



## ANIMAL SERVICE CENTER OF THE MESILLA VALLEY BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

The following agenda will be considered at a regular Meeting of the Animal Service Center of the Mesilla Valley Board of Directors to be Held on **Thursday, April 28<sup>th</sup>, 2022 at 9:00 am** at the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 700 N. Main St., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

### AGENDA

- I. **Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance**
- II. **Determination of a Quorum**
- III. **Changes to Agenda and Approval of Agenda**
- IV. **Minutes**
  - a. Approval of the Minutes from the regular ASCMV Board Meeting held March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2022.
- V. **Reports/Presentations**
  - a. CfPP Presentation: Cherished K-9 – Carla Baker
  - b. City and County ACO Reports – City Animal Control and County Animal Control
  - c. Shelter Statistics/Activities – Dr. Trina Hadden
  - d. Committee Reports
    1. Finance – Eric Enriquez, Committee Chair
    2. Executive – Becky Corran, Committee Chair
    3. Facilities – Kasandra Gandara, Committee Chair
- VI. **Discussion Items**
  - a. Mutt & Meow Fest
  - b. Distemper Discussion
- VII. **Action Items**
  - a. Resolution 2022-05: Accept the \$50K Petco Love Animal Welfare Organization Grant
  - b. Resolution 2022-06: Adopt the ASCMV FY23 Annual Budget
- VIII. **Public Input**
- IX. **Chair and Board Comments**
- X. **Adjournment**

**Next Meeting: Thursday, May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2022 at 9:00 am.**

If You Need an Accommodation for a Disability to Enable You to Fully Participate in this Event Please Contact Us 48 Hours Before the Event at [382-0018/v](tel:382-0018) or [541-2128/tty](tel:541-2128). Posted Dated: April 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2022.



[ASCMV.org](http://ASCMV.org)

3551 BATAAN MEMORIAL WEST, LAS CRUCES, NM • 575-382-0018

1 **ANIMAL SERVICE CENTER OF MESILLA VALLEY**

2  
3 **March 24, 2022 at 9:00 a.m.**

4  
5  
6 **BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

- 7 Becky Corran– Chair  
8 Lynn Ellins – Vice-Chair  
9 Yvonne Flores - Board Member  
10 Kasandra Gandara - Board Member  
11 Fernando Macias - Board Member  
12 Manuel Sanchez - Board Member  
13 Eric Enriquez - Ex-Officio Member  
14 Mary Lou Ward - Ex-Officio Member

15  
16 **BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:**

17  
18 **I. Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance (9:00 a.m.):** Chair Corran called the  
19 meeting to order.

20  
21 **II. Determination of Quorum:** A quorum was determined.

22  
23 **III. Changes to Agenda and Approval of Agenda:** Motion by Board Member  
24 Macias, second by Board Member Flores. Motion passed.

25  
26 **IV. Minutes**

27  
28 **A. Approval of the Minutes from the regular ASCMV Board Meeting held**  
29 **February 24, 2022:** Motion by Board Member Ellins, second by Board  
30 Member Gandara. Motion passed.

31  
32 **V. Reports/Presentations**

33  
34 **A. City and County ACO Reports - City and County Animal Control:** Brian  
35 Hulsey from County ACO gave the report to include 246 reported strays of  
36 which 153 were picked up; 42 cats and 111 dogs. There were 12 sick or  
37 injured animals; one cat and 11 dogs. There were 16 owner release  
38 animals: all dogs. A four year comparison chart of reported strays was  
39 shown; it is vague due to being the beginning of the year. A four year  
40 comparison chart of field return to owner was shown.

41  
42 Additional animals picked up included 12 sick or injured animals, two  
43 welfare holds, 22 shelter quarantines, four court hold facility quarantines,  
44 and seven animals in the live evidence facility waiting for the judicial  
45 process. There were no rabies submissions for February. A slide of the  
46 Geo Districts was shown. District 1 had six dogs and zero cats; District 2

1 had 29 cats and 13 dogs which was lower than January; District 3 had nine  
2 cats and 25 dogs; District 4 had two cats and 27 dogs; District 5 had two  
3 cats and 19 dogs; District 6 had four dogs and zero cats; District 7 had 17  
4 dogs and zero cats. A graph was shown of the stray cats picked up by  
5 District; a graph was shown of the stray dogs picked up by District. The  
6 reasons for the owner release animals included one aggressive where it  
7 was beginning to be aggressive toward people and animals but hadn't been  
8 vicious yet, one vicious, three unable to care for the animal, three livestock  
9 killing or attack, one for animal health issues, five for an elderly woman  
10 moving out of state going into respite care, and two where owners were  
11 unable to keep the dogs on the property.  
12

13 Board Member Flores asked what they do with animals that are aggressive,  
14 vicious, and/or have owners unable to keep restrained on property. The  
15 county takes the animals to the ASCMV. If it's something to deal with in-  
16 house with a warrant or something then they are held in the county facility;  
17 currently there are seven. The animals in the court hold facility waiting for  
18 petitions are usually dangerous or vicious. The county waits for the courts  
19 to deem the animals as dangerous and/or vicious and then decide whether  
20 the animal will be euthanized or back to the owner; the decision is made by  
21 a judge. Every dangerous or vicious animal case is dealt with individually  
22 case by case; if it's already bitten and shown extreme acts of violence then  
23 it could be euthanized; if it's an issue that cannot be replicated then it can  
24 be put up for adoption.  
25

26 Board Member Ward added that when the Animal Control Officer first goes  
27 on a case, depending on the elements of the case and supporting evidence  
28 of a dangerous or vicious animal, then the Officer will come back to the  
29 office to discuss the case. Officer Hulseley prepares the cases for the other  
30 Officers as they must go back into the field. Once it is prepared, a warrant  
31 will be obtained, through the District Attorney's Office then the Magistrate  
32 Court. The animal is then seized and put in the court facility awaiting the  
33 court trial. A petition is also filed at the same time due to state statute; 10  
34 days once the animal is in custody to file it. The outcome of that case  
35 depends on the court; sometimes it takes a while and sometimes it doesn't.  
36 The owner release of aggressive animals are given to the Shelter with the  
37 information and the owner signs the animal over to the Shelter. The Shelter  
38 becomes the new owner and may do what is necessary. Sometimes the  
39 owner will request euthanasia upon owner release.  
40

41 Clint Thacker clarified that if the animal is relinquished to the county then it  
42 is their property until the animal comes to the Shelter. The county has every  
43 right to say they want the animal euthanized if they decide to. Board  
44 Member Gandara asked the differences between home quarantine and  
45 Shelter quarantine as well as how long the quarantine last. A home  
46 quarantine by definition is the dog is able to be confined on the property

