

## ANIMAL CONTROL COMMISSION

### Minutes of the Regular Meeting

March 10, 2008

A regular meeting of the Fairbanks North Star Borough Animal Control Commission was held in the Borough Chizmar Room, 809 Pioneer Road, Fairbanks, Alaska. Ronnie Rosenberg, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

#### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ronnie Rosenberg, Chair  
Shellie Severa, Vice-Chair  
Kathryn Cardarelle  
Mary Ann Fortune  
Karen M. Wilson  
Shirley Harris

#### GUESTS PRESENT:

Victoria Meyer, Juli Phililbert, Linda Castor,  
Donna K. Buck-Davis, Andrew Davis, Mark Castor,  
Linda Cook, Kathy Vaupel, Don Kiely, Lynda Van  
Rossum, Laura M. Saunders, Robbie Wyman,  
Ken Wyman, Jamie Marschner, Suzanne  
Summerville, Paul Van Rossum, Michelle P.  
Casavant, Deb Lanigan, Pat Streeter,  
Sandy Klimaschesky

#### ABSENT:

None

#### STAFF PRESENT:

Matt Ruger, Animal Control Manager  
Barry Jennings, Emergency Ops Director

The minutes of the February 11, 2008 Animal Control Commission meeting and the agenda for this meeting were approved with one correction on page four: Jack Rasmussen was former manager of Noel Wien Library, not the North Pole Library.

**Ronnie Rosenberg** opened the meeting by asking the commissioners to review the agenda and asked for comments or additions. The agenda was approved.

#### CITIZENS' COMMENTS:

**Ronnie Rosenberg** there were several members of the public present and asked for a show of hands to see how many wanted to testify—there were about six—and noted each would get three minutes. She then proceeded down the list of names.

**Victoria Meyer**, 318 Slater Street, Fairbanks, addressed the term “we’re going to have to open her up” used when she adopted a female dog about three weeks ago. The dog had been spayed she stated she was told the owners lie so they would have to open her up to find out for sure. She stated she asked if there was another way and everyone at the “rescue” (shelter) used that phrase. She also stated the vet at Mt. McKinley used that phrase and didn’t even check the dog. She said Mr. Ruger then recommended that she take the dog to Dr. Zachel who is a consultant for the borough. Dr. Zachel told her there was no reason to believe that the incision made was for anything other than being spayed and he would write a note to that effect. She stated she was testifying to object to the use and the thinking of that phrase and

that way of thinking. She said she was told she could have a blood test taken but that it would have to be shipped to New York to be tested but there are other places for it to be tested. To find that permeating the "rescue" and vet mentality she found very disturbing and cruel. "It's a cruel term, 'we'll have to open her up'. Every means should be used not to use that phrase and to not to even do that to a female dog."

**Rosenberg**, to clarify, asked if it was the language that mainly bothered her.

**Meyer** said that and the attitude that goes with it. "She's not a baked potato; we're not going to open her up. We shouldn't be thinking like that or using that phrase. I am very disappointed with the Mt. McKinley vet. She didn't even look at the incision. It wasn't until Dr. Zachel looked at her and shaved the area and looked closely at her. I wonder how many other dogs have been spayed more than once. The reason I found out she had been spayed is because I accidentally met the person who brought her to the rescue in the first place. She could have been spayed or opened up again. That's my complaint and my suggestion. Thank you very much."

