
SOUTHWEST COMMUNITY FINANCING AUTHORITY

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

April 9, 2015
2:00 p.m.

Murrieta City Council Chambers
1 Town Square
Murrieta, CA 92562

Members Present:

Brian Tisdale	City of Lake Elsinore
Bridgette Moore	City of Wildomar
Randon Lane	Vice Chairperson, City of Murrieta
Kevin Jeffries	County of Riverside, 1st District Supervisor

Members Absent:

Maryann Edwards	City of Temecula
Vicki Warren	City of Canyon Lake

Staff and Guests were also present at the meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The special meeting of the Southwest Communities Financing Authority (SCFA) was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Chairperson Bridgette Moore. The following board members were present: Chairperson Bridgette Moore, Members Brian Tisdale, Kevin Jeffries and Randon Lane. Members Vicki Warren and Maryann Edwards were absent.

2. FLAG SALUTE:

Vice Chairman Lane led the group in the flag salute.

3. MEMBER COMMENTS: None at this time.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF February 5, 2015:

Member Lane made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of February 5, 2015.

Seconded by Member Jeffries

Motion passed unanimously.

5. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR UPDATE/LETTER FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR:

Program Administrator Christopher Hans reminded the audience and the Board that at the last meeting this Board directed a subcommittee be formed call the Executive Committee. It is made up of staff members from the cities and the county; every member agency is represented. They were directed to go back and look at the audits that were discussed in the last meeting. They were also directed to go back and look at the contract and bring back recommended changes and improvements so that the board can consider approving that contract going forward with AFV. The Executive Committee met twice and they activated a subcommittee. The subcommittee is different in that it has staff from the cities, county and AFV. So we have representatives from all the JPA plus AFV and that group looked at the contract and made a lot of suggestions on ways to improve the contract which is being brought forth for consideration and approval. There were a number of improvements being recommended the improvements always falls down to one main theme and that is getting more involvement from all of the cities, their staff and the Board so that they can meet quarterly, more involvement and more input equals a better result.

6. PERFORMANCE REVIEWS (AUDITS):

A. Timeline of Events and Program Administrator Authority: Member Lane asked how the timeline lays out the normal process of doing the annual report. He stated the timeline has expanded more into an investigation and that is not reflected in the timeline, or did he miss that somewhere as he had gone through it.

Mr. Hans stated one of the improvements recommended, in which cities and AFV agreed is to have a regular yearly review of operations. We will not call it an audit because it just a review of operations. The term audit is negative but a review of operations can have suggestions; and when the group works together their suggestions can be used to make improvements all year round and that shouldn't wait until the fifth year of a 5-year contract. He stated this was his mistake as the Administrator not to bring this up earlier. In the fifth year of a 5-year contract he did push for a review/audit and that's what happened. Mr. Hans stated he did not think there are any secrets that because of this audit there were a number of questions, complaints, suggestions, and emails that came up around that time. He stated that was never meant to be a part of this review/audit and it was never folded into the review/audit, but we did have to deal with the questions and complaints that came in.

RECEIVE AND FILE.

B. Review of Performance Results by AFV and EMC: Mr. Hans gave a highlight for the sake of the audience and the Board. The review committee consists of representatives from all of the cities and county looked at both the audits and comments that came from AFV and the committee fully accepted all the comments of AFV and supported their recommendations/suggestions on their changes to how the shelter was run. We fully supported what AFV said. Member Lane addressed a question to AFV: "We looked at the timeline and we have gone back through it; we were not all in agreement with the

process but now do you feel that the problem has been fixed from the perspective of AFV"? Ms. Kris Anderson responded "as far as the audit that was conducted from the information we were given our responses pretty much stayed the same. Going forward I hope we would do this like an audit, have things we are going to look at while sitting down and talking to staff and looking at computer systems. We are going to do a step-by-step and find out procedures of how we actually operate the shelter rather than just having people ask questions and however they interpreted and then it is gone. She added getting it [the audit] in a timely manner [helps] so that everyone can make comments.

- C. Approval of Performance Review-Associated Budget in the amount of \$15,000; Improvements going forward:** Mr. Hans stated one of the recommendations of the subcommittee is that a Contract Review Committee (CRC), consisting of the same members of this subcommittee would handle contract administration and review, debating the best areas to focus for the auditor and the actual company that performs the performance review. It would be a completely neutral party that doesn't show favoritism and when the results come back, they will be given first to the CRC. AFV, being a part of that committee, will see the results first hand and will be able to discuss it and say what their ideas are and what their recommendations are going forward. The final results of that subcommittee working together could be a number of recommendations to make improvements out of that process. This fits in with the theme of greater involvement and will be more transparencies for the Board, the public, for all the cities and county.