1 away from other animals and people and up to date on vaccinations with  
2 proof then they can be on a home quarantine. The quarantine lasts for 10  
3 days not including the day of the first bite. An ASCMV quarantine is the  
4 same but the animal is at the shelter. The court hold quarantine is the same  
5 as the ASCMV quarantine with caretakers checking daily. Owners choose  
6 where they wish the dog to go for quarantine as they are considered  
7 property.  
8

9 Home quarantine depends on how the property is laid out. Some people  
10 have kennels with enough room for the dog to move around in or property  
11 with multiple fence lines to keep the animal separated. During the  
12 quarantine process an Officer checks three times to make sure the dog is  
13 still on the property and not showing any signs of rabies. If it is found that  
14 the dog is not confined or running loose then the county can obtain a warrant  
15 to seize the dog for the rest of the quarantine or the owner can say they  
16 want it taken to ASCMV or a vet. Those cases depends on each individual  
17 case. Public Relations deals with deals with informing the public of any  
18 cases. Chair Corran mentioned she had to do a home quarantine once  
19 before and she appreciated how the Officers handled it.  
20

21 Board Member Ward elaborated that as long as people have things in place  
22 the animal can be home quarantined; totally separated for 10 days from any  
23 and all animals and people as required by the state. Those quarantines  
24 tend to be simple cases of misunderstandings where the dog accidentally  
25 bit or got too excited and bit someone. Any animals that aren't updated on  
26 vaccines or running loose are taken in. The court hold facility does house  
27 animals for bite quarantine. The only animals that won't be housed are stray  
28 animals; public aren't allowed to view strays and the county is still under  
29 construction in regards to the floors. All strays go to the ASCMV for their  
30 owners to come claim ownership. If a stray bites someone and gets taken  
31 to the ASCMV then once the owner claims the animal it can then be moved  
32 to the facility to free up space in the Shelter.  
33

34 There are notices and information that goes out for cases, due process.  
35 There are not notices sent to the area in regards to a hearing for cases  
36 unless they're big ones. If there is an increase in cases in a specific vicinity  
37 then a notice will be sent out.  
38

39 Officer Gino Jimenez from City ACO gave their report to include 444 stray  
40 animal calls; 216 were gone on arrival and 240 were apprehended. 177  
41 were impounded at the ASCMV; 107 dogs and 70 cats. There were 51  
42 successful field return with 14 unsuccessful for a total of 65 identifiable stray  
43 animals. A three year comparison chart of stray animal calls was shown;  
44 it's keeping similar to 2020 and 2021. A three year comparison chart of field  
45 RTO was shown; February was a good month of RTO's. The Community

1 Cat Program was dispatched to 55 cats in trap calls; three were identified  
2 as Community Cats and the Officer released them in the area.

3  
4 Reasons for owner release included nine the owner was unable to care for,  
5 six for aggression either to people or other pets where two killed another  
6 dog and one bit the owner's sister, four the sister moved and left them  
7 behind, three dogs were sick or injured with one being a euthanasia request,  
8 two the owner passed away and the son couldn't take the dogs, one the  
9 dog is always escaping, one the owner moved to a new apartment and the  
10 landlord did not allow the dog, one where the dog barks too much, and one  
11 the owner was moving and could not take the dog with. The reasons of  
12 being unable to field RTO include six where the chips were not registered,  
13 eight had no contact with the owner by phone or at the residence, and one  
14 chip was registered in Colorado.

15  
16 There was clarification of the numbers of animals apprehended; these  
17 numbers include cats and dogs only. Almost half of the animals reported  
18 are gone on arrival; apprehending the animals are out of the Officers  
19 control. This is consistent throughout the months. Many factors are in this  
20 such as time, Officers on duty, when the call came in such as night or  
21 morning, and etcetera. Board Member Macias understands why there was  
22 difficulty understanding the numbers. The total number of stray animal calls  
23 include the amount apprehended, the amount returned, and the amount  
24 unsuccessful returned. Officer Jimenez stated that he will be happy to flip  
25 how the information is given to help understand the numbers. Board  
26 Member Macias suggested reorganizing the information in a way that it  
27 flows; start with the total number. Lieutenant Joy Wiitala explained that the  
28 two numbers of gone on arrival and apprehended don't add up in the total  
29 because they take the 444 from the actual record management system as  
30 far as reported strays. The other numbers come from the actual ACO  
31 Officers. It was suggested to have the information correlated prior to the  
32 meeting to avoid additional questions.

33  
34 Board Member Gandara asked what the process for the different  
35 quarantines from the City's perspective. Their procedure and policy is very  
36 similar to the county's due to state statute. The only difference is the county  
37 has their own court hold facility and the City uses the ASCMV. An example  
38 was given of what would happen if a dog bit someone but is updated on  
39 vaccines and can be quarantined on the property. The owner would sign  
40 an agreement stating that they are responsible for the dog while it is on the  
41 property and under quarantine. It is a three step process: first day, fifth day,  
42 tenth day where the Officer goes out to inspect. At the initial inspection the  
43 Officer looks to make sure the dog can't escape from the property. If for  
44 any reason they think it can the home quarantine will not be approved. It  
45 would then be up to the owner to decide what facility they wish the dog to  
46 be quarantined at. The Officer escorts the animal to whatever facility they

1 go to. If the dog is lost, stolen, escapes, or dies the owners will call the  
2 Control Officers immediately so that they can patrol the area if it escaped,  
3 assist in filling out a police report if it was stolen, and follow the proper  
4 channels to perform an autopsy if the animal died within the 10 days.  
5

6 They do not seek a warrant until they're actually trying to deem a dog  
7 dangerous or potentially dangerous. The only other reasons would include  
8 an owner that is interfering with them taking the dog into quarantine or  
9 refusing to allow them to take the dog; a warrant will be given from a  
10 Municipal judge. Lieutenant Wiitala clarified that a warrant is for a person.  
11 For any reference to a dangerous dog it would need to be motion for an  
12 order to seize the animal; it's called a warrant but technically isn't one. If  
13 there is a potential dog that has harmed or killed someone a motion is  
14 requested to seize the animal; different for each court as there is a City  
15 ordinance. They would ask through the municipal courts and ask if there is  
16 enough factual evidence to support this being a dangerous or potentially  
17 dangerous dog. When that process begins they take ownership of the dog,  
18 not the Shelter even if it's staying with them.  
19

