

Washoe County Regional Animal Services Advisory Board

MINUTES-VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING

Friday, February 11, 2022 @ 9:30 a.m.
WASHOE COUNTY REGIONAL ANIMAL SERVICES
CENTER CLASSROOM
2825 LONGLEY LANE, #A, RENO, NV

MEMBERS

Naomi Duerr (Chair)
Irene Payne, (Vice Chair)
Jill Dobbs
Paul Anderson
Trudy Brussard
Julie McMahon (late)
Kitty Jung (absent)

STAFF

Shyanne Schull (Director)

LEGAL COUNSEL

Jen Gustafson (Deputy DA)

-o0o-

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

The meeting was opened and a quorum was established.

PRESENT: Naomi Duerr, Irene Payne, Jill Dobbs, Paul Anderson, Trudy Brussard,
Julie McMahon

ABSENT: Kitty Jung

2. PUBLIC COMMENT [Non-Action Item]

No public comment.

3. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 22, 2021 MINUTES [For possible action]

VICE CHAIR PAYNE: Motion to approve Minutes of October 22, 2021.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Seconded the Motion. Motion carries.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Commented on the Minutes. Commented on page 29,
“Discussed recently dealing with 70 pound dog with extreme aggression to other dogs and

euthanasia was the best course of action for the dog and the human.”

CHAIR DUERR: Sought clarification for the same.

MEMBER DOBBS: Agreed to pinpoint the sentence that is problematic and recommended suggestion from Member Brussard on language.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Indicated “Euthanasia is the best course of action for the dog because of the incident. This is a benefit to the human.” Confirmed there needs to be language to break up “dog and human.”

CHAIR DUERR: Wanted to simplify further.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Suggested to leave out “human” all together.

CHAIR DUERR: Agreed it could say, “It was the best course of action.” Agreed it was the intent of the transcriber.

MEMBER PAYNE: Agreed, “The best course of action.”

MEMBER BRUSSARD: And delete the remaining.

CHAIR DUERR: Confirmed that Mandy was able to make the notes and revise the Minutes.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Commented that for the record, it was a comment of Member Dobbs and feels that Member Dobbs should agree that was what she intended to say or did say at the previous meeting.

MEMBER DOBBS: Agrees with the revision.

CHAIR DUERR: Motion and second to approve Minutes as amended. Minutes are adopted.

4. INFORMATIONAL UPDATE ON OPTIONS VETERINARY CLINIC
[Non-action item]

CHAIR DUERR: Indicated that Diane Blankenburg was supposed to be in attendance.

MANDY: Confirmed she had not had contact.

CHAIR DUERR: Item skipped for now and will circle back if she attends the meeting.

5. DIRECTOR'S REPORT [Non-action item]

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Commented on attendance at meeting and rescheduling from January meeting due to COVID.

CHAIR DUERR: Commented on the Power Point presentation.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Last quarter animal intakes were 3,053 which was above the same quarter last year. COVID askew's the numbers. Falls within the same statistical intake numbers in same quarters, years prior.

Animals microchipped on intake in this quarter than the last five fiscal years. 997 this quarter which is up from 818 the same quarter last year.

Animal outcome – includes top five outcomes for animals that come into our care. The zero percent is reflective of 12 animals that died while in care; 3% euthanized, or 12 animals. Disposed of 95 animals deceased upon intake or by request of owner – disposed 370 of deceased animals. Transferred 1,335 to rescue and returned 1,221 animals to owners. Confirmed the 10 year average of return to owner percentage.

56% of animals returned by way of microchip. Good, solid number. Hoping to increase the numbers of animals microchipped upon intake.

1,224 returned in total and 347 were returned in the field and deferred from having to be impounded and brought into the shelter. Hopes to continue strategic goals to increase with identification, community collaborations.

Field service calls. (Video). Discussed video that was a reunification of a dog that had been missing for 6 weeks. Dog was stolen from owners. The dog was

microchipped and Animal Services picked up the dog and family was notified and reunified.

