MCAS Community Advisory Committee

Notes from Meeting on January 20, 2015

In Attendance: CAC: Karol Dietrich, Kara Kerpan, Tonia Wagner, Marci Jo Carlton, Jeff Gosda, Megan Mautemps.
MCAS: Mike Oswald, Ann Potter, Gail Wilson.
Others: Sue Diciple, facilitator, Michael Grimmett, Ombudsman, Jessica Morkert-Shibley, Communication’s Office

The meeting convened at 6:30

Minutes from the November 10, 2014 meeting were approved.

Updates and Announcements

MCAS

• Mike Oswald announced his retirement from Multnomah County Animal Services on April 30th.

• Mike provided the following updates:
  o Things are going well at MCAS right now. The live release rate is up. MCAS social media is up and running and the website is very popular. MCAS is financially stable and has a great management team with great staff and volunteers.
    ▪ ➔ CAC members requested to be put on the list for the Friday Memo.
  o A lease for the satellite site is being negotiated at this time. The 1000 sq. ft. site under negotiation is on N. Lombard.
    ▪ CAC members expressed regret that there will not be room for dogs at the site. Mike noted that a site that could accommodate dogs has extensive additional requirements, and that the shelter is crowded with adoptable cats while the dog population at the shelter continues to decline. Additionally MCAS is planning a pilot project on dog adoption.

• MCAS had a decade high adoption month in December

• MCAS has hired a trainer, Denise Mullenix, to come and help shelter staff and volunteers’ enrichment.

• MCAS will be revamping the cat cages to make them bigger and better.

• The Oregonian is still planning a second article on the topic of pit bull-type dogs. The reporter has shown interest in county data and other research.

CAC

• Megan conveyed the concern of a Sauvie Island resident that cats and dogs are being “dumped” there. ➔ Mike asked Megan to have the person who raised the issue contact him directly via email.
Jessica Morkert-Shibley was introduced
• Jessica is from the Multnomah County Communication’s Office. She attended the CAC meeting to introduce herself and to offer the committee any help they might need.

Multnomah County Ordinance amendment – “Animal Rescue Entities”
• Handout-Senate Bill 6 – Animal Rescue Entities (2013 Legislature) This is a new state law that was effective January 2014. The 2013 Oregon Legislature passed Senate Bill 6 which amended the Oregon Revised Statutes to regulate Animal Rescue Entities. The State Law requires animal rescue entities to obtain licenses, maintain specific records and permit inspections by enforcing agencies. The law establishes civil penalties for licensure, record keeping and operations violations.

• In overviewing SB 6 Mike noted the following:
  ➢ The motivation for this law was several incidences of animal neglect.
  ➢ Multnomah County is taking action to codify the new state law into Multnomah County Code Chapter 13.
  ➢ MCAS is both an “Animal Rescue entity” and “Enforcing Agency” under the new law, which presents a challenge.
  ➢ The enforcement role required of the counties is to inspect records, issue permits, and fine for violations. This is not completely new territory for MCAS because MCAS is already issuing permits to “doggie day care” and boarding entities.

• During CAC discussion the following issues were raised:
  ➢ CAC members expressed concern about the affordability of permits. A mechanism such as a sliding scale was suggested.
  ➢ A CAC member asked what the impact of the law might be on entities like the zoo. MCAS staff was unsure as to whether or how the law would relate to zoos.
  ➢ Members requested that handouts such as the one distributed at the meeting be distributed in advance when possible.

Shelter Review Overview
• Discussion of Case Study 2 – Three years old, 18lb spayed female. Issues raised included:
  ➢ Human behavior: The impact of human behavior on the situation was discussed, e.g. how the food and treats were given, especially as the dog was known to have food aggression issues. It was noted that from the case study information it is unclear what the human is doing; only the dog’s behavior is known.
  ➢ Size of the dog: Different opinions were voiced as to whether/degree to which the size of the dog is an issue in the assessment of the degree of danger posed by the dog, e.g. a 60lb dog vs the 18lb dog in this case study.
➢ **Assessment**: It was agreed that if assessed according to the Dunbar Dog Bite Scale, the two bites at level 4 would indicate that this is a very dangerous dog.

➢ **Options**: Options that could be considered within the Shelter Review process were discussed, e.g. whether the dog could be successfully placed in a home without other dogs. There were differences of opinion on the CAC on this point.

- Ann discussed Case Study 3 – Three years of age, 70lb neutered male that was aggressive with other dogs but very responsive and attached to people.

**Agenda items anticipated for the February meeting**

- Feedback on Shelter Review
- Feedback on guidelines for animals being sent back into the community.
- Introduction to the CAC of Randall Brown, the new Chief Field Supervisor, who will review issues being encountered in the community and guidelines and principles for compliance for CAC consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm.