

Washoe County Regional Animal Services Advisory Board

DRAFT OF MINUTES-VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING

Friday, August 28, 2020 @ 9:30 a.m.
WASHOE COUNTY REGIONAL ANIMAL SERVICES
CENTER CLASSROOM
2825 LONGLEY LANE, RENO, NEVADA

MEMBERS

Naomi Duerr (Chair)
Annette Rink
Paul Anderson
Jill Dobbs
Irene Payne
Al Rogers
Kitty Jung (absent)

STAFF

Shyanne Schull (Director)

LEGAL COUNSEL

Jen Gustafson (Deputy DA)

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

The meeting was opened and a quorum was established.

PRESENT: Naomi Duerr, Paul Anderson, Jill Dobbs, Irene Payne, Al Rogers

ABSENT: Kitty Jung, Annette Rink

2. PUBLIC COMMENT [Non-Action Item]

Ardena Perry: Discussed WCRAS calling the Sparks Business License Department requesting a business license over a Sparks business that doesn't have a Commercial Animal Welfare Permit. Wanted clarification on the job description for the Board to Animal Services and clarify they are to offer direction and not lobby the cities for their animal rightist agenda. Will be going before the Commission seeking a reprimand and a reset on how WCRAS business is conducted.

3. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 24, 2020 AND FEBRUARY 27, 2020, MINUTES [For possible action]

Ms. Gustafson: Requested the words "Other Members" be removed from both of the Minutes.

Chair Duerr: Thought it would be helpful to recognize if there is acknowledgment or thoughts on certain items.

Member Payne: Made motion of approval of the Minutes for January 24, 2020, and February 27, 2020, subject to the amendments suggested by Ms. Gustafson.

Member Anderson: Seconded the motion.

Chair Duerr: Motion carries unanimously.

Unknown: Confirmed that Annette Rink is present during the virtual meeting. Clarification was sought.

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

Director Schull: Prefaced presentation discussing the statistics. Information was prepared from the last meeting to clarify information and requested feedback accordingly.

Chair Duerr: Recalled starting with the FY16 on the left side going to the FY20. Made that recommendation in that most read from left to right and how data is presented.

Director Schull: Two quarters worth of data was presented. Comparison was made of the same quarters of the last four fiscal years. The numbers were unique because of COVID-19, and services were significantly impacted re: field pick up of animals, as well as the lobby.

At the beginning of the pandemic, when the County gave direction to start scaling back the public interface, the lobby was closed and services were continued via phone and on line. Field services were also scaled back to emergency calls only. The decrease reflected in the last two quarters were reflective of the pandemic and having scaled back services.

Commented that the community was very understanding and continued assistance in location and reunification. The emergency night drop boxes were utilized and contact with the public was minimized.

Overall, staff was pleased with the overall cooperation of the community and continue services, protect staff, and continue care for the animals.

Discussed animals that come into care that are already chipped and because of the free microchip program, it was felt it is irrelevant to be able to reflect that not only is the program effective and is working, but how many animals actually get reunited as a result of the microchip. For the last two quarters of fiscal 2020, the numbers coming in were decreased because of COVID and were not equal to the prior fiscal years.

Directed members to the information detailed on the slide are animals returned or live release from the shelter. 45% on the last quarter/last fiscal year were returned to owner. In Quarter 3, it was the highest percentage of return to owner in same quarters over the last four years – possibly due to COVID and people being at home. 36% of animals in Quarter 4 or 683 out of 1,887 were already chipped.

Discussed overall percentage of animals over the last four years that are already chipped is increasing. Feels it is a reflection of a successful microchip program. 41% in the last quarter were transferred to Res-que. 3% to 4% of animals are either euthanized or died coming into care; newborns or sick/ill.

Chair Duerr: Complimented Director Schull on information and charts, and confirmed information presented.

Member Anderson: Inquired as to Q4, the increase to 11% of died or disposal and requested clarification.

Director Schull: Confirmed those numbers are roadside deceased animals, as well as a private person's animal that they want WCRAS to dispose of. It doesn't necessarily reflect an animal that died in their care.

Member Anderson: Good to know information.