Took in approximately 6,262 calls in the last quarter. Majority are stray animal calls, animals loose and at large in the neighborhood. 839 welfare calls. 594 bite investigations. 536 noise complaints.

Welfare calls. Commented on the previous presentation on number of animal hoarding cases. Last quarter, the number of welfare calls has not increased (lowest of last 5 fiscal years), but complexity and nature of calls are changing. Offered to share statistics at next meeting for hoarding cases.

Commented that the last four years, there were 4 to 5 significant animal hoarding cases, there were anywhere between 10 to 50 animals in one home or property. So far in 2022, there have already been four cases. Recent arrest of two subjects where they had 34 dogs from a two bedroom apartment. Staff is prepared to provide care for the animals until the case is adjudicated which puts a very big strain on the shelter, the capacity, the level of cleaning and work that staff is required to do. Will address it at the April Advisory Board Meeting.

Discussed animal hoarding case in December of 2021. Animal Services was requested by Code Compliance to visit a property that was vacant, and the owner had passed away. The property had been vacant for over a year; no utilities, no services, no water. When final walk through had been conducted, it was apparent the lock was altered. It was obvious squatters were on the property and had 39 cats. Majority were very sick with upper respiratory disease. Unable to track down the owner of the cats and once healthy, the cats were adopted out quickly.

Discussed community members who contacted Animal Services for assistance. Discussed the prior case of all the dogs dumped at Sun Valley Regional Park last year. Call was received indicating a man was attempting to trap dumped dogs and bringing them home resulting in over 50 dogs living in their home. Animal Services and NHS was able to stagger the intake of dogs to be properly housed and up for adoption.

QUINN SWEET: Discussed outreach progress for the last quarter.

Discussed the four events conducted and 42 CARES program referrals. Did 202 spay/neuter. 137 seniors were provided with pet food. 629 vaccinations provided to the community.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked for a reminder of a CARE referral.

QUINN SWEET: CARES program is designed to provide assistance with veterinary bills for those who are low income and unable to afford veterinary care for pets. Up to \$300 is provided for a veterinary bill.

CHAIR DUERR: For example, if the owner goes to Options, is help provided? Or do they have to go through CARE first?

QUINN SWEET: Confirmed that the owner has to be referred to CARES program. Options is a referring partner. SPCA also works with CARES to do referrals. Also staff member can make a referral if they encounter an individual that needs help.

Discussed 2022 Outreach plans and progress. Hoping to add at least three community vaccine clinics. Discussed possible horse microchipping clinics, additional senior vaccine clinic, and community events.

MEMBER PAYNE: Asked about the community events.

QUINN SWEET: Discussed the dog show parade and ART PAWS.

Discussed social media page. For quarter two, 47 days of social media, and have 634 followers. Currently at 870. 154,000 people have been reached through the social media posts and posts have been shared 4,000 times. Feels it is a very positive impact.

CHAIR DUERR: Commended Quinn on the accomplishments in six weeks.

QUINN SWEET: Confirmed that social media is going well, and looks forward to the growth. Provided information re: website. 14,000 people per month; 4,000 users per week. Home, lost and found, licensing are most visited. Provides good communication with the public.

MEMBER PAYNE: Commented on great work.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Agrees that the social media platform provides opportunity to engage with community, answer questions.

CHAIR DUERR: Commented on the immediate feedback it provides.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Last slide provided updates for code updates. Strategic plan for next five years is getting ready to be kicked off.

Last item was ADISA organizational assessment which provides a reminder about NHS and WCRAS have an assessment performed every five years on the facilities. Assessment was wrapped up this week, results and the report will be shared at a later date. If not by the April meeting, then the following.

CHAIR DUERR: Inquired if any members of the Board participated and Chair Duerr was interviewed.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Indicated she thought a meeting was set up with Member Dobbs.

