

Washoe County Regional Animal Services Advisory Board

**DRAFT OF MINUTES-VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING**

Friday, April 21, 2023 @ 1:30 p.m.  
WASHOE COUNTY REGIONAL ANIMAL SERVICES  
CENTER CLASSROOM  
2825 LONGLEY LANE, #A, RENO, NV  
~VIA ZOOM TELECONFERENCE~

**MEMBERS**

Naomi Duerr (Chair)  
Irene Payne (Vice Chair)  
Paul Anderson  
Jill Dobbs  
Trudy Brussard  
Julie McMahon  
Mariluz Garcia

**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, Paul Anderson, Mariluz Garcia, Jill Dobbs, Trudy Brussard, Julie McMahon

Also present Mandy Cirone, Tom Schley, Director Shyanne Schull and Tammy

**CHAIR DUERR:** Discussed NHS presentation re: facility assessment. Presentation is not able to take place today. Also instructed attendees to raise their hand re: comments since all are present via Zoom.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT [Non-Action Item]**

Tom Schley advised of a written letter received from Kelly Boland and it will be shared on website.

VICE CHAIR PAYNE: Suggested Ms. Boland's letter be read on the record.

CHAIR DUERR: Agreed that it could be read on the record. Introduced Kelly Boland to read letter.

MS. BOLAND: Reading letter into the record. She is a certified animal behavioral consultant with a Master's Degree in animal behavior and specializes in shelter animal behavioral care for 23 years. Worked with NHS staff for the K9 evaluation team. Also presented seminars on animal behavior. Greg Hall at NHS caused problems and ended her work with NHS.

MS. PERRY: Discussed being pleased with the work going forward on the variance permit. Commented on the original Interlocal Agreement and the two references of Animal Control to pass ordinance specific to area. Suggested parcel size and make the limit higher for animals in the unincorporated areas, however, there are a lot of subdivisions being built. Wondered if language could be considered that Animal Control could consider urban versus rural in its ordinances. Language in 3.2(e) references earlier subsections actually covers everything in 249.

CHAIR DUERR: Thanked Ms. Perry for her comment. Introduced Brittan Griffith.

MS. GRIFFITH: Advised of people who want to share NHS experiences and concerns for NHS. Not prepared today, but will provide additional information in the future.

CHAIR DUERR: Thanked Ms. Griffith. Indicated a special meeting may take place re: NHS. Also discussed continued technical issues. Introduced Rebecca Goff as next speaker.

MS. GOFF: Introduced herself as the new Nevada State Director for the Humane Society of the United States. Wants to attend meetings moving forward. Represents the entire state, but based in Reno.

MAYOR SCHIEVE: Expressed her disappointment that NHS presentation has been canceled. Also wanted to know how long it had been agendized.

CHAIR DUERR: Confirmed the presentation had been scheduled about 2-1/2 months.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed it had been agendized for approximately three weeks. Discussions have been ongoing for several months. The invitation for the presentation was sent to Mr. Hall on 01/27/23 asking him to be present to do the presentation. Does not have details as to the cancellation.

CHAIR DUERR: Confirmed it was canceled, but hopeful to reschedule in the future.

MAYOR SCHIEVE: Confirmed she spoke to NHS Chair, Chris Wells, and there was no indication that presentation was canceled. Has concerns and questions. Wants a request sent immediately to meet formally with their Board. Very disappointed.

CHAIR DUERR: Since the appearance was canceled, and not agenda item, she is considering a special meeting for agenda items.

MR. SCHLEY: Indicated no additional public comment.

**3. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 27, 2023, MINUTES [For possible action]**

VICE CHAIR PAYNE: Made a motion to approve the minutes.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Seconded the motion.

CHAIR DUERR: Motion passes unanimously.

