentary stories to come alive. With the use of images, sounds, words, and music, documentaries create a sense of authenticity in a dynamic new way. This aids educational resources, as it not only captures the audience’s attention with the strategic use of visual communication, but allows the viewers to retain a message from the film. The documentary gets the filmmaker’s purpose across by entertaining the viewers’ mind with the brilliant representation of a mixture of visual elements. If done successfully, audience members should be able to maintain much of the information and walk away from the film with the filmmaker’s sense of purpose. Although there are a number of reasons behind purposes and methods for using documentary film, Marcus argued that two of the most powerful and appropriate are as a way to explore multiple perspectives and as a way to teach about controversial issues (2009).

Mutlu (2013) conducted a study using 79 teacher candidates who had taken the
Environmental Sciences course during the 2012-13 academic year from the Science Teaching Department of Nigde University. Mutlu attempted to address the benefits of instructive documentaries used in the environmental courses involving the topics of global warming. He wanted to see just how effective documentary use is in instructing teacher candidates about global warming. The experimental group was exposed to a ‘global warming’ course that used documentary films, while the control group was taught using traditional instruction methods. Prior to and after the study application, teacher candidates participated in tests to evaluate their success (Mutlu, 2009, p.263). The posttests showed that the teacher candidates that were in the experimental group turned out to be more successful than the control group teacher candidates. This shows that the teacher candidates that learned with the use of documentaries had a more effective learning experience than the teacher candidates that learned using traditional methods. The teacher candidates noted the ease of visual learning through video documentaries.

The documentaries that the experimental group watched included ones dealing with science, history, nature, space, adventure, discoveries, politics, sociology, economy and biographies (Mutlu, 2009, p.263). Consequently, use of documentaries can present numerous opportunities for case analysis, problem resolution, rendering abstractions objective, conveying historical backgrounds, and demonstrating an event spread to phases in extended time periods (Mutlu, 2009). Teachers quite often rely on documentaries as a supplement to the learning material that they present in the classroom because of their ease of use and specialized content.

Mutlu mentioned that education based on documentaries in different disciplines should be encouraged and also stressed that more research should be done on documentaries not only for their effect on academic success but also in elimination of misconceptions as well as their impact on attitudes (Mutlu, 2013, p.266)
Marcus (2009) conducted a study that explored how students analyzed and interpreted film in their high school history classes. Students rated documentary film as a particularly accurate and trustworthy source of knowledge about the past. When asked to respond on a 5 point scale (1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree) if “documentary films are accurate and trustworthy sources of historical information” the mean of student responses was a 4.07/5. This was done at the beginning of the school year, but when the students were asked to respond to the exact same statement at the end of the school year, the mean came out to 4.10/5. These means, that the students believed documentary film was accurate and trustworthy. They were roughly equal to their beliefs about the accuracy and trustworthiness of textbooks, primary sources, and their history teachers (Marcus, 2009, p.279). Students had also said that documentary film was more accurate and trustworthy than the Internet, feature films, the government, and fellow students (Marcus, 2009). Similar to a study by Stoddard in 2009, students viewed documentaries as trustworthy sources of information as compared to their textbooks and other classroom readings (Marcus, 2009). Marcus (2009) stated that documentary films are “perspective-laden narratives” which allow students to understand a variety of issues, events, and people that they might not have been exposed to in their textbooks.
Process

Interviewees:

I selected the interviewees by researching presidents, directors, or heads of no-kill animal shelters on O‘ahu, and also the education partnerships manager at an open-admission animal shelter on O‘ahu. I also looked into experts in animal welfare. I interviewed three individuals from three different organizations that deal with animal welfare on O‘ahu. Two of the organizations are local shelters (one open-admission shelter and one closed-admission shelter) and one is a national organization. No-kill shelters are generally called closed-admission shelters, as they are not able to take in every animal that is brought in to them. Open-admission shelters take in all animals that are brought in, but deal with overpopulation in their shelters, which often leads to them having to euthanize healthy animals. Underneath each individual organization listed below are the key personnel (directors, presidents, founders, etc.) that I interviewed for my documentary. By interviewing personnel from all three organizations, my documentary has a variety of different perspectives from qualified people that are knowledgeable about animal shelters in general, no-kill shelters, and companion animal overpopulation. The selected interviewees are considered to be public figures that often speak about professional topics regarding animal overpopulation, animal shelters, and current policy.

