

From: [Rachel Bullies](#)
To: [Stockdale, Serena](#)
Cc: [Partington-Judge, Peri\(External Contact\)](#)
Subject: Re: Animal Services Advisory Board public comment
Date: Friday, May 16, 2025 4:55:39 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Thank you for emailing me. I was in the lobby before 9am and it didn't let me in until 9:15am. My name is Rachel Gazes, I have directed for Bug A Bull rescue for a decade.

I came to address a deeply concerning situation involving a dog named Churro, who was adopted out through Nevada Humane Society and later surrendered to our rescue due to significant ongoing medical issues that were not disclosed or managed at the time of his adoption.

When Churro came to us in March, just two months after being adopted, he was in a horrific medical state. His face and body were swollen with fluid, his skin was covered in painful rashes and elephant skin, and he was suffering from an advanced yeast infection. His coat was in such poor condition that he appeared Merle. He still had visual impairment, and his adopter, an elderly individual, was unaware of both the yeast infection and the continued need for treatment.

We stepped in and immediately began intensive care. He has required multiple veterinary visits, steroids, medicated baths, and most notably, a referral to a specialist where he was finally diagnosed with fibrosian esotropia, a permanent, congenital vision impairment that had never been properly identified before. While we are appreciative that NHS was able to complete his entropion surgery, it is deeply concerning that he was adopted out in such a fragile state to a home that was clearly unequipped to meet his ongoing needs.

I want to emphasize: we said nothing negative publicly about NHS when we took Churro in. In fact, despite my direct knowledge of the limitations that exist in a shelter system as I worked for NHS for a year. We remained gracious and professional. Since March, Churro has been featured in multiple posts across public rescue boards, many of which NHS was tagged in by others. We've had team members who previously worked with NHS reach out excited that he was now in our care.

That's what made the recent promotional post so upsetting. NHS used Churro's image in a public fundraising appeal, stating that his sight had been "restored", a blatant falsehood. Not only was that misleading, but it also had real consequences. We were immediately flooded with concerned messages from donors and supporters asking if he had been returned to NHS, whether we had lied about his diagnosis, and even if we had taken donations under false pretenses.

One potential adopter reached out confused, stating that she had been told by us that Churro had a lifelong congenital condition, and yet NHS's post suggested he had been cured. That confusion led to her deciding not to move forward with applying for adoption.

We tried to resolve this privately. We left kind, factual comments. We sent polite messages and emails. We were left on read for over six hours. It wasn't until we made a respectful public post and tagged

NHS that the content was finally removed. The response that followed was a cold, AI-generated comment (they forgot to remove the CHAT GPT dashes) that deflected responsibility and suggested that we were unwilling to collaborate, a claim that couldn't be further from the truth.

To make matters worse, a handful of volunteers then began spamming our page. One volunteer's initial comment was flagged by our filters for inappropriate language. Afterward, multiple volunteers copy and pasted an identical accusatory message, claiming we were deleting comments and attacking NHS, again, a completely inappropriate and disproportionate response to what should have been a simple, professional correction.

This experience revealed a larger issue: the lack of protocol in verifying the current status of animals before using them for promotional purposes. Had anyone at NHS taken a few minutes to check on Churro's case, especially since he was no longer in your care, they would have learned he had been surrendered and was undergoing intensive medical treatment. Using his image to solicit donations and estate planning support without knowing his actual condition is not only misleading, it's unethical.

If NHS is genuinely committed to collaboration and transparency, the proper course of action would have been to reach out to us, confirm his status, and highlight the shared efforts between both organizations to support Churro's journey. We would have gladly joined in a joint post celebrating his progress and encouraging support.

Instead, we were ignored, misrepresented, and then publicly insulted for daring to speak up. That's not how teamwork works.

I am asking today for this board to consider implementing a standard of due diligence before animals are used in promotional or fundraising material, particularly if they are no longer in NHS's care. I also ask for a clear protocol for communication with partner rescues to prevent these kinds of breakdowns in the future.

We are all here for the same reason, to serve animals and give them the best chance at life. But that requires trust, professionalism, and accountability.

Sent from my iPhone