Director Schull: Introduced a slide that indicates animals that were able to return because they were micro chipped. She feels that it is a result of a success of the program and is another tool of resources to utilize to return animals home.

Quarters 3 and 4 of the last fiscal year, the numbers stayed up in terms of the percentage of animals that they were able to get returned as a result of a microchip. Currently, over 60% of overall animals that were returned, were returned because they were micro chipped. She feels it speaks volumes to the value of the microchip program. Continued discussion of tracking the metrics to support the program, but to also educate the community the value of microchips. When offered free microchip, most owners will do so.

Chair Duerr: Inquired if the micro chipping can occur at the vet.

Director Schull: The shelter microchips during normal circumstances. As a result of COVID-19, micro chipping is not being offered during business hours. But ordinarily, during business hours, a Washoe County resident can bring their pet into the facility for a free microchip, or to a vaccine clinic, or to any of the events. Other shelters may also offer micro chipping.

Chair Duerr: Inquired if there are multiple registries.

Director Schull: Confirmed there are multiple registries depending on the microchip. There is a microchip look up phone number and website to research the chips.

Also discussed returned animals and if they are returned in the field before they are ever impounded or are the animals returned once they've reached the shelter and they have already been impounded and resources and time have been spent on the animal. Overall, the five year average is 68% that are returned once they come into the shelter and 32% are returned in the field. The goal is to increase the 32% and provide information on the resources available to the animal.

Chair Duerr: Inquired as to how it is achieved to return in the field. Wanted specifics as to how it works.

Director Schull: Clarified that her field staff explore quite a few strategies when they are picking up animals. Staff have computers in their vehicles that are connected to the data base, as well as smart phones and microchip scanners.

The first step is to attempt to see if the animal has identification, i.e., a license or collar with information. If not, the animal is scanned for a chip. If so, the owner will be contacted. If unsuccessful in reaching the owner, then a note is made in the data base and a picture is taken which is uploaded and becomes available on the website within 20 minutes. Anyone from home can research every shelter animal on the website.

If a pet owner is contacted out in the field, attempt is made to meet so the animal doesn't have to be impounded. There are instances where an owner has contacted almost at the same time and staff can do reunifications or matchings out in the field. If staff has time, they will post on Lost and Found Pets of Northern Nevada Facebook Page, and look for information on the lost animal. Lost and Found Reports are also researched in data base.

There are a number of steps that staff takes in the field that are covering every avenue

of reunification with the owner without having to bring it to the shelter.

Chair Duerr: Discussed the large amount of thunderstorms recently, and wondered the impact of it on staff.

Director Schull: Confirmed that windy weather, thunder, lightning, fireworks, they are triggers for many animals. There is an increase in calls when those scenarios are in play.

Summer has been very busy. Anxious to report soon that there have been a large number of cruelty calls that are concerning. Not sure if it's related to the pandemic with people home and irritated with family, taking it out on pets. Reports very disturbing cases recently.

Chair Duerr: Thanked Director Schull.

Director Schull: Presented additional information on a chart. May see a little difference in the calls, such as welfare cases. Welfare calls and cruelty calls were the blue bar; unfounded calls are they grey, and lighter blue is a citation was issued or Notice of Civil Penalty. Quarters 3 and 4 had lower call volumes – perhaps attributed to the pandemic because people were home hopefully taking care of the animals.

Discussed updates to the Board and even though services were impacted and staff was still working and providing services to be proactive. Staff collaborated with SPCA re: dogs locked in hot vehicles which is the biggest issue. Over 600 calls last year with animals locked in hot vehicles. Feels community awareness needs to be increased.

A campaign was designed to share on a wider basis, but for the time being, they wanted to share information such as signs for businesses to participate. Social media sharing is occurring to provide information. Also reaching out to the community who is not on social media. SPCA worked with partners to get electronic billboards around Washoe County – one on 395 and one on Vista Boulevard.

Chair Duerr: Wanted to discuss further how the Board can help further. Requested at the end of the report to be able to brainstorm together.

Member Dobbs: Confirmed social media was the best way to share, but the timing wasn't great because of the pandemic which created push back from business partners as far as laminating signs to hang in parking lots and in business windows. There was concern about the physical part of the campaign because of COVID. She wants to move forward with

having the Spanish version created. She is excited to grow the education, the campaign, and the awareness.