**4. INFORMATIONAL UPDATE ON NEVADA HUMANE SOCIETY'S ("NHS") FACILITY ASSESSMENT [Non-action item]**

CHAIR DUERR: Confirmed request of assessment and hard copy. Presentation won't take place. Director Schull previously provided summary of audit.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Offered recap of previous assessment discussions. NHS and WCRAS are required through Professional Service Agreement to have professional organizational assessments completed every five years. The agencies worked together in 2020. The goal was to secure the same vendor. NHS deadlines were not met so assessment groups ended up being two separate groups. ADISA provided WCRAS assessment. NHS secured their own vendor.

WCRAS provided to the Advisory Board their assessment and progress at last meeting. It will take a few years to accomplish. Advisory Board requested updates from NHS to provide updates.

CHAIR DUERR: Recalled the 40-page document provided. Recommended that WCRAS and NHS post the audits on the websites to be available to the public.

VICE CHAIR PAYNE: Expressed her disappointment on NHS cancellation of presentation. Received numerous emails from concerned citizens re: NHS and causes great concern about the animals in their care. Requested a special meeting to discuss the emails.

MS. DOBBS: Echoed Vice Chair Payne and Mayor Schieve's disappointments. Also received over 20 complaints and emails within the last week. Mr. Hall of NHS was asked to present the assessment. NHS is prohibiting WCRAS from doing the necessary work. Requested special meeting to discuss NHS.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Echoes previous comments.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Echoes previous comments and requested special meeting to address issues.

MEMBER McMAHON: Also echoes comments. Advised that she is the instructor for the veterinary nursing program and partners with Washoe County. Discussed the improper transfer of animals. Hopes for quick resolution.

CHAIR DUERR: Also expressed her concern. Has also received letters. Recommends emails to Director Schull re: same and made available on website.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirms an Advisory Board email has been created specific for the community to convey information to the Advisory Board. It will be a general email box that will be forwarded to Advisory Board.

CHAIR DUERR: Requested email information.

MR. SCHLEY: [animaladvisoryboard@washoecounty.gov](mailto:animaladvisoryboard@washoecounty.gov).

MS. GUSTAFSON: Mentioned it's indicated on the first page of agenda. Requested clarification as to email address.

MR. SCHLEY: Corrected it to [advisoryboard@washoecounty.gov](mailto:advisoryboard@washoecounty.gov).

CHAIR DUERR: Confirmed it is [advisoryboard@washoecounty.gov](mailto:advisoryboard@washoecounty.gov).  
Is suggesting a special meeting be scheduled and will discuss under future agenda items.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Addresses letters that have been received. Wants to confirm that letters are available for everyone to view.

CHAIR DUERR: Discussed that only some members and NHS members were copied, but not universal.

MS. GUSTAFSON: Commented that the sender of the email has the control who it goes to. Any email that is meant to be official business, she recommends from public comment that it go to the Advisory Board email.

CHAIR DUERR: Requested that any Board Member who has received a letter that is pursuant to discussion on future agenda item, that it be submitted to staff at the Advisory Board so it get distributed/posted accordingly.

Also discussed anything received from any elected official that it should be provided re: any topic of discussion.

MEMBER DOBBS: Confirmed letters are generally posted on the website.

CHAIR DUERR: Suggested after meeting discussion on what is appropriately appended.

VICE CHAIR PAYNE: Clarified that special meeting will be scheduled re: NHS facility agreement. Recommended that the meeting is also to address community concerns re: NHS.

CHAIR DUERR: Will get meeting agendized.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Requested clarification of Article 13 of the PSA.

CHAIR DUERR: Confirmed it will be properly noticed via email and mail re: special meeting. Meeting will be scheduled and addressed in agenda items.

Confirmed there was no additional public comment.

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

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Opened presentation with quarterly updates and highlight challenges accordingly.

Quarter 3 of this fiscal year. Animal intake is down since 2019 by 4%. Increase in animal welfare impounds of 41%. Increase in impounded quarantine animals. More bite cases. Microchipped animals that came in is 35%. NHS takes majority of animals once they've gone through stray hold period. Rescues up about 22%. Many stats are starting to skew of animals being redeemed versus not back to owners. A lot of animals are being brought in as strays but are owned when brought in. 32% returned to owners. 54% transferred to rescue. 10% deceased.