Mr. Hans went on to say one of the difficulties this year was holding a budget to 25K for administration and the only way to do that was by having only one board meeting. A recommendation of expanding to more board meetings is going to mean more costs; and there are associated costs with the audits. To sum up the recommendations of the subcommittee, a rough estimate cost of 15K will be needed from the SCFA member agencies. Member Jeffries asked if there was a buy-in from the cities on the increased costs. Mr. Hans replied no one voted no and there was a representative present from every city at the subcommittee meetings.

Member Jeffries made a motion to approve the Performance Review-Associated Budget in the amount of \$15,000.

Seconded by Member Lane.

Motion passed unanimously.

- D. Approve Increase in Allowance of Admin Expenses for FY 14/15 in the amount of \$26,855 due to Additional fees Incurred.** Mr. Hans gives an account of the expenses. It included insurance for the building, annual financial audit on JPA (which has been done annually for the past five years), County Counsel costs and an accounting of the two audits, plus an administrative fee of 1% that the County charges. Additional expenses of \$3,500 are projected for the rest of the fiscal year. Member Lane asked if the legal fees that were incurred included the emails, public records request and redactions. Mr. Hans replied yes, all County Counsel's charges are included here. Member Lane stated, just for the record the investigation was not approved by the Board

and there were some legal costs incurred by the Counsel, but he did not want to go through and break out penny by penny of what was spent. He believed that the cost of the investigation and legal counsel should belong to one city. But, he stated, we are here today and we should move forward. He stated, "But I want to state for the record that was my thought on the legal cost of this."

Supervisor Jeffries stated the last item on the list of the expenses incurred is dated 4/1/15 for \$8,437.10 for the County of Riverside Department of Animal Services for the admin audit performed. There were recommendations made by him and potentially another commissioner that utilizing County Animals Services to audit JPA and AFV was a little less than appropriate. He stated, "It was my perceptions that you do not hire your potential competitor to evaluation someone who could be your target of replacement. My concerns was that whatever came from the audit would be discounted at bias whether or not it was, that is how it would have been perceived and that is unfair to both parties involved in the audit. Nonetheless, it occurred under the best of intention to try and find an affordable way to accomplish it and bring in an organization that has experience with animal services in general. However, the results ended up as some of us had predicted, very controversial. A long story made short, I had a discussion this week with the staff of the Riverside County Executive Office. They have agreed to absorb the \$8,400 dollar charge so we are not going to have to pay for that from this authority. Going forward if we are going to bring in an entity to do an evaluation like that, we need to bring in someone who is not perceived to be a competitor. Unfortunately, it may actually cost more but there will be a different confidence level with the reports going forward. I would move the staff recommendation less the \$8,437.10 that is outlined in the staff recommendation.

Member Jeffries made a motion to approve increase in allowance of admin expense for FY 14/15, excluding the \$8,437.10, bringing the increase to \$18,417.90.

Seconded by Member Lane.

Motion passed unanimously.

7. APPROVAL OF AFV OPERATIONS AGREEMENT FOR NEW 5-YEAR TERM FROM JULY 1, 2015 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2020 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,055,176 FOR THE FIRST YEAR:

Public Comments were taken first:

Jeanette Marie Bassi: Ms. Bassi represents the Temecula Valley Women's Club, which is made up of over 160 women who support these communities and they have put over 1 million hours of volunteer work and over 2 million dollars of monetary funds to support the committees that they have selected, one of them being AFV. Ms. Bassi and Bob Pertie co-chairs the Animal Advocates Committee and they have 15 people present representing that committee. They want to share how much they support AFV. Temecula Valley Women's Club (TVWC) has been in existence for 30 years in this community. When they select a non-profit agency or organization to work with, they do their research and scrutinize the Standard Operating Procedures and policies to determine if this is a non-profit operation that they want to support. The selection of a non-profit organization is critical because it is a reflection of TVWC. They are so honored to have supported AFV for over 20 years. They will continue

to support them and as long as they are operating, AFV has done an incredible job in this community. The staff is loving, organized and AFV does everything possible to find homes for homeless animals. They are the best networked organization that she have every worked with in a shelter. If the shelters in the county could run half way as well as AFV we would see a vast improvement. She is here to share on behalf of the TVWC and the Animal Advocates Committee they are 100% in support of AFV continuing in their contract.

Joan Sparkman: She has lived in the valley for 46 years. She was on the original committee to form the AFV with Ron Bradley who was the City Manager of Temecula and also the intern City Manager of Murrieta. She has supported this group since their existence. She stated they are a wonderful group of people, who love animals, care for them and she doesn't know what they would do without them. If we compared them to any other governmental agency that might take over that position, there is no comparison. She is encouraging everyone to please vote to support AFV.

