

CLARK COUNTY ANIMAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Clark County Government Center
500 South Grand Central Parkway, ETD Room 3
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
December 16, 2002
6:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: HENDERSON, DAVID
HOFF, KARIN
MARCH, DEBRA
NOSEK, BARBARA
RIVKIN, SAMUEL

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 December 2, 2002 Minutes

A motion to approve the Minutes was made and seconded.

4. Regional Animal Shelter/Campus Options

There was extensive discussion with public comments at the last meeting so KARIN HOFF asked JOE BOTEILHO to review the process after which discussion among committee would take place followed by a recommendation. In 1998, the County began looking at various options and several brought forth proposals. NACA reviewed Clark County Animal Control and made recommendations regarding sheltering. This Committee has been very involved over the years, looking at various options, UNLV completed a study as to public access, service location and where services should be located and how to best provide services to the public. Public input was sought and received and in November 2001, the final input for options was presented and a recommendation was made to the Board of County Commissioners. This Committee recommended a regional shelter facility/campus at a central location with satellite adoptions as being the best option for the public. The Board of County Commissioners directed us to look at all options. We looked and received further direction and the Board of County Commissioners reaffirmed a regional shelter at a central location was their desired format. We finalized various options and the Board of County Commissioners made a request for one last call for ideas. At the last meeting, public input was again received, and animal

sheltering options for Clark County have been examined.

As to the continuation of Dewey as a contractor, they would not be regional nor present an opportunity to partner with other entities. North Las Vegas will not participate with any continuation involving Dewey. Humane groups would continue to participate and the public is familiar with Dewey but Dewey is away from Animal Control's high service areas.

With a regional shelter, North Las Vegas and the City of Las Vegas would partner as well as humane groups. The public is familiar with the site and is located in Animal Control's high service areas.

The third option presented by Dr. Stoecklin would have no City of Las Vegas participation and perhaps none from North Las Vegas. Humane groups would work with him. Initially, the public would be unfamiliar with the area but it is more accessible to high service areas.

The fourth option, a government owned facility, would not be regional nor a partnering with other entities. The public would be unfamiliar with the area but it would be more accessible to high service areas. (See attachment for full details)

DEBRA MARCH asked if the Cities acknowledge that these statements are true. ROGER VAN OORDT replied there have been regional meetings at political levels and they will share the costs.

SAM RIVKIN noted that the main factor was that it be a regional shelter and the cost of the project. SAM stated that the Animal Foundation offered the best deal. DEBRA MARCH noted that the Committee has looked at a regional shelter option and visited all the facilities. The Committee has looked at research done by Public Administration Department at UNLV and their direction for an optimum facility is a regional facility that allows us to partner with other entities. When the Committee looked at the facilities, they saw how important it was that the facility be accessible to citizens. We need a facility to be centrally based and which will allow us to cooperate with others. Optimally, a government owned facility would be best but we need to look at a regional facility as recommended by Animal Foundation (AFI). DEBRA asked how AFI would pay for construction of that facility. JOE BOTEILHO stated that if they have a \$1 million annual contract cost they can pay the debt service for the expansion and after that time reduce the cost to the county to just the operating costs.

BARBARA NOSEK had a slight concern about a regional facility and the direction the tide is going. She took a closer look at the numbers and 40 percent of the people will travel 21 miles, which means that 60 percent will not. KARIN mentioned all the talent in the room that people have worked so closely with animals for so many years and heard time and again this is not convenient. We should pay attention or maybe rethink what we mean by a regional shelter in terms of what takes place at a central campus and who the entities are. She was not thinking in terms of giving a contract but rather a balance of entities operating facility. She is cognizant of how the satellite aspect works and it would create convenience. However, relying on pet stores

is not a strong satellite program. If she had known the city was not interested in leaving, she would have looked at others. AFI, Diane and Jane are hard workers, and there is a lot to commend, but she cannot overlook a consistent pattern of irresponsibility with the animals and with the finances. As a Committee we are not only charged with care of the animals but also the county's coffers. Despite Mark Fierro's connection, AFI does not have a tremendous track record when it comes to fund raising. Goals have been missed along the way. They went back to the city to ask for additional monies. She cannot vote in good conscience for AFI.

DAVID HENDERSON said the Committee worked on it for more than 2 years and it was understood that a regional shelter included all 3 entities participating at a centrally located site in the busiest call areas. In a perfect world, publicly owned and operated would be first choice. He has never thought an animal shelter should be private. Reality is the financial cost of building and operating a shelter is impossible. We are charged with looking at where animals will get the best care. Thinks AFI will give them the best chance. He does have concerns about the past but believes things have changed for the better and makes a recommendation that the County go with the AFI proposal.

KARIN HOFF echoes some of Barbara's concerns. There is also a lot of goodwill and expertise and some unresolved issues. Fourteen questions have gone back and forth between Animal Control and Dr. Freer. The issues of access for rescue groups and Animal Control as well as fiscal performance of whoever the contractor might be. A performance bond and measures for services offered by any contractor should be included in the contract with stipulations as to why the contract might be increased. Guarantees from any of the options remain unresolved and are all contract issues, which would have to be developed with any contractor that the Board of County Commissioners might choose. We are looking at constrained options and following the direction from the Board of County Commissioners and this was a very strong direction – they wanted to work with the cities as partners. Public would be the best but there is no money. The County is over obligated because of debt from the Regional Justice Center and UMC and legislative session with tax packages that will be proposed. Since there is no money, they must partner. With that in mind, we must recommend a regional shelter but append recommendation of DR. HENDERSON that contract issues come back to this body for public discussions so that everything gets a full discussion. She asks that contract development be done with advice of the public and Animal Advisory Committee. Regional animal shelter is our only choice.

BARBARA likes Karin's rider. SAM RIVKIN moves for a vote on AFI with contractor rider. Motion made and seconded with BARBARA NOSEK opposed to the recommendation.

5. **Information-sharing by Committee Members**

Effective January 2, our 4th annual sterilization campaign began. Vouchers will be at all Clark County community centers, including Logandale, Moapa Valley, and the Laughlin Town Center representing \$25,000 worth of free sterilization vouchers to the public.

6. Comments by the General Public

DR. GLASSMAN congratulates the Committee for the time and effort spent on this item. Regarding the formulating of a rider, she thinks people would be more comfortable if the Animal Advisory Committee continues to have a role in evaluating how well the contractor performs and would like to see that included. She has some concerns and if the Committee has an active role in oversight, it may alleviate concerns.

TARA THOMPSON hopes someone stays involved so that we do not end up paying and paying for mismanagement. Motives of Commission are suspect. We have to look at dollars but behind every dollar is a life behind it.

MADELINE DAYTON asked a couple questions about why some are not allowed in the building at Lied. She rescued roughly 100 cats and a couple of dogs, has participated in Heaven Can Wait Spay And Neuter Clinic for 11 months until she publicly disagreed with management of Lied. Since then she is not allowed on the property. She is not impressed the Committee has given a contract to an organization that has thrown her and many other members of the rescue community out their door for disagreeing. How powerful is Janie Greenspun. How deep are the pockets? What good is it to the animals she rescues if she is not allowed on site? .

KARIN responded that the matter can be worked out in contract negotiations.

7. Set date, time and agenda of next meeting

Staff will advise the committee members of the next meeting date.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.