MEMBERS PRESENT:  LAYNE, KAREN (KL)  SAYEGH, S. SUSAN (SSS)  WHITE, DEBBIE DVM (DW)  MARY GIPAYA (MG)  JANELLE EDWARD (STUDENT)

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

2. Public Comment
KL advised that each speaker would have 3 minutes to speak. Seeing no one. Public comment closed.

3. Approval of Agenda
KL asked for a motion to approve agenda, motion by DW, second by SSS, all in favor, no opposition. Motion passed.

4. Approval of April 17, 2014 Minutes
KL advised that there were a number of changes to make on the meeting minutes. Changes are as follows: page 4, in the 2nd paragraph, the last sentence should read “without CCAC issuing a citation”; in the 4th paragraph, the first sentence should read “clarify right of entry”; the last paragraph, the 2nd sentence should have “added to rescue groups” as it pertains to the ordinance; On page 6, the 2nd to last sentence should read …”open meeting law but often sees it violated in other places than at the AAC.” Page 7, the 3rd sentence from end, should read “in 2009 was in 100%, 2010 and 2011 were in the 90%”. In 2012 it dropped to the 70% area and in the past year it is in the 40% of where it started. JA requested that the “s” be dropped from her last name to read “Edward” instead of “Edwards”.

SSS motioned to approve minutes with said changes, DW 2nd, motion passes.

5. Receive a presentation from The Animal Foundation regarding the Pets For Life event
Andy Bischel, Director of Development, The Animal Foundation (TAF), stated that TAF applied and was granted a $40,000 grant from The Humane Society of the United States for a Pets for Life program. The Funding comes from Pet Smart Charities and the program is dictated by the HSUS. The Pets for Life program operates in 22 cities and is about identifying and getting into specific neighborhoods to go door to door making the connection needed for pet owners to get their animals vaccinated and spay or neutered. By making this connection not only does it provide the opportunity for immunizations but it also gives responsible pet owner training. For the Las Vegas program, TAF, when applying for the grant, looked at where are the most unaltered pets coming from and the economic breakdown of the area. These same areas mirrored what Three Square stated for areas in need. Results showed that 56% of the occupants in the 89101 are Spanish or Latino and 24% are living below poverty level. This year’s goal is to provide 500 spay or neuter
surgery. Two events have already taken place since the start of the year. The first event was in late February and had a decent turn out, using this event to get accustomed to going door to door. This is not a marketing event to advertise “Free Spay or Neuter” but actually going door to door asking pet owners if their animals are immunized and/or Spay or Neutered, if the services are wanted and what the challenges are. Some challenges discussed were transportation, lack of education on Spay and Neuter and what the benefits to Spay and Neuter are. These neighbors are then invited to an event. The event in May was more successful. Over 200 citizens showed up at the East Las Vegas community center, located at Stewart and Eastern, 89101. As of June 24, 2014, 340 clients have been serviced, 83% responded positively to Spay and Neuter, 240 surgeries have been performed. At event number one, 180 participants with a 51% completion rate. This area, in comparison to others, is a social area amongst their neighbors which helps to spread the word about these clinics. This resulted ultimately to a 70% completion rate. The first event had 2.5 veterinarians and the second event had 4 veterinarians there to immunize the animals. This allowed for approximately 200 animals to receive vaccinations. Some of the larger events in Philadelphia and Los Angeles are immunizing approximately 400 - 500 animals. The more veterinarians that are available will result in more services provided and in a timelier manner. The extra time allows for more education on the benefits of both vaccinations and spay and neuter. An important aspect of this program is the follow up. Following up allows the distinction as to the problem of why one didn’t respond to the opportunity. If the problem was transportation, transportation is provided. This $40,000 grant is anticipated for next year and TAF would like to find a way to have a full time employee devoted to the Pets for Life program to help expand the program and touch those zip codes that are in need. A full time employee could help raise more funds and get the resources necessary to be successful. Andy stated that although most animals received at the shelter are Pit Bulls and Chihuahuas, at these events all sorts of breeds are showing up, such as terriers. Dr. White was acknowledged in helping exposing this event and getting more veterinarians on board to volunteer their time. Andy asked the board if they had any questions. KL stated that she appreciates all that has been done and wanted to say thank you to Pet Smart Charities because they have been the saving grace in this community. KL stated that the board is committed to these types of programs because these events are what is going to solve the problem of over pet population. KL suggested that Andy speak to Judy Erickson of Heaven Can Wait, who has a wealth of experience in going door to door. KL stated that it is very important to have Spanish speaking help at these types of events and Andy advised that quite of bit of the TAF staff are fluent in Spanish, reiterating that if they are able to get the wanted full time employee for the Pets for Life program, it is important that they are able to speak fluent Spanish. KL stated that it has been about 4 or 5 years that Clark County, the City of Las Vegas and North Las Vegas Animal Control started these types of vaccination clinics and due to lack of funding these clinics have stopped. KL concurs with Andy about the importance of having more veterinarians volunteering so that more services can be provided in a timelier manner. SSS asked if the events are being advertised other than by going door to door. Andy advised that part of the Pets for Life model is that you do not do any advertising; it is strictly by word of mouth. There is always the question of if you advertise for free spay and neuter do you actually get those who cannot afford spay or neuter fees or do you get those who can afford it but want it for free instead. The Pets for Life program is about working within a zip code who is in need. TAC must work within the constraints of the
grant. No advertising is needed, the business is already there. The clinic is currently open Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday and between low cost surgeries and the Pets for Life participants, TAC is full. SSS asked if this program allowed for vouchers to be issued for pets that are too young to have the surgery at this time. Andy advised that this is a voucher system, the animals get immunizations first and then come back for the surgeries. MG asked if the grant was for only cat and dog type animals or if it allowed for an equestrian element. A large issue in the Spanish community exists for unaltered equine. Andy advised that within the neighborhood that they are working, there are not equine. DW inquired about the statement of the need for more Veterinarians, to help with the management of time vs. the amount of clients that can be serviced, asking if there was a long line at the events? And or if people had to be turned away? Andy stated that no one was turned away, it would just allow for people to get through the lines quicker and would allow more time to educate those who are in need. Many of these animals have never been seen by a veterinarian before so he feels that it is a very valuable to get the knowledge of what being a responsible pet owner really means. DW asked what the time frame is for one zip code? Andy advised that some areas can take up to two years. The program starts with a six mile radius and expands out from there, always coming back to the core and work your way out again. Getting the needed resources can get another group started that can move into another area. KL asked if there was any public comment.