CHAIR DUERR: Agreed that it would be important to review.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Discussed that the assessment provides professionals from various backgrounds and they provide assessments to shelters. They will review field services, customer service, medical care, intake process, and provide suggestions to do better. Concluded Director's Report.

CHAIR DUERR: Inquired about annual report.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Indicates there hasn't been time to work on an annual report, but feels like it would be forthcoming. Wants to complete by end of calendar year.

CHAIR DUERR: Suggested a bi-annual report would be a more appropriate time frame. Requested it to be discussed on a future agenda.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed it will be in a future discussion. Confirmed more skill sets are available and feels the report can be modified and produce a sharper product.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked for Board comments.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Discussed that he isn't familiar with the organization that performed the assessment and asked for additional information.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Indicated she would send the entire background and packet. The assessment group is made up of several members who provide a variety of

backgrounds and will share information re: shelter assessment.

CHAIR DUERR: Wanted to know if the group was chosen? Are they on contract? How does it work?

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirms WCRAS can choose which organizational assessment vendor to use and wants to utilize the same vendor with NHS to evaluate both organizations. NHS didn't get paperwork in on time.

Shelter assessments and vendors that provide the service is very uncommon. It is very limited so research was done to find an organization willing to travel during COVID. Wanted an organization geared towards a municipal type shelter and not a non-profit.

Meetings and interviews were conducted with four different organizations. One would not provide an assessment because they only provide to non-profits. Another provided a proposal, but it was felt that expertise and background didn't meet the needs and skill sets that WCRAS was looking for. The third was comparable to ADISA but it wasn't going to work for NHS. Compromised and chose ADISA. This was the first time utilizing this group.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Wanted to know if the assessment was a requirement of the County or the State.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed it was a requirement of the Professional Service Agreement that NHS and Washoe County share. The requirement used to be every three years and in 2015, they asked BOCC to revise to every five years. Through the Professional Service Agreement that was agreed upon in 2002, it was whoever was at the table at that time that came up with the agreement, which has been modified a few times.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked for further comment. Hearing none, commented on a great Director's Report from Director Schull.

Confirmed arrival of Member McMahon, and welcomed her to meeting.

6. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO DANGEROUS DOG CODE [For Possible Action]

CHAIR DUERR: Introduced presentation.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed ADA and AS have been working on this code and provided periodic updates and hopeful of a final draft to present to BOCC to request amendments to Dangerous Dog Code.

Document was familiar but added to changes have happened since last discussed, and will review the same.

The Code definition for dangerous dog to be divided to discuss dangerous dog as well as vicious dog. Current code only recognizes dangerous dog. The chart provided information of current language and on far right was amendment proposals and suggestions.

Added two different categories for dangerous dog and vicious dog amendments. Trying to align more closely with state law and state law has always had it as dangerous and vicious and WCRAS has focused primarily on dangerous.

By breaking out in two different categories allow focus on less egregious violations by animals and moving down to vicious, it's more egregious and there are more requirements for vicious animals in amendment proposals.

If an animal behaves menacingly two times in 18 months without provocation, off the owner's premises or not confined in a cage, pen or a vehicle, they can be declared dangerous. If they severely injure a domestic animal without provocation and off the owner's premises, they can be declared dangerous.

Without provocation on two separate occasions within 18 months and they bite a human, they can be declared dangerous. It's always been that law enforcement can declare a dog dangerous if it's used in the commission of a crime.

CHAIR DUERR: Inquired about if the 18 months is a rolling average. How does it work? Does it start with an incident and go for the next 18 months?

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed, yes.

CHAIR DUERR: Wondered if the first one drops off after the first incident, and 18 months has passed, and then there's a second incident. Wondering if that becomes a first incident.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed, yes. The incident has to occur within 18 months of each other in order to qualify.

