

Washoe County Regional Animal Services Advisory Board

**MINUTES**

Friday, November 1, 2019 @ 9:30 a.m.  
WASHOE COUNTY REGIONAL ANIMAL SERVICES  
CENTER CLASSROOM  
2825 LONGLEY LANE, RENO, NEVADA

**MEMBERS**

Naomi Duerr (Chair)  
Annette Rink (Vice Chair)  
Paul Anderson (absent)  
Jill Dobbs (absent)  
Irene Payne  
Al Rogers  
Jeanne Herman

**OTHER MEMBERS**

Shyanne Schull (Director)  
Tammy Wines-Jennings  
Keith Munro

**1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL [Non-Action Item]**

The meeting was opened and a quorum was established.

**PRESENT:** Naomi Duerr, Annette Rink, Paul Anderson, Jill Dobbs, Irene Payne, Al Rogers, DA Jen Gustafson

**ABSENT:** Paul Anderson and Jill Dobbs

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT [Non-Action Item]**

Ardena Pery: Discussed comments regarding the Animal Advisory Board being an advisory board only. Requested the Board refrain from publicly claiming the status the Board has not had. Reminded them that the Board doesn't have the authority to enforce regulate or oversee WCRAS.

Chair Duerr: Confirmed that they are not an Animal Control Board. They are an advisory board to staff, and that's their role.

Verna Kooy: Discussed recent incident with her dog who escaped and had an altercation with another dog and bit the dog. A Dangerous Dog Determination was made. Requested lesser forms of punishment for certain situations and possible evaluations provided for the dogs who are determined dangerous.

Chair Duerr: Confirmed the roles of the Washoe County Animal Advisory Board. Also requested Director Schull to discuss practices and procedures for when animals get off leash.

**3. APPROVAL OF JULY 26, 2019 MINUTES [For Possible Action]**

Member Dobbs made the motion to approve the Minutes. Member Payne seconded the motion. Minutes approved unanimously.

**4. DIRECTOR'S REPORT [Non-Action Item]**

An informational update on the Department of Regional Animal Services' programs, statistics, emerging developments, financial updates, and other matters properly related thereto.

Director Schull: Reminded everyone that due to lack of quorum, the statistics discussed today were from three quarters and a lot of discussion will be had.

Quarter 3 and 4 of fiscal '19 and Quarter 1 of fiscal '20 are looking at intake numbers. Of those quarters, they took in almost 8,500 animals. 82% were stray; 11% were confiscate animals; 3% were bite animals and 4% were surrenders or others. Due to the three-quarters of time, it's an abnormally large number. The stray was 6,946; confiscates were 966; bites were 269 and others were (inaudible).

Live release numbers is 8,889. 52% of the animals that came in went out to transfer to either NHS, SPCA, other shelters or rescue groups. 27% were returned to owner. Failed to return to owner was 14% and relocated is 8%.

Chair Duerr: Inquired whether transfer includes the NHS. Director Schull confirmed it does. Chair Does confirmed all groups that are transferred to.

Director Schull: Discussed that more color and vibrancy is being added to visual aids, but trying to focus on meaningful status. One of the statistics that actually drives future endeavors and activities that are focused on. Statistic sheets were included in the packet to provide information on everything that is currently being tracked.

Discussed getting animals returned to homes is a big focus, and not only getting animals transferred out alive. Showed Quarters 3 and 4 of fiscal '19 and Quarter 1 of fiscal '20 of total RTO and then also broken down by animals chipped and returned, and provided information on how animals are being returned, by what method?

Chair Duerr: Wanted clarification on numbers and/or percentages on slide.

Member Schultz: Clarified the first slide is all three quarters and the current slide has the slides broken up.

Director Schull: Confirmed the first one is quarter three from fiscal '19 and the second one is quarter four and the third one is quarter one of this fiscal year. The last slide is all three quarters combined so the percentage is different because it's not an individual quarter.

The chart on the left is the total picture of how animals went out; micro chipped, shelter or field. There was a higher percentage of animals that were returned in the first quarter of fiscal year '20.

The graph on the right of the slide was total outcome to view outcomes total versus returned to owner. Quarter 3, 4 and 1 of fiscal '20, there was 46% of animals being returned to owner versus (inaudible) – Quarter 3 and 4, 38% returned to owner. Quarter 4 38% or 1,276 animals. 3,292 total outcome. Quarter 1 was a total of 3,276 total outcomes with RTO 1,271 or 39%.