Darlene Hilz: She is associated with the Lucky Sheep Dog Rescue, it is a non-profit and they have chosen to align with AFV. They fund promotions and grants for adoption, spay and neuter events, and emergency medical needs for animals. The reason they have chosen AFV is because they are compassionate and professional. It is an extremely difficult job, but every time we go in there, everyone does everything they can while keeping extremely professional.

Secondly, she stated AFV's employees are very business-minded which is important to the Lucky Sheep Dog Rescue team. AFV does not throw money at a problem; they figure out the best way to solve the problem by looking at the overall picture.

Thirdly, Ms. Hilz stated AFV is organized, well run and consistent, this is not an easy business. It is difficult when you have animals, people, the public, volunteers and managing all the volunteers is a huge task, and AFV does a great job. She gets feedback on all of her promotions. If she asks for facts and figures she receives them. AFV has spreadsheets and everything written down and AFV will tell her if money is not being wisely spent. Recently, they did a promotion and AFV informed her that she should spend the money differently. It is better spent in other areas so that they can get better results.

Ms. Hilz stated, she thinks keeping AFV is just making good business sense because they have been here and it is very hard to get donations, volunteers, and rescuers to align with you. This is a tough business and animals are very passionate and people have their opinion and she thinks AFV does a good job of attracting donors and volunteers. She is 100% behind AFV and will continue to give them support in the coming years. Thank you.

Mr. John Charnley: Associated with the Charnley Law Group; he stated it has been a privilege for the last 26 years to represent the AFV. Before that they were actually called Lake Elsinore Animal Friends and of course it has grown to this point. He thanked Bruce the attorney for negotiating difficult contracts. This is a better contract from a lawyer's perspective; it is cleaner and a lot of the issues that were raised at the last couple of meetings over the last couple of months have been addressed quite well. There are still some issues that may be brought back over the course of time as we go through this new type of contract as we try to clean up certain issues. The fact that you are now going to meet on a more regular basis and the fact that the Performance Committee is going to do

performance evaluations on a regular basis as opposed to once every five years will be a tremendous improvement. Obviously, we are concerned that we don't blur the lines between the non-profit aspect of our entity and public aspect in which AFV is responsible for. We did express some concerns to Bruce about the philosophy section, the area of communication and compliance, and we cannot understand under any circumstances why any complaints that would be brought to any public official in any of the member jurisdiction would be kept secret. If the goal is to bring forth improvements, then obviously we recognize that we are human beings and that there is always going to be room for improvement. So the fact that people are getting complaints and not turning them over to either you or us makes it impossible for us. So from now on, as far as we are concerned, if the complaint is brought in and is referenced in the newspaper or anywhere else it will not exist as far as we are concerned until it is brought to our attention and we are given a reasonable opportunity to respond. Criminals get that right and we as volunteers for the most part should also have that right.

Mr. Charnley stated that cost is always a factor, since we rely so heavily on donations. That's when these things happen (issues) that have been brought to the forefront, these secret meetings, these alleged complaints; these types of things we see go on, something that Supervisor Jeffries just pointed out. The potential for conflict does have an impact on us and it needs to be examined; we run a program where people provide us with food (not money) and we give that food to people who cannot afford to buy food.

Mr. Charnley thanked Bruce for all of the hard work that he did. And Mr. Charnley stated this is a good contract and I sincerely hope that you approve it. Thank you very much.

Christopher Hans stated the discussion on the particulars on the contract went on even in to this week with the subcommittee. Typos could be fixed by counsel as long as it doesn't materially change the contract. We spent the majority of our time talking about the complaints section of the contract. That was the topic that came up the most and it is probably an area that will continue to be debated. We came to the best recommendations that we could and it is not necessarily something everybody loved. From my point of view, the contract says that the JPA will retain control of complaints that are released. And that is going to be managed by this Executive Committee made up of non-AFV members but members of the cities and county. There can always be a legal reason not to release something and that should be managed by the JPA and the JPA legal counsel. Mr. Hans thinks that another thing added was that there will be some situation where it will be hard to tell if something should be released or not. We are recommending in the contract that we find an ombudsman, a neutral party to make decisions on specific topics. He stated he is working with AFV to come up with improvements if necessary.

Member Lane asked, on the front page the recommended motion gives an amount of \$1,055,176. On page 25 in the contract, it says it shall not exceed a total amount of one \$1million dollars. He wondered what is the change or reason for the difference. He stated his understanding was that the contract was supposed to be \$1 million this year and then have a cost adjustment for ever year thereafter.