Member Anderson: Inquired as to where the posters come from if they have businesses available to present the posters.

Member Dobbs: Confirmed the electronic version can be provided. Part of the push back received was that volunteers were not willing to go put up the posters, and staff was not available. She also would have signs created and available for pick up.

Director Schull: Confirmed that her team will also deliver posters.

Member Dobbs: Agreed that the electronic billboard is very bright and eye catching. Very appreciative.

Director Schull: Second to the animals in hot vehicles, there was previous conversation with Member Dobbs of using the spay/neuter suite at WCRAS. A partnership has been created with SPCA's medical team to provide low cost spay/neuter to the community, hopefully on an ongoing basis. Turning over discussion to Karen Stark.

Ms. Stark: Discussed the new programs started. Paired with SPCA for the spay/neuter. The animals are getting top quality care, and staff is working well together. The public will glean a lot of benefit from grants received to assist with programs.

Surgery days are on Thursdays and 20 spays/neuters can be performed. Any animal that is not current on vaccinations, those are provided at no charge though the CARES program.

The team at the SPCA calls the community to remind them of appointments, provide instructions. The SPCA also provides copies of after care for the animal. On August 6, 2020, is when the program began, and every week since. Says the program is a lot of fun.

Discussed those qualifying for the program are anyone living within the 100% poverty level. The public can get the link from the website. Calls and appointments are made to determine who will qualify by the number of people in the household, or if anyone is getting government assistance (Medicaid, disability, unemployment) or seniors that are 60 or over and qualify by income.

Chair Duerr: Inquired as to if they accept or turn away a lot of people.

Ms. Stark: Confirmed that about one-third of the calls received are qualified for the programs. The calls are screened on the phone voice mail and it is clarified they have to be low income. When someone is disqualified, they are informed that the SPCA and NHS have alternative programs that aren't so restrictive. They are referred somewhere to help.

Chair Duerr: Inquired as to the demand and how well they're filling the demand.

Ms. Stark: If it is determined someone won't qualify, they are provided information about how hard puppies are, spaying the animal, etc.

Member Dobbs: Can follow up on further information for the demand of affordable, high quality spay/neuter programs is astronomically high. People with a 50 pound dog is quoted from \$500 to \$800 for a female spay which is a significant expense for a lot of individuals. There is a large need for female spays. Working on a variety of programs to help address the T&R program and having access to quality vet care is difficult. Our area is very much affected by it.

Further discussed the SPCA having a vet available which allowed the program to be expanded. Her goal is continuing to grow affordable spay/neuter as much as possible in this area. NHS has vets in transition. There is also a vet clinic opening soon called "Option Veterinary," which will be providing affordable vet services.

It was increasingly hard to meet the demand before the big growth in our area, and so it continues.

Chair Duerr: Has also met with the Options Vet staff and provided presentation and it is welcomed for the low income individuals who need vet care. A stand alone vet center with rotating vets is being created for lower income.

Member Dobbs: They are full vet services, not just spay/neuter.

Director Schull: Discussed a recent call from a lady who had a cat needing to be neutered who was quoted between \$200 to \$400 from her local vet. She didn't qualify to the program, but was referred to SPCA or NHS to do. The cost saving is huge between the three groups.

Member Dobbs: Continued information about spay/neuter program. Currently, the program is a voucher program. For cats, it is \$10. So the recipient has to pay up front and then an appointment is scheduled. For dogs, it is \$20. Great savings to the community,

including vaccinations and/or licensing.

Discussed that if a free service is offered, often times a very high percentage of those individuals will not show up for the services, and it's a waste of everyone's time.

Instructed Karen Stark to discuss more about the grant that kicked this program off the ground and got it going. But the goal is to be able to continue to fund through the CARES donation fund, and eventually through a percentage of dog license fees. They hope to continue to offer the service. The voucher co-payment may have to be adjusted depending on the needs.

Ms. Stark: Confirmed all officers are provided with flyers and cards for the service so they can take them out when they meet with someone who needs that service. People who live in motels or are homeless mostly have animals not spayed/neutered, and they are referred to the programs.