Chair Duerr: Clarified discussion.

Director Schull: Discussed the average length of stay for the animals. Once they are in, how quickly are they moved out, and how is care provided? Animals are moved out within 9 days as a whole, dogs and cats combined. It will be tracked more closely.

There are animals that have to be networked a little harder if NHS doesn't take the animals. There is work with other groups and shelters to place the animals to create open spaces for animals that need those spaces.

Member Schultz: Blue area described the year prior in that particular quarter. It's quarter to quarter, but also reviews what is done the year before in that time frame.

Chair Duerr: Confirmed Quarter 3 of 2018 and Quarter 3 from 2019.

Member Payne: Inquired about the animals more difficult to place or the ones that don't go to any local shelters, wanted to know where those animals might eventually go.

Director Schull: Clarified that depending on the animal's issue or needs, WCRAS works with a variety of different groups who can accommodate those needs. If NHS isn't

able to receive an animal due to an issue, another rescue group may take the animal if they can focus on the particular need of the animal.

Member Payne: Requested an example.

Director Schull: Gave an example of a dog who would have a severe case of being in a kennel environment and wasn't socialized, they might work with CRCS who takes animals who need specific focus and rehabilitation. They might work with a rescue group that used foster based housing to provide care for the animals until adoption.

Member Payne: Inquired whether funding goes with the animal to help the facility rehabilitate the animal.

Director Schull: Confirmed that Animal Services does not participate in funding.

Discussed the revised version of the Power Point presentation on the website due to errors in the statistics. There were corrections that needed to be made.

Animal welfare and cruelty investigations discussed with a focus on the cruelty investigation portion of it. Cruelty cases are being tracked very closely to see if trends can be established, or cycles of time based on the time of year.

Quarter 3 of fiscal '19, 79 citations were issued; 210 unfounded calls, and a total of 494 calls. The unfounded ones are calls that typically a neighbor complains a dog doesn't have shelter or water, however, those items are not seen by the neighbor's view, and the call remains unfounded.

Quarter 4 of fiscal '19, there were 102 citations issues; 309 unfounded calls, a total of 702 calls.

Quarter 1 of fiscal '20 was a significant increase. 130 citations, 440 unfounded calls and 976 total calls.

Chair Duerr: Clarifies to the public that the County's fiscal year begins in July. Quarter is July 1 to September 30. Quarter 4 is spring. Quarter 3 is winter.

Linda Peri: Quarter 3 of '19 had almost 500 calls and only 300 were addressed. What happened to the other 200?

Director Schull: Explains that many of the calls are resolved. Many calls have

activity after activity because AC is working with the individual. Most are resolved.

Chair Duerr: Requests that the gap be indicated on the slides.

Member Schultz: It's her understanding that there are over 200 open cases that have not been resolved. Is it correct that one-third of the cases are not resolved?

Director Schull: Clarifies that it's pending or cases they are following.

Member Rogers: Requesting clarification on the jump from Q4 to Q1, 30%, is that typical? And are any other factors changed? Is the jump typical of the time frame?

Director Schull: Confirms that AC sees more calls in summer. In terms of the particular slide, when it is averaged over 700 calls for hot dogs in a warm season, that call volume comes from those animals being locked in hot vehicles, etc. Sometimes the vehicle has already left and that leaves the call an unfounded call.

Member Rogers: Inquired about the staffing.

Chair Duerr: Discussed the Puppies Plus issue and wanted to know the status.

Director Schull: The investigation remains open and unable to discuss. A trial is upcoming in 2020.

Chair Duerr: Confirmed trial in 2020.

Director Schull: Could not comment further because of investigation.

Chair Duerr: Explained that counsel are involved and settlement process prior to trial. There could be potential for settlement possibly.

Jen Gustafson: Settlement would pertain to civil. This is a criminal prosecution for Puppies Plus. In civil practice, settlement would occur. In criminal practice, a plea bargain would take place.

Chair Duerr: Confirmed there was no special insider information with regards to the investigation. AC is not involved not consulted. Requested information on the process when an individual is cited.

Director Schull: Confirmed it depends on what the citation is for or the violation.

Animal welfare investigations and cruelty investigations allow for issuance of citations at the misdemeanor level. Law enforcement would then issue citations if it is above a misdemeanor.

