

CLARK COUNTY ANIMAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Paradise Community Center
4775 McLeod Drive, Town Board Conference Room
Las Vegas, Nevada 89121
November 17, 2011
6:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: CONNELL, MICHAEL (MC)
 LAYNE, KAREN (KL)
 PENNEY, JANNICE (JP)
 COMBS, CLAYTON (CC)

1. **Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. **Approval of agenda**

A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded.

3. **Approval of September 15, 2011 Minutes**

A motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded after changing SB 233 to SB 223.

4. **Receive a presentation by Lt. Mike Maynard from NDOW on the Department's response to injured wild animals and what service the department provides; and take any other action deemed appropriate.**

MIKE MAYNARD (MM) from the NV Department of Wildlife (NDOW) was asked to give a presentation on issues that had come up in prior meetings. NDOW is mandated by the State with enforcement of laws in the NRS for fish and game and boating enforcement. We manage wildlife. We don't set tags in our division. We are just enforcement. Hunting and fishing licenses pay for wildlife enforcement. In our region, the 4 southern counties, Nye, Clark, Lincoln and Esmeralda, we are 6 or 7 officers short right now. There has been a lot of confusion for injured and wildlife animal issues. I am not going to do anything about a coyote running through the desert or a dead coyote on the side of the road. If an animal breaks its leg out in the desert, it is going to be consumed by other animals. We don't interfere with nature. We do involve ourselves in human/animal issues not related to hunting if you have an injured wild animal in your neighborhood or if it appears to have an issue or it is there and you don't want it there. We don't receive funding for that and the law tasks us to do other things; urban wildlife has no money attached to it. We are not a general fund agency; taxpayer dollars do not go to us. We limit our urban wildlife response threats to human life or serious bodily injury, something like a mountain lion rampaging through a schoolyard. SB 226 is a new law currently affecting Clark and Washoe counties. It governs the trapping of furbearing animals in counties with a population of 100,000 or more. The Commissioners have to adopt regulations. The loose framework that started out months ago essentially says it is unlawful to set a trap other than a box or cage within 1,000 ft. of a residence. There are exceptions but that is the meat of the proposed regulations. The Commission had subcommittee meetings to get public testimony in both Reno and Las Vegas; there are pro trapping groups and groups for anti-trapping. There are homeowners with dogs who have been caught in a trap and that has pushed this in the legislature. The spirit of this is to prevent dogs from getting caught in leg traps. It has not been finalized so the wording will change. There was one line of thought that went to 1,000 yards, some wanted 10 miles, 1 mile. There are exceptions, private property, mousetraps, pest control companies are allowed and they can still use a box or cage trap that doesn't damage the animal's leg.

KL- we asked you to attend the meeting because of an injured coyote lying on the side of the road for two days. It finally ended up dying because nobody took responsibility. What I hear from you is that if the coyote had been in a neighborhood, you probably would have responded but because it was in a park or could have been on a highway, you would not have responded. We are trying to find out who is responsible in situations like this.

MM – It depends on where the coyote is, the issues surrounding it and without more specifics, I couldn't say what we would have done. As short staffed as we are, there are days there is one game warden for the entire southern region. If they are tasked with a boating enforcement or investigation, that takes priority over coyotes lying on the road, not because we are callous or uncaring about the disposition of the animal. It is simply a practicality. We don't have the staff to respond to every injured wildlife call. If it is something in a very public area and we have the manpower, it has not been an issue in the past. This call was never brought to my attention. If it were lying in the middle of a major intersection that would bump it up. If it is lying in the middle of nowhere, it is probably not going to get a response. Every response to a coyote ends in euthanasia. Coyotes are not protected and it is illegal to do anything but kill them. It is against the law to transplant a coyote. Unless there are really extraordinary circumstances, in some cases with the raptors, we may try to rehabilitate a couple raptors, but 99.9% of all wild animals that are injured, if we respond, will be euthanized almost immediately. There is no rehabilitation area for most of the wildlife and it wouldn't be successful anyway, not just for coyotes but also for many species. Some species are so sensitive that if you move them, even a half mile from where you find them, they are dead 99% of the time within a short period of time. Coyotes are so populous in this state. One estimate I heard, and this is anecdotal, is that you could probably kill 75% of them and it wouldn't make any difference in the population. They are extremely adaptable to an urban environment and are very prolific. We get calls on a daily basis about coyotes in the middle of Las Vegas and Henderson. Most of them have no fear of humans.