Thanked the rescue partners who step in and help. Top four rescue groups are NHS, SPCA, Res-que and Pet Network.

Lost animals reunited by microchip. Out of 625, 70% were reunited, which is the highest quarter of five years.

Field Services. Service calls are down by 19%. Bite calls are up 38% since 2019. It becomes a public safety and rabies concern. Will continue to track and monitor. Complexity of types of calls and investigations are changing. Seeing a lot more of types of calls of people who are overwhelmed and in over their heads with the number of animals in their care. Specialized skill sets with the officers to handle these issues.

Welfare calls are decreasing in terms of welfare numbers. 62% of decrease of unfounded calls are declining meaning the violation was unfounded.

Continuing work on reorganizing department. Dispatch supervisor has been added to staff who provides oversight, training and focus on working smarter and not harder. Attributes improvements to that personnel.

Discussed capacity challenges and issues of a stray hold shelter. Don't have the ability move the animals out for adoption or control the number coming in. Some things need to change in preparation for busy season. Capacity was reached in March and community was notified and asked to take action to help to alleviate pressure of overcrowding.

Discussed in the past that WCRAS has accepted owned, surrendered, relinquished animals on case-by-case basis. NHS is supposed to handle this. There have been a lot of issues with NHS stepping up. Current state of capacity won't allow WCRAS to accept surrenders unless detrimental. WCRAS will suggest community partners to accept owned animals.

Dangerous dogs in care sit between 1 to 4 months depending on the process. There are exceptions to come into compliance with code. No longer will be providing extensions. 30 day time limit is now in place.

Home quarantines have not been approved for animals who have bitten while off property. Changing protocol. If an animal is vaccinated for rabies and the home can be verified as secure, home quarantines will be allowed instead of at the shelter, for 10 days.

Most shelters don't have the ability, capacity or resources to provide safe holds. WCRAS provides safe holds for someone experiencing an emergency. Will hold for five days. No exceptions.

48-hour rescue transfers. This is to create a reasonable amount of time that an animal will be held for a rescue after they've gone through the stray hold. It pertains to NHS and all other rescue groups.

Owned animals. Owners are aware that their animal has come into care of WCRAS at \$9 a day. No longer holding after 5-day stray hold. They will become available for adoption. No longer grace periods.

Doubling up small dogs to provide more kennel space to accommodate more animals. This will be a regular process moving forward.

CHAIR DUERR: Asking how much longer for presentation.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Indicated there were approximately 10 more slides with information.

CHAIR DUERR: Wanted to open up for questions for changes presented to date.

Discussed a stray hold procedure of the five days. Wanted to know about the 48-hour hold on top of that.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Indicated that once the 5-day hold expires, NHS has the first right of refusal to transfer the animals, and that 48 hour applies to them.

CHAIR DUERR: Requested clarification on how the process works.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Once the animal becomes available off of stray hold, NHS receives a list that day of all available animals. Evaluators come to WCRAS and take the animals to conduct assessment. If favorable, dogs are transferred to NHS. Cats automatically transfer over past the stray hold. No behavioral assessment on cats. Needs to be a Plan B if 48 hours has expired that other adoption agencies are available for live outcomes.

CHAIR DUERR: Confirmed that NHS will either take them within the 48 hours or decline to take them.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Yes, that is correct.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked about day 7, which is 48 hours after 5-day hold ,then the dog wouldn't go to NHS, but any shelter/rescue?

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Historically, this challenge hasn't had to be discussed. The animals are staying longer beyond stray hold and haven't been evaluated by NHS, but haven't been declined either, is not acceptable.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked if anyone else had questions on new changes.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed that on home quarantine means they can't be around other animals, outside family members and can't leave the premise unless for a vet visit.