Chair Duerr: Inquired who does the investigation.

Director Schull: Confirmed that WCRAS does the preliminary investigation. If it's at a felony level, they reach out to law enforcement and provide information and request assistance. Another option is to contact the DA's Office to request for a direct file.

Chair Duerr: What happens in a dog bite case?

Director Schull: Confirmed that dog bite cases are not generally a citation. It depends on the circumstances of the case.

She referenced Ms. Kooy's earlier public comment that her dog was recently declared dangerous through an administrative hearing process, and within code there is a dangerous dog process where a dog has to violate a number of times prior to it being considered a dangerous dog. It depends on the criteria and evidence of the dangerous dog claim.

Animal Services reviews the evidence presented. If evidence substantiates that a dangerous dog violation has occurred, then information is submitted to the Administrative Hearing Office to be heard by the Administrative Hearing Officer.

The individual who owns the animal, any victims or witnesses are invited to attend the hearing to present any evidence, to testify in front of the Hearing Officer about what they saw, heard or experienced. Animal Services also attends to present information, history of the animal, individuals involved, and additional information.

Chair Duerr: Inquired about the process when a hearing is before a hearing officer and the role of the City Council regarding the findings of the hearing officer, and the appeal process.

Director Schull: Confirmed there is an appeal process. The individual who owns the dog declared dangerous has 30 days to request an appeal through a judicial court process. Confirmed it goes to a court, not to the county.

Chair Duerr: Confirmed there is an administrative process and then it goes through the court system.

Director Schull: Discusses the notice of civil penalty if someone is cited for failure to license their pet if they wish to appeal Animal Services decision to issue the Notice of Civil Penalty.

Discussed the permit processes, in addition to the dangerous dog process, has the same process to go through the Administrative Hearing Office, and then also has the right to appeal.

Ardena Pery: Discussed Richard Gammick's civil penalty law. As she recalls the law being written, one of the complaints was that it took three events for the dog to be declared dangerous unless there was substantial bodily harm. Is that not correct?

Director Schull: Confirmed that was the prior Dangerous Dog Code.

Ardena Pery: Recalls what Dick Gammick wrote that has not been changed through the Commission.

Director Schull: Confirmed it was changed when Dick Gammick was gone and was revised in 2015 or 2016.

Ardena Pery: Has concerns regarding the dog bite law currently as it addresses substantial harm. The language stating "substantial harm" is no longer in the law.

Chair Duerr: Recalls that changes were made in the 2018 period, or maybe it was 2016.

Ardena Pery: Wanted clarification of substantial harm.

Jen Gustafson: Recalls the code was changed in 2015 and it is only one incident. There is no substantial harm or level of harm. It depends on the circumstances and if the animal is found dangerous.

Chair Duerr: Suggested reaching out to County Commissioners if an individual wanted it changed.

Director Schull: Discussed if a dog was on a leash and a loose dog came up to your dog and your dog attacked, that dog would not be declared a dangerous dog if that dog was under your care and control and on a leash. It's when dogs are off leash or break through fences and get into other people's yards is when a dangerous dog scenario takes hold.

Verna Kooy: Discussed the dangerous dog restrictions which requires the dog to be put in a kennel outdoors. It does have to have a shelter with food and water required. It has to be padlocked. The dog stays by himself. She is disputing that the animal is left outside in the heat.

Chair Duerr: Advised she would talk to Verna Kooy following the meeting. It was not the proper forum to relitigate the issues.

Verna Kooy: She is worried that someone might file another complaint as to dog cruelty because her dog is left outside all day.

Director Schull: Discussed the outreach effort that the department has accomplished in the last three quarters. The Homebound Senior Program is when the veterinarian takes a vet tech and a program coordinator and visits the homes of seniors who are immobile or less than likely to be able to get to the vet to receive proper care for their vet. It is done once a month. Information is provided from Senior Services. All sorts of services are provided to the animals belonging to seniors. If further care is needed, there is a referral to another vet for treatment. There were 310 pets in the last three quarters in the program.

Pets micro chipped were 2,357. Any pet in Washoe County gets free microchip if someone comes in and asks for it. They want to be able to demonstrate how many animals were reunited with owners and how many were able to move into the shelter quickly. Tracking the number of animals actually chipped is helpful to WCRAS.