**Rosenberg** then worked her way down the guest list, all of whom declined, until reaching Linda Cook.

**Linda Cook**, 1589 Placer Drive, Fairbanks, stated that last May she went to Animal Control after having been called to come look at some dogs that needed to go out. She said she was handed a dog that couldn't stand on its own. Under any other circumstances she stated she could understand the reasoning for putting the animal out of his misery, but allowing a rescue to take the dog certainly should have been one of the choices. "Simply because a dog is old, and come on I am a bleeding heart, I take the ones that are old, I take the ones that are stressed at Animal Control, I take the ones that the public generally doesn't want. I don't compete with the public (except for once) for animals that are at Animal Control. That's what Animal Control is there for." She stated the dog was put into her arms but when she went to the front desk to fill out the paperwork she was told the dog was not available for adoption because it was on the euthanasia list. Matt wasn't in the office at the time so Barry approved her taking the dog. She stated she takes issue with the procedure when animals are on the list; that "it shouldn't be a capital offense to adopt an animal that's on the E List." She stated she's talked to people about that since then and nobody can figure out why that issue is so hard and fast. She recognizes that people with Animal Control deal with animals on a daily basis and staff has to find a way to cope and stated "I make no bones about the fact that I could not do your job. However, it is not simply about making a decision and having to stick with it. It is not taking the dog off the list to sit at Animal Control another week and rot. It's about someone wanting to adopt that dog immediately and it is out of there. There should be provisions for those dogs to be seen and adopted. That's what you are tasked with, adopting them out and caring for them while they're in your charge. You're not tasked with making a list and making sure those dogs die." She also stated that Animal Control does not call Homeward Bound and was under the impression it was because Homeward Bound is not under contract as a rescue. She stated that never made a difference over the previous four years and that it takes less time to call her than it does to euthanize a dog. She also noted she objects to rescues not being used more, that she is a rescue whether she has a formal agreement with the Borough or not, and she has never had issues with Animal Control. She said this should be about the animals as well as taking care of the people, she thinks there are rational ways to make sure the animals are cared for and that the peoples' psyche and mental health are also taken care of, but killing the dogs isn't the way to do it.

**Rosenberg** asked Ruger if he wanted to respond now or later.

**Matt Ruger** stated that he would like to respond to her concern about not being called recently. He stated he had spoken to Sabrina (Linda's daughter and the VP of Homeward Bound) the last couple of times he's seen her and she said Linda was under the weather and Homeward Bound was full so he decided not to bother her, thinking that when Linda was ready to take animals again she would call. As far as the contract is concerned, he can't move forward on that until he gets the information back that he requested in October. That's a decision made above him.

**Ruger and Cook** continued with a short discussion regarding the misunderstanding and subsequent breakdown of communication between Animal Control and Homeward Bound, agreeing that it was never Cook's intent to not be called and that Animal Control would resume calling her again.

**Rosenberg** then worked down the list to Lynda Van Rossum?

**Lynda Van Rossum**, 2179 Mavencamp Circle, North Pole, testified that she didn't have all of the facts but was hoping Ruger could address the issue of animals being euthanized that are too young. She noted they'd spoken about it in his office but wanted clarification that if an animal comes into the shelter less than eight weeks old, and it doesn't have a mother with it, is it euthanized?

**Rosenberg** stated it's in Title 6.

**Van Rossum** stated her mother, sister and best friend all work for animal control in the lower-48 so she is familiar with the fact that aren't always the facilities or manpower to care for a cat that has three-week-old kittens that have to be bottle fed. If it's the law she stated she isn't trying to change it, but she wanted to know if a rescue could be called before the shelter accepts the animals. She knew of an earlier situation in which Pet Pride was given a litter of kittens above the age limit but was denied a second one that was five weeks old. She wanted the five-week-old litter because they appeared healthier but was told she couldn't have them because of the ordinance. She asked if, when someone brings an animal in and the shelter encourages them to take the animal back home and bring it in when it's eight weeks old so it can be adopted out, and they decide to leave it anyway, could a rescue or somebody be called at this point?

**Rosenberg** stated the ordinance would have to be changed.

**Ruger** stated he would cover that in his Manager's Report since it comes up a lot.

**Rosenberg** stated she remembered when the ordinance was put into effect. Some of the reasoning behind it had to do with behavioral problems, immunity problems—you can't immunize them and you don't know where they have been or what they are carrying. Those are some of the problems. Additionally, there is no way to totally isolate the cats at the shelter, we don't have 24-hour staff to feed them at night, so that was some of the reasoning.

**Van Rossum** stated she understood but if underage, healthy kittens come in there are times when she would be more than happy to have the opportunity to hand-raise them. She also has

a cat that will mother any litter that comes to her house so behavioral problems shouldn't be an issue since they would be trained by her cat.

**Rosenberg** worked down the list to Robbie Wyman.

**Robbie Wyman**, 2420 Nugget Loop, Fairbanks, stated she used to be an animal shelter employee in the late 80's early 90's and left due to medical reasons. She has been out of state for quite some time for medical reasons but attended to testify regarding some of the ordinances, policies or new rules. She stated she has been bombarded with phone calls and has seen the letters to the editor in reference to the list. She stated that while employed at Animal Control she was one of those that did euthanasia and was the only rescue available in the community. She stated she took a lot of dogs and cats home, placed a lot and rehabilitated some. She said it's wonderful to see there are other organizations in the community now that are doing it so she was confused as to why some of them are not being utilized. She said she hopes there's just some misunderstanding going on and she attended to learn the facts and, if ordinances have to be changed, maybe finding out what needs to be done for the betterment of the animals and the community.