Discussed "vicious" and that inflicting on another animal or person would be more egregious, and they would have to kill or inflict substantial bodily harm: 1) upon a human on or off of an owner's premise; 2) kill another animal without provocation (domestic animal) off the owner's premise; 3) if the dog has already been declared dangerous and then the dog continues to exhibit dangerous dog behavior, the dog can then be declared vicious.

There are a number of cases where dogs are already declared dangerous by an Administrative Hearing Officer and the dog continues the behavior by getting loose off property and continues behavior. Currently, nothing set in Code to be able to declare a dog vicious. This will be helpful.

Discussed exceptions of when a dog cannot be declared dangerous or vicious. Currently, a dog cannot be declared dangerous because of a defensive act against a person who is committing, or attempting to commit, a crime. Hopeful to add that a dog cannot be declared vicious or dangerous if a person is committing a crime of wilful trespass upon the premises occupied by the dog's owner. For example, I a dog was defending itself in an attack by an unrestrained dog, and the defending dog was on a leash.

If a dog is actively working as an active agriculture guardian on private property or open range with permission of a livestock owner, a dog cannot be declared dangerous.

Dangerous dog provisions don't apply to animal shelters, commercial animal facilities, rescues, sanctuaries and licensed vet clinics. Currently in code. Changes are to be commercial animal establishment, to include pet stores, kennels, boarding facilities. And then a rescue sanctuary must have a 501(c)(3) and not just be a self-declared rescue. That will clarify which groups are actually excluded.

The signage requirements. If a dog is declared dangerous or vicious, currently all that's required is a sign indicating a dangerous dog lives on property. The proposal is department issued signage, which is already developed, that are bright and

bold, and are recognizable by any law enforcement agency as a dangerous or vicious animal lives on property.

The enclosure requirements. Currently, code requires specific enclosure requirements and isn't clear if a person can utilize the inside of their home. Current language is kennel. Proposal is offering a dwelling as a primary enclosure to be inspected by Animal Services to ensure it is acceptable to prevent animal from escaping and, if applicable, to prevent the entry of young children who might be unsuspecting victims. If the dog is going to be outside unattended, the dog has to be secured inside of an approved enclosure.

Work has been done with field staff who provide inspections and work with owners whose animals have been declared dangerous under current code. Feedback has been provided re: difficulty in getting existing kennel enclosure requirements installed and put on property. Enclosure size has been modified to 10x5 which is standard.

Additional language provided re: addition of dog, making sure there is an appropriate size increase for kennel of 5 foot width, per dog. Language is simplified on enclosure requirement.

CHAIR DUERR: Commented about the size of the enclosure, and the height. Wanted comments from the Board re: sizes.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Recalled previous discussion of kennels of a standard six foot height. Wanted clarification. Is six feet high enough?

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed that six foot height is standard for a dog kennel.

CHAIR DUERR: Wanted to know if height could be added to language.

MEMBER DOBBS: Language currently, "Washoe County Regional Animal Services will inspect for acceptable measures." Commented that it could be left up to specifying, i.e., per situation, dog size, etc.

CHAIR DUERR: Requested more specificity to make it simpler for everyone to know what the expectation is. It will still have to be inspected.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Added that current code indicates it is required to have a top. The height comes into play if it's a large dog into a small kennel. Small kennels

are not standard and wouldn't pass inspection requirements. It has to be attached to concrete footers, or has to have a concrete floor. All the other strengths for enclosures are left in the language, but trying to open up the opportunity for people to comply than having to try to have a contractor come and build the kennel. It's out of the realm for a lot of people .

CHAIR DUERR: Understood.

MEMBER DOBBS: Suggested if she could read actual Code. Draft Code has been submitted to the Board for review. The draft language currently says:

“A roof over the entire enclosure shall be constructed of not less than nine gauge chain link fencing or other material of equal or greater strength as approved by Regional Animal Services. The roof must be securely affixed to all sides of the enclosure. All fencing and gates shall be of suitable height to comfortably house the adult size of the largest breed of dog kept within that enclosure.”