Discussed grants received and how they are used. The ASPCA COVID-19 relief grant was \$20,000 and approved. The Dave and Cheryl Duffield Foundation Grant is where owners experience hardship due to COVID-19 was a pet food grant and received for \$5,833.00. The Spay Together Coalition Grant was received for \$630, specific to spay/neuter for people experiencing hardship due to COVID-19, and paid vet staff.

Also, the David and Cheryl Duffield Foundation Grant for HSUS Animal Care Expo was supposed to be for people to travel to the expo in Texas. It was canceled due to COVID, but virtual attendance was provided. The Portal Mania 2020, which is portals for the cat cages, were installed in the cat cages to allow the cat to get away from its litter box; one is where they play/sleep/eat and the other is the litter box.

The ASPCA Grant provided the surgery suite with supplies needed for surgery. Funds were split between the surgery side and spay/neuter to pay vet staff.

Member Dobbs: Discussed the current cat cages and what is considered humane or adequate for the cats. The cages without the portals is considered small and the portals provide more space. The grant provided much needed space for the cat cages.

Chair Duerr: Inquired if the portals divide the cage in half or does it make it to go from one cage to a different cage.

Member Dobbs: Confirmed that it takes two cages into one big cage, and then there is also a door to close which adds a safety component.

Ms. Stark: Discussed that in the past, kittens would be separated because there was not enough room for the kittens to be together in the cage which resulted in too many in one cage.

Discussed the pet food give away. Pet food was purchased every couple of weeks and every Tuesday, for six weeks, pet food was given away to people who were affected by COVID. Very well received by public and staff. 335 cats and 462 dogs were served. Large amounts and good quality food were provided.

Discussed the drive-thru vaccination clinics. Public comes by appointment only and 14 pets are vaccinated every 30 minutes. All services are provided to the animals and COVID procedures were practiced, and was quick and efficient. Next clinic is September 1st and September 21st. Extra clinics will be added, if possible.

Chair Duerr: Commented on how COVID is having to reinvent the way things are done, and thought the current services may continue rather than bring people back inside. The drive-thru is better for the public, better for the animals and better for the staff.

Ms. Stark: Agreed with Chair Duerr's comments. The drive-thru services moved more efficiently than having someone waiting.

Director Schull: Commented that Mandy and Karen "rolled with the punches through COVID." They had to learn how to do things differently to deliver valuable services to the community. Things were run much more efficiently.

Ms. Stark: Reminded that the pet food give aways were held the third Tuesday of every month. They are done outside and the seniors feel more free to come and talk about an animal, rather than being ushered out of the building.

Director Schull: Discussed Happy Tails. Have many cases still outstanding and wasn't able to share details. Presented the 2019 cases with the horses who were found astray together out in Spanish Springs on BLM land. The owner of the horses was found and it was determined the horses were abandoned. The owner was charged for animal cruelty. Pictures were provided of Dixie before/after. Provided pictures of Bo before/after. Both horses are currently in better homes.

Discussed the bi-annual report to the Board of County Commissioners from the WCRAS Board, and will continue working on it, and hopeful to share information at the next meeting.

Chair Duerr: Commented to Director Schull re: a great report from her. Confirmed Dr. Rink had joined the meeting.

Member Payne: Inquired when it is that Director Schull goes to the County Commissioners to make the report and wondered if any members of the Advisory Committee should be present.

Director Schull: Confirmed it would be helpful if a few Advisory Members were at the presentation.

Member Payne: Requested tentative dates to attend.

Member Rink: Had a question about the financing of the spay/neuters. Commented that vets who are in private practice who have hundreds of thousands of dollars of school debt, and feels that they can't offer low cost spay/neuters. Inquired as to the options of having establishing vet practices accessing grant money so they can off set part of the cost of spay/neuters, or other vet services, so the pet owners don't have to travel distances to get care.

Commented that if a vet establishes competition to practitioners in the community, there would be a reluctance to cooperate. Wondered if there was any way to bring the bar down to benefit Animal Services and the vet community.