20 City ACO also have a 10 day period as the county does; this is to see if the  
21 dog has rabies or something. They prioritize a person's health. Gathering  
22 information and facts may take more than 10 days depending on what  
23 needs to be gathered. An Officer will not release information to the public;  
24 it would be done through the Public Information Officer. The pet owner and  
25 victims, if any, are involved. However, it must be treated as a criminal  
26 investigation and so the general public only receives information as needed.  
27 The timeline for these cases is different each time due to what is going on.  
28 Currently the response time for strays is an average of 17 minutes; it can  
29 be higher on the weekends due to one Officer on duty.  
30

31 The vacancies for the open positions closed on Monday and they will begin  
32 the process today; there are currently only six Officers with two vacancies  
33 for a total of eight. There was discussion on added time for each animal  
34 with checking for the chip and taking them to a known owner; could take up  
35 to 35 additional minutes per animal. Board Member Gandara asked how  
36 many calls they receive after hours. Officer Jimenez doesn't know off the  
37 top of his head. Most citizens understand that after 10:00 pm it is  
38 emergency services only. He can research the number and let the Board  
39 know. Board Member Gandara stated that she has been receiving a lot of  
40 e-mails about potential vicious dog court cases. She is concerned that there  
41 are more issues with bites and suggested doing a GIS study to see if it's  
42 true; investigate and have a discussion with the advocates to come up with  
43 strategies to address this.  
44

45 When COVID first hit there was a tremendous amount of bites which were  
46 attributed to people staying home more; pets used to a different schedule

1 so they would act out. Owner victim bites stayed roughly the same  
2 throughout 2019 and 2020; 2021 plateaued and now it's trending  
3 downward. During the same amount of time all of the bites have all  
4 skyrocketed. COVID can no longer be used as the explanation and it is  
5 unknown why bites are increasing now. Board Member Gandara suggested  
6 that many people are still working from home and we're still in the pandemic.  
7 However, she believes strategies need to be created to address the issue;  
8 animal protection group to come and help examine this. She would also  
9 like a media campaign to inform the public and educate pet owners.

10  
11 Board Member Macias added that in any given month looking at the  
12 statistics there were 444 animals reported and out of that 217 were not  
13 apprehended; look at the positive in which over 50% of animals were picked  
14 up. If the average time response is 17 minutes than there was an animal to  
15 actually seize. The longer the response time the less likely to catch the  
16 animal which has a ripple effect towards possible dangerous animals being  
17 on the street. He recommended picking up more animals as the numbers  
18 increase how aggressive are they with adoption rates or shipping animals  
19 to other areas of the country. Historically Animal Control has always been  
20 lesser priority compared to Law Enforcement or Fire in terms of commitment  
21 of resources and personnel. He does believe the average is a good  
22 response time but it could be better. He also clarified the differences  
23 between arrest warrant and search warrant; one is to seize a person and  
24 one is to seize property. He will look at what their process, how they refer  
25 to warrants, and what their purposes are prior to the next meeting.

26  
27 Officer Jimenez stated that roughly three years ago he had the opportunity  
28 to give a presentation in Albuquerque for Blood Sports and sit down with  
29 their director to discuss trends in Albuquerque and Las Cruces. One of the  
30 things they were doing is Animal Control no longer responds to stray animal  
31 calls in Albuquerque but only to animals in custody; 50% of their calls were  
32 coming back without animals. Officer Jimenez doesn't agree with that idea  
33 due to the possibility the dog could potentially bite another animal or person  
34 later on. Board Member Macias stated that it takes the Control Officers  
35 even more time in the field searching for the animal because they're not  
36 readily identifiable; driving blocks around the neighborhood to make sure  
37 they don't get called back a second time. If there isn't an end product then  
38 it's a lot of wasted time. He suggested it would be a policy issue the Board  
39 should address in the future.

40  
41 Board Member Ward commented that when they hold people accountable  
42 for vicious dogs a lot of times depending on the severity of the dog attack  
43 then at that point the Sheriff's Department becomes involved due to  
44 possible felony charges. That has occurred with a lot of cases lately in the  
45 county. She clarified that the 10 day petition is filed at the same time they  
46 pick up the dog. The dog must be held for 10 days but the petition must be

1 filed within 14 days. Board Member Ward and Officer Jimenez have been  
2 discussing what to do with the dog attacks; possible developing a task force  
3 in regards to the Dangerous Dog Act and putting resources together.  
4 Potentially also meeting together to look at the numbers and see what can  
5 be done. Chair Corran stated that they need to think about all the different  
6 aspects that need to work together for this, human resource, budgetary,  
7 community resource commitments, best practices, and etcetera. There are  
8 too many dogs with too many irresponsible owners.  
9

10 **B. Shelter Statistics/Activities - ASCMV 2021 Annual Report:** Clint  
11 Thacker asked the people who came to the meeting to come up to the front  
12 and show their signs. Board Member Macias stated that he hopes Mr.  
13 Thacker will address the concerns of the people as part of his report; issues  
14 regarding the hours the Shelter is open. Mr. Thacker thanked the people  
15 for coming and sacrificing their time as they want the best for the animals.  
16 There may be some disagreements but everyone is here for the same  
17 reason.  
18

19 Mr. Thacker gave the ASCMV Executive Director's report. The current  
20 animal count is 415; 359 dogs, 56 cats. Total intake is 597 in February. Mr.  
21 Thacker stated that he's for the ACO only to report to in custody animals.  
22 A slide was shown of the animals transferred to rescues or places animals  
23 are sent to; ACTion Program for Animals are a big rescue taking animals  
24 that are sick or injured, Colorado Puppy Rescue are a big partner,  
25 Enchanted Pasts took 17 cats, and the Mile High Meows, Mutts, and  
26 Rescue group took 14. Staff is always looking for new rescues to work with  
27 and appreciate each current one immensely. Board Member Ellins asked  
28 if HALO was a new rescue; it's not. They've been around for two years now  
29 and are based in Phoenix, Arizona. They take animals from shelters and  
30 sell them at their facility.  
31

32 There were seven returns of dogs; two cats were returned. Assistance and  
33 education are given to the owners prior to returning; Ruff to Ready program  
34 with Doña Ana Humane Society and etcetera. February adoptions are at  
35 24%, reclaims are at 10%, rescued are at 38.5%, Community Cats are at  
36 19%, and euthanasia was 18.6% for a total live release rate of 83.2%.  
37 Euthanasia reasons for dogs were mainly due to behavior and  
38 aggressiveness; all around aggressiveness, not just one. Euthanasia  
39 reasons for cats were mainly due to medical and respiratory issues where  
40 they didn't respond to treatment. Parvo was also a high reason for  
41 euthanasia; puppies came in that tested positive and there are no resources  
42 available at the time.  
43

44 The volunteer program is thriving; 674 hours in February. There are 59  
45 people who volunteer on the dog team and 16 on the cat team with a current  
46 active of 228 volunteers. Total number of visitors evened out to the 830



1 mark; fairly average. Adoption appointments kept were 95%; 167 total  
2 appointments made with 67% finalized adoptions. The new walk-ins open  
3 house on Friday and Saturday from 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm had 101 groups;  
4 group can be a family of three, one person, and etcetera. There were 27  
5 adoptions resulting from those groups: 27%. The website page views were  
6 35,800; not original views but every time you look at a page. Facebook  
7 views were shown; it has leveled out since November at 2,573. They hope  
8 to see a spike in March for the drive through clinic which was a huge  
9 success. The pets of the week are Simba the dog and Ava the cat.