Amy Rouse, Henderson, NV. stated that the Pets for Life program is a great program however she expressed the need for advertising. Amy knows of people who can very well afford to have their animals spay or neutered but will claim that they cant. Amy believes that all should have the option for free spay or neuter because even those who have money have accidental litters. Andy responded that advertising is not part of this grant, however TAF is already advertising their own low cost spay or neuter program.

Jana Wright inquired about all jurisdictions having regulated spay and neuter, if this is part of the education that it is the law to have your animal spay or neutered. Andy advised yes, informing that at the previous event, the City of Las Vegas Animal Control was present for that specific purpose and to use their trailer to immunize cats. This also allowed for the citizens to meet CLV Animal Control in a neutral setting.

MG asked if micro-chipping was part of this program to help return pets to their owners should they get lost? Andy advised that it is not part of this program, but that TAF offers $25 micro-chipping.

Elizabeth Rubin (ER), Adopt A Rescue Pet, advised that one of their sister organizations participates in the Pets for Life program and that with the $40,000 grant there are very strict guidelines that need to be followed, one being that advertising cannot be part of the budget. Volunteers are extremely important as well as getting other donations, such as micro-chipping. ER reiterated that the primary purpose of the Pets for Life program is education, spay and neutering and vaccinating. Adopt a Rescue had an event close to the May Pets for Life event and the turn out in 89101 was amazing. It is important that multiple agencies come together to help solve these issues. ER congratulated TAF for the great impact that they have made in the area. Andy advised that micro-chipping is included and stated that the efforts are going well beyond the $40,000.

Annula Wylderich, advised that she had volunteered and that the event was excellent. The program targets low income families who would not be able to afford spay or neutering, even if
cited by Animal Control. If advertising was part of this program, too many would take advantage thus not allowing for the true purpose to help those in need.