Chair Duerr: Requested information as to making an appointment or the process of the microchip.

Director Schull: Information provided comes from the clinics or the outreach events that are conducted. They try and offer the microchip services at any of the events attended. Microchips are also provided at WCRAS. The statistic provided on the slide is just from outreach programs. People can come in at any time and ask for the animal to be micro chipped at the shelter.

Animals vaccinated are done so at a low cost vaccine clinic at the shelter the first Tuesday of every month. During the warmer season of the year, they try go to into the community, such as parks, and provide vaccine clinics. They provided vaccine services to over 3,000 animals through the vaccine clinics. The vaccine service at WCRAS has become so popular that they are out of space. They see an average of 100 pets on the clinics every first Tuesday. It was started in 2015, and is very popular.

**Happy Tails.** In terms of emergency response for Animal Services, this summer was a lot quieter than prior years. Three fires were responded to and shelters provided. On July 13, 2019, the Jasper fire was responded to and large/small animal shelters were set up. Separate shelter is set up for livestock/large animals. A total of 54 animals were housed during that fire.

The Long Valley fire on August 25, 2019, a small animal shelter was set up at Cold Springs Middle School and used the Livestock Events Center for livestock. Total of 18 animals were housed during that fire.

A fire in Spanish Springs required a small animal shelter that was provided. No animals were housed during that fire and the shelter was broken down the same day.

It requires a very large number of staff hours and is very labor intense to provide shelters during emergency situations. Recalls the Ironwood fire last year that staff responded to for several days and cared for over 300 animals.

This program is a very important component of services provided to include not only sheltering but evacuating for those who don't have the resources to evacuate their own animals.

Tammy Wines, Assistant Director: Discussed a recent call on August 21, 2019, regarding a horse that was down in the Washoe Lake State Park. It had been out with its owner and fell in a ditch. Park Services' employees attempted to get the horse out of the ditch when AC was called. WCRAS officers were sent out to evaluate the situation. The large animal rescue trailer was taken out to help the horse who at that time had been in the ditch for approximately two and a half hours. The horse was eventually retrieved from the ditch and treatment was provided to the horse with vet staff. The outcome was very good.

Chair Duerr: Requested clarification on rescue of the horse.

Tammy Wines: Confirmed the rescue strategy with the use of a backhoe bucket which lifted the horse out of the ditch. Staff assisted in encouraging the horse while rescue was in place.

Also discussed a call regarding a kitten being in a tree for two days. They got assistance from the Sparks Fire Department who brought the truck out and obtained the kitten from the tree who then went to NHS for adoption.

Future topics to be discussed at the next meeting is the livestock evacuation team who

will be volunteers from the community and members to assist during emergencies to provide more help to save animals.

**5. PRESENTATION AND UPDATE ON TRAP-NEUTER-RELEASE-MONITOR FERAL CAT PROGRAM [Non-Action Item].**

Director Schull: Discussed the TNR Program and when the Board of County Commissioners adopted the code, the day to day operations. In April, 2015, the BOCC adopted the feral cat management code which created a trap/release monitor system or trap/return monitor system for managing feral cats in Washoe County.

In order for the program to operate, a sponsor was needed to take on the responsibility of managing feral cat colony caretakers which some were already in existence. A formal process was needed.

The BOCC adopted the code. NHS is the only sponsor. A list is provided to Animal Services of feral cat colony caretakers in Washoe County. When a cat comes through a feral cat program, they are spayed/neutered, vaccinated, micro chipped and returned back to their areas.

Art Westbrook is the COO of NHS. Discussed cat action team and described it is to bring awareness to the public of how to live with feral cats. A registered colony caretaker is required to take care of the cats.

Assistance is provided to colony caretakers for equipment or assistance they need to keep the colony going. Assistance is also provided to those who don't want feral cats in their areas. A TNR coordinator is sent to provide cat repellent, motion sensors, etc. There is not a charge for this service.

Assistance is provided to colony caretakers for cat food. There are about 5 to 10 colony caretakers that food is delivered to every two weeks. If a new cat enters the colony that is not altered, the cat is trapped and altered, and then released back to the area.

About 30 to 35 TNR surgeries are conducted per week, or 1,800 TNR surgeries per year. Assistance is also provided for low cost spay/neuter for their personal cats.

In 2006, is when the TNR program was started. Since that time, a 40% drop has been noted in cat intakes between NHS and WCRAS.