JP – this coyote was in Sunset Park. It did lie there, suffering a long time. MM – you could kill as many coyotes as you want. You could walk out today and shoot 1,000 coyotes; reload and shoot 1,000 more. There is no restriction on it. If it is illegal to discharge a firearm, there are other means for euthanasia; you are more than welcome to use them. There is no protection on them.

ANULA WILDRIDGE (AW) brought this up at a previous meeting. There were two incidents at Sunset Park dealing with wildlife, one was a coyote pup that could only stand on its front legs. It was in the park, not on the road. Its sibling was in the road dead. The person who shared this with me was a witness. Animal Control couldn't do anything about it. NDOW was called and she was told somebody would show up. She was concerned as it was a hot Las Vegas summer day and it was a pup. She went back hours later and it had perished in the sun. Nobody had done anything to retrieve it, help it or even euthanize it. The other situation had to do with a duck that had both feet sheared off by one of those motorized boats in the lake and was being attacked by other waterfowl. Park visitors were very upset. Calls were made but no one came. Finally because everyone was getting so agitated, one of the Parks' maintenance men retrieved the duck and hopefully put it out of its misery. We realize agencies have budget shortfalls and are short on manpower but there are licensed vets in this town that can take care of wildlife. We do have groups such as NV Political Action for Animals willing to work with agencies to see what we can do to help come up with a solution for situations where an animal is suffering. If you can't save it, we would like to see it euthanized in a timely manner. We will work with you. MM has not heard of either incident. With third hand information, there is no way for me to respond. If you have an issue with wildlife or our response, I would ask that you keep records. I have no problem going back and checking to see if we made the right call. Third hand information, especially after the fact, is extremely difficult for me to validate. The story has changed since I have been here. First it was suffering in the street for two days and now it is hours. KL - if you have a situation where there is an injured coyote in a public park, would you respond? Animal Control is not going to respond because it is a wild animal. The assumption has always been that NDOW would respond but we are hearing that is not necessarily true. MM our response would largely depend on the manpower available. If I had people in the area that were available and could respond, we would. We had numerous calls last week for wild animals in public areas. Today, I had two employees at the CC Government center for a fox. It is not injured but shouldn't be there. I sent people to look for it. They didn't catch it but the reality is it simply depends. It is not that we won't do anything under any circumstance, it is simply a sliding scale depending on manpower availability and what else takes priority. If we have people available to address a coyote in the park issue, I have no problem asking them to do that. AW – our concern is if it is injured and you don't have the manpower, what do we do? MM – you can kill any coyote, anytime, anywhere. KL what this shows us more than anything else is we have issues. We have a wildlife agency that is funded to support hunters and a rural population lifestyle. When you talk about a population over 2 million and you have X number of officers and the encroachment on wildlife that we have here in the valley,

that is something that we probably need to look at in terms of response because we can't necessarily expect you to respond. We have had bobcats in neighborhoods. We have all kinds of situations and they are not always injured. I am hearing injured would be a critical issue. MM again it would be a sliding scale. I can't give you a hard and fast answer. We don't have the people to respond to every single wildlife call we receive. This is an issue in an urban environment. In rural areas, they are used to seeing wildlife and it doesn't register with them. In CC, a lot of people are shocked or even surprised to see a wild animal. We collect a lot of data on what we do with urban wildlife. Easily half of the wildlife calls we receive are misidentified. A lot of times it is not the species they think it is. Mountain lions are extremely rare and turn out to be bobcats or housecats. The actual calls for a mountain lion where it is a mountain lion you can count a few fingers on one hand for the year. It is extremely rare that people actually encounter a mountain lion. It does happen. I don't mind sending people out if we can get there and have the manpower available. It is simply a matter of the resources available at the time. With coyotes there is no prohibition on euthanasia. That is the standard across the board. As far as the duck, I can't think of any reason why we would not have responded. US Fish and Wildlife could have responded as well. JP asked DAVE MARCH (DM) if he would have killed the coyote. DM – no we wouldn't discharge a firearm in Sunset Park. JP asked MM how he would have killed the coyote since he couldn't discharge a firearm in the park. MM there are a lot of ways you can do it. It is a matter of practicality more than anything else. You could bleed it. JP so would animal control get up close enough to slice its throat? DM – no. KL – clearly this is an issue but this may not be the time to resolve it. I volunteer with an organization that does emergency response for injured animals. I get this all the time, no this person doesn't do it, you need to call this person and half the time with either state or federal agencies it is very difficult to get anybody on the telephone. Right now, given budgetary issues, especially with NDOW and given that Lt. Maynard says that they will do it but he cannot guarantee it. MM has responded to several coyote calls. Obviously you want euthanasia of the coyote to be humane, however, we have tools at our disposal to use. If it was a case where the animal couldn't run, we could get it in a cage and then take it out to the desert area so we can euthanize it. It depends on the circumstances. I can't give you a for sure on every single case. We have had people say it is going to die, get over here right now and it gets up and runs off at 20 mph. There is no easy answer. It is a very emotional issue in dealing with euthanasia in animals in general. We do try to be sympathetic to public perception and people's feelings. It is extremely rare that we euthanize an animal on site in front of people if we can avoid it. We try to minimize the animal's suffering and the anguish it may cause to the people to watch an animal be euthanized.

