1. Call to Order
SSS called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. Public Comment
SSS opened public comment. No public comment. Public comment is closed.

3. Approval of Agenda
SSS asked for a motion to approve the February 19, 2015 agenda, motion by PS, second by KW, all in favor, no opposition. Motion passed.

4. Approval of the January 29, 2015 Minutes
SSS asked for approval of the Minutes. PS motioned for approval, second by KW. All in favor, no opposition. Motion passed.

5. Discuss and Provide Recommendations for Requirements for Pets Kept Outdoors
This discussion is a continuation from the January 29, 2015 meeting. SSS opened public comment. Karen Layne, President of the Las Vegas Valley Humane Society, provided the committee with evidence of the high temperatures in Las Vegas. Layne presented a bell-shaped curve that showed high temperatures over the length of a year. Layne addressed items in 10.32.130 and 10.32.140. She suggested adding details about the quality and condition of the animal’s food and water. SSS extended Layne’s public comment time. Layne advised lowering the maximum heat temperature from “an extreme heat warning” to “above 100 degrees” in order to cover more summertime temperatures. She expressed cats and dogs less than 3 months of age must be housed inside. She also thought chaining should be no more than 8 hours; however, during summer months a dog should not be chained or crated outside. Annoula Wylderich, 4328 Morillo Street, agreed with previous comments on lowering the temperature threshold and keeping animals inside during hot weather. She stated animal control should have more authority to protect animals. Janice Ridondo, West San Miguel Avenue, mentioned she wants to hear committee comments before making public comment. She stated her belief in the animal control officers’ response to reported cruelty cases. SSS closed public comment.

SSS opened committee comment on the subjects discussed. Jason Allswang (JA), Clark County Chief of Code Enforcement, and SSS discussed Karen Layne’s proposal and the clarifications needed. The committee discussed 10.32.130 and 10.32.140. JA said “nutritious”, “supplemental cooling”, and “summer months” need to be defined. KW commented on regulating summer by temperature and not by calendar days. PS, SSS, and KW discussed temperature regulations versus calendar regulations. JA stated that professional pet facilities are required by state law to provide supplemental cooling at 85 degrees and higher. JA explained the current animal food and water regulations. JA, SSS, and PS discussed Karen Layne’s food and water proposal. JA warned against making the language too detailed, as it will become harder to enforce later on. KW stated Karen
Layne’s additions seem redundant to the language already in place. JA clarified the meaning of palatable for humans and animals. SSS and JA discussed the disadvantages to adding an outdoor animal age regulation (less than 3 months). SSS was concerned the language is only for dogs and cats. KF asked JA if this code pertained to cats since they should be strictly indoor animals. JA discussed outdoor cat regulations. KF and JA discussed animal cruelty subjectivity and adding details to language. SSS was in agreement with regulating outdoor temperature at 100 degrees and adding pot belly pigs to the ordinance. SSS thought the language pertaining to food and water is sufficient. Discussion was had between PS and JA about changing the proposed language. SSS agreed a dog should not be chained for more than 8 hours. KW suggested 12 hours instead of 8 hours due to a person’s work day. PS suggested no changes be made. JA and SSS discussed lowering the hours allows neighbors to monitor the situation and testify in the future. SSS asked for a motion to change dog chaining to a maximum of 8 hours. Second by PS. 2 to 2, KW and DW opposed, motion failed. SSS motioned a change to 10 hours. Second by KF. 2 to 2, KW and PS opposed, motion failed. SSS motioned a change to 12 hours. Second by KW. 3 to 1, PS opposed, motion passed. PS asked if dogs chained to a stationary object was included in the last motion and SSS said it was not.

6. **Receive a Presentation from Staff to Clarify Proposed Title 10 Changes Approved By the AAC on November 10, 2014**

JA explained the previous animal advisory committee reviewed Title 10 and made proposed changes. JA discussed the change that states “any business that sells animals, or pertains to animals in some way, is required to post a notice advising the county’s sterilization, rabies vaccination, and animal tagging laws”. Two-hundred packets containing the changes were sent out to businesses. From February 3, 2015 to March 6, 2015 comments are accepted from JA. JA clarified the changes in section 10.08.140 to the committee and the public. JA addressed the need to control pet overpopulation in Southern Nevada. JA said the statement “dealers, operators, and retailers must obtain a commercial sales permit and a business license and must designate all information required by the Nevada Revised Statutes, including where the animal has been purchased” is not changing. He said the statement “no person, except dealers, operators, or retailers, shall sell or offer for sale a dog or cat without first obtaining a breeder/show permit” helps pet store owners, as they will not have to obtain a breeder/show permit. JA clarified the new definitions of “dealer”, “operator”, and “retailer”. He continued to thoroughly explain the new additions to section 10.08.140, stating any entity collecting money made from transferring ownership of animals must be properly licensed. JA addressed the movement of animal posting requirements from 10.12 to 10.08.095. He also made clear on public record that he misspoke with Debbie White, D.V.M., on November 20, 2014; it is not written in state statute, but is stated in county code, that veterinarians must publicly post their relationships with pet store businesses. JA explained the process of placing this ordinance into effect. KW and JA discussed the definition of “dealers”. JA clarified code section 10.32 will be directly incorporated into the document presented to the County Commissioners.