KL closed public comment, advising action was not needed on this item.

6. **Discuss holding a vaccination clinic**
KL stated that the Palms Apartments would be a good place to hold a vaccination clinic; this is a low income area. She would like to do what has been done in the past to include using the City of Las Vegas trailer and working with Heaven Can Wait and the Animal Foundation. Volunteers are very important to have a successful clinic. More volunteers help the clinic move in a timely manner. Zip codes 89156, 89110 and 89121 are being targeted by other entities, but there is a lot of low income County territory that needs this type of assistance. Reaching out to Pet Smart and other agencies again would be helpful for funding. KL stated that this is something that has been done in the past and is interested to know if the committee is willing to make this effort again. The resident density in the apartment complex was asked. KL advised that she believed it was approximately 400 units, but 20% are vacant. She advised there were approximately 50 – 60 dogs in the complex. KL further asked if the committee wanted to look at the surrounding Clark County area of commercial center. It was stated that the amount of animals is needed in order to know how many veterinarians and volunteers would be needed. SS asked KL who would coordinate such an event, KL stated in the past it was a group of agencies that worked together. SS agreed with KL about starting small and targeting this one apartment complex. MG asked who the sponsor or lead would be for this event. KL stated that the Animal Advisory Committee would be the lead in doing the event. JE asked how many volunteers were needed. KL stated that the amount of volunteers needed would depend on how many veterinarians were there and the amount of people needing service. Keeping the event small and considering the size of the apartment complex, approximately 25 volunteers would be needed. Public comment opened.

Regina Harman asked who would be paying for such an event. KL advised that in the past The Animal Foundation and the Las Vegas Valley Humane Society paid for some of the vaccines, Heaven Can Wait paid for a veterinarian, and other veterinarians and volunteers donated their time. KL would like to see happen again. Regina stated that rescue groups are not in a position to help with funds, but could be a help with getting volunteers and the The Animal Foundation is the largest group that should help.

Mike White attested to the fact that this area is in need of a vaccination clinic.

Public comment closed.
KL asked the committee to make a motion to proceed. MG made a motion to proceed with the process of holding a vaccination/education clinic. SS second the motion, all in favor. Motion passed.

7. **Discuss the provisions of animal sheltering services in Clark County and make any recommendations deemed appropriate**
Chris Robinson (CR), Executive Director, The Animal Foundation (TAF), thanked the board for hosting the meeting and asked Chief Allswang the proper procedure to distribute materials to the committee. Presentation materials were given to the Animal Advisory Committee. CR started with a brief discussion of what The Animal Foundation does. TAF is a non-profit organization that provides a number of services; partly under contract with Clark County, The City of Las Vegas and The City of North Las Vegas to provide sheltering services at 655 N. Mojave. The animals are brought to the shelter in one of 2 ways, 1 being brought in by an Animal Control Officer of the stated local governments or by way of their constituents. CR wanted to make the distinction between TAF and Lied Animal Shelter; TAF is the organization and Lied Animal Shelter is a building on their campus. Both by state law and local ordinance there are requirements
that state these animals are held on some sort of legal regulation hold. Typically this is a 72 hour hold. During that time the animals are evaluated, medically and behaviorally, a determination of their outcome is then made; primarily 1 of 4 determinations is made for an animal to leave the facility. Such ways are: Returned to the owner, sent to be adopted, transfer to a rescue group or euthanized.

Other services that are provided are adoption services, rescue, foster, volunteer services, public spay and neuter clinics and vaccination clinics.

The distinction between the role that TAF plays with the contracts with local government and the non-profit organization providing volunteer services with private funding was stated by CR.

Gina Greisen questioned the open meeting law and how it pertains to distribution of materials to the audience. Chief Allswang advised that anything that a member of the audience provides is not subject to the open meeting law until after the meeting and materials can be copied and provided.

