

**City of Norman
Animal Welfare Oversight Committee**

**Norman Animal Welfare Center
Multi-purpose Room
3428 South Jenkins Ave**

**Monday, October 8, 2018
6:00 p.m.**

- I. Call to Order.....Co-chairpersons Mark Howery / Rebecca Bean

- II. Roll Call.....Co-chairs Mark Howery / Rebecca Bean

- III. Discussion & Approval of the September Minutes.Co-chairs Mark Howery /
Rebecca Bean
Action needed: Motion to Approve or Reject Minutes
Action Taken: _____

- IV. Monthly Statistics and Division Updates Mark Bechtel
- Status of Veterinary Position
Action needed: Acknowledge Presentation

- V. Old Business Updates and Follow-ups Mark Bechtel
- Update on Viewing Stray Hold On-line
- NAWC Phone Queue and Hold Time
Action Needed: Discussion and Acknowledge Presentation

- VI. AWOC Annual Report Update.....Co-chairs Mark Howery / Rebecca Bean
Action Needed: Discussion and Motion to Advance Report to City Council
Action Taken: _____

- VII. Fundraising and Community Outreach Co-chairs Rebecca Bean / Mark Howery
Action Needed: Discussion

- VIII. Review and Discussion of Public Comments Received
at September Meeting re: Ordinance Changes.....Co-chairs Rebecca Bean / Mark Howery
Action Needed: Discussion

- IX. Call for Agenda Items for Next MeetingCo-chairs Rebecca Bean / Mark Howery

- X. Miscellaneous Comments.....Co-chairs Mark Howery / Rebecca Bean

- XI. Adjournment.....Co-chairs Mark Howery / Rebecca Bean
Action needed: Motion to adjourn meeting
Action Taken: _____

Animal Welfare Oversight Committee

September 10th, 2018

I. Call to Order

Co-chairperson Mark Howery called the meeting to order at approximately 6:03 PM.

II. Roll Call

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Co-Chairperson Mark Howery

Co-Chairperson Rebecca Bean

Councilwoman Kate Bierman

David Biles, D.V.M

Jennifer Kidney, PhD

Kim Fairbanks

Kristy Wicker

Sandy Moore-Furneaux

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ashley Battiest, Norman Animal Welfare

Jeanne Snider, Asst. City Attorney

Major Kevin Foster

Mark Bechtel, Norman Animal Welfare Manager

Trey Amrein, Norman Animal Welfare Supervisor

III. Discussion and Approval of the July Minutes

A motion was made to approve the minutes, as amended for grammatical errors, by Jennifer Kidney. Rebecca Bean seconded.

IV. Monthly Statistics and Division Updates

Mark Bechtel began by giving a brief overview of the shelter numbers for July and August. He talked about the continued increase in intake numbers of both cats and dogs. Owner surrender numbers are down because of the managed intake that Norman has been doing to help with the numbers of animals coming into the shelter. He said the lower number of animals pulled by rescues in July was due to low staffing levels.

Shelter euthanasias for July included eleven dogs for behavioral reasons and four cats for medical reasons. In August, two cats were euthanized for medical reasons and three dogs for behavioral issues.

Mark Howery asked if animals in foster were reflected in the transferred out category. Mark Bechtel said, no; they are still counted as animals in shelter until pulled by a rescue or adopted. They are included in the length of stay calculation, as well. There are currently around 66 kittens out in foster.

Sandy Moore- Furneaux asked who is currently assessing behavioral issues at the shelter. Mark Bechtel said several staff members are involved in the process, including him. At this time, there is no specific criterion that is used.

Rebecca Bean asked if a specialized position that is dedicated to rescues should be looked for in the future. Mark Bechtel agreed that it would be something to consider in the future.

Kristy Wicker asked about seeing the statistics over periods of time to see patterns in the data.

Co-Chairperson Mark Howery introduced Dr. David Biles to the audience. He will be the new oversight committee member replacing Dr. Joe Carter. Mark also introduced Kate Bierman as the new council liaison for the committee.

V. Previous Business Updates

Mark Bechtel stated that the owner surrender list has gone from 113 in July to 94 in August, and he said that, of that number, several have been called back or had been left voicemails.