10  
11 Board Member Ward asked if there's any way to get the 2020 and 2021  
12 numbers for dogs being euthanized for aggression: for statistical reasons  
13 for the task force. Mr. Thacker stated he will get that for her. Chair Corran  
14 asked for clarification on the euthanasia on aggressive animals and whether  
15 it's the decision of the Shelter and separate of an assessment from an  
16 Animal Control Officer. Mr. Thacker stated that everything is taken into  
17 consideration; animals act differently in different circumstances and  
18 therefore staff tries to mimic the behavior to see what they do. Board  
19 Member Ellins asked how the 228 active volunteers compare to other  
20 periods of time. Mr. Thacker doesn't know the exact numbers but this is a  
21 lot more. The Volunteer Coordinator position has gone through a couple of  
22 people before getting this many.

23  
24 Board Member Gandara asked Mr. Thacker to explain his stance on the  
25 Center hours. Mr. Thacker stated that last month he went into detail in  
26 regards to the subject and felt that it was explained well. There was still a  
27 desire to have the visiting hours expanded whereas last month there was  
28 no physical connection for the public to walk through any areas of the  
29 Center that wasn't employee only places to get to the other animals. The  
30 Center is laid out completely different from 2019 due to the construction. At  
31 the end of the month there will be a presentation about the new facility; the  
32 parking lot area is supposed to be given back to the Center by the end of  
33 the month. If the parking lot will be paved and completed then they will have  
34 a pedestrian gate to access around the building.

35  
36 There will be a possibility that the public can then through right by his office,  
37 enter through the pedestrian gate, stay on the sidewalk, and come around  
38 as the area will no longer be a construction area. The construction company  
39 is very strict about OSHA rules and people wearing protective equipment  
40 when they come through a construction area regardless if the construction  
41 is nowhere near where they are. That access point will allow people to  
42 access two kennels. Mr. Thacker reminded them that even before the  
43 pandemic the ASCMV was never opened to the entire Center for individuals  
44 to walk through; it was the S kennels and the one behind it. The kennel  
45 behind the S kennels are now stray animals that just came in so the public  
46 can't be in that area. In order to access the other kennels the public would

1 have to walk through employee only areas, vet techs with dogs, manager's  
2 office, and etcetera. At the end of the month they should be able to extend  
3 the hours and have access to other animals.  
4

5 Board Member Gandara suggested adding data on the source of adoptions  
6 year to year; percentage of animals leaving to rescues and adoptions. She  
7 added that in reports year to year there seems to be many people coming  
8 to view the animals but not adopting them; the percentage is very important  
9 to know. Mr. Thacker stated that it is a big frustration his employees have;  
10 they need to stop what they're doing to walk people through and then the  
11 people just leave. His employees would like to stick with the appointments  
12 in order to not waste their own time. Mr. Thacker is trying to come halfway  
13 between what the public wants and what his staff wants; it is no longer a  
14 COVID issue. The medical director prefers the appointments due to the  
15 amount of noise in a kennel that comes from people walking through. There  
16 is also the factor of people putting fingers in kennels when they're not  
17 supposed to; it could spread disease. The issues tend to be dogs only;  
18 haven't heard any issues with the cats.  
19

20 Board Member Flores added that she would like to see how many viewings  
21 result in adoptions to see how much of the viewing contributes to adoptions.  
22 This data would prove to be beneficial as it takes time for the personnel to  
23 stop their duties in order to give a tour to the public and control them due to  
24 animal safety; it's a place where animals are taken care of. The data may  
25 allow them to ask to hire more personnel; there are some vacancies  
26 already. Chair Corran stated that the statistics are important but as much  
27 as they can it should be thought of a place where everyone can come to the  
28 middle and work together to move forward. Some issues she has heard is  
29 that some animals that are being seen are a subset which limits the number  
30 of animals that can be adopted, certain size dogs. There needs to be a way  
31 to broaden people's access to dogs of all sizes; possibly lend some City  
32 resources to help.  
33

34 Ex-Officio Member Enriquez stated that he'd like to sit down with Mr.  
35 Thacker in regards to access issues due to construction; see what the  
36 scheduling is for his staff. He'd also like to get with the project managers to  
37 see what can be done with alternative parking or access, possible shuttling.  
38 Board Member Ellins stated that hiring more people are always more  
39 problematic. He asked if volunteers could be used to escort the tour groups.  
40 Mr. Thacker responded that they're asking volunteers to be on a schedule  
41 for the walk through's; they are notoriously unreliable due to something else  
42 coming up. They will ask volunteers to come and help but will no longer try  
43 to do the scheduling.  
44

45 **C. Committee Reports**  
46

1           **1. Finance - Eric Enriquez, Committee Chair:** Josh Saffell gave the  
2 financial report. The unaudited financial statements as of February  
3 2022 included General Fund cash of \$1,390,256 and receivables of  
4 \$308,455 for a total assets of \$1,698,711. Liabilities total \$56,471  
5 with revenues collected in advance of \$197,008; this left an  
6 unassigned fund balance of \$1,445,232. Change in net position for  
7 all funds included General Fund total revenues at \$2,552,546 and  
8 total expenditures at \$1,934,434; a total net change of \$618,112.

9  
10           The budget to actual change in net position is 66.4% of budgeted  
11 revenue and 50.3% of budgeted expenditures. The budget parameter  
12 is 66.7%; revenue is in line but expenditures are under. A line graph  
13 comparison of expenditures versus revenues was shown; trend  
14 shows expenditures have gone slightly above revenue. Percentage  
15 of total expenditures included 49% salary, 16% benefits, 18%  
16 services, 8% supplies, 5% temporary services, 2% insurance, 1%  
17 capital, and 1% in other.