CR discussed the Campus Completion Project (a map displayed on projector screen). This project has not yet been proposed to the Board of County Commissioners, but will in the form of a Staff Report. The Campus Completion project has a cost of $28.8 million and sits on 8 acres. This property is leased from the City of Las Vegas under a 50 year total lease. Currently the campus has two permanent facilities, Lied Animal Shelter and the 22 dog adoption bungalows. Part of the proposal is a new 25,000sq.ft building that would be funded privately by TAF. This building would allow for the cat and exotic adoptions to move from the white temporary tent, the administration offices and Pima Medical Institute to move from the temporary trailers. All temporary structures are on temporary permits from the City of Las Vegas, who would like for TAF to vacate. On the other side of the campus is where the Lied Shelter building is. A request to the local government entities of $13.8 million dollars for the renovation of the shelter building will be made. The existing building was built in 2001 as a warehouse type building. At that time it was designed to house the City of Las Vegas animals only. In 2006 Clark County and the City of North Las Vegas requested to join the effort and create a regional animal campus. This resulted in going from 18,000 animals to 50,000 animals in one summer. The building was built with swamp coolers and air exchanges that were not separated. Extensive renovations need to be made; the renovations are air conditioning units on the roof, separating the HVAC units to prevent the spread of airborne diseases. The surgery center will be separated during renovations, at the cost of TAF. The plumbing that processes waste up 800 – 1000 animals on a given day needs to be upgraded. Seamless, disease resistant flooring and wall finishes will significantly reduce the spread of disease. The concrete floor needs to be replaced. Sealed isolation rooms for sick animals and emergency equipment, such as generators are needed. Along with the staff report that is being presented to the Board of County Commissioners, contract amendments will also be presented. The contract amendments consist of three categories; Finance of the renovations, non-profit tax exempt bonding is being looked into. The payback of these renovations would be included in these contract amendments. The second category would be the establishment, beginning in 2017, of a capital reserve fund. This would be an annual collective contribution of $220,000. The third category would be amendments to the animal services part of the contract. A clause in the contract states a CPI increase for operational base funding. This clause has not kept up with shelter services. TAF has been subsidizing shelter services. The proposal will suggest an operational base adjustment to address this issue.

Clark County has asked TAF to administer the feral cat trap program. TAF has agreed. Clark County has also asked that a clause be included in the contract to outsource the care of horses. TAF agreed.
The 72 hour hold period language has been changed, it now states to refer to state law and county code.

CR asked if there were any questions. MG, referring to the map, asked if the barn would remain on the campus. Would this be for smaller live stock? CR advised that with the drafting of the contract, this could go either way, TAF is willing to do either, however the local governments do not want to handle roosters or chickens. However the barn could be coop converted to handle the surprise need to handle the upward of 100 fighting roosters. KL asked about the decrease in impounds. CR stated that the reason that TAF has been able to continue to trend down in the number of euthanasia’s is because of the decrease in intakes. Lower intakes do not result in fewer animal days in kennels, they result in animals being able to be treated and stay longer to get the best treatment possible. Currently TAF is not in the position to have more kennels or space than they do animals. CR is not suggesting that animals are kept for longer than necessary and that the problem of holding animals for too long does not exist. Carly Scholten, Director of Operations TAF, advised having fewer animals coming in allows for TAF to provide more resources and time to each individual animal. An example of, if an animal is in need of an upper respiratory treatment that requires 10 - 14 days of treatment, this is something that TAF is able to do, all the while still being able to look for a rescue or an adoption for the animal. KL asked if this method is more expensive. CR stated yes, but to meet in the middle of both extremes is what is being done. The local governments costs do not increase based on the length of stay; the increased funding is for TAF. KL read from the HSUS “the new floor that caused all of this trouble turned out to be very difficult to clean; I later learned that even the manufacturer of the floor had told management that the floor was not a good choice for a shelter because it was very porous and difficult to clean. Our management board would not be talked out of that floor, yet after the cats died, there was talk about pressing charges against the flooring company because of what happened to the cats that were under our care.” KL is concerned with the $8 million in renovations to a building that was built in 2001. CR stated that because of what KL was reading is the reason CR took her current position. She wanted to fix this problem and she did. CR stated she cannot answer all the questions about what had happened prior to her coming to TAF but that if it is the dog bungalows that are being spoken of, these bungalows are working. What CR is now speaking of is the renovations of a 13 year old tilt up warehouse.