CHAIR DUERR: Discussed the challenge of no kennel space nor people to attend to the animals.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed current resources are being worked with while keeping a buffer to accommodate high volume animal cases for animals who may come in outside of the normal animal average count for the day.

MEMBER DOBBS: Inquired about doubling up for small animals.



DIRECTOR SCHULL: Doubling up on smalls of like genders or smalls that came from the same home just as a general practice to create more cage space.

MEMBER DOBBS: Agreed that animal welfare continues to be a challenge. Agrees that the 48-hour hold will help increase the flow in the community.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked about the welfare calls. Commented on 30% decrease from 2019.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Agrees that proper screening from the original call will reduce the details of the welfare case.

Discussed on how to involve the community with capacity challenges. 80% capacity seems to be what will trigger the call to action. Encouraging use of microchip scanning stations at Pet Stations throughout the community. Also waiting for additional marketing materials re: same.

Broadening education and resources about cats and what to do if a cat is found. Wants to help community understand cats. WCRAS will respond to cat calls if it is sick, injured or bitten someone. Cats don't always need to be in a shelter environment. What flags are raised if 80% capacity is raised?

CHAIR DUERR: Wanted clarification that it will be made clear in the agreement with NHS and the what new protocol would be.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Will be providing amendment language about the 80% benchmark that is something that is determined is critical zone.

CHAIR DUERR: Thinks of NHS relationship as continuum of care.

MEMBER GARCIA: Brings up capacity issues when she is able. Appreciates her leadership. Her district is Sun Valley. Wondered if it was considered if other partners would be available to provide microchip stations.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Indicated that Quinn Sweet will be focusing on heat maps and resources of microchips and licensing messaging, as well as microchip scanning station. Has a request from Options Vet Clinic to add to microchip scanning station. Also looking at a downtown location. Will address where gaps are missing for scanning stations.

CHAIR DUERR: Complimented on the program.

MEMBER McMAHON: Commented that local animal hospitals will also scan for chip and assist with communication.

CHAIR DUERR: Inquired if messaging should involve Quinn? Or form an affirmative partnership.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Agreed that it was a great message to include in chip scanning services. Currently working on staff visit with veterinary offices to discuss various programs available and could include scanning information.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Wanted to know if fire stations had scanners.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Advised there is currently not a partnership with the fire departments. The Pet Station partnership came about from SPCA and Pet Stations are pet friendly and less intimidating for the community and simplicity purposes.

CHAIR DUERR: Liked the idea of the fire stations. Agrees it is a partnership worth thinking about.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Added that each of the scanning stations require maintenance. Agrees there could be a benefit of growing the program.

CHAIR DUERR: Would be good to know if there was a recording where the chip resulted in the return of an animal so it could track that data.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Tracking data isn't available at this time. Information is provided by Pet Station staff.

Discussed Animal Care & Control Appreciation Week. Celebrated the kennel and field staff for their dedication. Community is also invited. Occurs every April.

CHAIR DUERR: Commented on such a great staff and job well done.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Updated on presentation by Best Friends for a summit held at the Animal Foundation in Las Vegas. Presented outreach programs. Washoe County has over 40% reunification rate. Provided presentation on reunification program, microchip program, etc. Also asked to be a mentor shelter to a struggling shelter who can learn from our successful programs. Will keep everyone posted on progress.

Introduced Quinn Sweet to discuss outreach updates from last quarter.

MS. SWEET: Free collar/tag program: 72 new collars and 26 ID tags. Conducted five different events this quarter. CARES program supported 117 pets. Pet food distribution program served 275 unique seniors and 513 unique pets. At vaccination clinics provided 358 vaccinations. Slowest quarter but increase will happen moving forward.

CHAIR DUERR: Confirmed the outreach presentation is posted on the website.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Agreed.

MS. SWEET: Comparing quarter 3 from FY 2022 to quarter 3 FY 2023. Collar and tag program isn't old enough to compare to last year's data. CARES support last year was 70, this year 117.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked for clarification on what CARES support program is.

