ANIMAL CONTROL BOARD
SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, June 9, 2011, 7:00 PM

Sheriff's Office/Public Safety Building
Community Room (Room #1-152)
150 Bush Boulevard
(Seminole County Operations Center)
Sanford, Florida 32773

I. Call to Order.

II. Roll Call.

III. Minutes: March 10, 2011.

IV. Public Commentary

- Limited to 3 Minutes Per Speaker
- Speaker Request Form Required

V. Old Business.

VI. New Business.

A. Sunshine Law, Ethics and Public Records Training Conducted by Ann Colby, Assistant County Attorney.

B. Future Agenda Items.

VII. Reports.

A. Transport Statistics.

B. Kennel Statistics (Intakes & Outcomes).

C. Customer Contact Statistics.

D. Pet Data, Inc. Statistics.

VIII. Confirmation of Next Meeting.

- September 8, 2011 or September 15, 2011
- December 8, 2011
- March 8, 2012

IX. Adjournment.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING THIS NOTICE, PLEASE CONTACT MORGAN WOODWARD, ANIMAL SERVICES MANAGER, AT 407-665-5202. PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES NEEDING ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF THESE PROCEEDINGS SHOULD CONTACT THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT ADA COORDINATOR 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING, AT 407-665-7941.

PERSONS ARE ADVISED THAT, IF THEY DECIDE TO APPEAL ANY DECISION MADE AT THESE MEETINGS/HEARINGS, THEY WILL NEED A RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND FOR SUCH PURPOSES, THEY MAY NEED TO INSURE THAT A VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS IS MADE, WHICH INCLUDES THE TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE UPON WHICH THE APPEAL IS TO BE BASED, PER SECTION 286.0105, FLORIDA STATUTES.

PLEASE NOTE THAT WHILE MEETINGS OF THE ANIMAL CONTROL BOARD ARE SUBJECT TO THE SUNSHINE LAW AND ALL ARE WELCOME TO ATTEND, NEITHER THE FACILTIY NOR, IN MANY CASES, THE MATTERS DISCUSSED BY THE BOARD ARE SUITABLE FOR YOUNG CHILDREN. WE WOULD REQUEST THAT, UNLESS YOUR CHILDREN ARE TESTIFYING BEFORE THE BOARD, THEY REMAIN EITHER AT HOME OR OUTSIDE THE HEARING ROOM, WITH APPROPRIATE ADULT SUPERVISION.

III. MINUTES: MARCH 10, 2011

UNOFFICIAL

SEMINOLE COUNTY
ANIMAL CONTROL BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

March 10, 2011
7:00 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gail Nagan
Marylin Wittmer, Vice Chairman
Debra Garrambone
Kathleen Prince
Gayle Hair
Dr. Joe Vaughan, Chairman

MEMBERS ABSENT: Keith Weissman

OTHERS: Morgan Woodward, Animal Services Manager
Ann Colby, Assistant County Attorney
Elaine RiCharde, Clerk to the Board

The following is a non-verbatim transcript of the Seminole County Animal Control Board meeting held March 10, 2011, at 7:00 PM, at the Sheriff's Office/Public Safety Building, 150 Bush Boulevard, Sanford, Florida.

I. Call to Order.

Dr. Vaughan called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

II. Roll Call.

Roll Call was taken by the Clerk. A quorum was present.

III. Minutes: December 9, 2010.

Motion by Ms. Wittmer to approve the minutes.

Ms. Prince asked for a correction. Ms. Prince then read verbatim from the minutes, section IV, Public Commentary, as follows: "Ms. Prince asked to speak and to make a comment to the audience. She issued an invitation to volunteer at animal control at the shelter. Her invitation was answered with a loud outcry from the audience."

Ms. Prince said she would like for the minutes to read it was a loud, negative outcry.

Dr. Vaughan called for discussion.

Ms. Nagan said she thought the correction was Ms. Prince's opinion.

Ms. Prince said it was a negative outcry.

A member of the audience began to speak directly to the Board relative to Ms. Prince's correction. Dr. Vaughan gaveled the meeting to regain order. However, the speaker continued to address the Board.

Dr. Vaughan took control of the meeting. He said approximately fifty five people were present and if all chose to speak the meeting would be very long. He said if the audience interrupted the meeting by making comments to the Board the meeting would last even longer. He asked audience members to submit speaker forms.

Ms. Nagan said to add there was a negative outcry but they said they do a lot of volunteer hours outside of animal control. She asked Ms. Prince if she would be OK with that.

Ms. Wittmer said she agreed it was a negative outcry.

Ms. Nagan said yes but because they were saying they already do a lot of volunteer work outside of animal control.

Ms. Prince replied that Ms. Nagan went into that further down in the minutes and she (meaning Ms. Prince) wanted to add the word negative.

The Clerk verified with Ms. Prince that she wanted the word negative included all three times where a loud outcry was recorded in the minutes.

Second by Ms. Prince. Motion passed unanimously.

IV. Public Commentary.

Dr. Vaughan announced the Board would take public commentary and called for speaker request forms.

Morgan Woodward, Animal Services Manager, asked to speak. Mr. Woodward said he was passing to the Chairman a recommendation made to him relative to the Rules of Procedure to allow public commentary to extend beyond twenty minutes so all who so wish can be heard. Dr. Vaughan agreed to do so.

Debra Bates, 1017 Sarita Street, Sanford, addressed the Board on the subject of proposed leash laws. She read the following verbatim statement. "I'm reading from a typed text. I'm not here to pick a fight. I'm not here to change anyone's beliefs or value systems. However, I'm also not here to blow any

sunshine up your skirt and tell you how fabulous you are. I'm unhappy with the way my tax dollars are being used for animal control and I'm here to ask a few questions that no one seems to want to answer. I own a home in Seminole County. I work with feral cats and I do TNR work out of my own pocket. I've built elevated, insulated shelters for the animals I care for as well as feeding stations. My belief is if I feed them I fix them. I've also spent hours educating my neighbors and getting permission to get outside pets spayed and neutered at my own, personal expense. Others simply get caught in my trap without any owner permission. Well, if I feed them I fix them. No one has complained and my community has had a stable population for the last three years. Now, you learned people want me to put collars and leashes on them. Are you kidding me? I challenge each and every one of you to do that very thing with one of the ferals being held at animal control. They are a completely different species than dogs and should be treated accordingly. Cats have been living outdoors in close proximity to humans for at least eight to ten thousand years. Claiming cats belong only indoors or on a leash is contrary to the habitat and natural history of the species. Just because these animals were either born outside or dumped there should not constitute a death sentence. And please don't give us the they kill indigenous wildlife rhetoric any more. Empirical data proves the human race is far more detrimental to all forms of wildlife and it's usually in the name of the almighty dollar but we disguise our killing with the broad loss of habitat excuse. Those who think cats are a major threat to wildlife use misleading language to avoid human accountability. While (inaudible) cats killing birds and wildlife trivializes critical issues facing those species today all of which are human caused. As for diseases statistics now bear out that a managed colony is at least as healthy as a household cat. And if this is a community safety issue I would point out that no human has died after being bitten by a rabies infected cat in more than thirty years. You all know the kill statistics for Seminole County. They were read at the last board meeting. A leash law for cats will allow animal control to pick them up and take them to a place where virtually one hundred per cent will be killed. I'm sorry but if this is the best you can do you need to change your frilly animal ordinance rhetoric from humanely euthanized to reflect what it truly is execution. In a perfect world every animal would have a home and want for nothing. But we don't live anywhere near perfect. And the human race continues to amaze me with its poor stewardship of this planet and its creatures. Not every cat enjoys the luxury of a warm home and loving family. So we should kill it? Have any of you actually done TNR work? It's not easy or fun waiting in the heat, the cold and the rain all hours of the night in hope of catching one particular elusive animal in a drop trap but we do it. We volunteers and fosters spend our own money vetting, feeding, caring for these animals. We go out twice a day three hundred sixty five days a year barring nothing to make sure they are healthy, fit and have clean water. Now we're supposed to put collars and leashes on them. Thanks guys. As if Florida weren't already a laughing stock. Let's just all head back to our caves and wait for fire to be discovered, shall we. If this is the kind of progress we have to look forward to perhaps it's time for new leadership. That's where real change begins. In closing I want

simply like to quote anthropologist Margaret Meade who said 'Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has'".

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Ms. Nagan asked to speak directly to the speaker who had resumed her seat in the audience. Dr. Vaughan consented.

Ms. Nagan asked approximately how much she spent on feral cats each year. Ms. Nagan asked for clarification that expenditures were out of the speaker's pocket. Ms. Nagan then addressed the audience as a whole and asked for a show of hands of how many spent more than a thousand out of their pocket every year on ferals. Ms. Nagan said feral cats that they (sic) want leashes on. She said out of their pocket as a volunteer. She said that was a lot of people. Ms. Nagan again addressed the audience as a whole and asked who spent less than a thousand but still did TNR and helped them.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Ms. Nagan asked Dr. Vaughan if she could just say for the record approximately thirty hands went up when she asked the question of who spent thousands a year. Dr. Vaughan consented. Ms. Nagan then said she just wanted the record to show that approximately thirty hands went up when she asked the question who spent thousands a year on the ferals. Dr. Vaughan confirmed with the Clerk the foregoing would be in the minutes.

Christine Logan, 300 Rose Drive, Sanford, addressed the Board on her volunteer activities at Animal Services. She said five years ago she signed up as a volunteer then became an employee at Animal Services and was now back to being a volunteer. Ms. Logan said she fostered many kittens, puppies, squirrels and opossums. She said she worked side by side with Animal Services employees. Ms. Logan said she spent four to five days a week, four to five hours a day at Animal Services training dogs that have behavioral issues. She did this to give the dogs every opportunity to get into and stay in a home. Ms. Logan said she helped Diane Gagliano with her school programs to help teach the public how to become responsible pet owners. She said Ms. Gagliano got her involved in going into schools by herself to teach children about spiders. Ms. Logan said she rescued a tarantula from Animal Services. Ms. Logan said these past years had been a privilege and honor to work side by side with the people at Animal Services. She said she believed they did not get enough credit for their hard work, the hard decisions they do. Ms. Logan said she had never seen people bust their bottoms to work hard to get animals out of the shelter and into rescue groups and into homes. Ms. Logan said it was an honor to be able to be with these people and to continue all the hard work they do every day to help these animals.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Pam Dixon, 3640 South Saint Lucie Drive, Casselberry, addressed the Board about Seminole County Animal Services. She read the following verbatim statement. "I'm a Seminole resident and also a volunteer and foster home for Animal Services. In the four years as a foster home I've helped Animal Services by fostering over one hundred and sixty cats and kittens. I've been blessed to watch the miracle of birth a couple times when I fostered a pregnant momma cat. Prior to my volunteer work here I'd been a volunteer and foster home to another local shelter. I selected the other shelter over Animal Services because I was under the false impression that Animal Services killed all animals they took in after a week. I learned that was not true when I volunteered at the Animal Services collection tents after their tragic fire in 2007. I met many Animal Services workers. I met other volunteers and I met people from the rescue groups there. That's when I learned that Animal Services makes every effort to save the animals. They even work with the rescue groups to get out animals into adoption and foster. The other shelter that I worked for forbid the rescue groups from coming to adopt any animals. When there was an outbreak of a horrible cat disease called panleukopenia I watched the other shelter when I was volunteering there euthanize all cats and kittens under six months of age, about two hundred of them, including coming to my house and taking two that I had in foster care at that time. During those same two months Animal Services people worked their tails off to sanitize everything daily. They put it in God's hands and only lost six kittens. I just want the Animal Control Board to know that I'm proud to be a volunteer for Seminole County Animal Services. The staff is very compassionate and caring and I'm a witness to their dedication and humane treatment saving animals.

Ms. Nagan asked Dr. Vaughan if she could make a comment. Dr. Vaughan consented.

Ms. Nagan said it seemed like at the last meeting there were some people in the audience who had complaints not against the staff and volunteers at animal control but against management and doing things to prevent animals from getting there in the first place like TNR. Ms. Nagan said just so you all know nobody ever to her knowledge and she was at the last meeting said anything negative about any you the volunteers or the staff that works there. Ms. Nagan said we agree with what you're saying well she agreed she couldn't speak for other people with what you were saying today. She said it was her impression at the last meeting that they were not bad mouthing any of the staff or volunteers. Ms. Nagan said it was what the County was not doing on the outside to prevent the animals being born ending up there that was the issue. Ms. Nagan said she would also like to say the reason you were able to volunteer was because a group of citizens including herself who for many years went to the County Commissioners and got things improved at animal control. She said there was

not one volunteer or volunteer coordinator until maybe four years ago. She said only because of the citizens. Ms. Nagan said we approached animal control, we were told it was a liability issue. She said we went to the Commissioners, they said have them sign a hold harmless. Ms. Nagan said just so you know nobody was against it because these were the people that pushed for it. She said she just wanted to clarify it.

Ms. Prince asked Dr. Vaughan if she could make a clarification. Dr. Vaughan consented.

Ms. Prince said according to the last minutes there was a part on the same page where we had the outcries. Ms. Prince then read verbatim from the minutes, section IV, Public Commentary, as follows: "Ms. Nagan spoke directly to Ms. Prince saying they do more than anybody at animal control does and she, meaning Ms. Prince, did not know what these people do." Ms. Prince spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying that it was she herself who said they do more than anyone at animal control does.