Rebecca Bean asked if that indicates that people on that list, who have made the decision to surrender, are now working harder to rehome the animals themselves, pointing out that some people can wait, but other cases are more urgent. Mark Bechtel said that staff does try to assess the severity of the need, and if it is an urgent matter, the animal is accepted immediately.

Mark Bechtel addressed the issue of not being able to see stray animals online. He said there is agreement that this can be done with our software. He has gotten a quote on how much it will cost and has already submitted a request for approval from the city council. The next step will be for the IT department at Shelter Buddy to finish the work and generate an invoice, and he's anticipating having that up and running within a month. Strays will be posted through Shelter Buddy on the Animal Welfare website, not through adoptapet.com.

Regarding the new phone system, Mark Bechtel said they have identified a few areas to work on. One of these is that the monthly report he receives does not reflect the citizens' concerns about long hold times. In the current report, it states that average hold times are around 35 seconds, which doesn't reflect the 30 -45 minute wait times people say they have experienced. He is working on the criteria for the report so that he can get a more accurate picture of wait times.

Mark Bechtel gave a quick update on the budget. The big changes were the \$15,000 addition to the medical budget, the \$5,000 addition to the food budget, and the \$17,500 increase to the animal care supplies fund.

Mark Bechtel spoke about the HVAC system and finding an answer to the problems that the shelter has been having. As the units are replaced in the future, they will be coated to extend their longevity. The cost quoted will be about \$2,000 per tonnage. There are nine units of various tonnages at the shelter.

Major Foster brought up the items on the budget that had not been approved. The car port for the adoption trailer, the additional outside kennels for the intake side, and the cameras and door access additions were not approved.

VI. Biennial Report Update

Mark Howery passed out an incomplete draft of the biennial report. He stated that tables three and four of the report are broken into two month segments to show seasonal trends. Any comments from committee members can be addressed at the October meeting.

VII. City Ordinance Proposals--Chapter 3/ Animal Welfare

Rebecca Bean introduced the proposed ordinance changes. These ordinances were updated in 2009 and then again in 2016. Anything underlined is something that has been added or is new.

Discussion began with changes made to Sec. 3-102, the definition of adequate shelter. The ordinance has been amended to strengthen the definition of adequate shelter to ensure protection from extreme temperatures and to allow for the animal to move freely or to lie down comfortably. There were no questions or comments on this section.

Rebecca Bean went over the new language in Section 3-1154 that codifies what constitutes an owner. This added language indicates that a person is an owner if he/she has kept an animal over seven days and provides food, water, and care.

Henry Baskeyfield commented on the policy at the shelter. When a citizen surrenders an animal to the shelter and they have had it for over seven days, the shelter determines them to be the owner for the purpose of surrendering it. He says this ordinance appears to say that if you keep any animal for seven days, you are the new owner of that animal.

Dr. Amy Tyler said that microchips are how the shelter identifies the owners.

Mark Howery suggested that if the policy is enough, then the additional language might not be needed.

Trey Amrein said that language could be added to include the use of microchips and tattoos to determine an animal's owner.

Rebecca Bean said that this section was something brought forward by Animal Welfare. She said that Animal Welfare could discuss the intent behind the change with city legal to make sure the language was correct.

Kristy Wicker commented that some animals listed under exotic wildlife are actually native wildlife. Jeanne Snider will contact Kristy for clarification.

Rebecca Bean introduced Section 3-205 that includes shortening the stray hold time at the shelter from five days to three. She said the idea comes from Animal Welfare staff and that

it is one solution to managing the flow of animals through the shelter more efficiently while not undermining the goal of saving animals.

She asked about the language involving exemption of any hold times for kittens and puppies under the age of four months “without a known owner or mother.” Does the shelter not have litters with mothers that come in that would also need to be exempt from hold times and moved out of the shelter as quickly as possible?