Mr. Bruce Fordon responded that is correct, and it looks like we are building that in. The consumer price index increase that was to accrue is not until next year. He asked "Mr. Hans do you have another take on it?"

Mr. Hans stated, he meant to put in the amount that was agreed upon at the last board meeting. They brought in their projected budget for next year and he thought that number was \$1,055,176; maybe Kris can update that. Ms. Anderson replied it is based on the cost adjustment for the first year, which is approximately \$998,000. Member Lane commented that needs to be fixed because the first year is \$1 million and every year after that there is a cost adjustment.

Member Lane stated the other concern is a whistle blower protection. Someone will bring forth a complaint and doesn't want to be identified. He stated "from a prospective as a Board member looking at complaints and where we got to last time, I guess I'm looking for a reason why that complaint wouldn't be brought forward to the Board as a whole and if nothing else into a closed session that would allow us to look at if there is any legal ramifications and thirdly, if we are going to operate as a Board and call for investigation of practices, shouldn't we as a Board know what those complaints are in some form or fashion?"

Mr. Bruce Fordon commented we should, and the whistle blower statutes that exist but are really not of concern to the JPA is one regarding AFV employees. The protection: if we have a contractor and one of their employees wants to bring forward an issue and they are seeking whistle blower protection that doesn't happen by this body, the JPA cannot represent them - they are not in that position. If they do not want their name given, the creditability of any complaint really has to do with the person making that complaint. Any complaint made where someone doesn't want to give their name is really of no consequence. There may be times when something else can be brought forth that goes to the Board; but we can't be in the place of advocating for that individual. The JPA has a purpose and we need to go forward with that purpose. The problem with closed session is that the rules are very specific on what can be discussed. Some of the other items do not fit and there is a severe penalty for going outside of those rules. Each issue needs to be looked at on a case-by-case basis.

Member Lane quoted a few lines from page 14 [of the Operations Agreement], and expressed concern that both the positive and negative communication brought forth by individuals is not adequately addressed. He stated, as a Board we should say, "...if you have a complaint bring it forward and we will address it accordingly. We need to; we have to as an obligation – at least for me representing my city. But if we don't have a complaint in writing from somebody I would even go as far as to say that if somebody wanted to remain anonymous I would be willing to understand that. But if we have a complaint that we have to address and everyone has to respond to and not just a work up of innuendos and accusations, how do we build that into the contract that says, "Bring forth your complaints to a built-in process that it needs to go through, and once it goes through that process we are going to make sure, first and foremost that it is addressed, corrected and we move forward, but not to have anything that allows for just anything to be thrown out"? He stated we are all in politics, and that happens all the time. How do we build it into the contract?

Mr. Bruce Fordon replied, it is not easy and to completely encompass everything is programmatic, because there is a certain universe that the JPA has control over. However, other entities do not fall within the purview of the JPA. Member agencies are their own entity

and unless common sense and good government, it's hard to put any restrictions on others, other than the JPA itself.

Member Lane stated, "...but we can as an organization say we don't have control over any other city, [as an example] the City of Murrieta. We don't have any control over whether or not I am going to provide information to AFV or to this Board. What the Board can say would be, "Mr. Lane if you don't provide us with that information, there is no complaint"". Mr. Bruce Fordon agreed with Member Lane and stated we will continue to refine this section.

Member Tisdale stated, "I appreciate Mr. Lane and the attorney for doing their best not to point me out or point out the City of Lake Elsinore, but I am a big boy and I can take it. We now have procedures for complaints and other things that did not exist. So, this body existed for five years and there was never any interaction from this body. When we first joined this JPA we had questions and some concerns about our numbers. The shelter used to be in Lake Elsinore, so Lake Elsinore's numbers are extremely high. So we have to balance whether we are going to fix sidewalks or pay for animal services. Now by law we must have animal services; that's not a question. In doing the right thing for our community is not a question either. The only concern is making sure that we get the value for our money. That's good government and that's all we are asking for. If I received a complaint for the city that said, Lake Elsinore's residents this happened then we turn it over to AFV and they deal with the complaint and we move on. I held a meeting with our staff and several individuals with the idea of helping with the marketing campaign and a flood of information came out followed by a flood of emails. There was not a procedure in place to deal with that so I took it to the Executive Director and County Counsel and disclosed everything. Every email I supposedly complained about, these folks have. I did not try to do anything in a vacuum nor had a hidden or secret meeting. All of this information was made available. My first question to them was can we have this in a closed session so that all the Board members are aware of it. I think they will vouch for that. So again, the way the county does business and the way our cities do business and how we bring things into closed session are a little different. They follow a little different rule on how they do it. But we all follow the same standard law rules. But what can go in closed session for the county is a lot different from the city. So it didn't make it there. But I took it one step further I met with all the city representatives and disclosed this same information with the city representatives so a lot of folks had this information and I think perhaps there were some breakdowns. With this committee we are cleaning up some breakdowns on the contract, such as making sure that the Executive Director and Counsel let folks know what is going on with certain things. The city should go back and look at their staff and make sure they are communicating to their elected officials so that they have the information because the information was there. Nothing was done in a vacuum or in secret and I was not trying to hide anything. I have nothing against AFV. My first puppy came from LEAF, when I first moved to the city. Every animal that I have owned has come from LEAF since I've been in the City of Lake Elsinore. So, I have absolutely nothing against AFV, we can renew their contract without an issue. We have a right when folks complain to clear it up. You can request all of the emails that I sent. There are some folks that have had it from day one every complaint that I ever received. That's why it was redacted and sent to legal. So, there were some people in there, members that worked at the clinic or shelters that felt they would be retaliated against if this information was shared. There were names given and other things were given. If we can provide the information it can gladly be provided. It has been with the County Counsel, all this information has been shared. There is nothing that I am hiding or trying to do or trying to backdoor anything