Ms. Nagan said that she meant, she agreed, she admitted, no she said the people in the audience she meant volunteer wise maybe not all but she knew people out here responsible for fixing four thousand animals or more, fostering or rescuing seven thousand or more, and the way Ms. Prince was speaking when it sounded like a challenge for them to volunteer at animal control she, meaning Ms. Prince, she, meaning herself, had the impression that she, meaning Ms. Prince, you need to go volunteer before you can say anything. Ms. Nagan spoke directly to Ms. Prince saying you accused them of bad mouthing staff and volunteers and that was not what they were doing. Ms. Nagan said maybe it was a misunderstanding between herself and Ms. Prince.

Ms. Prince replied then all the Board misunderstood.

Ms. Nagan said well she guessed so because she spoke to these people. Ms. Nagan, speaking directly to Ms. Prince, said maybe she needed to speak to them directly.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Claire Gaynor, 105 Hillcrest Drive, Longwood, addressed the Board as a rescue working with Animal Services. She read the following verbatim statement. "I am the area coordinator for Florida Boxer Rescue for Orange, Seminole and Osceola counties where I have been a volunteer for the past ten years. Florida Boxer Rescue is a 501(c)3 not for profit organization and we strive to rescue unwanted and abandoned purebred Boxers in central and western Florida and place them in safe, responsible and loving and permanent homes. I am proud to say we have rescued over thirty five hundred Boxers. In the past seven years I have worked with many animal services but none that have been

as helpful, engaging and courteous as Seminole County Animal Services. The majority of Boxers we pull from the service usually have some medical issues such as heartworms, cancerous lumps or deafness, and before I pick up a Boxer I know this information. Believe me most animal services don't give us this information when we pull. I can remember when I got a call about a Boxer that was not doing well and in very bad shape. When I saw this poor, little female Boxer that was literally on death's door with no light in her eyes, all I thought is how are we going to save this one. We placed her in a foster home that spent many months nursing her back to health before she was placed in her forever home. The staff at Seminole always asked about her so we sent her pictures of her progress? as cared about what happened to her. Many times we send staff pictures of dogs that have been pulled to thank them for working with us and to show the progress of the dogs. Florida Boxer Rescue does more with Seminole than just pulling dogs in need of medical services. When I get informed of a Boxer that is in adoption services I will send approved applicants whom we have done home visits with to adopt from this organization and most times my applicants will adopt that Boxer from Animal Services. So as a rescue organization we work hand and hand to assist each other in placing of these dogs in good homes. Seminole Animal Services understands that our rescue does property and vet checks prior to us doing home visits and understands that these dogs are going into homes that have been approved by us. Each year we participate in Seminole's animal rescue day because they know how valuable a service they provide us not only to Boxer Rescue but to all the rescues. All of my volunteers who work in Central Florida know that Seminole County Animal Services is the best animal services in the three counties and I have been grateful for their assistance and kindness in working with all of us. In my mind there isn't a better animal services in the state and one willing to work so hard to help so many dogs and work with rescue organizations. I want to thank them for all they have done for Florida Boxer Rescue and the other rescues."

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Ms. Nagan asked the speaker, who had resumed her seat in the audience, if she also worked with the public. Ms. Nagan said so you get Boxers that citizens rescue as well.

Jeanie Ahern, 1705 Retreat Road, Geneva, addressed the Board about Geneva's puppy mill. She wrote on the speaker form "I need help with this puppy mill – want this board to review the State Statutes on noise FL State Law 828.27 #3(7)."

Ms. Ahern said the code enforcement board would hear this case and hopefully this could be stopped. She said she needed the Board's help.

Dr. Vaughan asked Ms. Ahern to tell the Board about this issue.

Ms. Ahern explained that last April the property owner at 1801 Retreat Road said she was running a breeding business and was given the opportunity to get a commercial kennel license. However, the property owner withdrew her application for a commercial kennel license.

Ms. Garrambone asked what the property owner was breeding and how many.

Ms. Ahern responded all the little breeds such as Chihuahuas, Maltese and Shih Tzu's.

Ms. Garrambone asked how the animals were housed.

Ms. Ahern replied the property owner has a fifty foot puppy barn. She said inside the property owner's house she has little puppies and the breeding moms. She said the property owner has kennels around the puppy barn and her house and material on top of the cages.

Ms. Garrambone asked if these little breeds were all outside.

Ms. Ahern said no, in the puppy barn or the property owner's house but when the property owner let them out she has material on top of the runs so you cannot see from above. Ms. Ahern said she had been on the property and had seen the dogs.

Ms. Garrambone asked if there were a lot of dogs.

Ms. Ahern replied over a hundred.

Ms. Nagan asked how were the conditions.

Ms. Ahern replied poor. She said the dogs she saw had ticks and dogs that came on to Ms. Ahern's property had a helmet of solid matter on them.

Ms. Ahern said the property owner took down her multiple web sites. She said the property owner had fifteen cases in Brevard County of taking dogs from her home and then bringing them back after she said they were gone. She said it took Brevard County five years to do one hundred dollars a day in fines and the property owner moved, closing down three puppy houses, and came to Seminole County. Ms. Ahern said she was zoned agricultural A5 (sic) and could have an unlimited amount of dogs and an unlimited amount of noise.

Ms. Nagan asked what about the noise and odor problem.

Ms. Ahern replied it was bad and they had the smell of death. She said they have well water and very little was done there. She said the property owner

was given the opportunity to again apply for a kennel license by January 14th which the property owner refused to do. Ms. Ahern said the gates were chained. She said the property owner does not want anyone to access the property. She said the property owner was not cooperative. Ms. Ahern said we could not work with the amount, we could not work with the noise and their best hope was with code enforcement because the property owner does not have a business license or a kennel license and that was what this hearing was coming up. Ms. Ahern said we needed to convince the board (sic) that was a repeat even though she took her web sites down they would be back up given the history of Brevard County and here. She said we need your help.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Joanne Bradow, 201 Sheryl Drive, Deltona, addressed the Board about animal control.

Ms. Bradow said she does rescue. She said she has worked with Seminole County animal control for about fifteen years and they have been just wonderful. She said Mary Beth (sic) and everybody at Seminole did their utmost to get as many dogs and cats out alive as they can. She said she tried to help out by transporting animals and taking all the breeds she rescues and getting them out to good homes. Ms. Bradow said she was also a volunteer with Seminole animal control and that she helped with the annual Adopt-a-Thon and transporting dogs to other rescues to include taking dogs to the airport. Ms. Bradow said she also helps with fostering because her daughter fostered cats for animal control and when her daughter went out of town she took care of the kittens. Ms. Bradow said she has nothing but good things to say about Seminole animal control, the people and the programs. She said they all were very dedicated to good treatment of animals and saving as many as they can. She said she thought they were great.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Audrey Posocco, 1233 Pallister Lane, Lake Mary, addressed the Board about proposed ordinance items.

Ms. Nagan asked Dr. Vaughan if she could say something quickly before the speaker began. Dr. Vaughan consented.

Ms. Nagan said according to the minutes from the last meeting we had people speaking from the audience. She said one spoke about the anti-tethering, one wanted to know about how our tax dollars were spent, another one wanted to know if we were interested in going no kill which it takes years but there were things involved with that that we were not doing, it had nothing to do with anything inside animal control, and another person questioned why the rebate was taken away from the citizens. She said she did not see anything in

the minutes, anybody saying anything negative about the way inside animal control operates. She said there was nothing bad about the staff or volunteers. Ms. Nagan said Kathleen Prince mentioned apparently she (Ms. Nagan) was the only one who saw it that way and the rest of the Board saw it differently and she did not see how because she was looking at the minutes. Ms. Nagan spoke directly to Ms. Prince asking her to show that to her later during the meeting. Ms. Nagan said she did not see anything negative about staff or employees or the way inside was run.

Ms. Prince asked Ms. Nagan why she was even asking her that because people were saying when Dr. Vaughan gaveled the meeting to restore order. Ms. Prince stopped speaking.

Ms. Nagan continued to speak saying she was sure they were saying that because they were asked to because of the rumors that were on Facebook. Dr. Vaughan interrupted Ms. Nagan. He said the Board needed to get through the meeting and he was there to keep it on track. He apologized to Ms. Posocco for the interruption and asked her to continue.

Ms. Posocoo then read the following verbatim statement. "Tonight you'll be discussing proposed changes to Seminole County ordinances. As part of your conversations I implore you to revisit the decision to implement the leash law that will apply to all cats including ferals. If you move forward with this it will essentially be the equivalent of a death sentence for these animals and will insure that Seminole County remain a place that is not committed to identifying and at least trying new ways to improve the lives of these animals in our community and reduce our euthanasia rates. If putting a leash on a feral cat were in fact a realistic option then I would imagine that it would imply that these animals are friendly and adoptable. If that is truly the case I would ask why were three hundred and seventy cats deemed feral and killed between October 2010 and February 2011. As such if this ordinance change is made will Seminole Animal Services assist residents in putting collars and leashes on these ferals? Sadly, we also lag far behind the efforts of our neighbors. In reviewing the ordinances of those along our borders a definition is included to distinction among either a feral animal or a feral cat. Our proposed ordinance includes neither. I would also ask you to consider including this language as well. "

Ms. Nagan asked the speaker, who had resumed her seat in the audience, if she knew which counties had separate ordinances for ferals near here.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Kris Buchanan, 647 Short Oak Court, Sanford, addressed the Board as president and founder of T.E.A.R.S and wanted to introduce who we are and what we are doing.

Ms. Buchanan said she was a mom with three kids ages eight, six and four and that in itself was a full time job. She said she has a husband, she manages a house, she has two dogs and two cats, and she works part time at a pre-school. She said she has been an active volunteer and foster mom at Seminole County for three years including being at almost all events during those past three years. Ms. Buchanan said the highest amount of cats she fostered was eleven cats at one time which was a lot of cats. She said she has fixed the Kuranda dog beds for the Seminole County Animal Services for the last year and this was a family activity. She said in being so active with Seminole County Animal Services she saw a lot and she decided she wanted to be more active. Ms. Buchanan said she and a group of her friends formed T.E.A.R.S. which stands for Together Every Animal Receives Support. She said this was a 501(c)3 organization that was not a rescue group but a support group for Seminole County Animal Services. Ms. Buchanan said she started T.E.A.R.S. for three reasons. She said one was because, and a lot of people did not understand this, that the County facilities have to take each and every animal. She said it was unlike a lot of the rescue groups or even the S.P.C.A. (sic) which took only the owner relinquished. She said whatever the County gets called out on and whatever comes across their desk they have to take they cannot say sorry we are too full. Ms. Buchanan said a lot of people do not understand that or take the step to think about it. She said number two was the County has restrictions as to what surgeries and medications they were allowed to provide for the animals. She said T.E.A.R.S. did not have any restrictions. Ms. Buchanan said if something came into the county that needed a special surgery or it did not fall into the category of approved medications or it needed to go to a vet who was not approved by them, either the animal went untreated or was euthanized. She said now they can call on us and we can help them. Ms. Buchanan said the third reason was what a lot of people did not understand out there in the public was the county facilities cannot fundraise. She said the A.S.P.C. A. (sic) put out brochures that say we are their voice. Ms. Buchanan said it was truly the animals at the County level that did not have a voice because they were not allowed. She said that was why T.E.A.R.S. was formed and they were going to be their voice.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker. Kim Litz' name was called but she did not come forward.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Sandy Ribakoff, 498 Timberwood Trail, Oviedo, addressed the board on the subject of volunteering.

Ms. Nagan spoke out asking if we were going to be repetitive for everybody today. She said it was like the same everybody was talking about what they do at animal control. Dr. Vaughan said this was so rare to get a public

forum. Ms. Nagan said OK as long he was OK with that with whatever people talked about. She said she didn't mind as long as he allowed other people to be repetitive as well.

Dr. Vaughan asked Ms. Ribakoff to continue.

Ms. Ribakoff read the following verbatim statement. "I am of course a Seminole County resident. I've been a proud volunteer for Seminole County animal for five years. We have hundreds of volunteers who log in over fifteen hundred hours each month. They come into the shelter at random times to help with a myriad of needed jobs. This includes helping with flyers, preparing our gift bags given to new owners, we do laundry, cleaning food and water bowls, and of course showing our animals for potential adoption. We are not a highly funded shelter as maybe other institutions might be, and we volunteers as well as the shelter staff work very hard to maintain a clean, healthy and as happy an environment as is possible for these animals. We also have a wonderful foster program where the most needy kittens and cats and puppies will be fostered in a home to get well if they are sick or just to grow a little bigger and stronger in order to have a successful adoption when they come back to the shelter. I also began a program in cooperation with Pet Supermarkets in Oviedo with a once a month Saturday adoptions for kittens which so far has proven quite successful. For those of you who feel that what our shelter does is not sufficient I put this challenge to you. You would be welcomed to visit and shadow one of us volunteers. This way you will see firsthand what we do. Perhaps this may give you a better insight as how difficult and emotional the job of animal sheltering is. Remember these animals do not choose to be there. Until you work at a shelter you will never fully understand what we face in trying to get these animals adopted not only quickly but with success. And any new ideas to help us to continue to present these animals for adoption would be welcome. On a final note, I wish to thank the Board for allowing the volunteer and foster program to exist. Together with the staff we work extremely hard to help adopt out as many animals as we can each day and to give the second chance they are so deserving. I, of course, have a shelter cat at home. Her name is Umi. Umi is a Malawian name. It means life."