MS. SWEET: Discussed CARES program which is Community Animal Resources and Educational Services program. One main component is coordination of payment for vet services for qualifying referred individuals with pets. Most who receive support with CARES experience homelessness, low income, home bound seniors, local Veterans. Also provide pet food and supplies, vaccinations, presentations to organizations.

Senior pet food program. Last year was 159, and this year is 275 seniors. Vaccine clinic attendance decreased, maybe due to weather. \$10 deposit is required. Vaccination day is moved from first Tuesday to first Wednesday of the month.

Events conducted. Three vaccination clinics were held that served 197 pets. Three pet food distribution events that served 64% of home bound seniors. Did a presentation at elementary school students as part of career day. More presentations are scheduled throughout the year.

Social media account information. 587 new followers. Posted 115 times. Reached over 100,000 individuals. More than 25,000 have visited Facebook page. More than 14,000 interacted with posts.

Provided overview for next quarter. Scheduled another disaster prep presentation. Expecting to host 10 events in the coming quarter; 3 pet food distributions; 3 vaccine

clinics; 1 livestock chip clinic; 1 clinic in community in Sun Valley; 2 disaster prep presentations.

Shared that the CARES program was selected for the 2022 Washoe Impact Award for quality public service.

In 2022, 491 unique animals were provided for. \$150 per pet was average cost of care. The CARES program assists local low income resident facing eviction as her cat wasn't neutered. It was taken care of through CARES. Local senior with no income recovering from a broken back, her pet had significant wounds from being attacked from another dog. CARES fund assisted pet with treatment.

Discussed success story of Rowdy following a dog attack. CARES program assisted with Rowdy's care and treatment.

CHAIR DUERR: Remarkable presentation.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Future topics will be the off leash calls and code amendment updates.

CHAIR DUERR: Thanked them for a great presentation. Suggested larger data and less picture on screens.

**6. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO WASHOE COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 55 (ANIMALS AND FOUL) RELATED TO VARIANCE PERMITS TO KEEP MORE THAN THREE DOGS AND/OR SEVEN CATS IN CONGESTED AREAS OF COUNTY**  
[For possible action]

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Discussed the proposed amendments to allow the community to apply for to own more than the legal limit of animals. The variance permit code is in process. Currently, there are approximately 120 variance permits in Washoe County, and most are for dogs, not cats. They are very burdensome on the department to facilitate from start to finish.

Some of the changes being suggested will streamline the process. A lot of applicants don't take the process seriously. Additional staff has been hired. Language will try to refine the process.

The first suggestion is to outline the process for renewals and what are deadlines for applicant to have inspection completed. Proposing that inspection has to be completed 7 to 30 days prior to deadline. Cancellation/reschedule has to be made by applicant before 24 hours before appointment. Exception will be a 30-day grace period, if necessary.

Variance permit definition or what triggers variance permit need. If someone wants to have more than 3 dogs or 7 cats, required to apply for variance permit if lives in congested area of Washoe County.

The goal is to change the number of legal limit from 3 to 5. The ADISA assessment originally suggested 6 dogs. It would cut down the number of permits required by one-third, so the workload would decrease, as well as requirement for a permit.

The application criteria requires number and breed of dogs/cats to be listed, drawings and layout of property, emergency preparedness, application fee. Wants to add the purpose of keeping more than 5 dogs or 7 cats. Also to add contact information for property manager, landlord or HOA, if applicable.

New section 55.400. Nothing current re: perimeter of time for scheduling and attendance of inspections. Wants to make sure applicants have 30 days to get inspection scheduled from receipt of application and to be completed within 45 days of receipt of application.

Failure of applicant to be present at time/date scheduled will result in denial of permit. Happens very frequently that the owner fails to show up.