18  
19           Board Member Flores asked if liabilities are expenditures. Mr. Saffell  
20 stated that the best way to think about it is comparing a balance sheet  
21 to an income statement; the income statement is basically operations.  
22 Revenue is what's coming in and expenses is what's going out. The  
23 balance sheet is basically the overall performance; it's the assets  
24 which is what they have on hand to work with. The total liabilities is  
25 expenses that are upcoming; not paid yet but it will leave. The net  
26 change refers to the net change in fund balance.

27  
28           The income statement looks at the year whereas the balance sheet  
29 looks at the life of the entity. Change in fund balance is the difference  
30 between revenue and expenditures, if there's more revenue than  
31 expense the fund balance would increase. Whether or not the  
32 \$618,000 is still there at the end of the fiscal year depends on what is  
33 needed. Board Member Flores believes that this is good information  
34 for the public to know; \$618,000 isn't a lot of money from now until  
35 the end of the fiscal year. Chair Corran explained that the City does  
36 a number of administrative functions as outlined by the JPA  
37 agreement and one is the accounting.

38  
39           **2. Executive – Becky Corran, Committee Chair:** Chair Corran stated  
40 that they primarily worked on the agenda, updates on the  
41 construction, and what's been happening in the context of the Shelter.  
42 The full Executive Committee wasn't present, only Chair Corran and  
43 Mr. Thacker.

44  
45           **3. Facilities - Kasandra Gandara, Committee Chair:** Board Member  
46 Gandara stated they met via Zoom. There are still some issues

1 related to the building that Mr. Thacker and the Facilities staff at the  
2 City are working through. She asked Mr. Thacker to have a more  
3 consistent conversation with Assistant City Manager Enriquez related  
4 to that. The completion date has gone back and forth a bit.  
5

6 Mr. Thacker did not specifically meet with the Assistant City Manager  
7 but they were in meetings with discussions on the GO Bond initiatives.  
8 The existing Center has rust on the bottoms of the door frames and  
9 doors due to all the water being sprayed and used; original doors from  
10 late 1980s and early 1990s. A quote for replacing them has been  
11 received; reusing the stainless steel plate over the door, replacing two  
12 of the door frames which will be tricky as they are filled with cement.  
13 The reclaim kennel will have concrete poured in order to purchase  
14 more kennels or better utilize the space. Staff is looking at pouring a  
15 cement slab or footings for one of the transport containers for the  
16 facilities specialist; place for all of his tools and materials.  
17

18 Tom Gallagher who is the project manager with Public Works gave a  
19 presentation on the new Center update. Grading was a huge portion  
20 of the project; a lot of ground and dirt to move. Next there was  
21 electrical and plumbing to be done followed by pouring the  
22 foundations of the buildings and kennels. The exterior framing with  
23 structural steel has been put into place. The concrete brick looking  
24 materials is roughly 99% complete at the kennels. Within the past two  
25 weeks the roofing began as well as sheathing and fire proofing. El  
26 Paso Electric had power lines running directly over where the new  
27 building is and that had to be moved; coordinated with them as well  
28 as Comcast, Verizon, and Century Link. The lines were relocated to  
29 the south of the property.  
30

31 One challenge was the 40 mph winds in December which damaged  
32 the newly installed exterior framing studs. All loose studs were  
33 identified after an investigation and were replaced; 30% to 40%  
34 needed to be replaced. There are some procurement issues;  
35 contractors are able to buy the needed materials but it's taking longer  
36 to come in. There have been drastic changes in pricing, especially  
37 with roofing which has affected the ability to value engineer upcoming  
38 changes. For the most part there hasn't been too much negative  
39 effects from pricing. This is industry wide impacts from COVID-19.  
40 There are some issues with the door hardware; most likely will be  
41 delayed which is similar to the issues at Fire Station #3. The contract  
42 end date hasn't changed but may be more October or November.  
43

44 Board Member Flores is concerned about the GO Bond obligation for  
45 the end date. She asked if Mr. Gallagher foresees any delays to go  
46 beyond December. He does not believe there will be issues. The

1 contracts are written at the beginning of the project; any issues with  
2 getting material or changes happen then there is a 10% leeway in the  
3 procurement code. Receiving materials is an issue. However the  
4 contractor is still aiming for an end date of September 30th. There is  
5 a possibility it may be pushed back a month or two later. Procurement  
6 issues would be in the sense of what the contractor is trying to acquire  
7 and bring to the job for installation, raw materials, steel, roofing  
8 material, and etcetera.  
9

10 **VI. ACTION ITEM**

11  
12 **A. Resolution 2022-04: Accept the \$30,000 PetSmart Charities Major**  
13 **Initiatives Shelter Impact Relief Grant:** Elaine Stachera-Simon gave the  
14 presentation; grant writer for the ASCMV. The purpose behind the grant is  
15 to help get animals out of the ASCMV with a positive income. The invitation  
16 they received from the PetSmart Charities was outside of their normal grant  
17 cycle; one of only 24 organizations that were invited to apply due to the high  
18 intake. Staff looked at two specific areas: a way to augment the  
19 commitment to the community and community members who are animal  
20 owners and to augment the commitment to rescue and transfer partners  
21 whether local or out of state.  
22

23 Roughly 50% of the funding is going toward RTO's. After looking at a period  
24 of eight months in 2021 there were 695 animals RTO. If the animal is  
25 unaltered when returned the owner is asked if they would like them to be  
26 sterilized and given a price; most often the answer is no. Out of those 695  
27 only 151 were sterilized. The main reason people decline is due to not  
28 having funds available. This funds will allow staff to work with the people  
29 who want their animals sterilized but can't afford it. The other 50% of funds  
30 will be used to pursue new rescue partners and incentivize the current ones.  
31 For example, some rescues could take 10 animals but if the animals are  
32 sterilized they could take 20 and this funding will allow that to happen. Staff  
33 has until the end of November to meet the goal of 353 total animals  
34 impacted. Currently with the RTO program 39 animals have been sterilized;  
35 goal is 174. The rescue transfer partners are at 27 with a goal of 179. The  
36 grant has already been received. ASCMV may or may not have been the  
37 sole recipient.  
38

39 Board Member Flores motioned to accept Resolution 2022-04; seconded  
40 by Board Member Gandara. Motion passed.  
41

42 **VII. PUBLIC INPUT:** Harriet Dannhaus is a volunteer with the Shelter as well as a  
43 foster. She thanked the Board for allowing them to come up and speak. She  
44 commented that some people don't have internet access to be able to pick a dog  
45 to visit and create an appointment. Another concern is that the only area currently  
46 open is the small dog area which is 18 kennels and two per kennel: limited number

1 of dogs seen. As a volunteer she has access to various areas and doesn't  
2 understand why the public can't have access. She understands the construction  
3 issues without easily navigated paths for the back areas where the large dogs are  
4 housed.