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Kim Litz, 1886 N. Normandy Boulevard, Deltona, addressed the board about rescue and pulling from the shelter.

Ms. Litz said she works with New Spirit Aussie Rescue and she worked with the shelter probably ten years or more. She wanted to thank them for allowing her to work with them. Ms. Litz said she also volunteered and has worked tag day and the Adopt-a-Thon for eight years. She said she appreciated the fact that Mary Beth (sic) calls her when they get an Aussie. She said

Aussies' are not easy dogs to place because they are a herding breed and they need special homes. Ms. Litz said they allow her to rescue them.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Sara Bradow, 1902 E. Barlington Drive, Deltona, addressed the Board about fostering for Seminole County Animal Services.

Ms. Bradow said she fosters kittens for Seminole and she volunteers at their numerous adoption events. She said they have been doing a very good job.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Renee Fiott-Mitchell, 499 Cidermill Place, Lake Mary, did not identify any subject(s) on the speaker request form.

Ms. Mitchell said she has been a volunteer at Seminole County Animal Services for approximately four years. She said some of her responsibilities were to exercise and train dogs and her primary responsibility was to try to find the right dog for the right people that come into the shelter. She said she had the pleasure of bringing her neighbors in who had been a little afraid to come in. Ms. Mitchell said they did not realize how clean and friendly the facility was. She said they were really touched by how everybody seemed to know the dogs personally and assisted them to find the right dog. She said the dog they fell in love with came in as a heartworm positive dog. Ms. Mitchell said it was her opinion that dog might not have had a second chance if not for the kindness and compassion of the workers at Seminole County Animal Services. She said she owns a fostered puppy that came into Seminole County Animal Services at four weeks of age who again might not have had that opportunity had it not been for the wonderful foster program that allowed her and her litter mates to grow big and strong enough to be spayed and adopted.

Dr. Vaughan called for the next speaker.

Connie Powors, 1739 Rutledge Road, Longwood, spoke to the Board on the subject of volunteering.

Ms. Powors said she was a volunteer at Seminole County Animal Services. She said she was sorry if the Board was hearing a lot about this tonight but she thought it was great.

Ms. Nagan interrupted Ms. Powors saying she, meaning Ms. Nagan, did not mind hearing it.

Ms. Powors continued speaking saying she had been a volunteer over five years and started before Diane Gagliano was named as volunteer coordinator.

She wanted to thank the Board for allowing that position and the volunteer program to exist because it was a worthwhile and effective organization. She said personally she was responsible for PetFinder. Ms. Powers said she takes the pictures along with other volunteers who send the pictures to her, and she posts them online. She said we get over one thousand hits per day on PetFinder and to compare some of the other local shelters get less than two hundred. She said that shows you we are doing a good job, being progressive, using the Internet. Ms. Powors said we are anticipating perhaps using a Facebook page. She said using some area that the older generation may not be familiar with but the younger ones are. She said she hoped we are allowed to do that. She wanted to again thank the Board for allowing the volunteer program and for letting us come in this type of forum to express our opinion.

Ms. Nagan said she wanted to clarify she does not mind it was usually the Board does not allow people to be repetitive so she wanted to make sure everybody could come not just the select people that they (sic) want. There was a shout out from a member of the audience to which Ms. Nagan responded "That's fine, I have no problem." Ms. Nagan said she also wanted to clarify it was nice you were thanking the Board but the Board had nothing to do with having volunteers or being on PetFinder.

Ms. Garrambone interrupted Ms. Nagan. Ms. Garrambone said no offense but Elaine (sic) and she were there and there were fourteen meetings that year. Ms. Nagan resumed speaking and Ms. Garrambone continued speaking. Their remarks were disjointed.

Ms. Garrambone continued speaking saying Commissioner Randy Morris spearheaded that whole grant that came from the general fund. She said Commissioner Morris said "I'm getting people coming to me saying Animal Services needs more money" and he asked the Board to look at this.

Ms. Nagan spoke directly to Ms. Garrambone saying we (sic) met with him for two years and that was why he came to you. She said she was just saying it went to the Board but the citizens initiated it. Ms. Nagan said the citizens who wanted to be progressive were the ones who initiated it. Ms. Garrambone and Ms. Nagan continued speaking over each other and their remarks were disjointed.

Dr. Vaughan gaveled the meeting to restore order and called for the next speaker.

Ms. Garrambone and Ms. Nagan continued speaking. Ms. Nagan said it was not a who did what it was just you had to be clear.

Ms. Garrambone said it was there now and that was how they got their volunteer coordinator.

Ms. Nagan said right because of citizens going to the Commissioners.

Cheryl Lynn Vaughn, 1162 Village Forest Place, Winter Park, addressed the Board on the subject of rescue efforts in Seminole County.

Ms. Vaughn said she has Ruff World Animal Rescue. She said she gets calls from Mary Beth (sic) every so often and when she sees the dogs she's amazed they have even bothered to let the dog live and she would probably pass it by. She said Mary Beth (sic) had taught her a lot about what was adoptable and what you could work with to get it adoptable and get it a home. Ms. Vaughn said every dog she pulled from Seminole County Animal Services has been adopted. She said Mary Beth (sic) asked her to take dogs that were eight or nine years old that most shelters would not even have let out the door. Ms. Vaughan said she wanted to commend Mary Beth (sic) and her staff for taking such great care of them.

Ms. Vaughan said she wanted to quickly touch on the cat situation. She said she was a Seminole County citizen and she did not agree with feral cats. Ms. Vaughn said she did not agree with cats being trapped, neutered and released when they were wild. She said she did not agree for many reasons.

Ms. Nagan started to interrupt Ms. Vaughn by saying "Have you ever ... " when Dr. Vaughan said to Ms. Nagan to let the speaker finish. Ms. Nagan said she would wait.

Ms. Vaughn said she has property, she has agricultural animals and she has many cats that live there that were trapped cats that are semi-feral. She said she lost three of them this year, two of them were hit on the road and one was gone and she thinks an animal in the woods got it. Ms. Vaughn said it was a horrible world out there for feral cats. She said do not tell her on your colonies when you go out there if one was missing you go find it. She asked what if it was laying and dying and what if it takes four or five days for the animal to die.

Ms. Nagan interrupted Ms. Vaughn by saying they do yes they do.

Ms. Vaughan continued speaking asking you go find every single cat. Ms. Nagan's response was inaudible.

Ms. Vaughan said sorry but she did not believe that. She said she understood it was a very complicated issue and nobody liked to euthanize animals. She said she thought a kind death going to sleep was much better than fending for your life every moment outdoors, waiting for someone to bring you a little cat food. Ms. Vaughn said it was dangerous out there for cats. She said there were humans who did not like them, there were cars that kill them and

there were animals that prey on them. Ms. Vaughn said it was a horrible life in most instances.

Ms. Nagan asked Ms. Vaughan if she had TNR'd those cats, did she fix them and vet them. Ms. Vaughn replied she did. Ms. Vaughan said some were through Orange County and some she found in Seminole County. She said she got some from shelters including Levy County which has a shelter located right at the dump where the cats have absolutely no chance.

Ms. Nagan interrupted Ms. Vaughn saying there were people that relocate if it was a situation like Ms. Vaughn's where they were in danger.

Ms. Vaughn said her situation was no more dangerous than any of these other people's. She said she has a beautiful piece of property and had cats there for years. She said there were roads everywhere and it was dangerous, it was dangerous for animals to be running loose.

Ms. Nagan interrupted Ms. Vaughan saying people get run over too and we were not going to kill people.

Ms. Vaughn resumed speaking but Dr. Vaughan, Ms. Garrambone and Ms. Nagan spoke over her and their remarks were disjointed.

Ms. Vaughn asked if she could ask a question if it was appropriate. Dr. Vaughan replied affirmatively. Ms. Vaughn asked how to get on the Board and how to remove people from the Board. Ms. Garrambone responded by saying you apply when there is an opening. Ms. Vaughn again asked how do we remove someone. Ms. Prince, Ms. Nagan and Dr. Vaughan all made remarks that were disjointed. Dr. Vaughan said the County Commissioners appoint the Board and there was one appointee from the Sheriff's department and a veterinarian.

Ms. Nagan spoke directly to the audience saying "Does anybody in the audience do feral cats and if they're sick trap them again and take them to the vet." Again Ms. Nagan spoke directly to the audience saying "Are your cats happy, healthy and fine, no problems." Dr. Vaughan spoke directly to the audience asking them to raise their hands so he could count them. Again Ms. Nagan spoke directly to the audience saying "How many people know feral cats that are happy, healthy that you take care of that don't bother anybody." Dr. Vaughan said he counted twenty two people.

Dr. Vaughan announced that was the end of the public part of the meeting and invited the audience to stay and listen but that the Board would not take commentary back and forth.

V. Old Business.

A. Review Proposed Seminole County Animal Ordinance.

1. Sections 20.50 through Sections 20.55 (initially reviewed on 12/9/10).

Ms. Nagan asked was this dangerous dogs.

Ms. Garrambone said yes it went by Section 20.50 to 20.55 which was Article 3 dangerous dogs.

Ms. Nagan asked 20.50 right and Ms. Garrambone answered yes.

Dr. Vaughan called for discussion. More than one Board member responded they had comments. Dr. Vaughan said Ms. Wittmer could go first.

Ms. Wittmer said she had a comment on Section 20.50, paragraph h, the third sub-paragraph, Procedure for Declaring a Dog Dangerous. Ms. Wittmer then read verbatim "If the owner fails to obtain the Certificate of Registration for a Dangerous Dog within this time period and the dog is not impounded at the Animal Services Shelter, the Animal Services Manager or designee shall impound the dog or obtain a pick-up order from a court of competent jurisdiction to impound the dog until the Animal Services Board holds a hearing for the purpose of determining the disposition of the dog." Ms. Wittmer said her question was could the Animal Services Manager not then decide to euthanize without it coming back to the Board.

Ms. Colby replied no, that was statutory. She said when a dog had already been declared dangerous and they violate the terms of the dangerous dog, which probably was the Board's order, either the Board's order or Mr. Woodward's determination that was not challenged, but if it was after a hearing it was the Board's order and they have the right, part of due process, to come back to the Board and argue their case as to either there was no violation of the dangerous dog conditions or why under what circumstances there should have, they were allowed to have (sic).

Ms. Wittmer asked the owner can appeal it but if they don't, if they just, if they don't meet the requirements of the certificate and they don't appeal the Animal Services Manager from saying that they can euth it must come back to the Board even if they don't (sic).

Ms. Colby said it would come back to the Board because it was the Board's determination because the Board was almost acting as a court to determine whether or not ... She said obviously if the person said "Yes, I violated and I don't care take the dog".

Dr. Vaughan said which happens most of the time but there had been a couple where the Board had to come back.

Ms. Colby said the owner always has that option of due process to come back to the Board and argue whether or not they violated. She said that was a matter of fact for the Board to determine, whether or not the owner in fact violated the terms of the dangerous dog conditions. She said that was a matter of due process.

Ms. Wittmer said paragraph four (Section 20.50, paragraph i, Procedure for Declaring a Dog Dangerous) obviously took care of the fact if the owner did not appeal it.

Ms. Garrambone said she had a comment on Section 20.50, paragraph l, Procedure for Declaring a Dog Dangerous. Ms. Garrambone said she knew this language had been in there about when a dog would not be deemed dangerous as a threat if protecting its property, protecting its owner. She asked what about a situation where somebody went to break up a dog fight and they were bitten. She said they tried to break up two dogs and they were bitten by one of the dogs and it was not their dog. Ms. Garrambone said that was a situation where they could be bitten but that dog was not necessarily dangerous, it was in the middle of a fight.

Ms. Colby replied that was why there was an Animal Control Board to make those factual determinations.

Ms. Garrambone asked should it even be coming in front of the Board. She said that was a likely situation where the person was going to be bitten and they should not have been trying to break up a dog fight.

Mr. Woodward said if it was an issue where the dog inflicted a severe injury or what he determined to be a severe injury, then he would have no choice.

Ms. Garrambone said but that was an idiot human. She said any human who stuck their hand by the mouth of two dogs that are fighting was an imbecile.

Dr. Vaughan said there was a vicious dog hearing where it was guys who stole batteries from a junkyard and the dogs bit them and the dogs were charged as vicious dogs and there was a hearing. He said he thought they arrested the guys who never showed up but the Board had to go through the procedure.

Ms. Garrambone said when two dogs are tearing at each other and you stick your hand by their faces you were asking for it. She said the dog could not even know that was your hand that was there.

Ms. Colby said that was the reason why it would come to the Board. She said this was statutory language and not something staff dreamed up, but word for word with the Florida Statutes.

Ms. Garrambone said she knew it had been in there before.

Ms. Colby said the reason it was there was because it was tracking the statutes. She said the reason why it was somewhat vague was to allow the Board to make that judgment call when there were extenuating circumstances as to why this dog bit somebody. She said the Board had the right to make that decision and to declare the dog not dangerous even if the Animal Services Manager said it was.