because there were other methods that I could have taken with the information that I had; I took the method that I thought was the most prudent and provided it to the Executive Director that has operational control over this shelter and our Counsel. I support this and we have come a long way and some of the changes that were made in the contract were good for the cities and this JPA; and I will make the motion to support with the corrections or any typos or those kinds of things that were mentioned beforehand.

Chairperson Moore asked AFV about Section 8(m), if dogs declared as *vicious* under state and or local laws are unadoptable. Is it by breed? Ms. Bagwell replied it is absolutely not by breed. In state law, Food and Agriculture codes, potentially dangerous dog is any animal that doesn't even have to bite twice. If a dog makes someone take defensive action, then it is deemed potentially dangerous after two incidents. If it gets out again or there is another incident it automatically goes to vicious under the state law. It doesn't matter what breed; it could be a chi Wawa, poodle or whatever.

Chairperson Moore asked for clarification on placeable animals on the different medical conditions. What do you think about kennel cough? Ms. Willa Bagwell replied, "Kennel cough is treatable." If we can add in or label it as you have other things labeled there with medical conditions such as skin problems, bad fleas, skin infestation, broken limbs, abscess, kennel cough, or problems that may be treated. Willa stated, but then are you going to name everything?

Chairperson Moore stated Incoming animals must be checked immediately for collar tags and scanned for microchip by a qualified shelter staff within one day of arrival to the shelter. I'm questioning "one day". Ms. Bagwell replied one hour is in another area, here's where they get a cursory exam which will be scanning, looking for microchip, seeing if they are severely injured and they would move to the top of the list. Member Moore asked are you saying this in the same paragraph or is this in another part of the contract? Ms. Bagwell replied every animal that arrives at the shelter should receive a cursory exam within two hours. Chairperson Moore asked, "Does your officer carry the ability to microchip in the field? Ms. Bagwell replied, "Yes, every animal is scanned in the field."

Chairperson Moore inquired Section 8(u), "...AFV shall hold all stray and impounded animals not otherwise guardian identifiable for a period of time required by law." Ms. Bagwell commented, under the Food and Agriculture code, stray animals without any identification are held the first day of impound; that is the mandatory holding period. If they have tags, we must hold the day of impound plus ten days. Quarantined animals are held for 10 days and actually released on the eleventh day after quarantined. There are specific clauses as to how long the animal are kept. Furrow cats - 72 hours at the minimum.

Chairperson Moore commented regarding Section 8(g), "...If the matter is not resolved to satisfaction of AFV", should read "If the matter is not resolved to the satisfaction of the SCFA". Member Moore commented "I really like the contract, I think you have a lot more reporting, it seems like there's many other items to report within the month. I like the contract." Ms. Bagwell responded AFV reports every month.

Member Lane stated within the contract we have the normal audits but what of investigative audits, what is that process and who approves it? He stated he did not see that in there specifically spelled out. Mr. Fordon replied he thinks it will probably start like anything else,

if you are talking about if one of the reviews finds something that needs to go further, then at that point, depending of the degree of it, it might fall under other statues such as privacy and informants, and things of that nature. No, we don't have anything built in there for that. We have to deal with that on a case by case basis.

Member Lane stated he would like to add, if we are going to be doing any type of investigative audits or investigations that something is brought up or arises, it should be brought before this Board, and the Board needs to give that approval. "I don't think that it should be done at an Executive Staff level. I think if we are going to do any investigative audit into a complaint that someone has filed, then it needs to come before the Board and the Board needs to approve that audit." Mr. Bruce Fordon replied he understood and depending on if the quarterly meetings are approved we will be here again on July 2nd. So we can work on that and even have the changes as early as that.