5  
6 She added that Mr. Thacker didn't identify that there is an area called the R area  
7 on the Shelter map which is an outside kennel that houses 50 dogs; used to be  
8 called the reclaimed area but is mostly the long term large dogs. That is accessible  
9 outside and a path could be created going there. Currently there are tarps  
10 protecting the animals from the elements which can be rolled up and isn't in the  
11 facility so noise wouldn't be an issue. Ms. Dannhaus spoke with the medical  
12 director who suggested that there aren't walk throughs other times of the week due  
13 to the parking lot issue but if walk throughs are expanded daily for a certain amount  
14 of time it could potentially limit the amount of traffic in one given time. Currently  
15 the walk throughs account for 12 hours out of 61 hours that the Shelter is open to  
16 the public. Hiring more staff would be wonderful. She encourages staff to specify  
17 to volunteers what is needed at the walk throughs and potentially have volunteers  
18 help. She would like to try and come up for solutions. There are people who use  
19 the walk through as a fun excursion but there are others who just don't find the  
20 animal they want or wish to think about it.

21  
22 Frank Bryce thanked the people for coming and enjoys seeing more public input.  
23 He stated that the spay and neutering for cats needs to be back online; it's difficult  
24 for cats to be TNR'd. He added that there's a lot of people coming to them because  
25 when they take a stray to the Shelter the staff there tells the public to contact other  
26 rescues. Mr. Bryce does not like that policy. He would prefer the Shelter to  
27 develop a process of taking the animal in and evaluate the animal first; get the  
28 animal adoptable before sending the animal to rescues. Mr. Bryce would like the  
29 Shelter to form some kind of public panel to discuss these issues; a task force was  
30 for the ordinance but there isn't one for Shelter issues to work better together. He  
31 would also like a comment on the five dogs whose owner is in the hospital; he was  
32 told the dogs would be spayed and neutered and returned to the owner but that  
33 the dogs have to be out of the Shelter by 5:30 pm tomorrow evening. He's fostering  
34 16 dogs and five cats at his place but doesn't have room for five more large dogs.

35  
36 Mr. Thacker stated that he's been on vacation and isn't aware of any of those  
37 circumstances but he will find them out for Mr. Bryce. He added that the R kennel  
38 under the green tent is currently being prepped to have cement poured on the  
39 outside areas; not a place for volunteers or staff to be. Once the parking lot area  
40 is finished it will be easily accessible; just a matter of the construction areas and  
41 getting people to and from the areas safely. Board Member Flores commented  
42 that there is a lot of liability with some suggestions of allowing public in more areas.  
43 Once things are safer to access then they can address some of the requests being  
44 made. Mr. Thacker invited the Board to visit and get a visual of the area. The  
45 specific area outside will have new kennels after the concrete is poured. Mr.

1 Thacker stated that better results are coming; it just isn't as quick as some people  
2 would like to see.

3  
4 Once the new Shelter is built people will be able to visit from 8:00 am until 6:00 pm  
5 due to indoor and outdoor kennels. Cleaning won't be an issue as it is now. For  
6 as long as Mr. Thacker has been with ASCMV staff has had to clean before people  
7 can come see the animals, dangerous area with wetness and hoses. Therefore  
8 public viewing isn't open until noon to give the staff time to do so. The Shelter has  
9 never been completely open to the public; it's always been specific areas. The  
10 areas are coming along with new kennels and concrete is being poured; the new  
11 kennels are almost \$300,000.00. Chair Corran stated that she remembers when  
12 the euthanasia rate was 30% to 40% and she recognizes the importance of  
13 thinking about the safety of animals as well; keep them well and get them adopted.  
14

15 **VIII. CHAIR AND BOARD COMMENTS:** Board Member Gandara stated that she  
16 believes this is a very informative meeting and she's happy to see so many young  
17 people in the public talking about their concerns. She would love to see that more  
18 often even with the difficulty of meetings happening during the day. She wishes to  
19 send positive thoughts and prayers to Penny; the artist who had a dog bite. There  
20 is a GoFundMe account if anyone is interested in helping with her medical care  
21 funding. There are many people concerned about this issue and others as they  
22 relate to the Center, codes, stray dogs, and vicious dogs. Board Member Gandara  
23 is very committed to make sure they address this in a very strategic way. There  
24 has been conversation at Council related to this.  
25

26 She believes there needs to be a very robust conversation in regards to the  
27 ordinances and what resources are necessary to add a huge media campaign to  
28 educate the public on responsible pet ownership. LCPD and codes have lobbied  
29 for more FT's specifically to the Animal Codes Officers and having tools and  
30 resources necessary to do the work. It has been a deep concern of Council and  
31 they will have a work session specifically to the budget; the first one from the retreat  
32 in January. She invites the public to come and speak to what they believe the  
33 budget money should go. She would like to hear it specifically to the Center. Board  
34 Member Gandara has received a number of letters related to the Center opening  
35 up and she'd like to see those letters; read into public comment or into record at a  
36 meeting. She feels that many had very good points in relation to the large breed  
37 dogs; related to how the dogs are being advertising, kind of pictures, and etcetera.  
38

39 There is a volunteer coordinator and someone who takes professional pictures of  
40 the animals; regularity of photos is unknown. She encouraged any professional  
41 photographers who wish to volunteer their services to come; perhaps revisit how  
42 the photographs are being done to represent the animal better. She invited people  
43 who do not have internet to go to the library as they have computers for the general  
44 public; that may not be the answer due to transportation but she is willing to  
45 entertain ideas that were put forth in the letters. She advocates that the Board  
46 looks at those specifically. She also believes events need to be done specifically

1 for large breeds; bringing them to the Farmer’s Market, PetSmart, and other  
2 specific events to highlight the large breed dogs. The Center does do small  
3 adoption events and focus on large breeds sometimes; perhaps more should be  
4 done. She recommended utilizing the task force to have more regular and robust  
5 conversations.  
6