Dr. Amy Tyler spoke about a similar instance in California in which stray hold times were shortened to help save more lives. She had suggested an ordinance that stated that three or more puppies or kittens from the same location could go directly to adoption or be pulled by a rescue agency because litters of puppies or kittens are rarely reclaimed. The policy she had suggested was that any kitten or puppy under four months could go directly to foster to serve their stray hold time with the understanding that, if an owner comes forward, it would be returned to the shelter to be reclaimed. This differs from the ordinance proposed as it states that any puppy or kitten under four months can go directly to be processed for adoption and not serve any hold time. Dr. Amy Tyler said that over a period of eight months at the shelter, there were only 20 puppies that were reclaimed.

Rebecca Bean summarized by saying that litters of three or more can go directly into adoption or foster or pulled by a rescue. Single puppies or kittens that come into the shelter can be pulled by a rescue or go into foster but will still serve a three day stray hold in case an owner comes forward.

Mandy James asked why Sec3-205 (2) had been struck out. This was the section that increases an animal's impoundment period by 48 hours if the animal comes in with a microchip or displaying a tag. Jeanne Snider said that may have been an accidental deletion. It will be kept.

With regard to Section 3-205 (3), Trey Amrein explained that in the event that an animal comes into the shelter and an owner is experiencing a situation that prohibits him or her from picking up the animal, such as being in jail, after notifying the owner, the shelter may seek a petition from a judge for the release of the animal into the custody of the Animal Welfare Center.

John Bowman commented that animals are personal property. He doesn't think you can codify taking an individual's personal property.

Jeanne Snider said she would talk to district judges about this matter so that Animal Welfare can do the best thing for the animals.

Section 3-205 (7) added language into the ordinance to return cats that are part of the Trap Neuter Return (TNR) program to the original location in accordance with common program

standards. Kim Fairbanks said she thought this was a good ordinance, but that it wasn't happening often.

Trey Amrein asked about returning cats that had been trapped as a nuisance back to the original location after being altered and given vaccinations.

Dr. Amy Tyler cited a 2014 study in which the area that was targeted for TNR saw a 66% decline in animals being brought to the shelter over the course of two years. If a citizen had complained about the cat and didn't want it back in the area, it wouldn't be taken back to that area. Dr. Tyler said that they found that if they explained to the person who didn't want the cat back that it would stop marking and vocalizing, the person was often willing to take it back on to their property.

Kim Fairbanks said that this is already done by Hands Helping Paws. They do talk to the people who are having issues with community cats, and if they still don't want the cats back, Hands Helping Paws takes the cats into their rescue.

Henry Baskeyfield commented that if Norman Animal Welfare were to start a TNR program, there would need to be more language added to explain exactly what the shelter's role in the program was. Do we know where all the colonies are, do we know who is taking care of them? He believes there needs to be more language in the ordinance if the city is participating.

Dr. Amy Tyler said that she wanted it in the ordinances to open the door for something like this to happen in the future at Norman Animal Welfare.

Kim Fairbanks commented that this is the national trend, and that Hands Helping Paws does currently keep track of all colonies and most but not all caretakers.

Rebecca Bean said that the key word is "may." She thinks it does open the door to keeping more animals out of the shelter. It doesn't give the shelter any more obligations.

Mathew Clinton asked if there were any related increases in bird deaths from feral cat colonies. Jennifer Kidney said that the National Audubon Society's stance is to euthanize all feral cats because cats are supposedly the number two killers of birds. However, Norman's cat colonies that are well managed are probably not that big of a problem. Mark Howery agreed with Jennifer. He doesn't think there is data that shows what these specific colonies are killing. To his knowledge, most of these cat colonies that are being managed are at apartment complexes, strip malls, and other urban areas where they don't affect the wild bird population very much. He would have a problem with colonies being supported in areas like parks and other conservation areas.

Kristy Wicker talked about the fact that this program ideally is stabilizing the colony numbers and eventually reducing the numbers of cats.

John Bowman commented that this ordinance, as well as the owner surrender section, falls under Animal Welfare policy rather than ordinances, and he does not think they need to be codified.

The added owner surrender section 3. 206 was agreed to be more policy-related and could be taken out.

Sandy Moore-Furneaux said that there needs to be a provision added for euthanasia for dangerous or unadoptable animals because of aggressive behavior.