1) Oahu SPCA
   • President and Founder- Stephanie Ryan
2) Humane Society of the United States
   • Hawai‘i State Director- Inga Gibson
3) Hawaiian Humane Society
   • Education Partnerships Manager- Bonnie Oda

Visual Representations:

Visual representations can often be more effective than written information by itself. The
purpose of this documentary is to highlight my research regarding animal overpopulation and policies on O‘ahu in a creative and informative way. The documentary looks at various policies that would need to be taken into consideration to highlight the need for improved public policies, education to the public, animal sterilization, and legislation (or enforcement of existing legislation), and looks into a state-wide “network” that connects animal welfare organizations to work together to benefit the animals on island.

The review of literature provides the background research and through that research I have implemented those ideas through the production of a compelling, high quality documentary. The documentary contains the interviews from policy and no-kill animal shelter experts, my own research, and intellectually and creatively communicates those concepts and information within the scope of the documentary.

The responses to the interview questions helped me to better understand the issues, problems, and solutions, along with what the experts think works ‘best’ in regards to animal overpopulation and animal welfare organizations. I also attempted to find out and analyze issues specific to O‘ahu (our culture, community and even differences between rural and urban areas). In other words, I looked into how into animal overpopulation and if “no-kill” may work in Hawai‘i by looking into the circumstances and nuances specific to Hawai‘i (O‘ahu) that would enhance the success of the concept and implementation on O‘ahu. I made sure to define and explain the issues dealing with animal overpopulation and addressed all of the relevant issues on O‘ahu.

Also, the more rigorous, credible and authentic the research is presented within a documentary, the better. This credibility and authenticity was accomplished with ‘solid content’ (content) as well as ‘solid aesthetics’ (form), which in this case is within the affordance of a
Synopsis:

This documentary examines the current policy problems that are affecting animal overpopulation and animal shelters on O‘ahu, Hawai‘i and the reasons behind the euthanization of healthy animals on O‘ahu. The problem of animal overpopulation stems from public policies, lack of education to the public, lack of animal sterilization, and lack of legislation (or enforcement of existing legislation), which in turn add to the overpopulation of companion animals (cats and dogs) on the island of O‘ahu. This directly contributes to the mass euthanasia of healthy animals in animal shelters. By evaluating the current policy, we can make a case for better legislation and maintain a positive network that connects community members, animal welfare organizations, and the Hawai‘i state legislature to work together to benefit the animals on island.

Audience:

The intended audience of this documentary is people on O‘ahu who care about the welfare of suffering, abandoned, or abused companion animals. The documentary highlights some of the policies that were summarized in the written proposal. It also educates the public on companion animal overpopulation, from causes to prevention. The documentary provides important information and data that the people on O‘ahu would need to know to make an informed decision and take action.

With this documentary I have attempted to persuade public opinion and public action. By being informed with the facts, figures, and other information in the documentary, the public will be educated, which in turn should lead them to make decisions that will decrease companion animal overpopulation, and encourage them to promote more legislation and policies in support
of animal welfare. I would like to encourage local television stations to broadcast the
documentary in order to reach thousands of local residents who may be unaware of the current
problems. I have approached the documentary in such a way that persuades or effectively argues
specific viewpoints (or the viewpoints of the experts that were interviewed) based on the factual
research and information I have gathered, but I also realize it is important for viewers to be
aware of various viewpoints on the proposed problems.

**Documentary length:**

The total running time for the documentary is 21 minutes and 37 seconds. Stephanie
Ryan’s (OSPCA) interview lasted 8 minutes and 25 seconds. Inga Gibson’s (Humane Society of
the United States) interview lasted 34 minutes and 41 seconds. Bonnie Oda’s (Hawaiian Humane
Society) interview lasted 19 minutes and 14 seconds. These interviews were edited and shortened
in order to fit within the timeframe of the documentary. I took additional footage other than the
interviews including footage of my own cat and kittens, stray cats on the island, animals at the
O‘ahu Society for the Prevention of cruelty to animals, animals at the Hawaiian Humane Society,
and footage of scenery around O‘ahu that would benefit my documentary. I call that my “b-roll”
footage (or additional footage). The original b-roll footage gathered was approximately 3 hours,
37 minutes, and 3 seconds. This footage was significantly edited down before it was included in
the documentary. I also got permission to use the puppy mill footage from both the Hawaiian
Humane Society and Last Chance for Animals. The puppy mill footage came out to 8 minutes
and 32 seconds, which was also shortened and edited. For the documentary, I also created
original graphics that were used to enhance the message that I was trying to convey.

**Equipment for documentary:**

I own a camera, tripod, memory card, external hard drive, and disc reflectors. The Adobe
Premiere Pro software that I used for video editing was available in both the Crawford Hall computer labs (rooms 212 and 220) and also installed on my personal computer. I checked out a SONY HXRNX70U camera, LED lights, well as a wireless microphone from the U.H. media lab for the entire summer to use for my project (May-August).