7 Board Member Ellins commented that the pictures of the dogs don’t necessarily  
8 reveal the personality of the dog; how it reacts when you walk by the kennel and  
9 etcetera. He views the pictures every few weeks to see what animals are old and  
10 new. A focused event on large breeds should be something to be looked into.  
11 Board Member Flores stated that they are all truly saddened by the incident last  
12 week. Every Monday the pets of the week are announced and she believes the  
13 pictures are very cute. She had a discussion with Mr. Thacker on how they’re  
14 promoting the pets, specifically dogs. Most of them are a mix and they’ve stayed  
15 away from saying things such as pit bull mix. The City is very conscientious about  
16 that and has deliberating stayed away from putting a breed name. She added that  
17 the tips for safety really falls under a moral issue that falls on the entire community.  
18 An ordinance isn’t likely to take care of that. She believes community education is  
19 what’s needed; falls on everyone’s shoulders rather than one entity.  
20

21 Chair Corran thanked everyone for coming out to the meeting. She added that  
22 they are working on the TNR ordinance and will continue to do so to address  
23 community cats in the way they were intended when the ordinance passed last  
24 year. She greatly appreciates the work that Mr. Thacker and staff have done with  
25 that and the budgetary work. They are also working to address systemic issues  
26 and she appreciates everyone for being present; wonderful to see people who love  
27 animals.  
28

29 **IX. Adjournment (11:51 a.m.)**

30 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

31  
32  
33  
34 \_\_\_\_\_  
35 Becky Corran, Chairperson

36  
37 \_\_\_\_\_  
38 Lynch Ellins, Vice-Chair

39  
40 \_\_\_\_\_  
41 Yvonne Flores, Board Member

42  
43 \_\_\_\_\_  
44 Kasandra Gandara, Board Member  
45  
46



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

\_\_\_\_\_  
Fernando Macias, Board Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Manuel Sanchez, Board Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Eric Enriquez, Ex Officio Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mary Lou Ward, Ex Officio Member

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Amanda Lopez Askin, County Clerk

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Animal Service Center of the Mesilla Valley Board of Supervisors

**From:** Josie Trevino, Comptroller

**Initials:** JT

**Date:** April 18, 2022

**Subject:** Animal Service Center of the Mesilla Valley Unaudited Financial Report for March 31, 2022.

Attached are the unaudited financial results of the Animal Service Center operations for the period ended March 31, 2022. Some observations for your consideration:

- The Statement of Net Position (page 1) reported cash of \$1,165,878 in the General Fund. Total assets were \$1,577,151. Accrued payroll liabilities ended at \$57,038. Total liabilities were \$312,791. The unassigned fund balance was \$1,264,360.
- The Capital Projects Fund reported restricted fund balance of \$28,000 which is due to a transfer from the General Fund in fiscal year 2020.
- The Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance – Budget and Actual (page 2) showed YTD operating revenues in the General Fund at \$2,812,641 which is 73.2% of budget. YTD operating expenditures were \$2,375,401 which is 61.8% of budget. The operating income for the period is \$437,240.
- All expenditures were below the budget parameter of 75.0% except Insurance which is at 91.7% due to prepayment of premiums, Capital Outlay which is at 94.2% due to purchase of capital items.
- The Grants and Donations Schedule, page 8, provides a summary of grants and donations received.

CC: Leeann DeMouche, Director of Financial Services

CC: Josh Saffell, Accountant Supervisor

**Initials:** LD  
**Initials:** JS

**Animal Service Center of the Mesilla Valley**  
**Statement of Net Position**  
**March 31, 2022 (Unaudited)**

	<b>Fund 7440 General Fund</b>	<b>Fund 7441 Capital Projects</b>	<b>Fund 9440 Capital Assets</b>	<b>Statement of Net Position</b>
<b>Assets</b>				
<b>Current Assets</b>				
Cash & investments	\$ 1,165,878	\$ 28,000	\$ -	\$ 1,193,878
Accounts receivable	411,273	-	-	411,273
<b>Total Current Assets</b>	<u>1,577,151</u>	<u>28,000</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1,605,151</u>
<b>Capital Assets</b>				
Equipment, net of accum depr	-	-	177,109	177,109
<b>Total Capital Assets</b>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>177,109</u>	<u>177,109</u>
<b>Total Assets</b>	<u><u>1,577,151</u></u>	<u><u>28,000</u></u>	<u><u>177,109</u></u>	<u><u>1,782,260</u></u>
<b>Liabilities</b>				
<b>Current Liabilities</b>				
Accounts payable	58,745	-	-	58,745
Accrued wages payable	-	-	-	-
Accrued payroll liabilities	57,038	-	-	57,038
Revenue collected in advance	197,008	-	-	197,008
<b>Total Current Liabilities</b>	<u>312,791</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>312,791</u>
<b>Fund Balance</b>				
Restricted	-	28,000	-	28,000
Unassigned	1,264,360	-	177,109	1,441,469
<b>Total Fund Balance</b>	<u>1,264,360</u>	<u>28,000</u>	<u>177,109</u>	<u>1,469,469</u>
<b>Total Liabilities and Fund Balance</b>	<u><u>\$ 1,577,151</u></u>	<u><u>\$ 28,000</u></u>	<u><u>\$ 177,109</u></u>	<u><u>\$ 1,782,260</u></u>

**Animal Service Center of the Mesilla Valley  
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures,  
and Changes in Fund Balance - Budget and Actual  
For the Period Ended March 31, 2022 (Unaudited)**

	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual/Bgt %</u>
<b>Revenues</b>			
Pet licenses-CLC	\$ 40,669	\$ 3,548	8.7%
Pet licenses-DAC	14,389	7,734	53.7%
Vaccinations	53,010	38,300	72.3%
Pet micro-chip	30,292	14,452	47.7%
Onsite adoptions	90,000	78,664	87.4%
Return to owner-DAC	15,806	11,828	74.8%
Return to owner-CLC	25,792	15,783	61.2%
Spay/neuter	79,349	48,200	60.7%
Dona Ana County	1,450,000	1,141,545	78.7%
City of Las Cruces	1,750,000	1,377,727	78.7%
City of Anthony	6,000	6,800	113.3%
Donations & memorials	25,052	36,736	146.6%
Grant Revenue	237,519	32,861	13.8%
City of Sunland Park	2,858	-	0.0%
Village of Hatch	335	-	0.0%
Other revenue	20,973	15,132	72.1%
Investment income	-	(16,669)	-100.0%
<b>Total revenues</b>	<b><u>3,842,044</u></b>	<b><u>2,812,641</u></b>	<b><u>73.2%</u></b>
<b>Expenditures</b>			
Salary	1,815,834	1,164,674	64.1%
Benefits	576,986	379,795	65.8%
Temp agency services	130,000	95,402	73.4%
Repairs and maintenance	48,488	22,792	47.0%
Services	803,432	406,513	50.6%
Supplies	297,239	162,691	54.7%
Insurance	47,008	43,106	91.7%
Other	39,326	21,547	54.8%
Capital outlay	83,731	78,881	94.2%
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<b><u>3,842,044</u></b>	<b><u>2,375,401</u></b>	<b><u>61.8%</u></b>
<b>Net change in Fund Balance</b>	<b><u>\$ -</u></b>	<b><u>437,240</u></b>	
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>		<b><u>827,120</u></b>	
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>		<b><u>\$ 1,264,360</u></b>	