JANA WRIGHT (JW) – do you regulate trappers selling their pelts. MM we do. JW – so if I am a trapper and I catch coyotes and want to sell their pelts, I have to go through you. MM - in a manner of speaking. Some pelts of furbearers are required to be sealed and some are not. Coyotes are not but they do require a license. In that sense we regulate them. Bobcats have to have a seal. There are specific days you have to come in with all your pelts and you have to have a seal. Mountain lions have to be taken in and sealed but coyotes do not need to be taken in for a seal but if you are going to sell them, you are required to have a trapping license. Business licenses are not really our purview. We do if it is a taxidermy issue as we regulate taxidermy. JW – does the license give trappers the authority to sell pelts? MM- for a coyote yes. If it is a bobcat, they have to get it sealed. Some species, because of their protected status, like a mountain lion, in order to hunt it you have to have a tag, you have to bring it in and get it sealed so there are multiple stages to go through. Not all furbearers are under the same umbrella.

KL several of us in this room were very involved in SB 226. The exemptions mitigated everything you said about SB 226. MM - this is not the final version. Essentially the bulk of the language is that if a trapper wants to use a leg hold trap, it cannot be within a 1,000 ft. of an occupied residence. They are going to make changes. The exemptions are largely going to be based on things that are common sense. If someone has a 2-acre compound with a 6 ft. high brick wall and they want to put a trap in the back because coyotes are hopping over, there is an exemption. If they want to put one outside their wall on BLM land, they have the 1,000 ft. for a leg hold trap. It has not yet been decided where to draw the line and how the exemptions should be handed out.

GINA GREISON (GG) – if someone believes a trap has been illegally placed, should they call you? MM yes. GG – what is the penalty if someone moves a trap? MM – the way the statute currently reads is to displace a lawfully set trap, so there is a difference. GG – who prosecutes those cases? MM – we prosecute cases by the county. If we get a wildlife crime, it is a state law violation. We would either submit a criminal complaint or

write a citation. In either case it goes to the county district attorney. They review it and decide if it goes to court in the case of a criminal complaint. Usually in the case of a citation, it goes directly to the court and the judge deals with it. GG – do you arrest them or is it something the local police handles. MM – under most circumstances a misdemeanor would be a citation unless there was a further investigation and that would lead to filing a criminal complaint. It is not usually something we take them to jail for. GG – if someone did take lawfully placed traps, would the local police haul them off in handcuffs? MM – Arrest is a whole different topic. Under state law you are issued a citation in lieu of arrest. If someone is going ten miles an hour over the speed limit, by law you are supposed to go to jail. In lieu of that, you sign the ticket and we will issue you a citation that is a promise to appear and take care of it. You are giving me your word you will take care of this so I don't have to take you to jail. GG – it is a misdemeanor and not a felony to remove lawfully placed traps. MM – yes