55.410(1) to (5) for containment. Want to standardize the containment requirements. Current code is antiquated and complex. It will now require specific size for kennels for size of dogs, concrete floor or footers, walls securely attached, ACO has discretion that the top is enclosed if dog is a fence jumper.

The goal is to simplify and streamline requirements. A yard can be used as an enclosure as long as it is no less than 50 sq. ft. per dog, a perimeter fence is secure and appropriate height for the largest breed of dog. Inside of residence may also be utilized for vast majority. Securing the enclosure with specifications of 5x10 by 5' in height for one dog, to be increased by 50 sq. ft. for each additional dog.

Other requirements that would like to change would be is removing concrete flooring and footing and affixing requirements. Feels it is overkill for a variance permit dog. Specifying that shelter as defined in 55.010 shall be provided in quantity and size to accommodate each dog in enclosure.

Section 55.415, containment for cats. Currently, it must be a structurally sound enclosure, promotes ambient temperature, provide a sheltered area. For 8 cats, additional 100 cubic feet for each additional cat, provided water, food, resting perches and litter. Residence can be used to house the cat. The goal is to simplify and create a standardized sizing for cats. Proposing 50 sq. ft. per cat. Better definition of shelter and that cats have access to wholesome air.

CHAIR DUERR: Suggested to take comments thus far. Asked for comments from anyone.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed there are approximately 120 variance permits pending. About one-third variance permits will be eliminated if number is increased to five.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked for comments on new number proposals.

MEMBER McMAHON: Wanted to clarify “personal pets per parcel size” as mentioned earlier in public comment.

CHAIR DUERR: Thinks that is separate. This is just total per property regardless of size.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Thinks it does tie together.

MS. GUSTAFSON: Indicated parcel size has been thought about. The issue is putting limits based on that becomes a land use and zoning issue. If number of animals was tied to parcel size, it would require amendments to Washoe County Code Chapter 110, and would have to go through Planning Commission in different process.

It was decided to look at Chapter 55, the animal code. In animal congested areas, limits are in place. Parcel size has been thought about. Sticking with how it’s been based on animal congested area.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Shares his same concerns. Likes the zoning portion of it more. Agrees it can be more cumbersome, but it’s clean.

Confirmed that if it was raised to 5 dogs, it would reduce the number of permits about one-third. And out of the one-third, wanted to know if a survey was done to see if any of those properties are potentially in an area that would become a problem.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Survey has not been done because it is quite complex. Agreed about the land use discussion as a more scientific approach. The variance would depend on what the animal's needs are. Five border collies need quite a different scenario than five English Bulldogs. Very challenging process.

The nuisance, welfare and off leash complaints would still be pursued in the same way. Those individuals that shouldn't have a variance permit would be weeded out if they can't keep the animals responsibly.

CHAIR DUERR: Inquired if it could be three dogs for apartments and five for a house. And then a variance could be sought if those requirements need to be altered.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Suggested the apartment owner, not the tenant, would be the one to indicate the regulations. Feels there isn't a rental that doesn't already have a rule about a pet.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Inquired if 100% of the renewals are inspected each year.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Confirmed, yes, they are. Property is inspected. History of calls is pulled to determine activity.

CHAIR DUERR: Wanted to know when it would go into effect.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: The Advisory Board is the first to hear it. If no substantial changes, next would be the BOCC to make the amendments to the code section. Probably earliest to be adopted is summer time.

CHAIR DUERR: Inquired about the application inspection fees for the variance.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: For the application turned into WCRAS and adding some additional criteria that they are required to list.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked for comments on inspection. Seeing none, asked for comments re: containment.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Containment requirements would be for anyone who wished to have a variance permit for dogs. The current outline for containment requirements is antiquated. It goes by the size of the dog and increases from there on non-standard kennel requirements.

Wants to simply that requirement and allow for the yard to be used, but requiring the minimum 50 sq. ft. per dog and making sure perimeter fence is used to secure the animal. If a kennel is to be used, a 5x10x5 is used for one dog and to be increased by 50 sq. ft. for each additional dog.