CL opened public comment.

Bill Christy (BL), Las Vegas NV, addressed the discussion of the renovations of TAF, it is his understanding that the renovations are for executive offices and that TAF is not currently using the facility to its maximum. BL stated, under his analysis, the average occupancy for the dog kennels is 180 of the 296. This goes along with his analysis of TAF euthanizing approximately 60 animals a day. Due to TAF having a rate of 56% of their animals euthanized BL pleaded that new management take over the shelter.

Rex Reginald (RR), Las Vegas NV, expressed he had a way to raise funds and would like to help TAF. He believes that if you can get 5 or 6 celebrities to these events that tickets can be sold. RR offered his time to help with a fund raiser.

Bryce Henderson (BH), Las Vegas NV, founder of NKO, no kill shelter, a nonprofit with over
1,300 members; Devoted to educating the public and public officials about practices that are working in other areas to help save up to 90% of their animals. BH expressed that he does not believe that TAF needs the funding for the proposed facility, that TAF does not currently use the facility to its maximum capacity. BH stated that when he asked CR why the cat kennels are not being used to their maximum capacity, her response was that the notion of housing more animals will save more lives is misguided. BH stated that according to an article in Vegas Magazine, the renovations will include expanding administrative offices, adding an education center and building more comprehensive infrastructure. BH asks if this is the best way to spend tax dollars. Per contract, according to BH, Clark County has already paid TAF $3.9 million for the construction and expansion of the shelter. BH states in 2011, working off a budget of approximately $1 million, HCW spay/neutered almost 13,000 animals at a cost of $78.00 each in comparison to the $80 that Andy stated. TAF contract is set to expire with Clark County in June 2015, therefore BH states it would be premature to give additional tax dollars at this time, when there is a chance that the contract will not be renewed.

Gina Greisen (GG), Nevada Voters for Animals, states that it is her understanding that if a presentation is given then the backup documentation is to be given out to the public at that same time. GG asks for clarification on this for future meetings. GG read from the Humane Society, 2007 report, page 177, “management must learn to reach out and cooperate with other groups and people, admit mistakes and move on in a constructive fashion. New leadership should be mindful of maintaining a good relationship with other groups and working to resolve problems whenever possible.” “Maintaining accountability to the public”. GG stated that she is aware that all groups have worked hard at maintaining good working relationships. GG asks the board to deny the request for more money until contract negotiations are made.

Keith Williams (KL), West San Miguel, discussed the numbers from Lied; a graph was shown of cats and dogs taken in at the shelter, due to the mandatory spay and neuter the numbers have dropped significantly. 2018 prediction, it is expected that the number of impounds should be at about 50% of what they were at the peak. Euthanasia numbers have also dropped, 50% reduction is expected by the end of this year. In 2008/2009 the cost per impound to the jurisdiction it was approximately $91 an animal, because of the reduced impounds, these costs are increasing. This will result in a predicted amount of $275 per impound in 2019. This occurring in the first 3 days at the shelter; Based on the current contract, the cost to the jurisdictions is projected to rise. If the contract was modified to peg costs at the 2013 level, $106 per animal plus allow for the 5% increase per year. By pegging that cost the predication for 2019 there would be a $2.5 million difference. KL believes it is the first 3 days of the shelter services contract that needs to be focused on.

KL closed public comment.

MG asked about the statements being made of “getting new management” and if anyone had asked the current management to work with them and if so, is the current management not working with them or are they? Is there a realistic solution to the number of Euthanasia’s?

Bryce Harper (BH) answered the 1st question that MG asked by stating that TAF has been approached to work together on some issues, further stating that he is aware of a number of people who have also approached TAF and they were turned down. BH believes TAF likes to isolate themselves. For the 2nd question, he believes there are realistic solutions, such as doing what is being done in other areas, such as Los Angeles who is saving 80% of their animals. BH mentioned the high adoption fees in comparison to the City of Henderson, NV. Holding more adoption events is a good solution. PetSmart policy, because they want to adopt out all of the cats, requires TAF to use all of the kennels, BH expresses this should be done at the shelter.
DW stated that due to the economy, and as a business owner, it has been difficult for companies to keep their doors open. Many veterinarian practices have been faced with rising costs in supplies and pharmaceuticals. DW gave the example of one product that increased 125%. DW asks for consideration when it comes to the cost of caring for the needs of animals.