Director Schull: Appreciated Dr. Rink's concern and that it has been address through various spay/neuter programs in terms of the clientele being targeted. The current clientele are not receiving any vet services as a whole. Education of vaccinations and spay/neuter are discussed to that clientele.

In addition, other programs are voucher programs that are given to the client to utilize at a vet of their choice so the vet community is still allowed to participate. It allows for a wider participation from the vet community. The program is still very new.

In terms of grants for vet hospitals, it is an idea and would have to come from any of those funders who are looking to deliver spay/neuter services in a different avenue.

Member Rink: Requested confirmation re: contemplating it for Washoe County.

Director Schull: Because the program is so new, it is a priority now to utilize the shelter's spay/neuter suite because resources are already in place to provide the service. Not opposed to considering a voucher program to use vet community. The License Plate Fund

comes from the State of Nevada to shelters that participate. It is a voucher issued to rescue groups who take animals from the shelter that are not spayed/neutered and off sets the cost for services. The current voucher program is being utilized to a certain capacity.

Member Rink: Thanked Director Schull for the information.

Member Dobbs: Added additional information. Spent a great deal of time to launch a voucher program in Washoe County and received negative feedback from vet clinics. Feels it needs a willingness from vet clinics to participate. A dental voucher program provides people to go to a private practice vet to get dental services for the animal, if they qualify. Also voucher programs with some emergency clinics. Most vets don't want to be a participant in a voucher program.

Discussed that Winnemucca had a voucher program and it ebbs and flows based on how much business the vet clinics are getting doing other things. It is sought out in the more rural areas.

Also discussed loan forgiveness programs. If a graduate works in a rural area or shelter for a certain period of time, the university could forgive that graduate's student debt depending on the perimeters of the program.

Member Rink: Confirmed she was the contact person when working for the State. Agrees with Member Dobbs on the program and was surprised at how many vets were actually interested in applying. Thanked Member Dobbs for the information.

Chair Duerr: Inquired as to the barrier on the voucher.

Member Dobbs: Confirmed it is money and time. Some vets are into it, and others are not. If Washoe County's clinic was utilized, then they don't have to rely on a vet servicing because it's so inconsistent. If their own program was created, it would be consistent in providing services for the community.

Chair Duerr: Requested comments about the report just provided. Commented on a great report. Appreciated the attention to the detail.

Director Schull: Requested feedback from the Board that if those statistics worked, templates will be created and that will be the reporting moving forward so they are not constantly playing with the numbers.

Unknown: Likes the statistics and how they were created. Wondering if

there was a way to bifurcate the “died in care” from “disposed of.”

Director Schull: Commented it depends on how the report is written. It’s just a matter of how messy you want the visual to look. It can be separated out, if necessary.

Chair Duerr: Suggested to use a consistent color scheme for each quarter so it’s easy to compare quarter to quarter.

Member Anderson: Requested if it could be broken down re: those who have died in care versus picking up a dead animal. The numbers to him looked alarming. Sought clarification.

Apologized that he needed to leave the meeting. Commented on DA Gustafson’s work on the proposed changes to the Bylaws. He does not object.

Chair Duerr: Confirmed they still have a quorum. Thanked Member Anderson for attending.

Member Anderson left the meeting.

5. UPDATE ON WASHOE COUNTY REGIONAL ANIMAL SERVICES’ 2021 LEGISLATIVE SESSION GOALS [Non-action item]

Checked in with Member Rogers.

Member Rogers: Still in attendance.

Director Schull: Last discussed at the January meeting. Long term goals were put off because of COVID-19. Recently had a meeting with Clark County, the Legislative Liaison, as well as the State Representative for the Humane Society of the United States, to discuss the list comprised in Northern Nevada, and also to discuss Southern Nevada concerns.

Currently, there is a paired down list. Priorities were gauged and a list created.

First, is amending NRS 171.1775 gives Animal Control Officers authority to prepare and issue citations, but also in accordance with 171.1773 in which it states that a peace officer may prepare citations. Seeking to clarify that Animal Control Officers have the authority to issue citations within the scope of duties. Should be a sample language insertion. Clark County is in alignment with this priority.