Camera

- I used the SONY HXRNX70U camera to record the interviews. This camera offers 1920x1080 60P full HD recording at 28Mbps. The recording format is AVCHD.

Tripod

- Ambico 54 inch tripod with radial support braces for maximum stability

Microphone

- Canon EOS Rebel T5i Digital Camera External Microphone Vidpro XM-L Wired Lavalier microphone
- 20' Audio Cable

Memory Card

- SanDisk Ultra 32 GB SDHC Class 10 Flash Memory Card 30MB/s.
- Used to record all interviews in full HD video (1080p)
- Class 10 performance and fast transfer speeds
- Can store over two and a half hours of Full HD video

External Hard Drive

- WD My Passport external hard drive 1TB
- Data transfer rates up to 480 Mbps
- Password protection and hardware encryption to protect all data on device

LED Light
• Neewer® CN-160 160PCS LED dimmable ultra high power panel digital camera/camcorder video light
  ▪ There are three filters included with LED light, one white filter to soften the light (diffuse effect)
  ▪ Hot shoe design can be attached directly to the video camera or digital camera

Reflectors
• LimoStudio 32" 5-in-1 Photography Collapsible Light Disc Reflector
• 5-in-1 multi photo/video disc reflector
• Size when open: 32" Diameter
• Used for outdoor filming

Computer
  I used the iMac computers provided in Crawford Hall (rooms 212 and 220) to create my documentary because of the video editing software that is available on them. I also own a MacbookPro “13 laptop that I used for research and editing.

Software
  For my digital video editing, I used Adobe Premiere Pro. I have used Adobe Premiere Pro for previous class projects and have had great results. Adobe Premiere Pro offers fantastic applications for editing, adding audio, and more. The software allowed me to move, rename, and transcoded files to various formats, and save my project on an external hard drive.

Style of Documentary:
  The documentary is an expository documentary. Expository documentaries speak directly to the viewer, often in the form of an authoritative commentary employing voiceover or titles, proposing a strong argument and point of view (“6 Types of Documentary,” 2009). These films
are rhetorical, and try to persuade the viewer (“6 Types of Documentary,” 2009). Visually, I wanted the colors used in the documentary and the typography chosen to be easy to read, but visually pleasing to viewers. Some of the text colors were altered to effectively get my message across (using red words to stress a negative concept).

**Techniques:**

*Actuality*

This includes raw film footage of real life events, places, people, and animals.

*Direct Interviews*

Interviews were conducted with heads of animal welfare organizations that spoke openly on their organizations’ behalf. Interviewees were filmed speaking directly about certain topics, prompted by the questions that I asked them. The interviews give viewers a sense of realism. To achieve this much detail from what may be a one-hour interview, clips of only a few minutes were shown in the actual documentary. Interviews on opposing sides of an issue are shown to give the viewer ample information about a topic.

*Text*

There were certain instances during the documentary, where text was added. This offered information and explanations to the actual footage.

*Setting:*

The preferred location of each interview was in or near the environment each interviewee worked. Viewers are then able to see the natural environment in which the interviewee normally works. For example, an interview at the Hawaiian Humane Society, took place on the organization’s property. If it is wasn’t possible to record inside an organization for any reason (ex. excessive noise from animals or the organization lacked a physical location), then the
interview took place on the property, but away from anything that would disrupt the video footage.

**Interviewee Consent:**

I created an interviewee consent and talent release form that describes the research project, activities and time commitment, benefits and risks, confidentiality and privacy, and voluntary participation aspects of the project. Participants were able to read the consent form in its entirety before the interview took place to see if they would actually like to participate or not.

**Permits:**

I have location release forms that have been customized for each individual organization. The location permit was essentially created to get an organization’s permission to record on their property. They ensure that I have permission to make and use videos taken on each organizations’ property.

**Interview Questions:**

1) What are some of the main factors that affect overpopulation of companion animals? Are any of these factors specific to Hawai‘i or O‘ahu in general?

2) What policies do you know currently exist that address cat and dog overpopulation in Hawai‘i?

3) How do you think Hawai‘i’s policies are working concerning the overpopulation of companion animals?

4) What are some ways that your organization copes with the overpopulation of companion animals?

5) What policy implementation would affect cat and dog overpopulation in Hawai‘i?

6) What are the positive aspects of having limited-admission animal shelters?
7) What are the negative aspects of having limited-admission animal shelters?