KL – the issue for us would be if we come upon an injured coyote in a public park, what would you recommend to the person finding that coyote? MM – with the hunting season, if you call right now, you are not going to find anybody. Call our urban wildlife hotline. It is usually staffed 8 to 5 Monday through Friday and if it is possible to send somebody out and we have the availability to do so, we will respond. KL – if it is after 5 pm, what happens? MM – it may be more difficult as after 5, the business offices are closed. Depending on the seriousness, you would call our dispatch, 775-688-1331, and they would see if somebody is available. It is our after hours number but it is not 24 hour dispatch so I can't guarantee somebody will be there. It varies, do we have somebody available and what is the seriousness of the call. KL – if someone saw a bobcat sitting on their fence and they were one of the last houses toward the desert, what would be your response? MM – if it were a bobcat, you would call us. Our response would be dictated by the circumstances. If somebody sees a bobcat that jumps off the fence and goes into the desert, you saw a bobcat. If it is in your yard threatening your dog or cat, obviously it is a more serious issue. It depends on what the animal is doing. We get quite a few calls from people saying I saw a bobcat in the desert. We are not sending someone out to respond to a bobcat in the desert. It depends on what the animal is doing, on the circumstances. I understand people are scared sometimes and we will make reasonable efforts depending on the circumstances. It will have to be on a case-by-case basis. You should call 911 if an animal is attacking someone; that is an A1 priority. The hotline tells you if this is a life-threatening emergency, hang up and call 911. KL – how many dogs have you had caught in traps? MM – in 15 years none, reality is that it has been released and somebody calls us after the fact. Most people, if they find their dog in a trap, are not going to wait for me to show up. They will take the dog out and get it to a vet. There are some that probably go unreported.

KL – there is a grey area that exists between the calls Animal Control takes and the calls that NDOW responds to and that area is the cause of major frustration for a lot of the citizens. As the valley grows larger and more congested, some of those issues are going to continue to crop up. MM's advice is simple. If it is a wildlife issue, call us.

5. Review a proposal from Best Friends Animal Society on an ordinance to ban the selling of cats and dogs at Pet Stores; and take any other action deemed appropriate.

KL – we heard from Best Friends at the last meeting about why they are proposing this ordinance. MC – We want the meat to put into an ordinance.

ANDREA GUITERREZ (AG), the coordinator for the Best Friends Animal Society, wants to encourage the Committee to consider moving this forward and urges you to join the 15 other cities that no longer sell dogs and cats. Intent is to eliminate puppy mills, increase adoptions and reduce taxpayer burden. We would like pet stores to change their business model, offer products, services and space for shelter animals and rescue organizations to adopt out animals. Best Friends has partnered with stores that have done this and we have found it to be viable; it would alleviate a significant burden on taxpayers, shelters and rescue groups by increasing pet adoptions while still allowing the pet stores to stay in business. We would like CC to continue leading the way in pet protection by supporting this ordinance that we consider to be compassionate, progressive and fiscally responsible and that addresses our pet overpopulation. Turned in a petition with over 1,000 signatures.

JW – you need to decide tonight whether to move forward with an ordinance or not. In Albuquerque, NM it says “pet stores may not sell companion animals but may sell other living creatures, including but not limited to fish, birds, rodents, insects, reptiles and other where they have permissible exotic animals.” It can be clean and simple. Our DA would have to weigh in. Business impact needs to be done but it can be pet stores can’t do that but you can adopt out if you are a 501C3 or the Animal Foundation and pet stores would be willing to let you bring your animals there. KL is not sure it is necessary to say in the ordinance that rescue organizations can bring their animals there as they are already allowed to do that. The big issue is that you are prohibiting the sale and we have also had a request to include pigs in that proposal as well. MC – that is what I thought we were going to get at this meeting. Thou shall not sell puppies and kittens. We are done with descriptions and explanations. What we want to do is have it in writing in an ordinance fashion so we can present it to the BCC.

DAVID HENDERSON, DVM, thinks the ordinance has minimal potential to do any good. Although I am no fan of pet stores, the one thing it does do is take a shot at the puppy mill industry. As a private practitioner, I keep track of where people get their animals when they bring in a new puppy. I always encourage people to go to a rescue group or the shelter, to go anywhere but a pet store to get a new pet because they are saving a life. There are quite a few people who absolutely will not get another dog unless it is a specific breed, a Maltese, Miniature Dachshund or Shih Tzu. These are the dogs being sold at the pet stores. In my practice, when I ask them where they got the pure bred puppy from, it winds up being underground people. This ordinance does nothing to address these people and they are very surreptitious. Officer March will tell us it is very difficult to track these people down. They won’t even meet them at a residence; they meet them in a parking lot and when they try to call the people a week later, they can’t get hold of them. This does absolutely nothing to address that. When we look at dogs being killed at the animal shelter, we are looking at 65% to 70% Pitbulls and Chihuahuas. This is not what is being sold at the pet stores. To put this up as something that is going to reduce euthanasia is not realistic. If we want to shut down puppy mills, we need state, local and county laws and it is still hard to enforce. The real thing that works is the s/n law. We did have an ordinance several years ago to mandate that pet stores maintain the same standards as any rescue organization would maintain. Any dog or cat that leaves that store has to be sterilized before it leaves the store. That would be a better way. I am no fan of pet stores and it wouldn’t break my heart to have them all closed down but the people going underground are the people selling them without a license; that is where most of them come from. I question everybody about where they got their pet. At least 70% percent are from the fly by nights.