Second, is where a hearing process is created for an individual who has been arrested as a result of animal cruelty. The problem with the language is that the majority of people cited for animal cruelty in Nevada are not arrested. The hearing request doesn't pertain unless they are arrested. Requesting to add "if they are cited or arrested" then it triggers the hearing process for that individual.

Third, the specific statute used the most is 574.100, which is all of the cruelty section of NRS. Wants clarification on:

- Inserting failure to provide sufficient potable water in an amount reasonably sufficient for the animal, the species of animal. The way it is worded currently is pretty ambiguous.

- Inserting failure to provide access to quality food. Discussed situations where the owner is feeding inappropriate food for the animal species.

- Failure to provide veterinary care. It is not currently in the statute. Failing to provide vet care or causing an animal to suffer is a routine issue that they are issuing citations for.

- Depriving an animal of good and wholesome air. Discussed situations where animals are locked in vehicles, moving vans, motor homes, restrooms in filth from a hoarder house. Wants language re: good and wholesome air for an animal.

- Neglect – Depriving an animal of grooming, reasonable for that species, to prevent pain and suffering.

- Insertion to cause an animal to ingest narcotics or alcohol by intention.

Confirmed these are the priorities for this statute. Wants to be able to stack charges to people who are cruel to animals.

Discussed restraining an animal and adding the word "containment" so crating and tethering could be addressed. It is not a priority. Needs to have a little bit more time and this one will be scrapped for the time being.

The time frame for tethering a dog – seeking to decrease. Originally had discussed 8 hours. Board feedback discussed travel time to/from work. The collective feeling from group meeting was that this is unenforceable. Not a lot of support on this. Thoughts were discussed re: extreme climates rather than hours of tethering. Feels that it will impact the

department significantly.

Chair Duerr: Feels it is very unenforceable as to the hours. Too hard to prove. Weather conditions are much easier to enforce. It may create additional work, but give an additional tool in daily work.

Director Schull: Agrees it would be a much cleaner way. It's unenforceable as it's written – 14 hours. It's very challenging to enforce.

Chair Duerr: Sought opinions from the Board.

Member Dobbs: Agrees. If it is being reduced to 10 hours, agrees with Director Schull and would prefer language re: extreme weather. Seems more productive.

Chair Duerr: Suggested a reduction in time – maybe an affidavit from whoever witnesses the tether. Suggested options if the animal is tethered all day/night.

Director Schull: Discussed the crating issue. Suggested the crating issue be discussed next session. It's not a large issue in Washoe County and Clark County didn't have a big concern about it.

574.110 – Abandonment. Ambiguity the way it's currently written in NRS creates a lot of challenges. It's unenforceable because of the way it's written. Abandoning an animal should be wrong regardless if it's disabled or not. Also should be wrong whether 3 hours of time has lapsed or not. Has ideas from Clark County to revise the statute.

574.090 - Subsections 2 through 3. This is the disposition of the fighting animals creating a probable cause hearing to have the ability to divest the ownership rights of the birds expeditiously – whether euthanize or rehab. WCRAS doesn't have the capability to house fighting roosters. Seeking a better process.

574.080(1) – Taking possession of the animals and implements used in fighting. This is a language clarification to omit the word “authorized by law to make arrest” because WCRAS officers are not authorized to make arrests, but having authority to receive the implements. Seeking clarification.

Transporting and tethering an animal in the back of a vehicle. There was not an appetite for this issue because welfare issues don't deal with moving vehicles and transportation of animals unless it's agricultural related. Needs sample language, as well as a lot of exclusions for farm animals. Clark County does not have a problem with it.

Increasing the space for retail establishments that sell dogs and cats. Discussed the minimal floor size. This issue isn't a priority because there aren't a lot of retail establishments remaining that sell animals. It would also require a business to remodel for a caging system. It was not a priority for the group. Some of the requirements were not realistic for a retail establishment.

Chair Duerr: Complimented on presentation. Submission by September 1st. Inquired if the County would sponsor the Bill, or another organization.

Director Schull: Responded that Washoe County is not going to be utilizing any BDR requests. Sponsors will be found for the requests. Collective support needed from Clark County and pair down the list. DA Gustafson will assist in amendment language, and sponsors will be sought.

Chair Duerr: Asked about details or the process from the Board.