Sec.3-223

Altering of Dogs and Cats

Rebecca Bean said the idea behind this ordinance was to follow other towns in Oklahoma and nation-wide that have said, if you are not going to breed your animal, then it should be spayed or neutered. Written into the ordinance are provisions for getting a breeder's license if you do want to breed your animal. The goal of the ordinance is to combat the number of unwanted litters of kittens and puppies.

Dr. Amy Tyler commented that mandatory spay and neuter laws are not supported by the AVMA or the ASPCA and not supported by the Humane Society of the United States. AVMA does not support the mandatory spay and neuter of privately owned non-shelter animals. These mandatory laws may contribute to owners avoiding licensing, rabies vaccinations, and vet care for their pets. These types of laws may scare people from getting the vet care that they need.

Rebecca Bean said that the Norman community does have several low cost spay and neuter opportunities available to the community. She spoke about allowing a certain amount of time for education before implementing such an ordinance.

Laura Bowman asked why would the city introduce a mandatory spay and neuter ordinance without a provision for those owners who don't want to have their animals altered for reasons other than for breeding purposes.

Rebecca Bean said that what Oklahoma City has done is provide an exemption for people with purebred animals.

Henry Baskeyfield said that he doesn't think that Norman citizens are as much of the problem as people from the surrounding areas now trying to bring the animals they found to Norman Animal Welfare to be adopted.

Kate Bierman said she thinks that Norman is carrying the burden for surrounding areas for services that the shelter provides. She, herself, has had to turn away people every day from

her business because their dogs are unaltered and they want boarding or daycare services for their animal.

Dr. Amy Tyler said the proven way to reduce pet overpopulation is targeted spay and neuter programs.

Mandy James asked how the ordinance was going to be enforced and where will we put the extra animals that come in because people can't afford to have their animals altered?

Mary Katherine Long commented that Oklahoma City doesn't have a mandatory spay and neuter ordinance; instead, they have an ordinance that says, if your animal ends up in the shelter, it will be altered before it leaves. She is skeptical about a mandatory spay and neuter law. She also noted that none of the low-cost spay and neuter facilities listed on the hand-out was located in Norman. She would like to see efforts made toward making spaying and neutering animals more accessible to the community.

Sereta Wilson said that perhaps the language is not correct. The problem that needs to be addressed are dogs that are continually at large and returned to their owner without being altered.

There was a question about who came up with the proposed changes. Jeanne Snider said that there was a working group of council members, committee members, and Animal Welfare staff. Some changes have been discussed before, and ultimately, they would be brought before the public and then to the city council.

Jeanne Snider said that it looks like this ordinance needs to be looked at again and reworked.

Jessica Beam commented that, if we say that everything that comes through the shelter needs to be spayed or neutered, there is no way for medical staff on hand to perform all those surgeries.

Rebecca Bean said that there is no question that, if this ordinance is passed, we would have to consider how to make sure that it is possible.

There was a general consensus that the new added section on marking of altered animals was not needed and was removed.

Sec. 3-301

A section was added that made it unlawful to allow any animal to be dyed, colored, or otherwise altered for the purposes of using it as a promotional item, prize, or giveaway.

The word "business" in section (k) should be reconsidered..

Section 3-401 Tethering. There were two options for consideration. One prohibits tethering of any animal with a specific exemption that Animal Welfare Officers may grant for a short duration. The second option allows tethering with specific conditions.

Sereta Wilson commented that she had a specific complaint in Ward Five that related to tethering, and there was nothing in our ordinance that said you couldn't leave your dog out on a tether year round in harsh conditions. This ordinance would give Animal Welfare Officers the ability to intercede in those cases. This ordinance would be for when there is a complaint or problem with a dog living in an inhumane condition.

Laura Bowman said that temperatures might be breed specific.

Dr. Biles said we need to ask why people tether their dogs. There could be underlying issues.

Sereta Wilson said, in her instance, neighbors asked if they could help build a fence, help get vet care for the dog, or adopt the dog. They were told by the owner that it was his dog and this was what he wanted to do with it.

Henry Baskeyfield said the reason anyone ties up a dog is to keep it contained; some dogs can't be contained by a fence.