CHAIR DUERR: Inquired if it reads 10x5.

MEMBER DOBBS: Agreed that it does say 10x5.

CHAIR DUERR: Wanted to know if the shelter has to be covered.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed appropriate shelter is required.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked for further comment. None.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Emphasized that staff has encountered the vast majority of dangerous dogs are kept inside. Kennels are a systematic thing that's required to adhere to compliance with Dangerous Dog Code, which is why “dwelling” was added.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Insurance requirements for an animal that's been declared dangerous or vicious.

Currently, it is required for a \$250,000 liability insurance policy per dangerous dog. New proposal is if dangerous dog and vicious dog are separated language, it will \$150,000 for dangerous dogs and \$250,000 for vicious dogs. Didn't want to require more liability insurance for dangerous dogs, but felt as if \$250,000 would

meet the threshold for a vicious animal attack.

Discussed animals being relocated, introduced into Washoe County, and transfer of ownership.

CHAIR DUERR: Inquired if this was the final review for code amendments and then it will be presented to BOCC.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed, yes.

Relocating a dangerous dog within Washoe County. Currently, all it says in Code is they must provide 30 days written notice to Animal Services. New proposal is more information, to include the name and description of the dog, a copy of the termination or order, dog's current address and proposed new address, and new application to register and have the inspection occur at new address. If owners are not able to bring the new address into compliance prior to moving the dog, the animal comes to Animal Services pending compliance.

Introducing a dog that's been declared dangerous or vicious from somewhere else into Washoe County. With current Code, it requires 30 days written notice. New proposal is name and description of the dog, a copy of the order from the other jurisdiction, and dog's current address and proposed new one. Currently, no requirement to come into compliance with our code because two jurisdictions are not likely to have same requirements and the codes aren't going to speak to each other. To require someone to come into compliance with our Dangerous Dog Code would be very difficult to do. Animal Services proposes being notified about the dog, reviewing code with staff, and requirements.

Transferring of a dangerous or vicious dog outside of Washoe County. Currently, 30 day written notice is required. New proposal is name and description of the dog, a copy of the order, and the dog's current address and new proposed one, and verification that the animal has been removed by change of address, new microchip update with information registered to new address, license indicating same. Currently, not a lot of restrictions or guidelines that AS can put on owners.

Transferring ownership of dangerous dog. This is a new section proposing to add. Within state statute, you cannot transfer a vicious dog. This applies only to a dangerous dog. The proposal is that Animal Services has to approve the transfer of the animal. The new owner must register the microchip under their name and they must comply with all of the dangerous dog requirements.

Unlawful acts. Currently, code specifies that if a dog has been declared, it must be leashed and muzzled if the dog is taken outside of the enclosure. New proposal is that a dangerous or vicious dog not be left unattended if it's off the owner's property or outside of the enclosure. Also proposing that if the dog is taken out of the enclosure, it must be restrained by a Martingale collar and that it's attached securely to a lead that's no more than six feet long. And also, notification to Animal Services if the owner knows that the dog was at large, has attacked another animal or person or has perished.

Impoundment of a dangerous or vicious dog. Currently, it is required that a dangerous dog is immediately impounded when it's not validly registered, not secured or maintained on the owner's property, owner doesn't keep the liability insurance. If the dog attacks another animal or person, if it's in violation of anything, it may be impounded pending a dangerous dog hearing or in the interest of public safety. New proposal is if it's pending a hearing and it hasn't been declared dangerous yet, it may be impounded for injury to another animal. It will be impounded for injury to a human.

Post determination. If the dog has already been declared dangerous or vicious, if the dog is loose outside of the approved enclosure, if it's been relocated within Washoe County from outside the jurisdiction and the new address was not verified, or if there was a failure to turn over the dog for impoundment, it is a misdemeanor.