Member Payne: Thinks it's good work and is happy to support it.

Member Rink: Inquired if there was ever a problem with dog fighting. Clarified it was fighting roosters and not dog fighting.

Director Schull: The bill addresses both issues. Dog fighting is not a prevalent issue in Washoe County. Rooster fighting is an issue with some large cases in the last couple of years. The fighting cases are not small – usually a couple hundred birds.

Chair Duerr: Inquired if action needed to be taken.

Director Schull: Stated it was just an update just to keep informed. By the next meeting, additional updates will be provided.

Chair Duerr: Item closed out. Asked for public comment. No public comment.

6. APPROVAL OF PROPOSED BYLAWS [For possible action]

DA Gustafson: Requested members pull up Bylaws. Not too many changes. Listened again to the audio from the last meeting to confirm. Mandy pulled up Bylaws for review by members.

Discussing red line changes. Final changes will be incorporated within the vote. A

copy will be sent to Chair Duerr for review/signature.

Article I. No changes.

Article II. “As a result of the last meeting, there was feedback to add non elected members shall be appointed for a term of four years.” For elected members, there is no set term. The various boards can appoint each member of their board to serve whatever term they would like.

Article III. Quorum voting. No changes.

Article IV. Officers of the Committee. “The Chair shall be a voting member of the Advisory Board,” which is typical language. “As a result of the last meeting under the Vice Chair, this Board requested language if both the Chair and Vice Chair are not present at the meeting, what happens?” A temporary acting chair will be designated to conduct the meeting.

Article V. Staff to Assist Advisory Board. Under Recording Secretary, “that the secretary prepares the agenda. She doesn’t create content for the agenda, but just simply puts it together and posts the notices of the agenda,” which is an open meeting law requirement.

Article III. (Sic). Duties of the Director of Animal Services. “The Director shall prepare a periodic report rather than specifying bi-annual.” A periodic report concerning the recommendations and actions should be approved by the Advisory Board for presentation to the BCC. This Board approves the report before it’s submitted to the BCC and it’s not just incumbent on the Director to do that.

Article VI. Meetings. Clarifying the agenda that each agenda will be approved by the Chair and reviewed by legal counsel prior to posting.

C. Special Meetings. This is a result of Board’s last meeting to change it to two Committee members as opposed to three Committee members so there isn’t a quorum of people discussing any item that you’d need a special meeting for. If there are two Committee members who want to call a special meeting, they have the authority to do so.

Chair Duerr: Asked for clarification in adding an agenda item. Can anybody request an agenda item?

DA Gustafson: Article 6.3 - Agenda. “Items may be placed on the agenda by any member of the Advisory Board or by the Director. All other persons wishing to place an item

on the agenda shall contact the Chair for authorization to request an agenda item.”

Chair Duerr: Confirmed the language is good.

DA Gustafson: Page 6(f). Clarifying public comments. Crossed off “on matters not specifically aigenized.” The public can comment on matters on and off the agenda. No limitations. Three minutes per person for each comment period, not three minutes total for the whole meeting.

Article VIII(2). Changed from “Chair” to “Director of Regional Animal Services” as far as who has the duty to ensure that there is a recording secretary.

Article VIII(3). Copies of written draft minutes.

Comment for the bottom of the page. Took out “bi annually” and changed it to “periodically review,” submitting the report to the BCC.

Chair Duerr: Asked if anyone wanted to address the Bylaws.

Member Rogers: Requested clarification on Term. The language specifies the four year term once appointed, but any term limits provided? Right now, it’s open ended.

Chair Duerr: Asked Member Rogers his thoughts.

Member Rogers: Commented that having the ability to have the institutional knowledge and ongoing knowledge through the appointment process.

DA Gustafson: Doesn’t think it’s necessary to consider term limits at this point.

Chair Duerr: Agreed. The Board is new enough, but maybe in the future could be addressed to update the Bylaws.

DA Gustafson: Commented that it can be done either way. Term limits, or not. Discussed that when a term comes up, it is the County’s policy to advertise and open up.

Chair Duerr: Agrees it is a very common provision.

Member Payne: Agrees. Her term expired last year and she had to present to Washoe County Commissioners and reapply for the position.