TNR guidelines were discussed. No fee to the public. Microchips are provided to

feral cats 3 months of age or older. All feral cats get their ear tipped.

Member Rink: Inquired as to how a colony caretaker is picked.

Mr. Westbrook: Explains a TNR coordinator will make contact and explain to them what's necessary or required of a colony caretaker. If there is any health issues in the colony, the cats will be treated.

Member Rink: Inquired if a colony caretaker has to have private property. Wanted to know how neighbor conflict was dealt with.

Mr. Westbrook: They try to keep the colony in tact, but if the neighbor does object, the cats are trapped and distributed for adoption.

Member Rink: Commented on a three cat colony size. Wanted to know what colony sizes were.

Mr. Westbrook: Commented that the biggest colony they have right now is 35 to 40 cats.

Member Payne: Wanted to know how many colonies are in the county.

Mr. Westbrook: Was not able to provide that information.

Ardena Pery: Opposed to TNR. Discussed that Animal Services and NHS have both been refusing cats for quite some time. Inquired about further investigation into the TNR ordinance because she thinks it's antiquated. She did a public records request and found 100 cats that had rabies vaccinations and out of the 100, 92 were over a year out of date. She is opposed to releasing the population of cats. Inquired what will be done in getting the cats into compliance with NRS for rabies. She will do a public records request because it is a public health issue. She stated the rabies statistics have to come back to the county agency.

Mr. Westbrook: The colony caretakers are worked with to get TNR cats vaccinated with rabies. The cats are trapped to be vaccinated at no charge.

Director Schull: Discussed that in fiscal 2019, they took in over 4,638 cats. They don't leave out traps. The public can bring cats over the counter and they will be taken. If cats are injured, they will be picked up. They don't go out to pick up cats, but do take in cats.

Chair Duerr: Requested clarification on how it's determined if a cat is feral.

Director Schull: Described that a feral cat is an unsocialized cat that has not been around humans, and you can tell within the first five minutes. Some cats will settle down if they are domesticated. It is very stressful for a cat to be brought in and sometimes they will present as feral, and after a couple of days, the cat will relax and be treated as a domestic cat and not a feral cat.

Chair Duerr: Discussed her personal experiences with her cats.

Verna Kooy: Discussed her mother's feral cat colony which has been successful.

## **6. PRESENTATION AND UPDATE OF 2019 LEGISLATIVE SESSION [Non-Action Item]**

Director Schull: During the last Legislative Session there were some amendments to clarify for animals they hold on to indefinitely because of language that was inserted in the last legislative session. It had to be rectified. Twelve bills are tracked overall that are related to animals.

NRS 171 and 574 - the language changed. WCRAS suggested changes with the current language specific to dealing with animals as a result of an arrest – not an animal cruelty related arrest, but if someone was arrested, and if there was an animal involved, WCRAS was required to hold on to those animals indefinitely if the person who was arrested chose not to release the animal to WCRAS.

Statistics were then provided to assist with the current language that since the session of 2017, Animal Services had a total of 300 animals that were cared for as a result of arrests and/or placed in jail. Most of them were held for longer than 15 days. The longest was 118 days that the dog was in their care.

The average cost per day for those animals is \$9.00/dog and \$4.00/cat. Impact to the department was discussed and some sort of transfer of the animals to Animal Services was required.

Member packets contained SB 342. She also noted substantial changes to SB 574. Section 1 is where the focus is, and changes were made. She indicated more definitive and clear changes could have been made, however, it provides the language needed to disposition an animal after 10 days of notice. Once the person arrested is notified, the animal can be

made available for adoption or placement or euthanasia, if required, after 10 days. A list will be provided at any jail facility within the area that may have their pet. The responsibility falls on the state to provide information. If there is notification that falls through the cracks, it will be insured that contact will be made with the inmate at Parr and advise on animal status and after 10 days, it will be moved.

Chair Duerr: Confirmed cost per day. Inquired if a family member or friend can pick up the animal and hold the animal.

Director Schull: Confirmed the provision for them to designate someone to pick up the animal on their behalf, but they have 10 days to do so. There were previous instances of that pick up person not having contact information, and they wouldn't show up to get animal.

Chair Duerr: Inquired what happens if the designated pick up person doesn't show up, what happens to the animal.