Ms. Garrambone asked did that have to come before the Board or could it go to Morgan.

Ms. Colby it would come to the Animal Services Manager first and if there was any question about it, it would go to the Board.

Ms. Nagan said she had two questions. She asked what if the violation was only say they didn't have the dangerous dog sign up when they were inspected. She asked if it could be euthanized.

Mr. Woodward said that was a requirement under the certificate.

Ms. Nagan asked even that could have them euthanized, something as simple as that.

Mr. Woodward said it would have to come back to the Board.

Ms. Colby said it would have to come back to the Board to make the determination whether or not to extend the conditions, allow them to proceed, or to euthanize. She said the Board also had the alternative to euthanize the dog.

Ms. Nagan said her other question was to her an appeal meant that you could not be penalized for appealing. She said the letters that the people get when they want to appeal the dangerous dog, like the last one, the one year old yellow lab, they were told that if they appeal it there was a chance that the Board could decide to euthanize the dog. She said it was not a plea bargain and she could not find anything in the state statute allowing that. She said to her if Morgan said it could be euthanized and the owner appealed it to the Board we should be able to say yes just declare dangerous or it was not. Ms. Nagan said if Morgan only says it was a dangerous dog and the people want to appeal that their dog was not she did not think the Board should have the right to go one step further and say "Well, now we're euthanizing it."

Ms. Garrambone asked if wasn't it statutory.

Dr. Vaughan said it was in the Florida Statutes.

Ms. Nagan asked to be supplied with a copy (sic) because she did not see that.

Ms. Colby said she would be happy to supply Ms. Nagan with a copy of the state statutes.

Ms. Nagan said she thought the Board could, she read it that the Board could say to euthanize but if Morgan said that first. She said that was more like a punishment, who was going to appeal a decision that either you keep your dog dangerous and it might not really be or you have a chance it might be euthanized if you appeal a decision. She said that was not really a proper appeal process.

Ms. Colby said the appeal process also extends to the court when Ms. Nagan interrupted her saying most people could not afford that. Ms. Colby continued speaking saying this was one of the interesting things about this Board and why the Board was called a quasi-judicial board rather than just an average board because the Board's sole responsibility was not just to make recommendations the Board actually has judicial powers given by the State of Florida. She said that means the Board's orders were not appealed to the Board of County Commissioners, they went to court.

Dr. Vaughan said they went to court like a zoning board.

Ms. Nagan said but then they have to be able to afford a court reporter and transcripts and a lot of them do not have money for that. She said in her opinion she would not have declared the one year lab dangerous for a freak accident. She said to her two little stitches were not severe, disfiguring injuries. Ms. Nagan said yes, it was a horrible thing that happened.

Ms. Garrambone said that was statutory also, stitches.

Ms. Nagan said no, no, severe, disfiguring stitches. She said that was not disfiguring in her book.

Ms. Colby began to speak again saying it was up to the Board when Ms. Nagan interrupted her saying but they did not appeal it and it could have been because they saw it could be euthanized.

Ms. Colby continued speaking saying the statute did not say one stitch, two stitches when Ms. Nagan interrupted her saying it says disfiguring though. Ms. Colby continued speaking saying a three inch scar or you got your leg torn

off. Ms. Colby said facts were to be determined by the Board and it was within the Board's jurisdiction to decide.

Ms. Nagan asked did it not say it had to be disfiguring.

Ms. Garrambone said she did not think so.

Dr. Vaughan said no.

Ms. Nagan yes, she saw that word.

Ms. Garrambone said there was another section, there was a paragraph that says sutures.

Ms. Colby said there were several levels of determination. She said for example a dog that had previously bitten someone or caused an injury to someone, if that dog simply threatened someone and came back before the Board that dog could be euthanized. She said in fact that dog shall be euthanized if it was found to have done that threatening behavior even if it did not bite anybody. Ms. Colby said there were different levels set out in the statutes as to what the Board's range of action could be. She said it could range anywhere from levying very simple conditions to letting the dog go, to having the dog euthanized and it depended on what section of the statutes.

Dr. Vaughan began to speak saying the state statutes superseded any county ordinance when Ms. Nagan interrupted him saying she did not see any definition of severe in ours (sic) but she did see it in the state statute and she knew she saw disfiguring but she would get that for the next meeting.

Dr. Vaughan said OK.

Ms. Nagan said she could be wrong.

Dr. Vaughan called for more discussion.

Ms. Wittmer said she needed a little clarification when Ms. Garrambone asked Ms. Wittmer if her (meaning Ms. Wittmer's) paragraph was before her (meaning Ms. Garrambone's) paragraph and that she (meaning Ms. Garrambone) was on h. Ms. Wittmer said her paragraph was first. Dr. Vaughan said Ms. Wittmer could speak first.

Ms. Wittmer said it was the first paragraph (Section 20.51, paragraph f, the second sub-paragraph, Procedure for Dangerous Dog Hearing) and she understood that. Ms. Wittmer said if the owner failed to obtain the Certificate of Registration and the dog was impounded by Animal Services that the dog shall be euthanized. She said the next paragraph was essentially the same only that

the dog was not impounded at Seminole County Animal Services but then it had to come back to the Board. Ms. Wittmer asked just because it was not housed at Animal Services then it had to come back to the Board rather than just being euthanized when Ms. Garrambone spoke over Ms. Wittmer asking because you could not just go get it was that why. Ms. Wittmer continued speaking saying as in the first paragraph and she knew you had to go get a court order to get it.

Ms. Colby said you had to get a court order to go get it and at that point the animal was not considered, because the owner had it in his possession, it was not abandoned.

Ms. Wittmer said OK.

Ms. Colby said it was not abandoned and we have to give the owner full, due process. She said if they just left the dog and they did not care enough to come to a hearing about the dog, they have abandoned it and they have waived their right to that due process. She said as long as they were in possession of that dog or had possession then we would afford them every element of due process until they waive it or we conclude due process.

Ms. Garrambone said her issue was with paragraph h (Section 20.51, paragraph h, Procedure for Dangerous Dog Hearing) and she understood, especially on the heels of paragraph g which was in the statutes about the Board's decisions being final, and then paragraph h saying a stay could only be issued by a court or the Animal Services Board and she was OK with ending it there, not the Animal Services Manager or designee. She said that was just one individual and she thought it should really end at the court order or the Animal Services Board.

Ms. Colby said there was a reason for that. She began to explain that the Board would order that the dog be euthanized by a certain day. Ms. Garrambone said and they file an appeal. Ms.Colby continued with her explanation saying they file the day before that date. Ms. Garrambone said the court could give them a stay. Ms. Colby resumed speaking saying the court has not yet entered a stay. Ms. Colby said technically if the court entered a stay on the twentieth day which they would be allowed to do and the Board's euthanasia order was for the nineteenth day then we could legally euthanize that dog and it would be over and that would be it. Ms. Colby said our preference would be if a person took the time to file an action in the court even if the court had not gotten around to issuing that stay, she would call Morgan and say a court action has been filed.

Dr. Vaughan said give it a couple of more days.

Ms. Colby resumed speaking saying she would say do not euthanize that dog until we have had due process and everything has been cleared out and we

get a court order. Ms. Colby said usually in that time period it was not enough time to get a quorum of the Board together.

Ms. Garrambone said maybe we should put that in because otherwise Morgan was in a position of being hounded possibly and she did not think one person should have to make that decision on each one of these cases.

Ms. Colby said in most cases he did not and he would rather leave the decision to the Board or to a court.

Ms. Garrambone said right because we have a vote or otherwise it was a judge.

Ms. Colby said we only put that in because of the situations that have occurred where we have had someone who has filed a court case at the last minute, we know some kind of court action was going to take place, the court has not yet ordered a stay or sometimes people do not know they have the right to ask for a stay. Ms. Colby said she would prefer not to euthanize any animal even though a standing order exists until such time as all due process has gone through, that we made every last effort to keep the animal alive until there was a court order otherwise.

Ms. Hair said it was not easy to get all of the Board together.

Ms. Garrambone said right, if it was within the last day she could understand that.

Ms. Colby said if it was the last day of the order, she had a court action and there was no way she can get the Board together to make the decision to put a stay.

Ms. Garrambone asked to put in some language in there as far as that then.

Ms. Wittmer said the only objection she would have to that was the Animal Services Manager could have not declared the dog dangerous to begin with so he had the authority not really to override the Board's order but he already had the authority to either declare the dog dangerous or not to declare the dog dangerous. She said she did not see any problem with the language.

Ms. Colby said the only reason we were putting the language in there was Morgan has to follow the Board's orders which were essentially the orders of a court that the dog be euthanized. She said however because the matter could be delayed by a court order or by an action filed in court, yes we really should wait and let the Board put a stay on their own order because really the Board should be only ones that would do that. Ms. Colby said because of the time

considerations we wanted to give Morgan the option to put a stay on it and not euthanize the dog because of the Board's order which was standing there when somebody else has a court action pending. She said it did not happen all that often, it was pretty rare but it had happened and we would prefer to be able to keep the dog alive until all due process has been exhausted.

Ms. Hair said to move quickly.

Ms. Garrambone said you have your reasons.

Dr. Vaughan called for more discussion. Ms. Garrambone said they have their reasons for what they have in there.

Dr. Vaughan called for more discussion.

Ms. Garrambone asked on page 29, paragraph m (Section 20.52, paragraph m, Requirements to Obtain and Maintain a Valid Certificate of Registration for a Dangerous Dog) that was new, that was something you put in, the spay or neuter required, because this had come up at previous meetings with the certificate, so that was new.

Mr. Woodward replied that would be a new requirement.

Ms. Garrambone asked was that new.

Ms. Hair said she had a question. Ms. Hair asked if being aggressive was genetic where you would not want the animal to have any babies because they might be aggressive. She said she did not understand the spay or neuter.

Ms. Garrambone said it would depend on how it happened. She said it would depend on if we could be one hundred per cent positive how it happened. She said there was always that question.

Ms. Colby said there were no designations as to breeds because by law in the State of Florida you cannot distinguish, you cannot enact laws or take action based upon the breed of the dog. She said the law in Florida presumed all dogs to be equal. Ms. Colby said you cannot enact laws that say all pit bulls will be spayed and neutered because we're afraid they're going to all be aggressive.

Ms. Hair asked if wasn't this about dangerous dogs.

Ms. Colby replied yes.

Ms. Hair asked so if a dog was declared dangerous it had to be spayed or neutered.

Ms. Garrambone said that was what this was saying.

Ms. Prince said an intact animal can show aggression more than one that was not.

Ms. Hair said that was why she was asking if it was genetic or why was that.

Ms. Prince said it was hormones.

Ms. Garrambone said you can have a one year old that bit somebody and the dog never bites again. She said because after that time it actually receives training or maybe proper care. She said you do not know why it bit, you do not know if it will ever bite again in the next maybe twelve or thirteen years that it would be alive. She said that was why this came up at a previous meeting and we discussed that and how can you take somebody's property and tell it (sic) you have got to do this when maybe they have got the dog and they really do not even know how to care for it at that point. Ms. Garrambone said this was kind of a big one.

Ms. Prince asked Ms. Garrambone if she was OK with the requirement of spay or neuter.

Ms. Garrambone replied no, she absolutely was not. She said she was not OK with it the first time when we came up with it. She said this was like saying take your child, bring it down and sterilize it because it has ADHD and it might pass it on.

Ms. Wittmer said well it's not quite (inaudible).

Ms. Garrambone asked would anyone who had a child would you say do not reproduce in the future. Ms. Garrambone said people with children that have that are not perfect would understand this perfectly. She said they would say you know what this is ridiculous.

Ms. Nagan said we have so many animals anyway (inaudible).

Ms. Wittmer began to speak but Ms. Garrambone spoke over her saying she agreed every animal should be spayed or neutered. She said her animals were not but that did not make it right for somebody else.

Ms. Wittmer asked but wasn't this because most intact animals were more aggressive

Ms. Garrambone said that was not true. She said you could have an animal that was aggressive because of the way it was treated.

Dr. Vaughan said he could not recall one vicious dog hearing in the last twenty years where every one of the male dogs one of the conditions was that they be neutered. He said you could have about maybe a sixty to sixty five per cent chance it would change behavior in the male dogs. He said basically male dogs did things because of their libido. He said males thought that way.

Ms. Nagan said she thought it was state law anyway.

Dr. Vaughan said the state did not have it.

Dr. Vaughan said with females you probably have maybe a fifty to fifty per cent chance of changing behavior as far as being neutered. He said as far as the genetic predisposition of aggression there had not been a lot of research data in dogs. He then spoke about such research data in wildlife and bovine breeds.

Ms. Hair said the hormones made sense to her and she did not think about that.

Dr. Vaughan said most vicious dogs the Board has had were male dogs. He said ninety percent of the vicious dog bites were not the poor dog but it was the owner and the neighbors and the situations and it had nothing to do with the dog. He said unfortunately the dog caught the flak.

Ms. Colby said one of the considerations when we were looking at this was specifically not as a consideration of the animal but this was a situation where you have a person who was probably the one who caused the dog to be dangerous in the first place and this was going to be a small step to make sure they were not going to breed any more dangerous animals, that they were going to turn dangerous, from this animal. She said generally people who kept these intact dogs would breed them.