Mandy James said one of her neighbors has a dog tethered because the neighbor is worried it will harm other dogs or people or be harmed itself. Sometimes, a dog is tethered for the protection of other people and animals.

Rebecca Bean said enforceability is the important part. If there's an acceptable amount of time for a dog to be tethered, then how will that be determined?

Kate Bierman asked if the dog that was on the tether would be a situation that Mandy would complain about. The point is that this ordinance is not used as a sword, but as a shield. This is needed for the times when people are seeing a dog on a tie-out day in and day out for years.

Jeanne Snider said that maybe this could be changed and put under the section for cruelty, instead of a ban on tethering.

Emily Nichols thinks the main concern is neglect and not containment.

Rebecca Bean ended the discussion by saying dogs tethered are five times more likely to bite a child. She thought it was beyond an animal cruelty issue; it's also a human safety issue. When looking at how to change the language, she wants to make sure its enforceable and also that the expectations for the citizens are clear.

Section 3-402 discussed confinement of dogs and cats. The new proposed ordinance would be one of two options. The first option is that no cats are allowed to be at large, with

exemptions for TNR or barn cat programs. The second option is for no cats at large unless they are current on vaccinations and have a pet license.

Kim Fairbanks said she would like to see option two as it is mainly what is already in place.

Rebecca Bean pointed out that it is already part of the current ordinances that any cat that is allowed to go outside must already be altered.

Sandy Moore-Furneaux said she preferred option one because of the effect outside cats have on bird populations. Dr. Amy Tyler commented that this type of ordinance wouldn't help with that, and that targeted Trap Neuter Return programs can help stabilize and lower outside cat numbers.

Sandy Moore-Furneaux wanted to add to section 3-501 that those institutions that are keeping wild animals may do so as long as they are following appropriate guidelines and have permits to keep or maintain exotic or native wildlife.

Rebecca Bean wanted to strike the word licensed from "licensed circus"; in her research, she discovered that there is no governing body of circuses and no such thing as a licensed circus.

VIII. Call for Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Mark Howery said we will be revisiting the ordinances and also discussing the biennial report.

IX. Miscellaneous Comments

There were no miscellaneous comments.

X. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Sandy Moore-Furneaux at approximately 8:51 PM. The motion was seconded by Rebecca Bean, and the motion passed.

X Mark D Howery

Oct 8th, 2018

X RM

Norman Animal Welfare Monthly Statistical Report September 2018



IN SHELTER ANIMAL COUNTS

	2017			2018			Comparisons	
	Canine	Feline	Total	Canine	Feline	Total	Difference	Percent
Beginning	82	80	162	84	126	210	48	30%
Ending	42	94	136	80	118	198	62	46%

ANIMAL INTAKES

	2017			2018			Comparisons	
	Canine	Feline	Total	Canine	Feline	Total	Difference	Percent
Stray at Large	88	67	155	126	83	209	54	35%
Owner Relinquish	13	19	32	4	7	11	(21)	-66%
Owner Intended Euth	5	0	5	2	1	3	(2)	-40%
Transfer In	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	#DIV/0!
Other Intakes*	5	2	7	7	0	7	0	0%
Returned Animal	NA	NA	0	19	5	24	24	#DIV/0!
TOTAL LIVE INTAKES	111	88	199	158	97	255	56	28%

*Confiscate, Protective Custody, Born in Shelter, and all other infrequent entries

OTHER STATISTICS

	2017		2018		Comparisons	
	Total	Total	Total	Total	Difference	Percent
Wildlife Collected (DOA)	N/A	0	5	5	5	#DIV/0!
Dog Collected (DOA)	N/A	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!
Cat Collected (DOA)	N/A	0	2	2	2	#DIV/0!
Wildlife Transferred	N/A	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!
Intake Horses	N/A	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!
Intake Cows	N/A	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!
Intake Goats	N/A	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!
Intake Sheep	N/A	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!
Intake Rabbits	N/A	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!
Intake Pigs	N/A	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!
Intake Other	N/A	0	5	5	5	#DIV/0!
TOTAL OTHER ITEMS	0	0	12	12	12	#DIV/0!