KL – are you okay with the “no pet store shall display, sell, offer for sale, barter, auction, give away or otherwise transfer or dispose of dogs or cats?” MC yes but I thought we were going to add pot-bellied pigs. This isn’t a cure all, solve all but it is a start on getting to the backyard breeders. KL wants to make sure her reading is correct in terms of the rescue organizations that regardless of how young the animals are there is no differentiation between rescue groups in pet stores and ones adopted out of other locations. I assume most rescue organizations are going to bring in any animals they have available and not necessarily just kittens and puppies and they are already s/n regardless of how old they are. MC motions for staff to draft an ordinance. JP seconds motion. KL is not convinced this ordinance will reduce the number of animals going to local shelters. I would say this is at the bottom of the list for some of the reasons Dr. Henderson talked about. Our issues in terms of dogs are dealing with the Pitbulls and Chihuahuas; those are the ones being killed and the cats. CC has made a fantastic effort to resolve that problem and we are starting to see our cat numbers come down as we deal with the feral cat issue. I think the s/n ordinance has gone a long way toward convincing people they have to s/n their animals and the changes in Title 10 requiring rescue organizations to s/n their animals prior to adoption instead of giving out a voucher are all the things that have made the biggest difference in CC in terms of reducing the number of impounds. Motion passed.

6. Review a draft ordinance regulating the feeding of pigeons; and take any other action deemed appropriate.

JW – a constituent contacted Commissioner G after Henderson rewrote Title 7 and asked if CC could have similar language on pigeons being a nuisance so Chris directed Animal Control to come up with an ordinance to bring before this Committee to see if there was an appetite to amend Title 10 to cover feeding pigeons. KL – I

e-mailed Rich Molinari because I was curious about how many citations had actually been issued for pigeon feeding and he said CLV handles it differently. It is up to their Code Enforcement people. It looks to me like the ordinance is a take off from Henderson as opposed to what CLV is doing. There doesn't appear to be any effort to try that. So we are going toward the Henderson ordinance, is that correct? DM – we were directed to draft it this way. JW - this isn't verbatim from the Henderson language. County staff that does research on ordinances came up with the language presented today. The Commissioner said there wasn't that much of a difference and she was fine with this wording. If this Committee doesn't want to recommend that the BCC move forward with this ordinance, you can do that. It was a means of giving a little bit of power to Animal Control if there is somebody down in a park feeding the pigeons, if you can actually catch somebody. It is going to be like barking dogs; it is not going to be a priority. MC – I had a question when I read this and I talked to DM earlier. I asked if this would interfere with a private individual who has a coop of pigeons; say tumblers, racers or homers. This is strictly for the at large pests. I agree with this 100%. KL – I was at that Henderson meeting and thought at that time that would never happen in CC because I could see some of the issues between feral cats. As a humane organization we often tell people to feed the feral cats at night and pick up in the morning so neighbors won't complain. What often happens is people leave too much food and you see pigeons in the morning going after that food. The other issue is now because we have a coyote problem in some parts of the county, we had to revise it and tell them to feed in the morning. When the coyotes come in at night, they eat the food and the cats. I have a problem with this because we do have feral cat colonies and because we feed feral cats, pigeons come to eat the excess food. JP agrees with this ordinance. I have horses and the pigeons will actually move the horses out of their feeder to get at their food. It is a sporadic feed, you have 200 pigeons in the middle of the road, and some of them get hit because they are not smart enough to move but then they are going to move over to my horses and I don't like pigeons in my horses. They discard; my horses eat it. It is a germ transference for me so I am in total agreement with this ordinance. KL – both of you are assuming we will be able to control the pigeon feeding. We tried to do the same thing with feral cat feeders for 10 years. We put down 100,000 cats and we didn't resolve the feral cat issue until we came up with a new way of doing it. It seems to me, and I understand exactly what both of you are saying, they are unsanitary and everything else, but I am not convinced, and I would like to see how many citations have been issued. MC – there is no law. KL – but there is an ordinance in CLV and one just passed in Henderson. I would like to look at this a little bit more before passing it on.