Ms. Garrambone said what concerned her about this was what if they have maybe a Doberman Pinscher that was a year old or a German Shepard that was eight months or ten months maybe this dog could get into better hands or a better family or somebody that would take it if it was a really a good animal and somebody might be interested in taking it from them if it was not spayed or neutered. She said whereas as soon as you spay or neuter it somebody (inaudible).

Ms. Prince asked would we want that.

Ms. Garrambone said yes if it went to a better home when Ms. Wittmer spoke over her saying but if it was a dangerous dog you were not supposed to do that.

Ms. Garrambone said but it may not be and if it went to somebody who knew animals when Ms. Prince spoke over her saying we were talking about dangerous dogs not just pets out there.

Ms. Garrambone continued speaking. She said a dangerous dog that was declared dangerous at eight or ten months or a year knows that may be when Ms. Prince spoke over her asking if she (Ms. Garrambone) wanted to put an age limit on here for requiring the spaying or neutering.

Ms. Nagan said so they appeal and we could say it was not dangerous.

Ms. Garrambone continued speaking saying because if it was a young dog when Ms. Prince spoke over her saying when we get into the hearings was when we go through all this kind of stuff.

Ms. Garrambone said we ask how old the animal is and if it was a good, purebred animal this animal has a chance to maybe go off to a better home.

Ms. Prince said they did not go off to better homes.

Dr. Vaughan said once they were dangerous you could not send them across to other counties, you could not do that. He spoke directly to Ms. Garrambone asking what type of wording she thought would be appropriate. He said basically this was verifying what the Board had done for the last twenty years. He said he did not think there was one case where a vicious dog was declared dangerous that it was not neutered.

Ms. Nagan said we never had a case like that. She asked why don't we wait till we have a case like that.

Ms. Garrambone said if it was in here we could not wait till we have a case and that was what she was saying.

Dr. Vaughan said he understood Ms. Garrambone's point because it was an infringement of government on personal rights.

Ms. Garrambone asked if it was not in here we could make that restriction in the declaration couldn't we.

Mr. Woodward began to reply saying there were allowances in the Florida Statutes that allow the Board to make additional when Ms. Garrambone spoke over him asking to make restrictions on the individual animal.

Mr. Woodward answered yes.

Ms. Garrambone asked but we could not take it away if we left it in. She said in other words we could not go easier if it was in the ordinance.

Ms. Colby replied no, if it was in the ordinance it was going to be required.

Ms. Garrambone said if it was not in the ordinance we could make the restriction.

Ms. Colby replied yes.

Ms. Garrambone said if we believed it was a dog that had been with somebody five years we could then say "You know what this animal needs to be spayed or neutered at this point."

Ms. Wittmer asked if the Board could take a vote.

Ms. Prince said yes, let's vote.

Dr. Vaughan said there were two points whether we require the spay neuter of a vicious dog or we do it individually, those in favor of leaving it as it is in a and b (Section 20.52 Requirements to Obtain and Maintain a Valid Certificate of Registration for a Dangerous Dog, paragraph m, sub-paragraphs a and b) raise your hand. Ms. Nagan asked if that meant fixing it and Dr. Vaughan replied yes. (Ms. Nagan, Dr. Vaughan, Ms. Wittmer, Ms. Prince and Ms. Hair raised their hands.) Dr. Vaughan called for all opposed. (Ms. Garrambone raised her hand.)

Dr. Vaughan said no else on the Board seemed to care and he understood Ms. Garrambone's point. He said he could not think of one case and they were never puppies and it was always the owner.

Ms. Garrambone asked if the Board did ones that were a year old.

Dr. Vaughan said not breeding dogs and things like that.

Ms. Wittmer said she has a copy of the state statute for the definition of a dangerous dog. She said one of the definitions was and then read verbatim "has aggressively bitten, attacked or endangered or has inflicted severe injury on a human being on public or private property." Ms. Wittmer said that was pretty broad.

Ms. Garrambone began speaking and Ms. Wittmer continued speaking and their remarks were disjointed and inaudible.

Ms. Garrambone said it could be a one year old dog that threatened somebody on a sidewalk or felt threatened and it would be declared.

Ms. Nagan asked what did it say for severe for the definition, that went further.

Ms. Garrambone said that was what she was saying, doing it on an individual basis.

Dr. Vaughan said we live in a society where if someone threatened you, said they were going to beat you up, they could file a warrant or what not.

Ms. Wittmer said severe injury was just one of the definitions. She said it was either aggressively bitten or attacked or endangered or has inflicted severe injury so any of those would apply.

Ms. Nagan said so where's the (inaudible) that she could have sworn she saw it. She asked was it not in there.

Ms. Garrambone asked you don't think we have people who come in here for hearings and lie.

Dr. Vaughan said the Board was on section m (supra) and the Board voted to leave it as it was on page twenty nine.

Dr. Vaughan called for additional discussion on Sections 20.50 thru 20.55.

Ms. Garrambone said moving a dangerous dog to another residence and asked could you move it out of the area.

Ms. Nagan said yes, if you do all that stuff.

Ms. Garrambone asked what about if you moved it out of the county.

Dr. Vaughan said the county would have to be notified where the dog was going to and the same restrictions would be required.

Ms. Colby said that was state statute.

Ms. Garrambone asked if you moved it out of the state.

Mr. Woodward said if the animal was moved out of the county we would need to know about it and where it was going and he would do his due diligence to let the appropriate authority of wherever the animal was going to let them know a dangerous dog was moving into their area.

Ms. Garrambone asked if they could not move it before Morgan's determination.

Mr. Woodward responded correct.

Ms. Garrambone asked this was all pretty much the same.

Dr. Vaughan responded yes and called for more discussion. There was none.

VI. New Business.

A. Nomination of Officers.

Dr. Vaughan called for nominations for Chairman.

Ms. Nagan nominated Ms. Garrambone for Chairman. Second by Dr. Vaughan.

Dr. Vaughan called for additional nominations.

Ms. Prince nominated Ms. Wittmer for Chairman. Second by Ms. Hair.

Dr. Vaughan called for additional nominations.

Ms. Nagan asked if we did vice chair also. Dr. Vaughan replied the Board usually does the chair first and then the new chairman would take over the meeting.

Ms. Wittmer nominated Dr. Vaughan for Chairman. The nomination failed for lack of a second.

Dr. Vaughan called for a vote on Ms. Nagan's nomination. Ms. Nagan, Ms. Garrambone and Dr. Vaughan voted for Ms. Garrambone.

Dr. Vaughan called for a vote on Ms. Prince's nomination. Ms. Wittmer, Ms. Hair and Ms. Prince voted for Ms. Wittmer.

The vote for Chairman was tied at three and three for each nominee.

Dr. Vaughan called for a re-vote.

Ms. Nagan and Ms. Garrambone voted for Ms. Garrambone.

Ms. Wittmer, Ms. Hair, Ms. Prince and Dr. Vaughan voted for Ms. Wittmer.

Ms. Wittmer was elected Chairman and immediately assumed the office.

Ms. Wittmer called for nominations for Vice Chairman.

Ms. Nagan nominated Ms. Hair for Vice Chairman. Second by Ms. Prince.

Ms. Wittmer called for additional nominations. There were none.

Ms. Wittmer called for a vote on Ms. Nagan's nomination. The motion passed unanimously and Ms. Hair was elected Vice Chairman.

B. Adopt Rules of Procedure.

Mr. Woodward asked to speak and Ms. Wittmer consented.

Mr. Woodward said a mistake was made to the 2010 Rules of Procedure (Rules) that was not caught until prior to this meeting. Mr. Woodward handed out copies of the Rules the Board has been following which were different than the Rules previously distributed.

Ms. Wittmer asked if these were the Rules adopted and voted on.

Mr. Woodward replied yes except for one change recommended by the Acting County Manager, that being to remove the twenty minute time limit from the public speaking section.

Ms. Nagan said it used to be open ended and we never had a problem and we never ran late. Ms. Nagan said people spoke three minutes and they did not become repetitive.

Mr. Woodward said that was the way he had it laid out in the current Rules and the Board could add that requirement back in.

Ms. Wittmer asked where it was in the old one.

Mr. Woodward answered page three, item six, Order of Business, sub-section four, Public Commentary.

Ms. Garrambone asked you just put the limited to three minutes per speaker but not the overall limit.

Mr. Woodward said the Chairman controlled the meeting so if the Chairman wished to move the meeting along then he could definitely ask for no more repetitive comments and only new comments be made.

Ms. Wittmer called for discussion.

Ms. Garrambone asked if there were any other changes and Mr. Woodward replied that was the only change.

Ms. Nagan asked that meant from now on there was no limit to how many people could speak.

Ms. Garrambone said no, three minutes per speaker.

Ms. Nagan asked just three minutes but as many people as OK well at any meeting correct.

Ms. Garrambone said depending on what was going on.

Ms. Nagan asked any meeting though correct.

Ms. Wittmer asked should there be something in there about it was up to the Chairman to limit it.

Ms. Nagan said that would become a pick and choose issue.

Dr. Vaughan said that was the privilege of being the Chairman.

Ms. Nagan said yeah (sic) but then it would become pick and choose and that was not really democratic.

Dr. Vaughan again said that was the power of the Chairman.

Ms. Nagan said she meant for years we had two people who wouldn't let two people speak and now today all of a sudden when it's you know.

Ms. Wittmer took control of the meeting and asked for a motion to adopt the new Rules.

Ms. Nagan asked but was that for every meeting from now on that people when Mr. Woodward said for every regular meeting.

Motion by Ms. Nagan that an unlimited number of people can speak.

Ms. Prince said the Board was talking about the whole Rules.

Ms. Wittmer said the Board was adopting the new Rules.

Ms. Garrambone said the Board adopts the Rules every year.

Ms. Nagan said OK and asked was that the only change made that there was no more twenty minute rule.

Mr. Woodward said correct.

Motion by Ms. Nagan to adopt the Rules of Procedure as presented. Second by Dr. Vaughan. The motion passed unanimously.

C. Final Review of and Recommendation to the Director of Public Safety of the Revised Seminole County Code, Chapter 20, Animal Ordinance.

Ms. Wittmer asked if the Board had reviewed all of it.

Ms. Nagan said wait but today it was on there again. She said Ms. Hair and Ms. Garrambone were out last time so she would like to bring up a couple of little things again.

Mr. Woodward said he would like to point out up to this point the Board had reviewed all sections with the exception of 20.80 to the end of the ordinance. He said that was a portion of the entire ordinance the Board had not seen up to this point. Mr. Woodward said the Director of Public Safety had encouraged him to encourage the Board to make a swift decision on the ordinance as to whether or not they support it. He said if the Board wished to review section eighty to the end and then if there were any questions going back over the entire ordinance he would be happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Nagan asked if she could bring something from the last time about the leash law. She said Ms. Garrambone and Ms. Hair weren't here.

Ms. Wittmer consented.

Ms. Nagan said that somebody who spoke mentioned it was pretty much like saying you have to put collars and leashes on horses it was pretty much impossible for feral cats. She said she did not understand how we could have when Ms. Garrambone spoke over her saying that was OK you know what she was thinking her dog would never get a bath again.

Ms. Nagan continued speaking saying whoever thought that this was a practical ordinance would they be willing to demonstrate because it was ridiculous.

Ms. Wittmer said she did not think it was necessary to demonstrate.

Ms. Nagan said well it was an impossible thing to do. She asked how could you have a law when Mr. Woodward spoke over her saying at the upcoming HSUS Expo there would be a class on, due to advances in technology, collars for cats that are acceptable. He said so if it was being when Ms. Nagan

spoke over him asking on feral cats and Ms. Garrambone spoke over Ms. Nagan saying come bathe my dog.

Ms. Nagan said she was talking feral cats. She asked were they saying for feral cats, she didn't think so.

Mr. Woodward replied he had not been to the Expo yet but they were putting on a class saying collars are perfectly acceptable for cats.

Ms. Nagan said but not for ferals. She said she knew the woman who ran the feral program.

Ms. Wittmer asked if that part had not changed had it.

Dr. Vaughan said the leash law for cats has always been there.

Ms. Wittmer said this wasn't a new thing.

Ms. Garrambone asked why was this back in here after we voted on it already.

Ms. Nagan said we didn't vote on anything yet.

Ms. Garrambone said not this Board but the Animal Control Board voted on this already.

Ms. Nagan asked to have a leash law for feral cats.

Ms. Garrambone said no we voted it down. She said we voted down the leash law.

There was a loud outcry from the audience.

Ms. Wittmer gaveled the meeting to restore order.

Ms. Garrambone said this came before the Animal Control Board. She said sorry you guys were not on it then.

Ms. Wittmer said the Board does not have that authority.

Ms. Garrambone said she was saying it came before the Animal Control Board before and we voted it down and now it was stuck in there again.

Ms. Wittmer said she was going to call for a vote.

Ms. Nagan said, speaking directly to Ms. Wittmer, wait a minute, you're saying, you're saying that you think feral cats should be on leashes do think it's possible.

Ms. Wittmer said she was saying that this has not changed, she was saying feral cats when Ms. Nagan spoke over her saying this was a new ordinance.