CHAIR DUERR: Felt that as long as it was per dog and that other requirements were per kennel, i.e., concrete floor, were revised.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Want to remove those requirements as over burdensome and not necessary. Dangerous dog process have those requirements for good reason.

CHAIR DUERR: Wanted to confirm if the containment was just for the variance? Does the containment apply to dangerous dogs? What is actual suggestion?

DIRECTOR SCHULL: This requirement would be just for any or all of the dogs on a variance permit, not anything related to dangerous dogs. This is just specifically to variance permits. The only reference to dangerous dogs is to try and get to a more unified kennel system by providing the size requirements similar in each permit systems.

CHAIR DUERR: Confirmed the next suggestion was the same, but for cats. Over seven cats would meet the requirements.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Discussed 55.420(1)(a)-(d) discusses the approval or denial of a new application for variance permit. Currently, Animal Services considers any complaints related to the premises within the year preceding the application. Allows for neighbor comments. Staff inspection and recommendation is presented to Director who will approve/deny within 90 day period and may place special conditions on the permit.

Would like to transition to is to consider any misrepresentations in the permit application. For example, if someone lies on the application, and also a three year violation period instead of one year. Also, any unpaid fines that the applicant has could be considered as denial.



CHAIR DUERR: Wanted to know if the applicant can cure it if payment is made.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Currently, if a variance permit has been sent to collections, approval conditions will be made to bring fees to date.

Continuing on 55.420(4), the Director shall approve within 90 days of receiving the completed application. This can be challenging due to delays. The goal is to change the 90 days to 120 days which will allow more time for research to approve or deny. The Director has to consider the number and the size of the dogs or cats residing on the property, written objections, any other information the Director deems relevant to the application.

CHAIR DUERR: Wanted to confirm that in the interim of the process, the owner can still keep the dog.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: If they already have the animal, yes.

Discussed subsection 5(a)(e) – requirements for variance permit that require dogs to be licensed and microchipped. ACO are to be allowed to inspect property before permit is issued. Goal is to add the addition of dogs/cats over the age of four months that they are required to be vaccinated for rabies. If applicant fails to comply with reasonable request for inspection, permit may be denied or revoked. And then AS shall be notified within 30 days of any change to the permit, including new animals, death of any animals, or change of any ownership.

CHAIR DUERR: Feels like people will fail on this one.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Feels it's possible.

CHAIR DUERR: Inquired as to what the penalty is.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: These are requirements to have a variance permit and to keep one. So at renewal, if there was a failure, it would be noted at that time. Wouldn't necessarily be grounds for revocation.

Section 55.420(7). Want to add a time period after a denial that a person cannot reapply.

CHAIR DUERR: Wants to know if the number of animals applied for would change the reapplication process.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Feels it would depend on criteria utilized to deny.

Section 55.430(1)(a)-(g). Exclusion currently is to exempt service animals. Want to remove that language completely.

Section 55.440 - variance permit renewal fees. Looking to add a late fee if a variance permit lapses. Failure to pay renewal fee within 30 days of renewal deadline may result in permit revocation.

Section 55.450(1)(c) - revocation and appeal. Currently, variance permit may be revoked if a permittee receives more than one NCP or citation for any Chapter 55 violations within one year, or a citation for cruelty to animals, failure to comply with variance code requirements or permit conditions. Goal is to add if a permittee receives an NCP or citation of 55.110 or 55.190 or 55.460(2) it may qualify for grounds for revocation.

Variance permit revocation appeal. Goal is that anyone that has had a variance permit revoked may not reapply for three years.

CHAIR DUERR: Inquired if some are being revoked during the year.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Indicated 7 to 10 have been revoked.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked for comments on the overall variance additions.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Thanked Director Schull for a great job. Supports it.

VICE CHAIR PAYNE: Confirmed all the changes work and appreciates all the hard work.

