

CLARK COUNTY ANIMAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES

Clark County Government Center
500 South Grand Central Parkway, Pueblo Room
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
September 24, 2001
6:30 p.m.

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

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m.

2. Approval of agenda

A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded.

3. Approval of September 10, 2001 Minutes

Motion to approve the Minutes was made and seconded. Page 3 clarification
Asterilization@ refers to cats and not people.

4. Discussion of animal sheltering

BARBARA NOSEK advised that this phase of the Committee's recommendation to the Commission does not focus on ownership or who operates the shelter. It deals with where a shelter should be located. Another aspect is field operations. Ownership at this point is not really relevant. The Commission is looking for location options.

Debra March was unable to attend this meeting but wants placed on record that she will review the tapes of this meeting before making a decision.

E-mail from Peggy Smith(attached) was read by BARBARA NOSEK.

KEN RUIZ, secretary Las Vegas Humane Society, submitted a proposal (attached) based on what is best for the animals. UNLV study shows that every county they contacted has a public shelter. Makes them wonder if the other counties know something they don't. He believes one shelter on the East and one on the West may be the best. New Hampshire had a program at a cost of \$.15 per person per year to provide sterilization for animals. TTVAR, Trap Test Vaccinate Alter and Return to Caretaker, is probably the most cost effective program they run and they are the only ones who run it.

DR. JOSEPH FREER, Dewey Animal Care Shelter, presented a proposal with the Dewey Center remaining the main shelter, reinstatement of pet licensing to pay for leasing of a satellite shelter in North East (NE) area of the community. Dewey would be the licensing agent for the rabies control authority and the price would be \$10 for altered animals and \$25 for non-altered with a process for senior citizens. In addition to establishing a shelter in the NE area, with an approval of two 5 year extensions, Dewey would renovate the existing kennels and build a brand new enclosed system. It would take about 20 percent compliance to pay for running of a satellite shelter in the NE area. At 50 percent compliance, the County would generate enough revenue to run a satellite shelter (lease) and receive a return of an additional \$833,000 which Dr. Freer would like to see given to various animal organizations in the community for spay/neuter education. No additional costs for sheltering at Dewey would be incurred by the County.

Dewey would continue to provide an internet access site showing the animals. The satellite shelter would keep the animals closer to the people who lose them and provide two adoption agencies on two separate sides of town. He believes the community is ready for multiple shelters. This would provide additional time for animals to be adopted. After a certain amount of time at the satellite shelter, the animal would be moved to Dewey in order to work with animal outreach organizations and to adopt animals out. He wants to shoot for no adoptable animals being put to sleep. Clark County would see an increase in reimbursements for animal sheltering, adoptions and return to owners by additional exposure. Spay and neuter prior to adoption are a very important aspect. Existing kennels at Dewey would be taken down and new kennels done completely. Someone else owns the land that Dewey is on and it would work out for them financially to put up the new facility.

SAM RIVKIN does not believe in licensing, as the costs to carry out the program exceeds the rate of return.

ANN HERRINGTON, Media Partners for Pets, has worked with Dewey for several years getting out animals for adoption. She has seen many animals saved because groups are working with Dewey. She believes it is a great option for the County to have the opportunity to have a brand new shelter built at no cost to tax payers. Licensing is the way to go.

James Lusk's letter, as an individual, not as a representative of Dewey, was read into the record and is attached.

BARBARA NOSEK announced this would be the last time for public comment on this item. At the next meeting, no comment will be taken from public on this as the Committee will deliberate and decisions on this item will be the focus.

DR. MYRA GLASSMAN supports the proposal put forth by the Humane Society. A negative financial incentive for each animal that is euthanized should be in place so that the shelter operator loses money for each animal euthanized. It must hit the pocket. She is opposed to reinstating licensing. Low compliance may be due to high transiency in the valley. People don't even comply with registering their vehicles.

JUDITH RUIZ believes we have to stop the influx of animals into the shelters and the only way to do that is by strong spay and neuter programs. Taking an animal out of the shelter is wonderful but is not the same as getting them spayed or neutered so less animals go into the shelter. If we have more people, we will have more animals. As far as tax payers money not being used, no matter how you look at it, it is tax payers money.

BRENDA GOVER is for licensing as it helps animals in many aspects but believes there must be an incentive for compliance. The rescues groups have worked very hard to get animals out to adopt-a-thons and she is all for a brand new state of the art facility.

CHRISTINA ROTTER agrees with the comprehensive approach. It is not just a matter of getting animals in and out of the shelter. She likes the comments about having fines for euthanasia. She presented a handout (attached) on which she listed two options She favors option B.

5. Information-sharing by Committee Members

DR. HENDERSON pointed out about 12 percent of the animals in the shelter are lost pets so Jim Lusk's written statements about most of them being from loving homes is not substantiated.

6. Comments by the General Public

None

7. Set date, time and agenda of next meeting

Staff will give an overview at this meeting which is just for deliberations of shelter options. The next meeting was scheduled for Monday, October 15, 2001 at 6:30 p.m.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:34 p.m.