DM – our concern at Animal Control is the operational side. It has been compared to handling barking dogs. We no longer respond to barking dogs. The calls were holding for 2 months, never being handled. Officers come into work with 75 calls waiting for them. We stopped responding to barking dogs and now handle them administratively. We send cards in the mail and then send them to mediation and then to a criminal process because we were never getting there. It wasn't reasonable to expect citizens to wait 2 months and still not be able to come. The question is are we going to be able to get out there and are we actually going to catch anybody feeding pigeons or is it just another call in our queue that we know we are not going to catch anybody at because it is 3 days old already. We have that on stray dog complaints; 3 days old and we haven't gotten to it. It is not that we are not trying. We just have that many calls holding. We had 14 officers and I am down to 11. I am not sure that we can reasonably respond to the pigeon feeders. I am not saying we shouldn't have an ordinance. I am just not sure if having an administrative process from the outset isn't better. If we are dealing with people who are feeding on their own property, we can send them a notice as we do with barking dogs and advise them it is against the law to feed the pigeons. Just as barking dogs didn't get us many citations; we come out; dogs are not barking 99.9% of the time. In all of my years in the field, I issued maybe 3 or 4 citations where I actually caught a dog barking. It wasn't productive. It is also the volume of traffic, the calls we have which are much higher priorities. We are seeking to eliminate other complaints and go into administrative ways to thin out the calls the officers look at because of the multiple pages of calls waiting for each of them on our Chameleon program. They can't even see all their calls without paging down.

STEVEN PORTNOFF is the constituent that brought this to Commissioner G. I lived in the city many years ago when you could take care of the problem with an air rifle. Can't do that any more. Pigeons are pretty interesting. If you kill a couple of them, they all go away and roost somewhere else. The waste that is left behind is so bad and toxic; it actually eats through concrete tiles on roofs. They don't need to be fed and they don't need to be encouraged. In my almost 40 years of living here in Las Vegas, it has gone from being nice and

friendly and not having any problems in this city to a big town. There is a population of 2 million people here. Things have changed. I currently live in the county up by the Mormon Church on Sunrise Mountain. It is pretty rural. We have wild cats and other stuff up there. I live on acreage and so do most of my neighbors. I have a neighbor next door that has 24/7 night time/day time care and about 8 months ago, she decided she wanted to see the birds so she instructed all the Medicaid folks to feed the birds. Every morning I get up to 100 birds on her roof. I have gone over there. There is no teeth in the law. I called the Health District that used to deal with this stuff in the 80's and 90's. I called Animal Control and they do not handle pigeon calls so I am left with talking to my neighbor. Well my neighbor and I don't speak anymore. The help and I speak and the help says we tell her they shouldn't be fed but she wants to see the birds so I can't do anything about it, my hands are tied. I need a tool so someone in authority will tell my neighbor not to feed the vermin. These birds will eat anything that is left out anywhere. We are all adults but not all of us police ourselves. I hope this gets passed and it has teeth to it so I can make the phone call and have a citation issued because I would love to live pigeon free at my home.

GG – I share KL's concerns about the feral cats but I don't know if I should be concerned. It sounds like even if this gentleman did call Animal Control no one is going to show up because there are not enough resources. Feeding pigeons isn't going to trump a vicious animal, a bite or whatever other calls are holding. Do we pass a law because one person is having a bird problem? I don't know. I want to be sure if this were passed that it does not impact feral cats because you are leaving out food for them. Trust me – I am dealing with an issue right now where we passed a law at the state level, we were very specific about jurisdiction and have people exceeding that jurisdiction now even though the record is very clear, just like it is clear right now. It has been taken advantage of and there is a horrendous fight to try to make it stop. I hope this does not impact the feral cat colonies or people caring for feral cats. I care for a few myself and I wouldn't want to be in trouble for leaving out food for them.

KL – are you willing to look at some other options? Can we see what CLV or other localities are doing? You assume Animal Control will respond to your complaint. It seems this would be a grey area where it goes into an administrative process instead of going through the Court system. It seems to me we need to spend a little bit more time on the issue and try to identify other ways of looking at it. I am not convinced this is the way to go. We ought to see what other localities are doing. Do we want to add to the Court process or can we put it with the other administrative codes we set up in Title 10? Do we give it to Code Enforcement as opposed to having it done by Animal Control? I have a lot of questions that I am not convinced have been resolved by this ordinance. MC motions that the Committee accept the ordinance as written. JP seconds motion. KL opposes.