Member Jeffries commented if there is a reason for an investigative audit, which you may not want to disclose publicly at a certain point of time, it will have to be a closed session authorization for an investigative audit if that comes to the full commission.

Member Lane stated that goes back to his question. Mr. Tisdale spoke about this as well, of what goes into closed session or what doesn't go into closed session. I'm assuming if there are some types of personnel issues or we are dealing with something of a sensitive or legal nature (as an investigation) that is going to go into a closed session. Mr. Bruce Fordon replied if it has to do with SCFA personnel then definitely a closed session, and if we are talking about where we may be looking at criminal issues, law enforcement type matters than that an exception as well, we have those in closed session if it rises to that level. Member Lane stated we will have it set as such, from a legal stand point you will know obviously what needs to go in to a closed session from an investigative level and what is appropriate and what is not appropriate, and all the others will go through the normal process in public. Mr. Bruce Fordon replied exactly, yes.

Member Lane stated, "John, you have been on both sides of the table as council member before and now this, you can see the quandary here when you want something discussed publicly and when you don't. If it is not timely or valid you don't want to air it.

Mr. John Giardinelli, attorney for AFV, responded "Two things: Mr. Fordon and I had a conversation about making sure that we understood what would be released to the public would be final decision results, and that any drafts or anything in-process should be held back because, again, it's in-process.

Secondly, as to any employment related issues, you [the SCFA] have no employees as it applies to the animal shelter, all the employees are ours. So you have the best of both worlds. If there is a problem that rises to the level of a labor complaint, that is going to be my problem and we are going to deal with it. We will of course report what is appropriate under the contract and get back to you. I agree with you Supervisor Jeffries that anything that is in-process really needs to be held back because it could end up being nothing more than a grandstand by some member of the public who is upset because of something that happened to their animal that they didn't like. But, if it goes to the level where the performance committee believes that an investigation audit needs to take place, which by

the way, this has not happened in five years but conceivably could, and then at that point you will have the ability to make that decision. We have never had a problem of retaliation.

Member Lane stated maybe he is trying to accomplish the same thing and making it more difficult than it needs to be. He stated "there is a combination of things that I am looking at; I want to stay clear of the grandstanding if you will. This last one was a big negative, plain and simple, I don't want that to happen again. So, I am trying to look at the process and unfortunately you get government involved and we become more of a problem than becoming the solution. So, I am trying to make sure that we do not go off on something without the Board approval and that became part of the issues last time. As long as you are comfortable that we are heading in the right direction and you are comfortable with the contract, then I am fine with it and I will leave it alone; that was my concern.

Mr. Fordon stated he understood, and knowing that this is the policy of the board then it is his duty to carry it out. John said, we had a lot of good communication and a lot of good came out of negotiating this contract. Even right up to the very end we were negotiating it and we refined it quite a bit and it will meet those goals that you are looking to meet.

Member Tisdale made a motion to approve the Second Amended and Restated Animal Shelter Operations Agreement for the period July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2020.

Seconded by Member Lane.

Motion passed unanimously.

8. REPORT FROM AFV OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Ms. Willa Bagwell stated last year we had a spreadsheet where we had our best year ever for live releases - 80% of the dogs were released from the shelter and 50% of the cats. This is posted on the website every month so that people can track it.

In the past year we have rescued with several other groups; we are working with Best Friends and Animal Society in Utah for ground transport. We have partnered with Bark Avenue Foundation and Wings of Rescue who are known nationally. As the rescue coordinator for 30 hours a week, Monica works daily on sending emails out and working with at least 200 other rescue groups trying to get dogs out to rescues, to release space in the shelter. We actually have 700 rescue contacts that we work with and we hosted the Rescue Round Table this past year where different shelters from Santa Barbara down to San Diego got together and shared information on rescue groups. If someone new comes in all the shelters communicate daily on the rescue groups that we can work with. These animals' shelters have been checked out by Rick Browdy who owns the Bark Avenue Foundation and he has gone to all of these different shelters across the United States. Over the past year we have flown animals to New York, Washington (state) and Idaho where they have less of a problem with animals. They are not as crowded as we are and Rick rides on the transport with them and he said it is very rewarding. AFV has sent over 100 animals and we have picked up the cost for the spay and neuter of these animals, the microchipping and sometimes we pay for fuel for the airplanes, the heart worm test, and the help techs. We as

a non-profit are picking up those costs; it is not costing the city anything to get those animals out of the shelter. We are spending a tremendous amount of money on saving lives.”