Ms. Wittmer said this was not a new ordinance.

Ms. Garrambone said this was a rewrite of the ordinance that was what she was saying.

Ms. Wittmer said it was a rewrite of the ordinance but it has always when Ms. Nagan spoke over her saying no, she has it.

Ms. Wittmer said yes it has and asked if this a new ordinance.

Ms. Nagan said yes.

Mr. Woodward said the language change was new and it made a lot of additions to clarify discrepancies that were present in the old ordinance. He said the intent behind it was the same.

Ms. Wittmer said you can have a cat loose on your own property but it cannot go off your property when Ms. Nagan interrupted her saying you can with with permission. Ms. Wittmer continued speaking saying you have to have control.

Ms. Nagan said no. She said the ordinance now says if you have permission of the other property owners your cat could be anywhere if it was expressed or implied consent. Ms. Nagan said now what you were trying to do was that you need when Ms. Wittmer spoke over her saying the Board understood how she felt.

Ms. Nagan said no she wanted to explain. Ms. Nagan, speaking directly to Ms. Wittmer, said no, you do not understand.

Ms. Wittmer said she did understand.

Ms. Nagan said Ms. Hair and Ms. Garrambone were not here.

Ms. Nagan said that was not the only thing being changed. She said you also want that the people need written consent from the property owner which right now you only need to say it was OK or say nothing. Ms. Nagan said you also want to make when Mr. Woodward spoke over her saying he thought that

issue was already addressed because you cannot prove intent. He said the only way you can prove that you have permission for that animal to be on the property was to have written consent.

Ms. Nagan said you could ask the person. She said you could ask them, if someone complained you say was it OK, you, animal control. She said people should not have to get written consent. Ms. Nagan said you were also changing the meaning of owner that if somebody feeds or cares for a feral cat for thirty days they were the owner and that was not the way it was now either.

Ms. Wittmer, speaking directly to Ms. Nagan, began to say the Board had been through all this when Ms. Nagan spoke over her saying OK what was the reason she would like to know the reason.

Ms. Garrambone said this was not getting past the Commission.

Ms. Wittmer said she was going to call for a vote when Ms. Garrambone spoke over her saying did anybody talk to their actual Commissioners because she was betting you did not. Ms. Garrambone continued speaking and Ms. Nagan began speaking and their remarks were disjointed.

Ms. Wittmer called for a motion to approve the ordinance as written.

Ms. Nagan said wait we did not even discuss the new stuff the trust fund. She said she had question.

Ms. Nagan said it mentioned when Ms. Wittmer asked where was she and Ms. Nagan replied article seven that we have grants.

Ms. Wittmer asked where was she in the ordinance.

Ms. Nagan said at the end, trust funds.

Ms. Prince said page fifty one.

Ms. Nagan said for i (Section 20.100. Creation of Fund; Acceptance, Investment, Use and Expenditure of Gifts, Grants and Awards to Animal Services, paragraph i) any gifts, grants or awards received subject to condition. She asked if we have ever received grants for Animal Services. She asked was anybody doing grant writing.

Mr. Woodward said typically there were no grants that were available for animal control. He said there were grants available for coalition building that animal control could participate in but they cannot do it alone. He said if there were grants for animal control he would love to have someone present those to him because by all means he would participate.

Ms. Nagan asked if Animal Services was allowed to apply because they were not a non-profit or did a non-profit have to apply for animal control for grants.

Ms. Colby said the County has on staff a grant writer who applies for grants when they become available and they write grants for many different departments.

Mr. Woodward began to speak when Ms. Garrambone spoke over him and their remarks were disjointed.

Mr. Woodward said the Animal Shelter Challenge was a competition where anyone who had their animals posted on PefFinder could participate and it was all done by voting where the public went in, selected the shelter they wanted and voted for the shelter once a day. He said in the State of Florida for the past three years with the exception of one time, Seminole County had always come in first and received a $1,000 grant. Mr. Woodward said Animal Services also received a $1,000 grant for the most votes in a single week. He said almost two years ago Animal Services received $5,000 because we came in second in the entire nation.

Ms. Wittmer asked Ms. Nagan if she had an objection.

Ms. Nagan said no.

Ms. Garrambone said at the time of the votes Mr. Woodward let people know to go in and vote.

Ms. Nagan, speaking directly to Ms. Wittmer, said she knew she (meaning Ms. Wittmer) did not like the topic but she (meaning herself) wanted to question each person individually.

Ms. Wittmer asked about what.

Ms. Nagan said about the leash law. She said she wanted to question then spoke directly to Dr. Vaughan saying he was a veterinarian did he think when Ms. Wittmer spoke over her saying she did not think this was necessary.

Ms. Nagan said it was, then speaking directly to Ms. Colby, said how can you, you are an attorney.

Ms. Wittmer said if somebody wanted to participate in this discussion they were welcome to participate in this discussion

Ms. Nagan said but it had to be now in the public.

Ms. Wittmer said she did not think Ms. Nagan needed to ask every single member of the Board what they thought or what their objections were.

Ms. Nagan spoke directly to Ms. Colby saying she was the attorney and could you have an ordinance when it was not possible to do. She said forget about enforcing. Ms. Nagan said if it was impossible to even do it how can you have an ordinance that was like having a leash law for squirrels, for tigers. She said she knew it was impossible so she did not understand how we could have it.

Ms. Wittmer said it was possible to keep your animal on your own property.

Ms. Nagan said a feral cat belongs to the community.

Ms. Wittmer said no.

Ms. Nagan said yes there were thousands of them out there. She asked who did they belong to.

Ms. Wittmer called for additional discussion.

Ms. Wittmer spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying she had made her point and they all understood how she felt.

Ms. Nagan said but you know what if we fixed them they would not end up at animal control and there would be more room at fosters so it was a win win.

Ms. Wittmer spoke directly to Ms. Nagan saying they all understood how she felt

Ms. Wittmer called for additional discussion.

Ms. Prince said one lady spoke at the start of the meeting and said she fed feral cats and she spent thousands of dollars and she, meaning herself, commended the speaker for that. Ms. Prince said the lady said she fed and fixed and all that. Ms. Prince said to her the lady owned all those cats.

Ms. Nagan said she, meaning the speaker, was doing a service.

Ms. Garrambone said she did not think it was one issue.

Ms. Nagan said if the speaker did not do that though there would be so many more at animal control.

Ms. Prince tried to ask a question of Ms. Nagan but Ms. Garrambone spoke over her until Ms. Prince yielded to Ms. Garrambone.

Ms. Garrambone said in other words it was not just one issue. She asked do you have to agree with the whole thing to vote yes on it.

Ms. Wittmer said yes the Board had to agree on the whole thing.

Ms. Garrambone said well then we should have this discussion elsewhere.

Ms. Colby said to remember the Board was recommending to Tad Stone. If the Board chose to do so to recommend all this except for this paragraph or where you would choose some other recommendation. She said what we had tried to do was to put together something that was in line with what the lawmakers, the Board of County Commissioners, indicated to us were their desires. Ms. Colby said they could change their mind at any moment and when the Board of County Commissioners sees this and they want to change anything, everything or nothing, whatever they want that was what we would do.

Ms. Nagan asked Ms. Colby if she was saying the Commissioners want a leash law.

Ms. Garrambone said she was saying do you want to vote on this all at once or section it out.

Ms. Colby said she was saying the Board of County Commissioners has always passed a leash law. She said that was the law as it is. She said it is currently required and the leash law is in place today because that is what the Board of County Commissioners voted on to pass as law. Ms. Colby said the Board could certainly pull out a section if they chose and wished to make a different kind of recommendation to Mr. Stone with regard to that you have that right to do so, a Board can do that. She said if you wanted to pull out the leash law and say yes we recommend there be no leash laws you can make that recommendation. She said Mr. Stone would take that into consideration when he made his recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. Ms. Colby said she believed the reason they were pushing for this was because they want to get in front of the Board of County Commissioners.

Ms. Wittmer said she was calling for a vote and announced discussion was over.

Ms. Nagan said if she disagreed when Ms. Wittmer again announced discussion was over.

Ms. Nagan said it was about voting.

Ms. Nagan said if she disagreed with one item when Ms. Wittmer said she could disagree all she wanted and Ms. Nagan continued speaking asking do I approve it except for the one item or do I not approve it or do I approve it.

Ms. Garrambone said you have to vote no.

Ms. Wittmer called for a vote. She called for a motion to approve the ordinance as it was presented to the Board.

Motion by Ms. Prince to accept the recommendations as presented. Second by Dr. Vaughan. The motion carried four votes (by Ms. Wittmer, Dr. Vaughan, Ms. Prince and Ms. Hair) to two votes (by Ms. Nagan and Ms. Garrambone.)

Ms. Wittmer announced the Board approved recommending the ordinance as written to the Director of Public Safety.

Ms. Nagan then directed a question to Dr. Vaughan asking if he had ever had ferals in his practice.

Dr. Vaughan responded yes.

Ms. Nagan directed another question to Dr. Vaughan asking if he thought they could be leashed. She said he was a vet and he should know.

Dr. Vaughan said it really had nothing to do about a leash, it was all about animals running on other people's property.

D. Review of and Recommendation to the Director of Public Safety of Proposed Revisions to Animal Services Fee Resolution No. 2005-R-14.

Mr. Woodward said the Board saw this document once before and there had been no significant changes since the Board last saw it, but he wanted to bring it to the Board's attention one last time because the fee resolution would be submitted along with the ordinance.

Ms. Nagan said the Commissioners already saw this and disagreed with the five hundred dollar fee. She said she saw the video tape of it and Tad Stone presented it and they were very unhappy raising it to five hundred especially in this economy and they said any raises you do should not be for animals already declared dangerous. Ms. Nagan said so she was wondering why once again.

Ms. Garrambone asked why was it back again.

Ms. Wittmer made a remark that was inaudible to which Ms. Nagan said yes, she saw it on video and Ms. Garrambone asked don't you guys watch these and Ms. Nagan said she did not lie for the record.

Mr. Woodward said they did make a recommendation that the Board adjust it if you go two years without an incident that the animal fee could go down, the registration fee would be slowly decreased.

Ms. Garrambone said which was what we brought up in the meeting.

Ms. Wittmer said we already looked at this when Ms. Nagan spoke over her saying but no the County Commissioners said no to the five hundred they already said no to the five hundred and had Tad Stone take it back to the Board again.

Mr. Woodward said they did not say no they just did not make a motion.

Ms. Nagan said no they made comments how she remembered was Commissioner Henley, Van Der Weide, McLean they made comments that they could not believe more or less that we wanted to raise it to five hundred in an economy like this. She said they also said things that like the people with dangerous dogs even Commissioner Carey from 2002 and 2004 should not be raised and their fee was only fifty.

Ms. Wittmer began to call for a vote when Ms. Nagan interrupted her.

Ms. Nagan said one thing was missing from it though the spay neuter rebate was still in it, not in this document Mr. Woodward prepared but it was still in the Administrative Code and she said she would like to discuss it, it was never brought to the Board.

Ms. Wittmer said it was brought to the Board and we discussed it.

Ms. Nagan said no she looked at every minutes (sic), all the minutes and it was not in any of the minutes.

Ms. Wittmer said the Board did not make the budget. She said Commissioners vote on the budget.

Ms. Nagan said it was supposed to be brought to a Board meeting and it never was. Ms. Nagan directed a question to Ms. Colby asking was it ever at a Board meeting. She said she reviewed all the minutes.

Ms. Colby asked Ms. Nagan if she speaking about the rebates.

Ms. Nagan said yes.

Ms. Colby said she believed they pulled it out of the budget.

Dr. Vaughan said it never came to the Board.

Ms. Nagan said right, that was her point.

Ms. Wittmer began to speak but Ms. Garrambone spoke over her asking if the fee was still five hundred.

Ms. Nagan said the fee right now was fifty when Ms. Garrambone spoke over her saying the proposed fee when Ms. Nagan spoke over her saying yeah (sic) that was what everyone was saying.

Ms. Garrambone said that was what they already knocked down.

Ms. Nagan said right.

Ms. Garrambone said she was not doing this again and repeated she was not doing this again. She said because they already made us look like idiots.

Ms. Colby began to speak when Ms. Nagan spoke over her saying she thought they wanted the Board to review it.

Ms. Wittmer gaveled the meeting to restore order.

Ms. Garrambone said the Commissioners already yelled at us. She then directed a question to Ms. Wittmer and asking if she looked at the meeting.

Ms. Wittmer replied she did not.

Ms. Wittmer asked Ms. Colby if there was something she wanted to say.

Ms. Colby said the Board of County Commissioners by their budget actions already pulled the money taking the rebates out of the budget. She said so in other words there was no money.

Ms. Nagan said maybe we could get it back since the Board never discussed it.

Ms. Garrambone said no it was the Clerk's budget, they, just the State, Rick Scott today just hit them with another five per cent cut. She said she doubted we would ever get it back from the Clerk. She said every Clerk, sixty seven counties. Ms. Garrambone said you are not getting it back.

Dr. Vaughan said you never get it back.

Ms. Wittmer called for additional discussion. There was none. Ms. Wittmer called for a motion.

Motion by Ms. Prince to recommend the fee resolution as presented. Second by Dr. Vaughan. The motion carried four votes (by Ms. Wittmer, Dr. Vaughan, Ms. Prince and Ms. Hair) to two votes (by Ms. Nagan and Ms. Garrambone.)

Ms. Nagan said this was a waste of time because they already turned it down when it was presented a couple of years ago.

Dr. Vaughan said they could change it.

Mr. Woodward said all you were doing was making a recommendation.

Dr. Vaughan said they could put in whatever they want.

E. Future Agenda Items.

Ms. Wittmer called for future agenda items.

Ms. Nagan said she forgot to make a recommendation for the rules and procedures. She said instead of four times a year when like going over the animal codes took fifteen months if we could meet maybe six times a year or if it was still the four times meet more than an hour which was basically the average time we meet.

Ms. Wittmer asked if did we not just approve the Rules.

Ms. Nagan said yeah (sic) but she forgot this so she wanted to go back. She said four hours a year was so little.

Mr. Woodward said the Rules of Procedure say you will meet a minimum of three times a year.

Ms. Nagan said OK so we could make when Ms. Wittmer spoke over her asking why she wanted to meet more.

Ms. Nagan said because everything drags out and takes years to get done for the Board to do it and then it goes to the Commissioners. She said it would be more productive if the Board could either meet longer at each meeting or meet more often.

Ms. Wittmer called for discussion.

Ms. Garrambone said if it was something we were working on we could make it work longer.

Ms. Nagan said like the animal code she thought an hour every three months we should have met for at least three hours each time. She said this would have been done like that.

Ms. Garrambone said they were working on sections each time when Ms. Nagan spoke over her saying no they were finished she thought. Ms. Nagan said fifteen months to go over that was outrageous.

Ms. Wittmer called for future agenda items.

Mr. Woodward asked to add a future agenda item. He said the Board of County Commissioners requested that all boards receive training in regard to the Sunshine Law and that it be brought up at the next meeting as an agenda item.

Ms. Colby said it would actually be the Sunshine Law, public records law and the public ethics laws for officers.

Ms. Hair asked if that would be a special meeting or a regular meeting.

Mr. Woodward explained who can call a special meeting.

Ms. Colby said if the Board wished to call a special meeting to discuss this they could certainly do so and she would be happy to attend.

Ms. Wittmer asked if there would be a specific person doing this and Ms. Colby indicated she would be that person. Ms. Colby said she had been designated by the BCC to conduct this training.

Ms. Nagan said we did not vote on the code.

Ms. Garrambone said yes we did.

Ms. Wittmer said we should probably call a special meeting.

Ms. Nagan asked where were the procedures and administrative fees.

Ms. Wittmer called for any recommendations about when to do this training.

Ms. Garrambone said what about June because there was not anything else on the agenda for June.

Ms. Wittmer asked if they could do it at a regular meeting.

Ms. Garrambone said why not because there was nothing else to do in June since this was done.

Ms. Hair said she would like to do it quicker because the Board might be violating something they would learn about and the Board needed to find out.

Ms. Garrambone said most of us have been on the Board for (inaudible).

Ms. Colby asked why not tonight because she was prepared. She said the Board sent down a message they were to make this training available and mandatory for all boards as soon as the boards were ready to do it. She said she came prepared tonight just in case the Board wanted to do it tonight.

Ms. Wittmer asked for the time.

Dr. Vaughan responded 8:45 PM.

Ms. Wittmer suggested not doing it tonight.

Ms. Colby said if the Board wanted to have a special meeting she served at the Board's pleasure. She said if the Board wanted to do it at a regular meeting she would be happy to do it at a regular meeting. She said in general it would take about an hour or a little longer if the Board was excited and asked questions.

Ms. RiCharde asked Ms. Wittmer for permission to speak. She suggested that if this was the room the Board wanted to use to first find out the availability of the room.

Ms. Wittmer said she agreed with Ms. Hair that maybe the Board should do the training before the June meeting.

Ms. Garrambone asked if they could do it before the June meeting and call it a regular meeting.

Ms. Wittmer said yes.

Ms. Garrambone said then do the June meeting if we do not have something else that comes up.

Ms. Wittmer directed Ms. RiCharde to check the room availability and let the Board know.

Ms. RiCharde asked if Thursday night was the preferred night.

Dr. Vaughan said it was for him.

Ms. Wittmer said it was okay with her.

Ms. Colby began speaking. However, her remarks were disjointed and inaudible on the recording due to a conversation going on between Ms. Nagan and Ms. Garrambone.

Ms. Colby was still speaking and now audible when she said even if it was insignificant things like scheduling a meeting you cannot talk to one another outside of a public meeting.

Ms. Wittmer said among ourselves.

Ms. Colby was still speaking. However, her remarks were again disjointed and inaudible on the recording due to a conversation going on between Ms. Nagan and Ms. Garrambone.

Ms. Nagan then spoke out, speaking directly to the clerk, and said she had a question.

Ms. Garrambone said we did vote on that.

Ms. Nagan asked did we vote on all three things the fee resolution.

Ms. Wittmer said yes we voted on that.

Ms. Nagan asked the Rules of Procedures and the animal code.

More than one Board member responded yes.

Ms. Garrambone said, speaking directly to Ms. Nagan, you made the motion for the Rules of Procedure.

Ms. Nagan said she was just making sure (inaudible).

Ms. Wittmer said the Board voted on all of them.

VII. Reports.

A. Transport Statistics.

Ms. Wittmer called for discussion.

Mr. Woodward said he had one comment that was brought to him by Ms. Nagan. He said in the agenda packets the kennel statistics that were provided to

the Board correctly reflect the intakes and outcomes of animals. He said when these documents converted to PDF somehow intakes were manipulated and changed to say outcomes.

Ms. Nagan spoke out saying for anybody who was looking at the web site one of the intake statistics was really the outcome of what happened to the animals not where they came in from. She said it was confusing.

Mr. Woodward said he had not had time to review all the documents that were attached to the web. He said his fear was that there was more than this one mistake that occurred and it had to do with the way the documents were scanned in. Mr. Woodward said when they were initially scanned in it created a PDF format. He said Ms. Nagan suggested or made a recommendation to have them scanned in a manner that she would be able to copy and paste them because our current machine was not able to do that. Mr. Woodward said we were shown a way and given a procedure on how we can use our current copier to convert the documents but there were several steps involved. He said it basically converted the data over and auto corrected itself so we were going to look at that procedure and see if there was something we could do to make sure that the way it was actually scanned in was the way it was going to be portrayed as the documents posted on the web site. Mr. Woodward said he did not know how it was going to be corrected at this point but we were looking into it.

Ms. Nagan asked Mr. Woodward if he had spoken to Margo at IT by any chance.

He began to speak saying IT was the one who came over when Ms. Nagan spoke over him saying Margo seemed to be the brain about that.

B. Euthanasia Statistics.

C. Customer Contact Statistics.

D. Pet Data, Inc. Statistics.

Ms. Wittmer called for discussion on any of the reports. There was none.

VIII. Confirmation of Next Meeting.

- June 9, 2011
- September 8, 2011
- December 8, 2011

Ms. Wittmer said she would not be here for the meeting on September 8th and asked if anybody would have an objection to moving that to the following week, September 15th.

Ms. Garrambone said she could not tell at this point.

Ms. Wittmer said she would be out of town and if the Board could do that she would appreciate that.

Ms. Garrambone asked could we deal with that in June.

Ms. Nagan asked if anyone had a calendar.

Ms. Wittmer said if it could not be changed she just would not be able to be here.

Ms. Nagan asked if there were holidays.

IX. Adjournment.

Motion by Dr. Vaughan to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 PM. Second by Ms. Prince. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Clerk to the Board

VII. REPORTS.

FY09/10 STATISTICS ON ADOPTED ANIMALS TRANSPORTED TO SEMINOLE COUNTY VETERINARIANS FOR SPAY/NEUTER

	# TRANSPORTED	DOGS MALE	DOGS FEMALE	CATS MALE	CATS FEMALE
OCT	67	25	23	11	8
NOV	90	35	29	11	15
DEC	126	35	31	27	33
JAN	87	25	23	17	22
FEB	83	26	30	14	13
MAR	79	29	24	9	17
APR	84	33	32	15	4
SUB	616	208	192	104	112
MAY	79	32	29	8	10
JUN	92	21	22	26	23
JUL	108	36	43	20	9
AUG	104	31	35	17	21
SEP	88	40	22	9	17
TOTAL	1,087	368	343	184	192

FY10/11 STATISTICS ON ADOPTED ANIMALS TRANSPORTED TO SEMINOLE COUNTY VETERINARIANS FOR SPAY/NEUTER

	# TRANSPORTED	DOGS MALE	DOGS FEMALE	CATS MALE	CATS FEMALE
OCT	87	36	28	11	12
NOV	73	27	22	13	11
DEC	108	30	26	31	21
JAN	109	35	34	15	25
FEB	144	28	42	30	44
MAR	107	33	33	21	20
APR	78	37	18	10	13
MAY					
JUN					
JUL					
AUG					
SEP					
TOTAL	706	226	203	131	146

Kennel Statistics Report
Intakes from 10/01/10 to 04/30/11

		CAT	DOG	FERRET	KITTEN	OTHER	PUPPY	TOTAL
BORN IN THE SHELTER	BORN IN SHELTER	43	0	0	5	0	10	58
	TOTAL	43	0	0	5	0	10	58
DISPOSAL REQUIRED	FIELD	198	45	0	0	629	0	872
	FIELD OWNED	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	NIGHT	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	OVER THE COUNTER	15	21	0	1	6	0	43
	TOTAL	214	67	0	1	635	0	917
EUTHANASIA REQUIRED	FIELD	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
	OVER THE COUNTER	46	105	0	0	4	0	155
	TOTAL	47	106	0	0	4	0	157
FOSTER	FIELD	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	OVER THE COUNTER	0	0	0	5	0	0	5
	TOTAL	0	1	0	5	0	0	6
OWNER SURRENDER	OTHER	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
	FIELD	84	75	0	11	2	21	193
	OVER THE COUNTER	181	86	6	58	70	19	420
	TOTAL	265	162	6	69	72	41	615
PROTECTIVE CUSTODY	OTHER	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
	CRUELTY	0	4	0	0	1	1	6
	EVICTION	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	HOSPITAL	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
	OWNER DETAINED	0	6	0	0	2	1	9
	POLICE	1	8	0	0	7	2	18

	TOTAL	2	27	0	0	10	4	43
QUARANTINE	FIELD	30	64	0	1	18	1	114
	OVER THE COUNTER	10	20	0	0	1	0	31
	SPCA	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
	TOTAL	42	85	0	1	19	1	148
RETURN	FIELD	0	3	0	0	0	1	4
	OVER THE COUNTER	14	77	0	0	0	13	104
	TOTAL	14	80	0	0	0	14	108
STRAY	OTHER	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	FIELD	1304	857	6	148	438	87	2840
	NIGHT	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
	OVER THE COUNTER	584	297	4	62	83	44	1074
	TOTAL	1890	1155	10	210	522	131	3918
TRANSFER	OTHER	0	1	0	0	2	7	10
	ANIMAL CONTROL	0	10	0	0	0	0	10
	SPCA	0	9	0	0	0	1	10
	TOTAL	0	20	0	0	2	8	30
TOTAL		**2517**	**1703**	**16**	**291**	**1264**	**209**	**6000**

Kennel Statistics Report
Outcomes from 10/01/10 to 04/30/11

		CAT	DOG	FERRET	KITTEN	OTHER	PUPPY	TOTAL
ADOPTION	AD TV	0	2	0	2	0	0	4
	REFERRAL	14	25	5	46	0	10	100
	RESCUE GROUP	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	WALKIN	139	412	0	103	21	126	801
	WEB	3	11	0	12	0	2	28
	TOTAL	156	452	5	163	21	138	935
DIED	AT VET	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	ENROUTE	2	0	0	0	9	0	11
	IN FOSTER	0	0	0	8	1	2	11
	IN KENNEL	18	3	0	0	7	3	31
	IN SURGERY	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	TOTAL	23	3	0	8	17	5	56
DISPOSAL	OTHER	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	BURIED ON SCENE	0	0	0	0	7	0	7
	CREMATION	221	74	0	2	626	1	924
	CREMATION-VET	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
	LANDFILL	1	0	0	0	17	0	18
	TOTAL	223	77	0	2	650	1	953
DEAD ON ARRIVAL	DOA	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	TOTAL	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
EUTHANASIA	AGED	27	61	0	0	3	0	91

	ANIMAL AGGRESSIVE	0	42	0	0	1	1	44
	PEOPLE AGGRESSIVE	17	69	0	0	2	0	88
	BEHAVIOR MANAGEABLE	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	BEHAVIOR SEVERE	109	52	0	0	0	0	161
	CONDITION MINOR	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	CONDITION SEVERE	126	91	0	4	12	2	235
	FELV/FIV	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	FERAL	642	0	0	6	0	0	648
	HEARTWORM MINOR	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	HEARTWORM SEVERE	0	20	0	0	0	0	20
	ILLNESS SEVERE	524	42	0	71	77	10	724
	INJURY MINOR	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	INJURY SEVERE	52	19	0	0	136	0	207
	PREGNANT	54	1	0	0	0	0	55
	RABIES TESTING	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
	SPACE	62	27	0	0	0	1	90
	UNDRAGE/WEIGHT	347	0	0	12	50	0	409
	TOTAL	1966	425	0	93	286	14	2784
FOSTER	CONDITION MINOR	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	ILLNESS MINOR	3	0	0	1	0	0	4
	INJURY MINOR	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
	PREGNANT	1	0	0	5	0	0	6
	SPACE	2	1	0	2	0	0	5
	TIME/SPACE	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	UNDRAGE/WEIGHT	0	0	0	45	0	1	46
	TOTAL	8	2	0	53	1	1	65