Director Schull: Confirmed there is 10 days from the notice being provided to the animal owner to either the inmate or designee comes to pick up the animal, or it becomes available for adoption.

Chair Duerr: Wants to know what happens if the designee doesn't show up, and is there feedback to the inmate to advise their designee hasn't shown up.

Director Schull: Confirmed there is no process to go back in and let the inmate know their designee didn't show up.

Chair Duerr: Made suggestions as to the new program.

Director Schull: Confirmed the new forms are being used and there has been 5 to 7 animals who will be moved through the system. The information who is provided to the inmate is, "The animal becomes available 10 days from today. It's your responsibility to find someone to pick up this animal." It is too time consuming for Animal Services to go to Parr and make contact with the inmate is too labor intensive.

Chair Duerr: Wants to know why the inmate can't receive a phone message.

Member Rogers: Wanted clarification on code revision to get SB 342 in.

Director Schull: Confirmed there will be no code revision. However, if the

BOCC wishes to adopt code revision, the time line can be shortened to five days. She suggested the 10 day time limit be tried first, and see if a code revision is even necessary. If it allows the animals to be processed in 10 days, is it really worth going through a code revision to save 5 days. Wants to try this process first.

Chair Duerr: Inquired as to the status of those pets who have been processed this way from the inmate.

Director Schull: Did not have the information requested and will research.

Chair Duerr: Requested that Director Schull provide the information at the next meeting as to how the new system is working.

Ardena Pery: Wanted to know if there was proof provided when the inmate designates who picks up the dog.

Director Schull: Will follow the process to identify the designee. Gave an example of someone who was arrested multiple times and this process provides care when that inmate doesn't have anyone else to care for the animal.

Chair Duerr: Discussed the incident with Puppies Plus and wanted to know what happened to the animals in the store?

Director Schull: Those animals in question remained in the care, custody and control of a provider of Puppies Plus who was not in custody.

Chair Duerr: Requested an opportunity to provide advice and/or information for a proposal for legislation. Requested that Animal Services get on the agenda for the Advisory Board.

Director Schull: Thinks it would be beneficial to do so.

Chair Duerr: Wanted ideas presented at a meeting for discussion. And then at the second meeting, be able to provide advice to move forward.

Director Schull: Reminded to also discuss the outline of code, legislative concerns, and things they want to address to the Board.

Chair Duerr: Discussed upcoming county code changes and reminded Director Schull to determine when the Board should provide advice.

Director Schull: Advised about a lot of revisions in code that have occurred to date and that they revisions will be cleaned up, and will be discussed with the Advisory Board regarding the areas they need help in clarifying.

Chair Duerr: Confirmed timing for legislation change.

**7. UPDATE ON COUNTY'S SOCIAL MEDIA POLICY [Non-Action Item]**

Director Schull: Discussed the county's protocol or policy. The Board requested at the last meeting why Animal Services did not have them on a Facebook page and utilize social media. It was asked for Director Schull to provide the policy regarding social meeting.

She advised that unless someone is an elected official, there is not the ability to have their own social media. Washoe County's Facebook and Twitter pages are managed by the Communications Division, and are growing rapidly. Only departments with an elected official are allowed to create their own social media sites. Notice is required before something is to be posted.

Advised they utilize the County Manager's Communication's Team and their Facebook page and Twitter accounts for all soliciting. Karen Stark develops tweets. Anything that is Facebook friendly will be shared with the Communication's Team to share on their behalf. They do not have their own page.

Member Payne: Feels that opportunities are being missed to be able to engage with the community regarding animal related topics. Inquired as to the process to get the policy revised and/or talking to the Commissioners. She feels social media information would be beneficial communication with the community.

Chair Duerr: Advised that there is an opportunity to talk to the new County Manager about revising the policy for social media. She thinks it is something that should be revisited and has the potential to touch a lot of families in the community. Requested to be part of the BOCC presentation.

Director Schull: Agreed as to the process.

Chair Duerr: Discussed the various Advisory Boards and who attends when the annual report is presented to the Council. Inquired as to when the next Annual Report would be due.

Director Schull: Advised an Annual Report has not been completed yet.

Chair Duerr: Requested that the item should be brought up under New Announcements and Information (#9) and confirm/schedule same.

Member Rink: Inquired as to how many Facebook posts are created per month or per week through the County website.