The board did not feel that they had enough information to make any recommendations or to take any action.

8. **Comments by the General Public**

Amy Rouse, wanted to talk about the pet store animals that are being purchased having to be spay or neutered. KL advised that after public comment, this issue can be discussed.

Mike White stated that on the animal control website the statistics have not been updated since 2011, however if more timely and accurate information was available some of the concerns would be lessened.

Annoula Wylderich, is bringing the Criminal Investigation Division of HSUS to our community in September to provide training to all law enforcement on animal fighting crime investigation. The officers who take the training will get post approved credit, and will be able to access the extensive database of the HSUS. The City of Henderson Animal Control has offered to host this event, along with Clark County as cohost. Annoula believes this is a great resource.

Rex Reginald, produced a show called When Pets become Predators, the show offered reward money and it worked to catch the criminals involved in animal fighting. Rex wants to introduce pet friendly landlord registration. This registration will allow the landlord to be given a waiver, thus being able to charge more money. This should not be breed specific. Rex would also like to put a minimum value on all dogs and cats of at least $1,000. The reason for this is if someone kills your pet it can be considered a misdemeanor or felony. Rex is willing to do all the leg work if he can get the support of the committee and the community.

SS asked Rex if he has approached the insurance industry, those who provide homeowners insurance and have exclusions as they pertain to different breeds. Rex advised he had not, but will do whatever necessary.

Bill Christy (BC), Reno went No Kill about 5 or 6 years, he states that Reno was in a much more difficult position than what we are dealing with here. BC further states that the City of Henderson kill rate is only 23%. BC believes it is because of the $65 adoption fee, in comparison to the $105 - $250 at TAF. BC also expressed that the Shelter in Reno reached out to TAF here in Las Vegas, asked if they could show how they have made these changes and that they were told “no thank you”. BC believes at a 56% kill rate, the animals have the same chance of survival if they were living on the streets.

Sandy Dillion (SD) commented about a dog that was placed on the rescue only list because he needed his teeth cleaned and his rear dew claws cut off. SD is not a rescue but acts as foster and by the time the public could be made aware, the dog only had hours left to live. SD was able to get the dog. SD questions why a rescue has to pay a fee to get the animal when there is only hours left of the animals life.

Bryce Henderson (BH) wanted to expand on the Pets for Life program and the request of $28.8 million for renovations made by TAF. BH stated that 360,000 animals can be spayed or neutered for $28.8 million or a pretty building can be built, which would fix the problem that is at hand?
Harold Vasko, HCW, invited all to the Spay and Neuter Clinic that is being held on July 13th at Bonanza and Eastern. Details can be found on the Heaven Can Wait website.

Gina Greisen (GG), Nevada Voters for Animals, thanked Chief of Code Enforcement Jason Allswang and Animal Control for all of their hard work. GG spoke of expanding AB15, which is the required posting of sterilization requirements. GG believes these requirements need to be made of pet stores, mobile home parks and apartment complexes. All sterilization, spay and neuter requirements should be provided to residents in writing.

GG read a final quote from the 2007 HSUS report. “Another problem that can arise as a lack of a plan of orderly rotation of board members on and off the board, if the same people serve year after year, there is no way for new blood or new ideas to come to the board. Despite their sense of commitment, these same people will make the organization a closed corporation, rotation prevents the ingrown possessiveness sometimes found on self-perpetuating boards. In the time of rapid change the presence of new people who bring a new perspective will promote creativity and innovation in board decision making.”

GG asked, If the City of Las Vegas owns the land and TAF owns the buildings, should the contracts not be renewed, legally will happen as a result?

KL Public Comment Closed.

Changes to Title 10 and follow up on the vaccination clinic should be presented at the next meeting.

9. **Set date, time and agenda for next meeting**
   August 7, 2014 at 6:30

10. **Adjournment**
    MG motion to adjourn, all in favor, meeting adjourned.