Chair Duerr: Agreed to leave it until it becomes an issue.

Opened comment to public re: proposed changes to Bylaws.

Ms. Perry: She will reserve comment.

Chair Duerr: Called for a motion to approve Bylaws as amended.

Member Dobbs: Motion made.

Member Rink: Seconded the motion.

Chair Duerr: Motion carries unanimously.

DA Gustafson: Requested that if original signature is used that it be sent to her for the file.

7. 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: Floor is opened for comment.

Member Dobbs: Addressed previous comment by Director Schull re: increased abuse rates. Requested information.

Director Schull: Hopeful that the stats will be ready by the next meeting. The current quarter has increased rates, but it is too soon to determine. More egregious cases are being presented.

Jill Dobbs: Confirmed that it is happening nationwide and is interested in seeing the stats next meeting.

Chair Duerr: Confirmed a spike in mental health issues, homelessness, related animal issues. Also an increase in abuse amongst families and people. COVID restrictions have perhaps caused these issues.

Also discussed that the City of Reno adopted the ordinance that forbid the sale in retail settings for dogs and cats. It was implemented immediately. Thanked everyone for all

efforts in preparing the ordinance. Next, the City of Reno is seeking to implement a penalty to go along with ordinance. Rather than hold up the ordinance, a secondary ordinance will be implemented.

Discussed the letter sent to Sparks and Washoe County. If there is an appetite for a meeting and presentation, Chair Duerr will be willing to do so, or a representative from the Board. Independent data information is being requested to decide if Sparks or Washoe County wants to take on.

Member Payne: Agreed it is wonderful news and kudos to all for moving forward.

Chair Duerr: Commented on that a number of members of the City Council were very passionate on issues. Interest has actually grown, including the Council. Over time, more people have gotten pets and have a better insight into the issue and their own experiences. Mentioned conversations with people who have adopted from retail stores, and discussed the health the pet. All pet owners have spent a significant amount of money at the vet following the purchase from a retail store.

Discussed animals from shelters at retail settings, there is enthusiasm. It provides access to the public. Interested in further input.

Also discussed that there is a belief that breeders sold animals through retail stores. Several opined that is rare. In Washoe County, most breeders sell direct.

Jill Dobbs: Educating people over the last decade in what to look for in a responsible breeder. A responsible breeder wants their clientele to come to the facility, meet both parents, have a conversation so it's a good match. A responsible breeder isn't going to want someone in an apartment with an active pet. Responsible breeders don't look for retail pet store environments. A responsible breeder will make a lifetime commitment to their animals, and they don't want that animal to have to be rehomed.

Chair Duerr: Commented on education and responsible pet ownership. Does not have requests for future agenda items. Requested confirmation of the next Board meeting.

Director Schull: Confirmed the next Board Meeting is October 23, 2020, at 9:30 a.m.

Chair Duerr: Confirmed.

Director Schull: The October meeting is the last meeting calendared for this year.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT [Non-action item]

Ardena Perry: Indicated that she felt this has been one of the most alarming batches of items. Reminding staff and the Board the nature of the Interlocal Agreement, the nature of expectations from Animal Services. She has over 340 people who have been told by Animal Services they cannot pick up a stray, bring the dog in, and it is being documented. Opening spay clinics at public expense for a non-profit shelter.

Commented that the County Commission called for a dual audit of both agencies. There is no contract with SPCA. The County doesn't have authority to sublease the surgical suite to the SPCA. It's a misuse of government funds. Will deal with the laws in the Legislature. Animal Services is not supposed to be an inter local body.

Commented on the City of Reno to be the most putrid, disgusting, devastation of a business and a family – the most disgraceful, embarrassing public circus she has ever seen behind a roster.

Requested that the Advisory Board to read why they were created, which is to direct staff at Washoe County, not direct other governments. We are not Nevada Animal Services. We are Washoe County Animal Services. Elko, Winnemucca, etc., can provide for their own population.

Chair Duerr: Appreciated Ms. Perry's perspective. Public comment closed.

9. ADJOURNMENT [Non-Action Item] [Agenda Item 8]

Chair Duerr declared the meeting adjourned.