Director Schull: Thinks maybe 2 or 3 a month for Facebook and 2 Tweets a week which consist of announcement, upcoming events. She feels Facebook is more valuable because you can share more information than Twitter. The animal posts get the most attention.

Member Payne: Believes social media is a valuable tool. Wants the community to be educated about the work they do and believes they would get more support.

Chair Duerr: Posts on social media about 4 times a week. Keeps connected with the community and gets feedback.

Member Rogers: Believes it is an administrative process and suggested Animal Services could be the poster child for social media. It would be beneficial to Animal Services to do so.

Chair Duerr: Wanted to confirm the Board is available for any assistance.

**8. SET 2019 MEETING SCHEDULE [For possible action]**

Chair Duerr: Suggested meetings be held the fourth Friday of every month and provided dates for scheduling as: 1/24/20; 4/24/20; 7/24/20; 10/23/20.

Director Schull: Confirmed all those dates work for Animal Services.

Chair Duerr: Reconfirmed 1/24/20.

Member Payne: Confirmed she is available.

Chair Duerr: Reconfirmed 4/24/20 and 7/24/20 and 10/23/20.

Member Dobbs: Confirmed schedule.

Member Payne: Confirmed schedule.

Chair Duerr: Requested a motion.

Member Rink: Made a motion to accept the dates provided by Chair Duerr.

Member Payne: Seconded the motion.

Chair Duerr: Motion passes.

**9. WASHOE COUNTY REGIONAL ANIMAL SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS AND/OR STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS, REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION AND SELECTION OF TOPICS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS**  
[Non-Action Item]

Chair Duerr: Discussed code revisions for next meeting on 1/24/20. By April and July, statutory changes should be in place for recommendation. They have to be submitted by the end of August, 2020.

Jen Gustafson: Doesn't know the calendars for recommendation.

Chair Duerr: Suggested discussions should start in January and have more discussion in April. She is worried about missing County Commission deadlines.

Member Herman: Recalls discussion about a code change necessary for changing the code for first offenses being a warning, etc.

Chair Duerr: Thinks it would be a code change.

Jen Gustafson: Has had several meetings regarding the dangerous dog code and revisions that were left out in 2015 need to be added. Also has had some preliminary discussion regarding substantive changes to be made to the code. Two meetings have been conducted internally discussing same.

Chair Duerr: Requesting item on agenda for input at the next meeting. Would prefer a "one strike before you're out" and not a "one strike you're out."

Member Dobbs: It would have to depend on how serious the first strike is.

Jen Gustafson: It would be properly agenzized for discussion.

Chair Duerr: Concurs with Member Herman that it's worthy of a conversation.

Discussed the complaints and what is a dangerous dog? What is an abandoned animal? Wanted clarification on the nature of the complaints received.

Member Payne: Wanted to also circle back on the social media conversation.

Chair Duerr: Annual report discussion by January – to be presented at the beginning of the calendar year, if not earlier.

Director Schull: Would have to discuss with DA Gustafson and also get Board's perspective regarding the information for the BOCC that this Board has been doing previously. More discussion would take place before a report would be ready.

Chair Duerr: Requests to get report prepared and then have discussions about what is missing and/or added to report. Wants the report to be submitted in February or March time frame. Suggested putting the picture, power point presentations, and implement the statistics into a report for review. Suggested just completing the report and comment on a mostly done report at the next meeting.

Member Dobbs: Provide a draft for review would give them a baseline for discussion.

Member Payne: Wanted clarification on is it a WCRAS annual report or is it an Advisory Board report. If it's Advisory Board, she feels it is for them to decide.

Jen Gustafson: Confirmed that the ordinance indicates the Director of WCRAS shall report the recommendations of Animal Services Advisory Board to BOCC. It would include the recommendations of this Board and it could also have other things as well, and is not limited.

Member Payne: The document contained an overview of the work done. The second part would be for the Board to decide what would be included. Suggested next meeting a draft could be presented and then supplemental information could be discussed to be included.

Chair Duerr: Wanted to know if Director Schull did any other separate report?

Director Schull: Indicated she does not prepare a separate report.

Chair Duerr: Agreed that it would be an opportunity to showcase what her department was doing under the auspices of the Board, and having both parts would be very

helpful. She is pressing for completion to be on another board agenda for budget schedule.

Director Schull: Indicated it is not presented to the BOCC, but they present to the Budget Committee.