LENGTH OF STAY (DAYS)

	2017	2018
	Dog	N/A
Puppy	N/A	14.7
Cat	N/A	20.7
Kitten	N/A	37

OWNER SURRENDER PENDING INTAKE

	Canine	Feline	Other	Total
Animals	66	55	0	121

Norman Animal Welfare Monthly Statistical Report September 2018



LIVE ANIMAL OUTCOMES

	2017			2018			Comparisons	
	Canine	Feline	Total	Canine	Feline	Total	Difference	Percent
Adoption	83	55	138	99	95	194	56	41%
Return To Owner	30	1	31	43	1	44	13	42%
Transferred Out	21	18	39	9	1	10	(29)	-74%
Returned in Field	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!
Other Outcome	1	0	1	0	0	0	(1)	-100%
TOTAL LIVE OUTCOMES	135	74	209	151	97	248	39	19%

OTHER ANIMAL OUTCOMES

	2017			2018			Comparisons	
	Canine	Feline	Total	Canine	Feline	Total	Difference	Percent
Died in Care	0	0	0	1	5	6	6	#DIV/0!
Lost in Care	2	0	2	0	0	0	(2)	-100%
Shelter Euth	9	0	9	8	5	13	4	44%
Owner Intended Euth	5	0	5	2	1	3	(2)	-40%
TOTAL OTHER OUTCOMES	16	0	16	11	11	22	6	38%

TOTAL OUTCOMES

	2017			2018			Comparisons	
	Canine	Feline	Total	Canine	Feline	Total	Difference	Percent
Total Live Outcomes	135	74	209	151	97	248	39	19%
Total Other Outcomes	16	0	16	11	11	22	6	38%
TOTAL OUTCOMES	151	74	225	162	108	270	45	20%

SHELTER EUTHANASIA DATA

	Canine	Feline	Other	Total	Percentage
	Medical - Sick	3	4		7
Medical - Injured	0	1		1	8%
Behavior - Aggressive	5	0		5	38%
Behavior - Other	0	0		0	0%
TOTAL EUTHANASIA	8	5	0	13	

MONTHLY LIVE RELEASE RATE

2017	2018
95.0%	92.9%

Live Outcomes / (Total Outcomes - Owner Int Euth)



Monthly Service By Assignment

January 2018 to September 2018
Norman Animal Welfare Volunteers (ALL)

Place	Assignment	Jan 2018 Hours	Feb 2018 Hours	Mar 2018 Hours	Apr 2018 Hours	May 2018 Hours	Jun 2018 Hours	Jul 2018 Hours	Aug 2018 Hours	Sep 2018 Hours	Total Hours
Norman Animal Welfare Center	Groomer	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00
	NAWC-Bather / Groomer	0:00	1:45	0:00	4:38	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	6:23
	NAWC-Beautification Volunteer	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00
	NAWC-Cat Socializer	101:36	115:22	106:15	112:13	28:09	72:27	59:42	54:06	35:49	685:39
	NAWC-Community Outreach Volunteer	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	4:30	0:00	0:00	6:00	0:00	10:30
	NAWC-Dog Handler	126:43	133:24	236:47	221:32	119:40	96:54	76:35	122:01	77:54	1,211:30
	NAWC-Foster Program	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00
	NAWC-Laundry	0:00	0:00	0:00	1:17	7:12	0:00	0:00	2:50	14:00	25:19
	NAWC-Lobby Greeter	58:12	62:23	30:29	51:00	47:12	57:45	50:30	75:45	45:06	478:22
	NAWC-Orientation	31:00	20:00	17:00	16:00	7:00	7:00	20:00	15:00	10:00	143:00
	NAWC-Photographer	0:00	0:00	2:38	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:55	0:00	0:00	3:33
	Other Volunteer Services	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00	0:00
Veterinarian Assistant Tech	44:29	18:39	23:40	50:56	63:19	65:25	81:00	3:00	12:05	362:33	
Total		362:00	351:33	416:49	457:36	277:02	299:31	288:42	278:42	194:54	2,926:49
Grand total		362:00	351:33	416:49	457:36	277:02	299:31	288:42	278:42	194:54	2,926:49