**Rosenberg** then moved down the list to Michelle Casavant.

Michelle Casavant, 1538 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave, Fairbanks, stated she had a couple of questions to clarify. She stated she had spoken with Ruger about this and also Rosenberg a few nights previous and thanked her for taking the time. She stated she and several others submitted a bunch of public records requests so that no more than eight pages per person would be copied so that they could get them free of charge so everyone could understand the type of statistics that we're dealing with. She stated Ruger did respond very timely and was very nice about it. He said that he was told that could not give copies of the records to anyone without being paid for them. She said it's not a big thing but she was trying to understand is who oversees what. Does the Board oversee the manager and the Borough oversee the Board?

**Rosenberg** clarified that by "Board" she meant "commission" then told her the commission does not oversee the Manager but has oversight over the shelter. The commission does not have managerial responsibilities. She then stated the Manager answers to the Director of Emergency Operations, currently Barry Jennings, who is overseen by the Chief of Staff who works directly for the Mayor. She noted the commission has nothing to do with setting the fees charged for anything, including public records.

**Casavant** stated under the FNSB it writes it right out that people will not be charged for eight copies or less. She said she is still trying to get copies of the 2007 euthanasia log. A lot of people don't realize how many animals are euthanized each month and maybe more people would get more involved and help out more and we'd have more foster homes and things like that.

**Rosenberg** asked if Casavant had pursued any of the things she told her about; to call Mr. Shefchik or the Legal Department about why they charge what they charge.

**Casavant** stated she had not due to traveling and meetings all day and she doesn't like to bother people after work but stated she will pursue that.

**Rosenberg** asked Ruger if he had any comments.

**Ruger** stated he believed public records requests are covered by FNSB Policy Letter 75.04 [Note: The policy letter is 75.01, paragraph C(1)] and it doesn't give a minimum number of pages. The policy is available for review on the Borough website next to where the request form is downloaded. Ruger states he's been providing eight copies per month free because that's how many pages the stats are and he wanted to make them available on a walk-in basis. He stated the monthly stats have the same information as the euthanasia logs and it's a lot less paper to go through. The only things not on there are the list of drugs used and the initials of the people who did the euthanasias but the other statistics are broken down pretty clearly. He said he had been giving the eight pages away free since he came on board because he wanted people to have access to those statistics just for the asking. He stated that was a mistake on his part because when he went back and reread the policy and was talking to Legal about some other stuff they told him those fees are set by Borough Assembly in the Schedule of Fees, which means he can't override them. He's been doing it wrong for 2 ½ years so he "kinda' got my hands slapped on that one."

**Rosenberg** worked her way through the rest of the list then asked if there were any more members of the public who would like to testify, not so much to testify as for clarification.

**Linda Caster**, 2097 Reno Lane, North Pole, testified that she is a licensed veterinary technician and wanted clarification about the euthanasia list. She stated she'd gotten a lot of phone calls at the clinic where she works. She wanted to know if, once an animal is put on the list, are they never available for adoption.

**Ruger** stated he has heard that question a lot and would be covering it in his shelter report.

**Caster** asked how she can comment if she doesn't know the answer.

**Ruger** asked Rosenberg if there would be public comments again at the end and noted that it may answer her question so she won't feel the need to comment.

**Rosenberg** stated there isn't usually public comment at the end but it could be added. She then asked if there were any other public comments. Noting none, she suggested moving on to the Manager's Report.

#### NEW BUSINESS:

**Ruger** read the Manager's Report (attached).

The new shelter software is just around the corner and should be implemented some time this summer. With the new software we will be able to upload digital photographs to the website as the animals are brought in and remove them as they are adopted. This can be done in real time. It tracks our numbers in accordance with the Asilomar Accords so we're comparing apples to apples and it won't just look at temperament/behavior as one category but stages of temperament and stages of behavior so we know what's going on with the animals.

**Rosenberg** added that Janice Golub, the volunteer who updates the website, wanted her to add that we just surpassed 1 million hits on Pet Finder for the Shelter Website.

**MaryAnn Fortune** asked Ruger if, with this new system, we will have the ability to print out easier to read tattoo and microchip listings for the after-hours volunteer who tries to match up animals with owners after business hours.