Chair Duerr: Wanted confirmation if it would be closer to April.

Member Rogers: Also would be his suggestion to throw a budget in there, and recognizing they are an Advisory Board, but be able to make recommendations that would meet the time line requested.

Chair Duerr: Discussed some of recommendations are going to be budgetary, a new program, enhancement of program, supplemental services. Those are the recommendations they would be making. Requested a synopsis of the budget and positions in the annual report.

Discussed a possible inner meeting just to review the report before it is turned over to BOCC. Wants to see a final draft prior to presentation.

Member Stark: Discussed upcoming events as they become more available.

Chair Duerr: Reminded that if special events should have WCRAS represented, it should be discussed and included as agenda item.

## **10. PUBLIC COMMENT [Non-Action Item]**

Mary Kennedy: Discussed neighbor who applied for an application to have more than three adult dogs. Wanted information as to why they didn't receive a letter, and what is determined by the Board for a variance.

Director Schull: Discussed that neighborhood notifications are provided to those individuals who live within 200 feet of the applicant. She requested Ms. Kennedy's contact information to verify from the file the variance permit application notifications. The process for a variance permit is outlined within the code. A review of containment methods are reviewed for code requirement, as well as number of animals, neighborhood complaints.

Mary Kennedy: Wanted to know if the condition of the animals was reviewed. Also wanted to know how a neighbor would know if a variance is received.

Director Schull: Confirmed animal conditions are reviewed. If a concerned

neighbor sends a letter, a courtesy notification is sent letting that person know whether or not the variance is granted or denied.

Mary Kennedy: Wanted to know the time frame for receipt of letter.

Director Schull: Advised the variance process takes between 30 and 90 days depending on an inspection, modifications to property.

Mary Kennedy: Wanted to know if there were signs to look for if a puppy mill operation was suspected.

Director Schull: Advised if someone is operating a breeding operation, to look for sanitation issues, welfare of the animal issues, large number of animals kept in cages.

Mary Kennedy: Wanted to know the steps to take if a suspected puppy mill operation was taking place.

Director Schull: Confirmed that Animal Services will respond to a report being made. If a person is breeding more than 5 litters of cats or dogs a year, it is required to obtain a breeding permit. If someone has more than 7 cats or 3 dogs, a person is required to apply for a variance permit if they live in a congested area.

Chair Duerr: Inquired about a commercial permit and details of same.

Director Schull: A Commercial Animal Welfare Permit would apply to a business or organization that is either selling animals, boarding animals, or keeping animals overnight. A breeding permit is for requirements for those who choose to breed from home.

Mary Kennedy: Wanted to know if the licenses have to be renewed and how would Animal Services know if they were.

Director Schull: There is only one breeding permit in the process of being approved in Washoe County. It's very difficult to enforce. You have to prove more than five litters per year. NRS and Chapter 55 require the breeder to list the permit number in all advertising.

Linda Peri: Reads the amended ordinance indicating Animal Control must notify in writing each person residing within 200 feet of the location from which the dogs will be kept and each person residing on property adjacent to the property. Confirmed she didn't receive a letter. Discussed the neighbor was advertising the third litter of puppies on

Craigslist, and the second litter on Facebook. Animal Control was there on September 21<sup>st</sup>. Puppies are lethargic and kept inside. Mother dog is very thin. A lot of breeding is going on and Linda Peri is feeding and watering the animals. Requested an agenda item to discuss further.

Director Schull: Wants to address her concerns and wanted further information on her possible breeding neighbor. She is familiar with all applications because she approves or denies. She is involved in the process.

Chair Duerr: Thanked Linda Peri for coming forward. Thanked Director Schull and staff for all their work.

Member Rink: Requested a summary of the permit requests received and wanted to know the status of how many are approved and denied and wanted an overview of what lead to the denial.

Director Schull: Confirmed she would prepare a summary. In the spreadsheet provided, the permit information is provided for approvals versus denials. She will provide an overview since code was changed.

Member Rink: Requesting generally what lead to the denial, not specifically for the applicant.

## **11. ADJOURNMENT** [Non-Action Item].

Chair Duerr: Thanked everyone for a great job. Asked for motion to adjourn.

Member Herman: Made a motion to adjourn.

Member Rink: Seconded the motion.

Chair Duerr declared the meeting adjourned.