DDA GUSTAFSON: Discussed boarding costs. Added is, "If your dog is impounded pending a dangerous or vicious dog determination and Hearing Officer doesn't find the dog dangerous or vicious, then boarding costs are not required to be paid."

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Introduced new section and advised there isn't any current language that helps address issues with particularly vicious animals that really shouldn't be released back into community. New proposal is that euthanasia is put back on the table for particular cases. If the AHO has declared a dog vicious and Animal Services requests the animal be euthanized, the AHO has the authority to determine if the dog should be euthanized. There is an appeal process if the owner wants to appeal.

If the animal is previously determined vicious and owner has demonstrated intentional reckless behavior or negligence, Animal Services has the authority to confiscate and impound the dog.

DDA GUSTAFSON: Clarified. 1) "If the AHO declares the dog vicious ..." It's only if the dog is declared vicious because the dog has attacked a human. If the dog has killed or inflicted substantial bodily harm upon a human is the only provision of the

vicious code which would trigger a Hearing Officer having the authority to find that the dog can be euthanized.

2) “If the animal is previously determined to be vicious and it attacks a person or another animal ...” If the dog is already vicious and then attacks a person or another animal due to the owner’s demonstrated intentional reckless behavior or negligence, then AS can immediately confiscate and impound the dog, and can go to a court for the determination of whether the dog should be euthanized or not. This is how the code is currently drafted.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Asked if DDA Gustafson wanted to highlight the 55.800 amendments.

DDA GUSTAFSON: Declined. Suggested clean up to reflect the current process of using the AHO. It’s basically minor amendments to bring the code up to speed and up to date with current hearing process and how it works.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Actual draft code language contains mostly clean up.

DDA GUSTAFSON: Felt it would be helpful to pull up actual draft code language. There is one additional section that is not on current chart and should be presented to Advisory Board.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: (Disconnected).

CHAIR DUERR: Asked about bathroom break. (Audio issues).

-o0o-

BRIEF RECESS IN ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

-o0o-

CHAIR DUERR: Reconvened.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Requested DDA Gustafson to continue.

DDA GUSTAFSON: Quarantine of biting animals. This hasn’t been previously presented. AS was wanting to add a section to include the Quarantine of biting animals or animals that have been in close contact with an animal suspected or known to have rabies.

Animal Services wanted to add this section to dangerous dog ordinance. It clarifies that it is actually unlawful for an owner or keeper of any dog, cat or ferret which has bitten a person and which the Rabies Control Authority has ordered to be quarantined to refuse to quarantine the dog.

Currently, the rabies code in Washoe County Code 55 are vague. And to clarify that if you're ordered by the Rabies Control Authority to quarantine you dog, you can't say no, and there would be consequences for someone to fail to quarantine a dog that's bitten someone or one that's been in close contact with an animal suspected or known to have rabies and which the Rabies Control Authority has ordered to be quarantined. That section has been added.

CHAIR DUERR: Appreciated the explanation.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Concluded the overview of dangerous dog proposals. It is hopeful that the next time it will be in adopted form. Will share a time line after BOCC is presented. Next step is to get the language adopted.

MEMBER PAYNE: Inquired about presentation of BOCC and support from Advisory Board.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Agreed it wouldn't hurt to have the support of the Advisory Board.

MEMBER PAYNE: Asked about the date for BOCC.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Will confirm when date is available. Feels that March will be earliest. Still work to be done.

CHAIR DUERR: Probably late March or early April.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed, yes.

CHAIR DUERR: Inquired to the Board re: any final comments, issues.

MEMBER PAYNE: Appreciates the changes. Feel as if it makes so much sense. Appreciates the hard work.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Commented on great teamwork. Suggested that a statement with the presentation could be presented to BOCC that says AB is in agreement

and be included.

CHAIR DUERR: Agreed with Member Anderson's comment.

MEMBER PAYNE: Agreed.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Complimented all the work. Makes a motion to include the letter proposed by Member Anderson.