MEMBER DOBBS: Echoes comments. Asked for clarification re: fostering litters, is there an express exemption?

DIRECTOR SCHULL: If the animals are not over the age of six months, they do not qualify for a variance permit anyway. But if a foster home has more than the legal limit of dogs or cats and continually do so, then a permit is required.

MEMBER DOBBS: Inquired if she had nine six-month kittens for 2-3 weeks, then there is no violation. But if it's for six months or beyond, it would qualify.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked for a motion to support the variance draft as presented.

MS. GUSTAFSON: Requested public comment first.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked for public comment re: proposed changes.

MR. SCHLEY: Indicated no public comment.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked for a motion to approve the amendments as proposed.

MEMBER McMAHON: Issued motion.

VICE CHAIR PAYNE: Seconded.

CHAIR DUERR: Motion carries unanimously.

7. **WASHOE COUNTY REGIONAL ANIMAL SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS AND/OR STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS, REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION AND SELECTION OF TOPICS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS** [For possible action]

CHAIR DUERR: Asked for any comment.

VICE CHAIR PAYNE: Noticed a comment made by a public attendee that the NHS CEO was listening to the WCRAS AB meeting.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Commented about the PSA.

CHAIR DUERR: Suggested that a special meeting be held and that it be agendized for NHS and discussion of their lease with the WCRAS and the audit with a presentation by NHS.

VICE CHAIR PAYNE: Reiterated to listen to the community suggestions and letters and requested it be included on the agenda for the special meeting. Feels issues have been raised that need to be addressed.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked Ms. Gustafson or Director Schull to provide the best format of the special meeting, and should it be attempted to do meeting in person.

MEMBER DOBBS: Echoed Vice Chair Payne's request that it all be part of public record and agenda. Would prefer an in-person meeting.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Requested hybrid meeting.

CHAIR DUERR: Suggested partly in person and Zoom information as well.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Strongly recommends hybrid meeting.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Wanted confirmation PSA would be discussed. Wanted to clarify statement earlier about Article 19 notification. In other words, if a member of public has complaint about NHS, there are three addresses to send notice of complaint to.

MS. GUSTAFSON: Clarified PSA notices.

CHAIR DUERR: Clarified what the meeting will be about.

MR. SCHLEY: Notified that Member Garcia left the meeting.

CHAIR DUERR: Confirmed yes, her computer died.

Asked for a preference of date and time for special meeting. May 8, 9, 11, 12.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Indicated vacation planned May 5-10. Will be back by the 11<sup>th</sup>.

MEMBER McMAHON: Also indicated that week is finals and graduation week of May 7-13.

CHAIR DUERR: Asked about May 15 and 16.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Available the 15, not 16.

MEMBER DOBBS: Available the 15<sup>th</sup>.

MEMBER BRUSSARD: Available the 15<sup>th</sup>.

MEMBER McMAHON: Available the 15<sup>th</sup>.

VICE CHAIR PAYNE: Available the 15<sup>th</sup>.

CHAIR DUERR: She will have Director Schull reach out to NHS. May 15<sup>th</sup> would be the special meeting date.

MEMBER DOBBS: Prefers a morning.

CHAIR DUERR: Scheduled tentatively for May 15<sup>th</sup> at 9:30 a.m. Location to be determined. Asked for any additional requests for agenda items and/or final comments.

DIRECTOR SCHULL: Thanked everyone for their time.

CHAIR DUERR: Read comment from BJ Perez commenting on a great job.

**8. PUBLIC COMMENT [Non-Action Item]**

MR. SCHLEY: Advised there is one public comment from “Jody.” Having audio difficulty.

CHAIR DUERR: Reads Jody’s comment that she is very impressed with Animal Services and wanted to know if a member of the public can request an item to be on the agenda.

MEMBER DOBBS: Jody replied a letter will be sent.

**9. ADJOURNMENT [Non-Action Item]**

CHAIR DUERR: Declares meeting adjourned.