8) Do the animal welfare organizations in your community work together?

9) Is there anything else you would like to talk about regarding animal overpopulation or animal shelters in the U.S. or Hawai‘i?

**Procedures For Interviews:**

I arrived on the site for each interviewee 15 minutes early. This gave me ample to find the location and guaranteed that I would be on time for the interview. I met each interviewee at a predetermined time at a predetermined location. I first went over the interviewee consent and talent release form with the participant so they would understand the research project, activities and time commitment, benefits and risks, confidentiality and privacy, and voluntary participation aspects of the project. I also went over the location permits when necessary.

After the interviewee consent and release form and the location permits were signed by participants, I chose an appropriate location to conduct the interview. I then set up my video recording equipment (camera, tripod, microphone, and memory card) and determined the most visually pleasing lighting (LED light, reflectors) and camera angles to be used. I first attached the lavalier microphone to the interviewee’s shirt. It was placed directly under their mouth, but was concealed as much as possible underneath their shirt to have clear audio during the interview. I had the interviewee sit/stand in the intended interview location. The camera equipment was tested (30 second clip) to make sure everything was in working order before I actually started the interview. I also played the clip back to make sure that both the sound and the video were working correctly. The camera was placed in an appropriate location to get a clear and professional looking shot of the top half of the interviewee’s body. I conducted the interviews by asking all nine questions and allowed interviewees to answer each. After all
questions had been asked and answered by the participant, I stopped recording, thanked the
interviewee, and started collecting all equipment.

After the interview was complete, I uploaded it to my external hard drive, compressed it,
and emailed it to the interviewee. If they disapproved of, wished to change, add to, delete, or
otherwise change the content of the interviews, they contacted me with that information before
August 31, 2014.

**Documentary Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research on expository documentaries</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on documentary production techniques</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on local animal overpopulation and animal shelters</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative documentary storyboard created</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible interviewees contacted about participating in the interview</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All materials collected and forms filled out (consent forms, location permits)</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews conducted</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final documentary storyboard created</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All interview video footage of interviews completed</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary editing took place from September 2014-October 2014</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Thesis Paper and documentary</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Findings

When I had initially started my research, it was my goal to attempt to convince the people of Hawai‘i as well as the animal welfare organizations in Hawai‘i that our state needed to be part of the “no-kill movement.” We needed to have exclusively limited-admission (no-kill) shelters on island in order to end the euthanasia of healthy cats and dogs. I also believed that it would only make sense that animal access laws should immediately be passed, in order to make it illegal for a shelter to kill an animal when a non-profit animal welfare organization was willing to save that animal. My research focused on everything dealing with no-kill shelters and policies that would need to be put into place in order to make Hawai‘i a “no-kill state.”

After conducting the interviews with animal welfare experts on O‘ahu, I realized that there is a much more important issue that needs to be addressed before Hawai‘i could even begin to start looking into being a “no-kill state.” Through countless hours of research and editing, I realized that my initial mindset slowly started shifting to the problem that needs to be focused on first, which is preventing companion animal overpopulation before it happens. I started to understand that community members, animal welfare organizations, and the Hawai‘i state legislature all need to take a more proactive stance on animal overpopulation, rather than a reactive one. With a proactive stance, we can all focus on preventative measures of dealing with animal overpopulation, rather than being forced to react to the negative aspects that come along with the problem. Through the process of gathering the information and applying it to the documentary medium, the purpose of my documentary and the story that I wanted to tell from the beginning had changed. The documentary specifically focuses on the problem that is addressed through the interviewees, which is preventing animal overpopulation through education, legislation, and sterilization. Using these three solutions, we can drastically reduce the
number of companion animals being born, thereby diminishing the number of animals being humanely euthanized in shelters.

All in all, as my ideas evolved, so did the creation of my documentary. In the beginning, I had an idea of what I was going for, but after all of the research, interviews, and editing, what came together is a unique creative endeavor that I believe is much more important to broadcast to the people of Hawai‘i. I hope that the changes that I made to my documentary have an impact on the community and encourage positive steps in decreasing animal overpopulation and euthanasia of healthy animals on O‘ahu.
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Appendix A

University of Hawai‘i

Consent to Participate in Research Project:
No-Kill Network and Policy Changes for Companion Animals on O‘ahu

Interviewee Consent and Release Form

My name is Claudia Veikune and I am a graduate student at the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa (UH), in the Department of Communications. I am conducting a research project that will include a video interview as a requirement for earning my graduate degree. The purpose of this project is to create a documentary based on my research that will examine current factors and policies affecting companion animal (dogs and cats) overpopulation on O‘ahu. I am asking you to participate in this project because you have experience with animal shelters on O‘ahu or are knowledgeable on closed-admission animal shelter practices.