7. Receive a presentation from the Educational Outreach Subcommittee; and take any other action deemed appropriate.

KL – as part of this effort we are trying to get all the animal organizations together to look at addressing part of that 5 year plan in terms of education and maybe doing some other things. I think they are looking at trying to do something in December. JP – being on the education subcommittee, I have looked at it from different angles and the learning curve has been tremendous. I thank everybody who has been involved in helping us organize this thing. The number of animals we destroy every year in this valley is heartbreaking so I got involved with the Southern NV Regional Housing Authority (SNRHA). I have brought a supportive coordinator from the Housing Agency to speak with you about the Senior Residential Councils within the senior living properties.

ANGELA WASHINGTON (AW) serves as a Program Specialist in the Supportive Services Department (SSD) of the SNRHA. The SSD has many roles in terms of providing support to residents of the Housing Authority. My focus is on establishing and supporting resident councils within the Authority. Resident councils are tenant organizations comprised of the residents in that particular community. As of this date, the SNRHA has 13 senior communities and others that are under construction. Each of these communities is comprised of some seniors who are active, able to care for themselves and have loved ones who regularly visit. Additionally, each of these communities is also comprised of seniors who are not very active, unable to fully care for themselves and who may not have loved ones who visit regularly. As such, the SSD, under the direction of Al Conklin, was thrilled to hear of JP's proposal to partner with the SNRHA to start a program that will provide support for our

seniors. Ms. Penney's proposal is to introduce a pet companionship project at the resident council meeting of the Housing Authority within our senior community. She has very graciously offered to attend resident council meetings and explain the benefits of caring for a pet and subsequently planning to introduce pets to some of our seniors. We understand that caring for a pet can serve as therapy that can assist with loneliness, isolation, limited physical exercise, lack of intellectual stimulation and boredom for our seniors. The SSD is very excited to partner with the Educational Subcommittee and JP in this wonderful effort.

KL asked what percent of the residents now have animals. AW believes there may be 30% to 35% of her councils. KL asked if the residents brought the animals in when they came in or after they were there. AW – Some have been lifelong companions and then there are circumstances where, for example, when she was visiting someone not long ago and her husband has passed away and because her children live away from her, her children pushed her to have a dog as a companion. At first she wasn't crazy about the idea but absolutely loves him now and values his presence in her life. KL – if that person dies and there is no one else in that community willing to take the animal or the family is not willing to take the animal, what happens to the animal? AW - that is a property management question and I wouldn't feel comfortable answering that but I can find out for you. Would think that through education, it can be addressed.

8. Discuss informational issues among committee members; and take any other action deemed appropriate.

DM – Our civil DA has changed so we are hoping for direction on SB 223 sooner than we expected. We are also working through a backlog of other things as well. PetCo and PetSmart letters went out on October 17, 2011. Title 10 was sent to the rescue groups on September 22, 2011. Business License cannot separate pet stores that actually sell pets from those that only sell pet supplies. There are 90 stores in those categories selling either pet supplies and/or pets in unincorporated CC, including PetCo, PetSmart and possibly even Walmart, etc., because they sell pet supplies.

KL –SB226, we did attend several meetings. It is a big issue and I am not convinced we are going to get any kind of agreement. I think they feel like it is not a big issue in CC but my sense is they don't want to talk about not allowing people to do trapping. We will be dealing with this issue for some time. There is going to be a hearing in January. If you are interested in this issue, keep in contact with me and I will let you know what is going on. Also for the National Feral Cat Day, the 3 organizations did over 400 cats in the 2-day clinic. Also want to thank Commissioner G for sponsoring a proclamation for all the groups in terms of what they had done. Alley Cat Allies were really impressed with the effort. They were shocked. They couldn't believe we had done 400 cats and at the clinic in November on a Sunday, we did 385 feral cats in one day. We are making an effort and it is those kinds of efforts that are making changes. Given this economy if we can keep the impounds steady or even slightly reduced, we are way ahead of the game. We are moving ahead and I am really proud of the work this Committee has done in those efforts even before I came on board.

9. Comments by the General Public

None

10. Set date, time and agenda of next meeting

Meeting will be scheduled after the BCC picks the Committee.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.