Ms. Bagwell showed a flight video. She stated, “This Saturday they will be flying out another 25 animals and the plane will be coming out of San Bernardino. We are partnering with Best Friends - Pup My Ride, which is an international company and they perform ground transports. We drive as many animals as we can take to Baldwin Park and meet up with their transport truck. We cover the cost of transporting these animals. We have a Foster Program coordinator, Robin; she works 30 hours per week trying to get the shelter animals into foster homes. Right now we are inundated with kittens and puppies, so she is trying to get those animals out of the shelter.

Our spay and neuter clinic is very successful; we opened it a year ago in July; we have done 6,455 spay and neuter surgeries, administered 14,686 vaccinations and implanted 1035 microchips at the clinic. We have been operating at three days a week, but as of May 4 we started operating five days a week because the community needs it. Our main street “Shot Clinic” in Lake Elsinore has been held for 27 years and last year, 3970 vaccines and 110 microchips were given at the park. We oversee the Dryden Grant that AFV has given to help low income families with medical problems for their pets; we also oversee the Riverside County Community Foundation grants for low income senior citizens and the Smirnoff grant (Kathy receives and administers this grant). AFV food bank is used to help individuals feed their pets. We deliver food to the homeless and a lot of senior citizens use this program. A lot of times we ask for food donation because our food bank supply is low because we help the community feed their animals. We distribute 2000 pound monthly to the community. Our Humane Educator is in the schools and she does tours of the shelter and she does Kids Camp. Last year, she gave presentations to 2,269 children and 933 adults. The kids love the Kids Camp, we just completed one last week. During the summer this goes on with afternoon programs where the public comes in and she talks about how to potty train, and what kind of animals will fit in to your family for adopting. We try to do a lot of educating to the public.” Ms. Bagwell showed pictures of children who attended the Kids Camp. A lot of children have birthday parties but instead of receiving presents the children want to help the animals. So, they come in with food and stuff that they have received at their parties. Volunteers are our heart and soul; in 2014 we had 1994 volunteers that donated 23,951 hours. This is huge; we would have to hire employees and pay them to do the work that the volunteers do. The volunteers help us tremendously. At this shelter we have a grieving room and this is very important to us. We are known for our humane euthanasia in Southern California. We can have people come from anywhere because we allow the owners to stay with their pet. We tranquilize every animal and they are humanely euthanized. Last year we performed 1768 owner requested euthanasia at the shelter and in the homes. We are working on a regional marketing program and all of the cities are involved. It has been very positive.

Darlene Hilz came up with the idea of the donation in which we give \$10 gift cards. You bring your pet in to the shelter for a free spay and neuter and you are given a \$10 gift card. Because the shelter is so full for chihuahuas and pit bulls we have increased the gift card amount to \$20 so that we can reduce the breeding of these dogs. AFV donated \$10,000 on “World Spay Day”, for spay and neuter and we actually approached each of the cities and asked them to donate \$10K for spay and neutering and \$2500 for microchipping. We matched their donations; all of the cities agreed except Canyon Lake and so moving forward

this has been a very positive program for the community and we appreciate all the cities partnering with us. AFV has donated a total of \$62,500 towards this program and we appreciate Darlene for donating the incentive for this program. Today, microchipping for every city is \$5, except Murrieta offers free microchipping. This shelter is a happy place but for 24 years we worked out of third world country conditions so having this shelter has been a blessing. The public appreciates having a nice place where their animals are kept and I think we have done a wonderful job on improving things for the lives of the animals in this community.

Chairperson Moore asked Ms. Bagwell is there any follow-up on the animals going up to Washington. Ms. Bagwell replied yes, and all of the animals are adopted. We receive pictures and we share this information on our facebook page. Rick Browning is in charge of Wings of Rescue and we have only lost 2 animals, one came down in with a parvo (3 days after it arrived) and another one came down with distemper from the Bakersfield's shelter. All the other thousands of animals have been adopted. Chairperson Moore asked Ms. Bagwell if she is going to have a "Shots Clinics" in other cities. Ms. Bagwell replied no due to the manpower.

9. APPROVAL OF CORRECTIOS TO REVENUE/ EXPENSE ALLOCATION FOR FY 13/14 AND FY 14/15:

Mr. Tim Brown, representative from Canyon Lake asked why are there differences in the allocation for the value of the expenditures and asked if the cost accounting was done properly. Mr. Hans stated this item was brought to the Board at the last meeting. The purpose of this item is to give an accounting of the money in the Contingency Funds which total \$75,000 and it gives an accounting of how the cost are spread to the five cities and the county. The basis of that spreading always ties back to the number of animals in the previous year brought into the shelter for each area. So more animals means more costs. Chairperson Moore asked Mr. Hans to meet with Mr. Brown after the meeting to explain the report.