**Ruger** said he wasn't sure but as far as he knew it would not be a problem because everything will be directly downloadable into Microsoft Excel, Power Point, Word and/or Access. With the current system any report, such as the monthly stats, requires setting up a database query and is a big deal. With the news system you should be able to just hit a button and the stuff comes out.

**Rosenberg** noted that it will be very good when we can break down the animals in terms of behavior—barking or whatever—vs. temperament that is dangerous. Right now we don't have the ability to screen adopters. You can suggest to someone with three kids that this might not be a good dog but you can't deny them that animal, so it should work out better when we can classify the animals better.

**Ruger** moved on to the euthanasia numbers for 2004 through 2007, noting that owner-requested euthanasias were not included in that number but were noted separately. He stated that owner requests frequently outnumber the other euthanasias so he separated owner-requested euthanasias so the yearly comparisons would be "apples and apples". He added that the shelter can't be held accountable for euthanasias they have no choice but to perform since the owner makes that call. Therefore, removing those from the ones the shelter has some form of discretion over gives an accurate picture of the numbers we can actually impact. He noted that when he says "discretionary" he still includes animals euthanized for humane reasons even though most are mortally injured or ill. Even though there aren't a whole lot of options in cases like that, he's still the one who ultimately says yes or no so they're included because he doesn't want to water the numbers down too much. It needs to be an accurate picture. He also noted for the guests that the numbers are public record and he'll be glad to share them with anyone interested in seeing them.

**Rosenberg** also noted that many of the animals that would usually be euthanized for humane and health reasons are saved because the Shelter Fund can provide funding for advanced veterinary care, so that's another factor to consider.

**Ruger** added that the donors have been very generous to the Shelter Fund. We have saved a lot of animals we otherwise would not have been able to. There are several three-legged dogs out there due to the Fund's assistance and even a rabbit that was literally resuscitated—brought back to life—which is an interesting thing to behold.

**Rosenberg** asked if there were any commissioner comments. There were none. She then asked if anyone that had not testified wanted to testify or, if someone wants to testify again, they could have two more minutes.

**Cook** offered a solution for the dilemma of releasing the euthanasia logs with drug and personnel information on them. She suggested simply blacking that information out. She stated that no one asking for the information cares how much drugs you have or who ended up doing the euthanasia.

**Rosenberg** told her we do not have that authority now under a Public Records Request.

**Ruger** noted that he can only redact information that's unreleasable under the law.

**Cook** asked if it could be done if the person requesting the records asked for it to be blacked out.

**Rosenberg** said Legal would have to approve it. If someone makes a Public Records Request by law you have to either deny it and explain why or you have to accede to it. You cannot retract information even if the person doesn't want it.

**Cook**, getting back to the subject of the euthanasia log, expressed concern that the process is now sanitized by having it done out of the public eye so the public doesn't know what's going on. She wanted to know why adoption of a dog to save its life was the wrong reason and, if the return rate on them is higher, what the rate is. She also wanted to know why people shouldn't know that the dog only has a certain amount of time left. "I don't think it's criminal to let people adopt an animal even if they have to subsequently adopt the animal out if it wasn't right for them. Your return rate, and staff having to go through five animals in a two or three month period, versus killing 25."

**Ruger** said the number seemed higher but he didn't have the numbers in front of him so he didn't wan to go into that.

**Cook** said she would really like to see those statistics because she cannot conceive that if the public knows a dog is on a short list it isn't going to take a critical look at an animal that is perfectly adoptable. She noted she wasn't talking about animals that have temperament problems.

**Rosenberg** said she's there four or five times per week and sometimes people ask her and sometimes she tells people if they see an animal that is old or an animal that is barking continually or is sick, if they see notes to the effect that the animal is not socialized, or an animal that's been there for six weeks, those are the animals that the average person is not going to want and they are candidates for the list. So, if that's what you're wanting to do (save an animal), pick one of those animals. There are people who do that.

**Cook** asked what is wrong with letting the public know that they're on the short list.

**Rosenberg** said it changes all the time depending on what comes in.

**Ruger** noted that the point from when the list is finalized until the euthanasia is done is generally a very short time. It is unknown what is going to be on that list because they don't know what will come in. Every animal is assessed daily for temperament and health, etc.

**Cook** stated all of the tenders know which animals have been there for a long time.

**Rosenberg** noted that customers do too because the dates are on their information sheets. "How can I get a call that says they're going to be making up the list and there are several dogs we would like you to look at so they don't end up on the list? In the same rationale you can also put that on the website and tell the public the same thing."