Activities and Time Commitment: If you agree to participate, I will interview you once in person, in a location that is convenient for you. If you are not on O‘ahu, an online video conference will be conducted and recorded for use in this project. The interview will last for about 15 to 30 minutes and only you and I will be present during the interview. I will record the interview using a digital video recorder. I am recording the interview so I may transcribe the entire interview and also to use some of the footage in a short documentary. If you choose to participate, you will be one of a total of nine participants who I will interview individually. The interview will consist of nine open-ended questions. One example of the type of question I will ask is, “What are some of the main factors that affect overpopulation of companion animals?”

Benefits and Risks: There are no direct benefits to you in participating in this research project. The results of this project might help me and other researchers to educate the public about animal overpopulation and current policy dealing with companion animals on O‘ahu. Your participation will contribute to our academic studies and research. We want to create an authentic record and make it available to scholars and the general public as a reliable document. To do that, it is important that your actual name appear as the interviewee on the transcript. In addition, the transcripts and media files of the interviews will include your name and likeness. Thus, one potential risk to you is a loss of privacy. As an interviewee in this project, you should be aware that your opinions or expressions in the video may be criticized by audiences.

By signing this form, you give your permission for any media footage and/ or photographs made during this project to be used by researchers and the public for educational purposes including publications, exhibitions, World Wide Web, and presentations. By giving your permission, you do not give up any copyright or performance rights that you may hold.

Voluntary Participation: Participation in this research project is voluntary. You are free to choose to participate or not to participate in this project and you may withdraw at any time from the activities in this research project. During the interviews, you can choose not to answer any question(s) at any time for whatever reason. After the interview, I will send you a digital copy of
your original interview. If you disapprove of, wish to change, add to, delete, or otherwise change the content of the interviews, you may do so by contacting me with that information at any time up to August 31, 2014. You can determine any restrictions regarding the interview both before and after you view your interview. Please provide any restriction descriptions to me before August 31, 2014.

I agree to the uses of these materials described above, except for any restrictions, noted below.

Project Name: No-Kill Network and Policy Changes for Companion Animals on O‘ahu, Claudia Veikune M.A.Thesis Research Project

Date:___________________________________________________

Name of person(s) interviewed:___________________________

Interviewer:____________________________________________

Reel Number:___________________________________________

Address:________________________________________________

Telephone Number:_______________________________________

Date of birth:____________________________________________

Researcher’s signature: ____________________________________________

Date: ______________________________________________________________________

Restriction description:____________________________________________________

Questions: Please contact me, Claudia Veikune, at cveikune@hawaii.edu if you have any questions regarding this project. Also, you can contact my supervisor Professor Patricia Buskirk at pbuskirk@hawaii.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you can contact the University of Hawai‘i, Human Studies Program, at (808) 956-5007 or via email at, uhirb@hawaii.edu

Agreement to Participate in
No-Kill Network and Policy Changes for Companion Animals on O‘ahu

“I certify that I have read and that I understand the information in this consent form, that I have been given satisfactory answers to my questions concerning the project, and that I have been told
that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue participation if I respond with that request before August 31, 2014.

I herewith give my consent to participate in this project with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights.”

_____________________________  _____________________________________________
Printed Name of Interviewee  Signature of Interviewee

______________________  
Date

Provide a Copy of this Consent Form to the Participant
Appendix B

Location Release Form

I, ____________________________________, the undersigned, as owner/agent, hereby grant to Claudia Veikune as lessee, the use of the premises described as follows:

Together with the access to and from said premises, for the purpose of filming said premises and/or recording sound for such documentary production scenes as lessee may desire, or for such other purposes directly related to documentary production as lessee may desire. The undersigned warrants that he/she is the owner/agent of said premises, and he/she is fully authorized to enter into this agreement and has the right to grant lessee the use of said premises and each and all of the rights herein granted.

Lessee may take possession of premises on or about _____________________ at _____ and may continue in possession thereof until ___________________________ at _____.

Lessee shall leave said premises in substantially as good condition as when received by it, reasonable wear and tear and use of said premises for the purposes herein permitted excepted.

Lessee shall own all rights of every kind in and to all photographs and recordings made by it on or about said premises and shall have the right to use such photographs or recordings in any manner it may desire without limitation or restrictions of any kind.

_______________________________________________ Date: ______________
(owner/agent)
Address: _______________________________________________________________
Phone: ________________________
Contact person on premises: ______________________________
Phone: ________________________