Member Lane stated he had a conversation with Mr. Hans on the amount of money he [as the Program Administrator] can spend every year. Mr. Hans requested, as the Administrator, he needs \$5,000 for many common and unexpected expenses; and he does not need a \$15,000 limit. Member Lane agreed with Mr. Hans that any expenditure in the amount of \$5,001 - \$15,000 goes to the Executive Committee and anything above \$15,001 goes to the Board. This item is part of a Board Policy change that needs to be added to the agenda it will be discussed at the next meeting.

Member Lane made a motion to discuss this item at the next meeting.

Seconded by Member Jeffries.

Motion passed unanimously.

With the understanding only if a representative is briefed before the meeting.

10. APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR:

Mr. Hans stated, in the spirit of involving all the cities and the county we found a part of the JPA formation documents that absolutely requires a Program Administrator but they allow the Board the option of appointing an Assistant Program Administrator, which I recommend is a good idea. It should be someone from one of the cities who has a dual advantage of being a volunteer, and also being from the Chair's city and that would be an advantage; if there is a change in the Chair; the Administrator's job could shift with the new Chair. Gary Nordquist for the City of Wildomar volunteered for this position.

11. APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION NO. 2015-01: INCREASE SCFA BOD MEETING DATES FROM ANNUALLY TO QUARTERLY, AND APPROVE \$5,000 IN INCREASED ADMIN FEES DUE TO ADDITIONAL MEETING DATES:

Chairperson Moore made one correction; July 2 and October 8 are the next scheduled Board meetings.

Member Lane made a motion to approve Resolution No. 2015-01 for the increase SCFA BOD meeting dates from annually to quarterly, and approve \$5,000 in increased admin fees due to additional meeting dates.

Seconded by Member Tisdale.

Motion passed unanimously.

12. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Ms. Willa Bagwell – Ms. Bagwell stated AFV has worked very hard for the last 27 and a half years to improve the lives of the animals in the valley. (Chairperson Moore stated, we appreciate what you are doing Willa.) Back in the 90's, 1600 animals were coming in to this shelter annually. We were euthanizing every day to make space for the animals that would arrive the following day, even though the housing and population has grown tremendously and the areas we service have increased in the valley. We have been able to reduce the number of animals coming into the shelter and reduce the euthanizing of animals drastically. We have made a huge difference of behalf of the community. AFV has always been focused on the animals but for the past seven months our focus has been on defending allegations that there are serious problems at this shelter. These allegations were stated at three City Council meetings in Lake Elsinore at a public forum. It was stated that all of the member agencies had concerns and to this date AFV has never been given the courtesy nor respect of even knowing what these allegations where. I find it very strange that Lake Elsinore is the only city that received complaints. I got up this morning glad that this day had come, where hopefully the contract would be approved and we could move forward and get back to constant training on what we do best. I read the Press Enterprise and here it is again today, in black and white the shelter in Wildomar had mishandled some situation. I would like it noted that since there is a Press Enterprise reporter in the audience that there was nothing mismanaged except for a few employees that has access to control drugs but they had not had background checks. AFV was unaware that the law had changed, and it went into effect in July. But within 48 hours of Dr. Kosmin letting us know that we needed background checks, all employees were approved and had background checks. I contacted other shelters to let them know of the new law and they were unaware of it. I hope you all have read Dr. Kosmin's report. Dr. Kosmin has been in practice for over 30 years he has worked

at numerous shelters and veterinarian offices and he is currently the President of the Veterinarian Board. He conducted the audit at the shelter and he was the only unbiased audit that was performed. Among the many positive things in the report Dr. Kosmin wrote, it is my experience that few facilities are this organized. AFV has worked very hard to build a good reputation in the valley, since August when the public statements were made about all of the severe problems at the shelter. We have seen a severe drop in donated food and supplies for the animals. This will affect the annual budget. The JPA has spent over \$28K in legal fees and over \$14K in audits (except for the \$8K that was taken off) that could have been used for a much better cause. AFV has spent thousands of dollars in attorney fees and instead of those funds going towards the animal programs or even a Public Relations person to repair the damage. We have always operated the shelter to the highest standards our integrity has been questioned unfairly and my frustration is over-the-top with the manner in which the way that AFV has been treated. Our Board of Director will not continue to allow this organization to be defamed nor slandered. AFV respectfully request that measures are taken by the JPA to address complaints properly and prevent further damage to AFV reputation. We hope to move forward in a positive manner with each and every city in the county.

13. ADJOURNMENT:

The Board adjourned the meeting at 2:00 p.m. to its regular meeting of JULY 2, 2015, at 2:00 P.M., at the Murrieta City Council Chambers, 1 Town Square, Murrieta, CA 92562.