**Kathryn Cardarelle** agreed, stating she volunteers there too and knows who's going on the list just by looking at them. "I don't have privy information but I read the cards and tell them the

same thing Ronnie said earlier.” She noted she reiterates the reasons, adding “not house broken” and “not pretty”.

**Rosenberg** said most of the people that want animals like that will inquire. They usually have other animals like that.

**Cardarelle** noted there’s a woman she sees at least every other month or every third month that asks which cats she should look at. “I know what she means and I go back to school and tell them we have a dog that may go on the list. He’s not very cute but he has a great personality, or I say if you’re looking for a cat there’s a cat that’s been there for a long time. I think it’s really hard to ask the staff to do something like that. You know how short-staffed they are there. You know how difficult it is to run that place on a daily basis as it is and to monitor all those is just asking a lot. I think it’s wonderful; I have never seen this many people at one of our meetings, it’s cool.”

**Rosenberg** suggested that whenever Cook has vacancies she should call. “There is no one at (the shelter) that has time to go down a list and say, ‘Well this one wants poodles and this one wants this’ but if you have vacancies and you have the time give a call and say, ‘This is a slow week for me, I can take a couple dogs or a cat or whatever you want.’ They handle over 6,000 animals a year.”

**Ruger** noted the number is between 5,500 and 6,000.

**Cook** asked what the euthanasia rate is compared to what comes in.

**Ruger** told her it was 17.24% last year. “It’s down a lot. A few of those are those hit by vehicles and stuff where the kind thing to do is put them out of their misery. To try to keep them alive would be cruel. We would like to make it zero or as close to zero as possible.”

**Cook** stated she thinks the types of animal that end up on the list are over-emphasized. If AC is full, perfectly adoptable animals are put on the list. It is not a majority of dogs that are deemed unadoptable because of temperament. It’s because there is no space.

**Ruger** clarified that “temperament” means temperament or behavior.

**Cook** stated that what goes first then are perfectly fuzzy, nice dogs that are euthanized simply because the shelter doesn’t have room. She said it’s not popular to euthanize dogs that have nothing wrong with them except that there isn’t enough room for them. Those are the ones that people are upset about; not knowing that those animals are short-listed.

**Ruger** reminded her that it’s easy to blame Animal Control for this but Animal Control did not breed any of those animals.

**Rosenberg** noted there is also a limited number of adopters. “You could build a sanctuary that holds 10,000 animals. In this community the problem is there are not 10,000 adopters for those animals.”

**Cook** said the problem was that people showed up at Animal Control and were told that an animal was on the euthanasia list and could not be removed. She stated she had a long

conversation about this with Rosenberg when she picked up Bugs and she backed it up because it is important for the tenders to have closure.

**Rosenberg** confirmed that is a factor. “Do you know how crazy making (the list) is if people were running in and out? Your case was resolved.”

**Cook** stated, “I was given Bugs and walked up to the counter—not to inappropriately walk out with the dog as has been intimated—but to do the paperwork that I always do. Someone tried to relieve me of possession of the dog. Arguments ensued and Barry was called—you weren’t there—and I was given permission to keep the dog. I also stated that I would hold onto the dog until I left but if it was determined that the dog, according to your rules, had to die, I would give the dog back up. Please don’t intimate to anybody, in an email or any other fashion, that I was going to do something inappropriate with that dog.”

**Rosenberg** asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak.

**Castor** noted that she wanted to go back to the list and talk about purely adoptable animals that end up on it. “Once they are on the list they can never come off. Now let’s be honest with each other. What if the dog happens to be black and you’ve got 10 black dogs? It’s not a behavior issue or anything why, is there no special dispensation? Do you see what I’m saying?”

**Ruger** replied, “No.”

**Cook** stated, “I understand what you’re doing with the short list cutting it down, not letting the public see the dogs. That’s going to help in a lot of ways. Are you doing this now or is it in the future?”

**Ruger** stated euthanasia is done when the shelter is not open to the public.

**Cook** stated there should never be a time if a person wants a dog they shouldn’t get it.

**Ruger** said if animals have active interest shown in them, those animals are more adoptable than others. Color is not something that is looked at. The way it’s done now, the list is done after business that day and the euthanasia is done before opening for business the next day.

**Cook** stated she would like to see the statistic broken down of adoptable dogs that were taken off the list and then returned as opposed to other adoptable dogs that were taken out of the Shelter and then returned.