LOST	LOST	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	TOTAL	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
RELOCATE	RETURN	0	0	0	0	24	0	24
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	24	0	24
RTO	END OF QUARANTINE	1	28	0	0	0	0	29
	MICROCHIP	9	124	0	0	0	0	133
	PHONE	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	TAG IDENTIFICATION	4	31	0	0	0	0	35
	TAG LICENSE	0	18	0	0	0	0	18
	RABIES TAG	0	9	0	0	0	0	9
	WALKIN	77	371	1	8	9	2	468
	TOTAL	91	582	1	8	9	2	693
TRANSFER	OTHER	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	ANIMAL CONTROL	54	0	0	0	0	0	54
	RESCUE GROUP	32	183	10	4	219	33	481
	SPACE	12	20	0	0	0	1	33
	SPCA	1	17	0	0	0	8	26
	WILDLIFE	0	0	0	0	39	0	39
	TOTAL	99	221	10	4	258	42	634
TOTAL		**2568**	**1762**	**16**	**331**	**1266**	**203**	**6146**

SEMINOLE COUNTY ANIMAL SERVICES CUSTOMER CONTACTS
FY09/10

	FRONT DESK			DISPATCH	GRAND TOTAL
	LOBBY	PHONE	SUB TOTAL		
OCT	1,545	1,460	3,005	2,548	5,553
NOV	1,564	1,505	3,069	2,679	5,748
DEC	1,361	1,257	2,618	1,754	4,372
JAN	1,388	1,129	2,517	2,286	4,803
FEB	1,418	1,223	2,641	2,251	4,892
MAR	1,946	1,629	3,575	3,034	6,609
SUB	9,222	8,203	17,425	14,552	31,977
APR	1,416	1,260	2,676	2,296	4,972
MAY	1,351	1,283	2,634	2,663	5,297
JUN	1,764	1,706	3,470	2,801	6,271
JUL	1,467	1,473	2,940	1,921	4,861
AUG	1,599	1,635	3,234	2,188	5,422
SEP	1,883	1,861	3,744	2,350	6,094
TOTAL	18,702	17,421	36,123	28,771	64,894

SEMINOLE COUNTY ANIMAL SERVICES CUSTOMER CONTACTS
FY10/11

	FRONT DESK			DISPATCH	GRAND TOTAL
	LOBBY	PHONE	SUB TOTAL		
OCT	1,537	1,547	3,084	2,326	5,410
NOV	1,668	1,694	3,362	2,418	5,780
DEC	1,202	1,281	2,483	1,726	4,209
JAN	1,794	1,594	3,388	2,129	5,517
FEB	1,529	1,599	3,128	1,907	5,035
MAR	1,706	1,783	3,489	2,634	6,123
APR					
MAY					
JUN					
JUL					
AUG					
SEP					
TOTAL	9,436	9,498	18,934	13,140	32,074

PET DATA CONTRACT
FY09/10

FISCAL YEAR 09-10 CUMULATIVE

Collections

PetData			
	Oct	$	12,503.00
	Nov	$	13,220.00
	Dec	$	11,722.00
	Jan	$	12,308.00
	Feb	$	13,610.00
	Mar	$	15,081.50
	SUB	$	78,444.50
	Apr	$	13,234.00
	May	$	13,096.00
	Jun	$	14,000.50
	Jul	$	13,789.50
	Aug	$	15,066.00
	Sept	$	11,005.50
	Total	$	158,636.00
Animal Services			
	Oct	$	3,206.00
	Nov	$	3,383.00
	Dec	$	3,256.00
	Jan	$	3,709.00
	Feb	$	3,544.00
	Mar	$	4,597.00
	SUB	$	21,695.00
	Apr	$	4,652.00
	May	$	4,502.00
	Jun	$	4,446.00
	Jul	$	4,136.00
	Aug	$	4,333.00
	Sept	$	3,606.00
	Total	$	47,370.00
Total Collections		$	206,006.00
Oct-Mar Collections		$	100,139.50

Disbursements

PetData			
	Oct	$	8,533.90
	Nov	$	8,816.75
	Dec	$	7,900.95
	Jan	$	8,397.00
	Feb	$	8,908.65
	Mar	$	10,416.55
	SUB	$	52,973.80
	Apr	$	9,397.10
	May	$	9,350.00
	Jun	$	9,501.65
	Jul	$	9,592.20
	Aug	$	10,299.30
	Sept	$	7,881.95
	Total	$	108,996.00
Animal Services			
	Oct	$	7,175.10
	Nov	$	7,786.25
	Dec	$	7,077.05
	Jan	$	7,620.00
	Feb	$	8,245.35
	Mar	$	9,261.95
	SUB	$	47,165.70
	Apr	$	8,488.90
	May	$	8,248.00
	Jun	$	8,944.85
	Jul	$	8,333.30
	Aug	$	9,099.70
	Sept	$	6,729.55
	Total	$	97,010.00
Total Disbursements		$	206,006.00
Oct-Mar Disbursements		$	100,139.50

PET DATA CONTRACT
FY09/10

Fees owed to PetData

# of new licenses		
Oct		2,326
Nov		2,415
Dec		2,163
Jan		2,300
Feb		2,421
Mar		2,847
SUB		14,472
Apr		2,574
May		2,560
Jun		2,601
Jul		2,628
Aug		2,782
Sept		2,123
Total		29,740
Fee per new license	$	3.65
Total	$	108,551.00

# of replacement licenses		
Oct		1
Nov		1
Dec		0
Jan		1
Feb		2
Mar		0
SUB		5
Apr		1
May		0
Jun		1
Jul		0
Aug		2
Sept		1
Total		10
Fee per license	$	2.00
Total	$	20.00

Returned check(s), etc.		
Oct	$	42.00
Nov	$	-
Dec	$	6.00
Jan	$	-
Feb	$	68.00
Mar	$	25.00
Apr	$	-
May	$	6.00
Jun	$	6.00
Jul	$	-
Aug	$	141.00
Sept	$	131.00
Total	$	425.00

New license fees	$	108,551.00
Replacement license fees	$	20.00
Returned check(s), etc.	$	425.00
Total owed to PetData	$	108,996.00

Oct-Mar New Fees	$	52,822.80
Oct-Mar Rep. Fees	$	10.00
Returned Checks	$	141.00
Total Owed Pet Data	$	52,973.80

PET DATA CONTRACT
FY09/10

Fees owed to Animal Services

Fees collected by Animal Services

Oct	$	3,206.00
Nov	$	3,383.00
Dec	$	3,256.00
Jan	$	3,709.00
Feb	$	3,544.00
Mar	$	4,597.00
SUB	$	21,695.00
Apr	$	4,652.00
May	$	4,502.00
Jun	$	4,446.00
Jul	$	4,136.00
Aug	$	4,333.00
Sept	$	3,606.00
Total	$	47,370.00

Fees remitted by PetData

Oct	$	3,969.10
Nov	$	4,403.25
Dec	$	3,821.05
Jan	$	3,911.00
Feb	$	4,701.35
Mar	$	4,664.95
SUB	$	25,470.70
Apr	$	3,836.90
May	$	3,746.00
Jun	$	4,498.85
Jul	$	4,197.30
Aug	$	4,766.70
Sept	$	3,123.55
Total	$	49,640.00

Total collected by Animal Services	$	47,370.00
Total remitted by PetData	$	49,640.00
Total fees owed to Animal Services	$	97,010.00

Animal Services Disbursement

General fund

Oct	$	6,588.10
Nov	$	7,170.25
Dec	$	6,631.05
Jan	$	6,811.00
Feb	$	7,540.35
Mar	$	8,364.45
SUB	$	43,105.20
Apr	$	7,764.90
May	$	7,755.00
Jun	$	8,379.35
Jul	$	7,492.80
Aug	$	8,090.70
Sept	$	6,123.05
Total	$	88,711.00

Trust fund

Oct	$	587.00
Nov	$	616.00
Dec	$	446.00
Jan	$	809.00
Feb	$	705.00
Mar	$	897.50
SUB	$	4,060.50
Apr	$	724.00
May	$	493.00
Jun	$	565.50
Jul	$	840.50
Aug	$	1,009.00
Sept	$	606.50
Total	$	8,299.00

Total general fund disbursement	$	88,711.00
Total trust fund disbursement	$	8,299.00
Total Animal Services disbursement	$	97,010.00

Oct-Mar Gen Fund	$	43,105.20
Oct-Mar Trust Fund	$	4,060.50
Total Disbursement	$	47,165.70

PET DATA CONTRACT
FY10/11

FISCAL YEAR 10 - 11 CUMULATIVE

Collections

PetData

Oct	$	11,845.00
Nov	$	10,903.90
Dec	$	10,035.50
Jan	$	12,569.50
Feb	$	11,381.50
Mar	$	12,778.50
Apr	$	-
May	$	-
Jun	$	-
Jul	$	-
Aug	$	-
Sept	$	-
Total	$	69,513.90

Animal Services

Oct	$	4,501.00
Nov	$	3,299.00
Dec	$	3,711.00
Jan	$	4,352.00
Feb	$	3,906.00
Mar	$	5,289.00
Apr	$	-
May	$	-
Jun	$	-
Jul	$	-
Aug	$	-
Sept	$	-
Total	$	25,058.00

Total Collections $ 94,571.90

Disbursements

PetData

Oct	$	8,402.30
Nov	$	7,296.70
Dec	$	6,928.40
Jan	$	8,849.65
Feb	$	7,930.20
Mar	$	9,055.90
Apr	$	-
May	$	-
Jun	$	-
Jul	$	-
Aug	$	-
Sept	$	-
Total	$	48,463.15

Animal Services

Oct	$	7,943.70
Nov	$	6,906.20
Dec	$	6,818.10
Jan	$	8,071.85
Feb	$	7,357.30
Mar	$	9,011.60
Apr	$	-
May	$	-
Jun	$	-
Jul	$	-
Aug	$	-
Sept	$	-
Total	$	46,108.75

Total Disbursements $ 94,571.90

PET DATA CONTRACT
FY10/11

Fees owed to PetData

# of new licenses		
Oct		2,302
Nov		1,998
Dec		1,896
Jan		2,421
Feb		2,168
Mar		2,466
Apr		0
May		0
Jun		0
Jul		0
Aug		0
Sept		0
Total		13,251
Fee per new license	$	3.65
Total	$	48,366.15

# of replacement licenses		
Oct		0
Nov		2
Dec		1
Jan		1
Feb		0
Mar		0
Apr		0
May		0
Jun		0
Jul		0
Aug		0
Sept		0
Total		4
Fee per license	$	2.00
Total	$	8.00

Returned check(s), etc.		
Oct	$	-
Nov	$	-
Dec	$	6.00
Jan	$	11.00
Feb	$	17.00
Mar	$	55.00
Apr	$	-
May	$	-
Jun	$	-
Jul	$	-
Aug	$	-
Sept	$	-
Total	$	89.00

New license fees	$	48,366.15
Replacement license fees	$	8.00
Returned check(s), etc.	$	89.00
Total owed to PetData	$	48,463.15

PET DATA CONTRACT
FY10/11

Fees owed to Animal Services

Fees collected by Animal Services

Oct	$	4,501.00
Nov	$	3,299.00
Dec	$	3,711.00
Jan	$	4,352.00
Feb	$	3,906.00
Mar	$	5,289.00
Apr	$	-
May	$	-
Jun	$	-
Jul	$	-
Aug	$	-
Sept	$	-
Total	$	25,058.00

Fees remitted by PetData

Oct	$	3,442.70
Nov	$	3,607.20
Dec	$	3,107.10
Jan	$	3,719.85
Feb	$	3,451.30
Mar	$	3,722.60
Apr	$	-
May	$	-
Jun	$	-
Jul	$	-
Aug	$	-
Sept	$	-
Total	$	21,050.75

Total collected by Animal Services	$	25,058.00
Total remitted by PetData	$	21,050.75
Total fees owed to Animal Services	$	46,108.75

Animal Services Disbursement

General fund

Oct	$	7,134.70
Nov	$	6,177.30
Dec	$	6,344.60
Jan	$	7,266.35
Feb	$	6,723.80
Mar	$	8,006.10
Apr	$	-
May	$	-
Jun	$	-
Jul	$	-
Aug	$	-
Sept	$	-
Total	$	41,652.85

Trust fund

Oct	$	809.00
Nov	$	728.90
Dec	$	473.50
Jan	$	805.50
Feb	$	633.50
Mar	$	1,005.50
Apr	$	-
May	$	-
Jun	$	-
Jul	$	-
Aug	$	-
Sept	$	-
Total	$	4,455.90

Total general fund disbursement	$	41,652.85
Total trust fund disbursement	$	4,455.90
Total Animal Services disbursement	$	46,108.75