CHAIR DUERR: Confirmed moving to approve changes to ordinance and include an introductory letter of support from the Board with compliments to the staff.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Seconded motion.

CHAIR DUERR: Motion carries.

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: Asked for comment on item.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Wanted information about assessment and feels that will guide the conversation over the next several meetings.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Is hopeful that a report will be ready by end of this fiscal year, no later, to be presented to BOCC because it is a requirement. COVID delayed a year.

MEMBER PAYNE: Commented on her position of sitting on the County Manager's Advisory Board. Discussed hoarding cases and the need for mental fortitude, as well as the team skill set, in dealing with hoarding cases, and she shared this information. The information was well received and commented that the County Manager's Advisory Board had no idea of what WCRAS does. Wanted to be able to provide future updates.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Advised she was asked to provide a presentation of Department Head meeting as a result of feed back to County Manager. It raises the level of awareness.

MEMBER PAYNE: Her presentation included the stressful nature of WCRAS staff.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Added to Member Payne's comments and thanked Director Schull in getting her group involved in the Nevada Peer Support Network. Appreciated all the hard work.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Enjoyed the opportunity. Looks forward to continued services for the staff. Reached out for potential support and training for staff. Offered to kennel staff and field staff and dispatchers. Wants to provide the resources and support necessary to help staff cope, have ability to local resources.

CHAIR DUERR: Thanked Member Anderson for the information.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Northern Nevada Peer Support Network, a non-profit organization started in Reno by a group of first responders for stressful times. It has now grown to include EMS, REMSA, nurses and military. Professional counselors are involved. No cost to the agencies to utilize the services.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked for any additional comment or topics for future agendas. Chair Duerr suggested a plan for annual or bi-annual report.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Commented on the summer flyers. What is planned? (Inaudible). Wants to be more prepared. What supplies, equipment, training is needed?

CHAIR DUERR: Indicated that would be a great topic in the quarterly report, or a separate item, to discuss fire season.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Commented on ways to help with public awareness to help shelters and not wait until the disaster happens. Social media is a great avenue.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Commented this will be the first time that Animal Services has the link to social media to actually share with the community the needs, where is the emergency shelter, when is it standing down, what are the needs? (Headset is cutting out).

MEMBER DOBBS: Discussed the need in the community. Seeing a dramatic rise in puppies regionally, as well as west coast. COVID's impacts on spay/neuter services and vaccines clinics is reversing a lot of the animal welfare movement forward progression made. Her marketing team will be working to put together a good

community resource list. WCRAS will also be included. It is critical to get the word out and talking about adoption and rescue. There is a tremendous growth in backyard breeders and illegitimate breeders. Discussion with the community is imperative. Suggested a presentation to the Advisory Board.

Also suggested a further topic of cat declawing on the agenda. Last legislative session discussed a state law trying to get passed prohibiting the horrifically tortuous practice of cat declawing (toe amputation). It failed the Committee because the Committee Members decided that they didn't know enough. Two years to educate the community on the importance of the statewide ban against declawing.

MEMBER PAYNE: Indicated that rotary groups are always looking for presenters and need to have a 15 minute presentation. Member Payne will assist to make the presentation happen.

CHAIR DUERR: Commented on the flow through impact with social media and how helpful it is.

MEMBER PAYNE: Agreed that the Advisory Board has a role to play in all of it on social media. It is a critical role.

CHAIR DUERR: Closed out Item #7.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT [Non-Action Item]

No public comment.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Reminder of next meeting on April 22, 2022, at 9:30 a.m.

CHAIR DUERR: Confirmed.

MEMBER McMAHON: Discussed her call to dispatch and the on-hold message still says, "Animal Control" instead of "Animal Services." Also working on campus with staff re: support for the college and thanked the team for their assistance.

9. ADJOURNMENT [Non-Action Item]

CHAIR DUERR: Concluded the meeting and confirmed it is adjourned. Wished all a great weekend.