**Rosenberg** stated very few animals are taken off the list because the animals are “mainly” animals that have been there for a long time and we’re getting full or they have behavioral problems.

**Cook** clarified, “So necessarily that percentage is small.”

**Rosenberg**, “Yes.”

**Ruger** said the system doesn’t track animals that come back multiple times that have been taken off the list. That’s anecdotal evidence from talking to the staff and noting animals that have come back several times.

**Cook** said, "At this time we're just concerned with the ones that get put back on the list. We're talking about staff documentation (?) here. Not the dog that comes back five times and then gets adopted. We're talking about a dog on the list that gets taken off the list and then comes back and gets put back on the list. There's two different statistics here we're dealing with."

**Rosenberg** replied that some people adopt dogs they can't deal with and bring them back. Others will give them to a friend or a neighbor. Maybe they're successful with it, maybe they bring it in, so it is very hard to determine. People don't keep up those microchips, they don't change their address, and they don't change their name. We have no one that's going to sit there tracking the 20 or 30 dogs that maybe were with candidates that are not finalized or suddenly come back. You would have to have a statistician sitting there all day doing that.

**Cook** noted, "He (Ruger) said the percentage of dogs that were adopted that come back."

**Rosenberg** replied that we do see some animals returned. "Those are animals that just didn't work out in that home, but some of them are returned for the reason they were relinquished in the first place, which isn't surprising."

**Ruger** added that, as he stated before, the system doesn't track animals like that. It's only noted in talking to the staff who recognize the animal has come back multiple times. "Another thing I don't want to get lost—because we keep talking about the numbers and what's good for the animals—is as the manager I have to be concerned for the health and well-being of my staff. When that was going on I would have staff members in my office crying "Why do I have to do this again?" It causes very real mental issues for people (Compassion Fatigue) and I can't and won't put my staff in a position where they need psychiatric help."

**Cook** replies that she understands that, stating she's a vet tech too and helps with euthanasia. "You're saying a percentage of these dogs that come back, I'm questioning the percentage. I'm trying to get it straight in my own head as opposed to the general population. Do you have a program for your staff so they can debrief? That's what we used to call it."

**Ruger** replied that the Borough does have counseling services available but because of the type of organization we are we cannot make it mandatory. We can only suggest it.

**Rosenberg** noted the time, that she was cutting off public testimony, and asked if the was a Facility Committee Report.

**Fortune** noted the Committee did meet and had a brief report. The meeting was held on March 4<sup>th</sup> at 5:30 p.m. and the Committee members present were Shellie Severa, Kathryn Cardarelle and herself. They discussed organizing the draft report into sections by physical limitations, safety issues, worker issues, animal care issues and maintenance issues and agreed that categories may be expanded as they go along. Cardarelle reminded Severa and Fortune that she had taken on more classes and has limited time for this project so it would be greatly appreciated if one or two other committee members could be recruited. Fortune will research the animal care issues and Severa will research safety issues then they will present their findings at the next session on Wednesday, March 26, at 5:30 p.m. in the Chizmar Room. Cardarelle will remain on the committee for overview of the research issues and to offer input.

**Rosenberg** asked if any other commissioners were interested in serving on the committee but there were no immediate volunteers.

OLD BUSINESS:

**Rosenberg** noted there are still three Commission vacancies. She and others are spreading the word but she was not aware of anyone who has applied in terms of hearing from the mayor's office.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS:

**Rosenberg** thanked everyone for attending the meeting. She continued, announcing that the automatic foamer has been purchased for use in applying the Virkon-S® disinfectant. It will apply it more evenly and reduce inhalation problems for the staff and animals, especially the smaller animals. It will take three to six weeks for it to be fabricated and then it will be shipped out of Massachusetts. She also readdressed the millionth hit milestone on the website. Lastly, she noted she got a call from Doug Yates, who is spearheading the fluoride-free Fairbanks effort, wanting to know if the shelter was aware that all the water we use and all the water west of the city is fluoridated. There is a citizen's group concerned about this and there was a City Hall meeting about it today. She said she told him she would bring it up and if people want to pursue it further they can get in touch with him or, as a Commission, let her know and it can be put on the agenda as a future issue.

**Cardarelle** and **Fortune** thanked everyone for coming and for their comments.

The next commission meeting is set for April 7, location to be determined, at 6:30 p.m.

A motion was made and seconded to close the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Submitted by Janice Vanderheiden for Matt Ruger

April 6, 2008