7. **Discuss and Provide Recommendations on Emerging Issues**

JA explained this agenda item is for suggesting future agenda items to be addressed. KW, SSS, and PS stated they would like to see this agenda item as a permanent fixture. SSS would like to see a vaccination/spay and neuter clinic. JA reminded the committee of their student member TV and to use her status to their full advantage.

8. **Comments By the General Public**
SSS opened public comment. Madeline Franco, 8183 Mosaic Harbor Avenue, commented that the language in Title 10 is too wide open and could be misinterpreted. Particularly section 10.24.020, she was concerned with small animals at large unfit for sterilization. Steven Stocking, 3109 Point South Circle, provided information from the Clark County business licensing office and the Nevada Secretary of State office about small animal home-based businesses versus home-based hobbies. He explained the state will not issue an operator a business license to a home-based business if its net earnings are less than $27,000. Stocking concluded his statement, saying without a state business license, Clark County will not issue an operator a business license. Riley Campbell, 4651 Mill Valley, expressed he does not agree with the all-encompassing effects of the Title 10 changes. Examples such as requiring a specialized water bowl or selling birds to a neighbor, Campbell does not agree with. Crystal Han, 3188 Redwood Street, suggested the committee discuss prior to opening public comment about agenda items. Han asked if there could be language or definitions put in place for “sanctuary” because it is different from a rescue organization.

Kat Kyle, 3452 White Mission Drive, questioned how to deal with an animal she no longer wants, pertaining to section 10.08.140. She also asked what “other animals” pertains to. JA stated he will discuss the answers with her after the meeting, as he is not legally allowed to answer during public comment. Belinda Hutchings, 4590 East Boston Avenue, commented on the chaining of animals for 12 hours. She would like it to stay at 14 hours for the nurses and doctors who work longer hours. George McKinney, 510 College Drive, questioned what needs to be done if accidental breeding takes place between small pets such as lizards or rodents. McKinney wanted to know what happens if you have too many offspring or if inbreeding is considered abuse. Joshua Cowart, Henderson resident, requested the board revisit Title 10 and review the trap, neuter, and release program. Cowart was concerned with the confusion about private party sales in section 10.08.140 and suggested “the other pet animals” be removed from the language. Ken Foose, owner of Exotic Pets in Las Vegas, suggested the committee introduce themselves so he is aware of whom he is talking to on the board. SSS said they will introduce themselves before the meeting closes. Foose commented on Steve Stockings’ comments about state and county business licensure laws. He also said certain members of the public sell him fish and canaries for his store and should not be required to hold business licenses. Darvez Mellough, 9624 Jeremiahs Court, stated he does not agree with the law telling the public what they’re allowed to do with personal property. He stated in order to follow the law, he has to break the law when selling animals. He said it is a slippery slope when dealing with the selling of personal property.

Anne Badou, 5272 South Maryland Parkway, expressed “other pets” is ambiguous. She recently purchased a snake from a colleague and does not believe a business license should be obtained to do so. If someone wants to re-home an animal, Badou thinks they should be able to do so because it’s personal property. She questioned what a person is supposed to do when they want to re-home or abandon an animal. She states the animals will be turned loose or abused if owners cannot sell them. Steve Heinz, 6491 Claremore Court, agreed with the previous speakers. He expressed if a snake were to accidentally lay eggs, it would become expensive to take care of the animal. He thinks it doesn’t make sense to obtain a breeding license for small animals because the animals aren’t sold for large amounts of money. Stephanie Tracey, Wild Things business owner, reiterates a Clark County business license cannot be obtained without a state business license. She commented it is unfair for anyone who makes the required $27,000 because they have to own their home in order to get a state license. She thinks Title 10 needs to be brought up to the new board and get public comments. She also thinks Animal Control does not need added work to their already busy schedule. Sierra Burgman, 620 National Street, questioned how she is to pay for hospital bills from bug infested dog food kept outside. She commented that it is illegal to keep a heating or cooling source outside that is not connected to a house, making it difficult to keep animals cool during summer. Burgman also asked if it was possible to be reimbursed for her kittens’ vet bill instead of collecting a re-homing fee. SSS closed public comment.
Before adjournment, SSS asked the committee to introduce themselves and who they represent. SSS introduced herself as a returning member and as the new chair representing the general public. PS introduced herself as a licensed small animal breeder who breeds dogs and show dogs. TV introduced herself as a representative of the students. KF introduced herself as the representative of veterinarians. KW introduced himself as a representative of humane groups: a central sponsor for managed feral colonies and Community Cat Coalition of Clark County.

9. **Adjournment**
SSS made a motion to adjourn. Second motion by KF, all in favor, motion passed. Meeting Adjourned.

10. **Next Meeting Date and Time.**
April 23, 2015 at 6:30 p.m.