**Animal Service Center of the Mesilla Valley  
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures,  
and Changes in Fund Balance - Budget and Actual - Executive Director  
For the Period Ended March 31, 2022 (Unaudited)**

	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual/Bgt %</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>			
Salary	123,593	85,561	69.2%
Benefits	53,612	38,778	72.3%
Temp agency services	-	-	0.0%
Repairs and maintenance	-	-	0.0%
Services	500	74	14.7%
Supplies	3,125	1,802	57.7%
Insurance	-	-	0.0%
Other	3,938	90	2.3%
Capital outlay	-	-	0.0%
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<u>184,768</u>	<u>126,305</u>	<b>68.4%</b>

**Animal Service Center of the Mesilla Valley  
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures,  
and Changes in Fund Balance - Budget and Actual - Medical Director  
For the Period Ended March 31, 2022 (Unaudited)**

	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual/Bgt %</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>			
Salary	570,262	286,503	50.2%
Benefits	153,663	74,261	48.3%
Temp agency services	-	-	0.0%
Repairs and maintenance	-	-	0.0%
Services	311,869	125,140	40.1%
Supplies	38,642	6,466	16.7%
Insurance	-	-	0.0%
Other	16,500	4,617	28.0%
Capital outlay	-	-	0.0%
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<u>1,090,936</u>	<u>496,987</u>	<b>45.6%</b>

**Animal Service Center of the Mesilla Valley  
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures,  
and Changes in Fund Balance - Budget and Actual - Kennel Director  
For the Period Ended March 31, 2022 (Unaudited)**

	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual/Bgt %</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>			
Salary	645,471	498,643	77.3%
Benefits	215,152	151,016	70.2%
Temp agency services	130,000	95,402	73.4%
Repairs and maintenance	40,488	22,392	55.3%
Services	9,515	3,404	35.8%
Supplies	152,825	125,402	82.1%
Insurance	-	-	0.0%
Other	17,888	16,600	92.8%
Capital outlay	-	-	0.0%
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<u>1,211,339</u>	<u>912,859</u>	<b>75.4%</b>

**Animal Service Center of the Mesilla Valley  
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures,  
and Changes in Fund Balance - Budget and Actual - Administrative Operations  
For the Period Ended March 31, 2022 (Unaudited)**

	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual/Bgt %</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>			
Salary	476,508	293,855	61.7%
Benefitis	154,559	115,711	74.9%
Repairs and maintenance	-	400	100.0%
Services	397,989	263,506	66.2%
Supplies	26,654	12,774	47.9%
Insurance	47,008	43,106	91.7%
Other	1,000	240	24.0%
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<u>1,103,718</u>	<u>729,591</u>	<b>66.1%</b>



**Animal Service Center of the Mesilla Valley  
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures,  
and Changes in Fund Balance as of March 31, 2022 (Unaudited)**

General Fund 7440	Revised Budget	July 2021	August 2021	September 2021	October 2021	November 2021	December 2021	January 2022	February 2022	March 2022	Total	Actual/Bgt. %
<b>Revenues</b>												
Pet licenses-CLC	\$ 40,669	\$ 2,012	\$ 1,536	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	8.7%
Pet licenses-DAC	14,389	892	1,069	593	711	839	839	1,278	695	\$ 899	7,734	53.7%
Vaccinations	53,010	1,775	11,490	1,525	1,390	974	974	1,670	723	\$ 10,913	38,300	72.3%
Pet micro-chip	30,292	1,105	3,365	720	1,325	2,645	2,645	810	542	\$ 670	14,452	47.7%
Onsite adoptions	90,000	6,920	8,785	11,504	12,150	7,812	7,812	11,930	8,467	\$ 8,801	78,664	87.4%
Return to owner-DAC	15,806	1,140	1,485	840	1,295	1,393	1,393	1,860	1,268	\$ 1,469	11,828	74.8%
Return to owner-CLC	25,792	2,443	1,508	1,210	1,955	1,190	1,190	1,455	1,543	\$ 2,829	15,783	61.2%
Spay/neuter	79,349	7,387	4,222	6,765	5,865	3,614	3,614	8,992	1,905	\$ 2,630	48,200	60.7%
Dona Ana County	1,450,000	319,000	102,818	102,818	102,818	102,818	102,818	102,818	102,818	\$ 102,818	1,141,545	78.7%
City of Las Cruces	1,750,000	385,000	124,091	124,091	124,091	124,091	124,091	124,091	124,091	\$ 124,091	1,377,727	78.7%
City of Anthony	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 6,800	6,800	113.3%
Donations & memorials	25,052	1,274	2,416	2,611	1,340	15,866	15,866	3,810	4,300	\$ 2,959	36,736	146.6%
Grant revenue	237,519	-	-	-	-	32,861	32,861	-	-	\$ -	32,861	13.8%
City of Sunland Park	2,858	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	-	0.0%
Village of Hatch	335	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	-	0.0%
Other revenue	20,973	1,798	2,429	1,418	1,596	1,479	1,479	1,417	1,053	\$ 1,590	15,132	72.1%
Investment income	-	-	971	(580)	(1,331)	(1,805)	(1,805)	(4,931)	(2,618)	\$ (6,374)	(16,669)	-100.0%
<b>Total revenues</b>	<b>3,842,044</b>	<b>730,746</b>	<b>266,185</b>	<b>244,306</b>	<b>262,059</b>	<b>293,777</b>	<b>255,491</b>	<b>255,199</b>	<b>244,787</b>	<b>260,095</b>	<b>2,812,641</b>	<b>73.2%</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>												
Salary	1,815,834	70,883	114,530	182,127	117,381	116,426	120,188	118,840	115,864	208,435	1,164,674	64.1%
Benefits	576,986	21,296	35,581	55,539	36,754	37,016	37,905	42,549	41,966	71,189	379,795	65.8%
Temp agency services	130,000	-	-	13,877	11,467	12,839	18,961	12,220	18,508	7,530	95,402	73.4%
Repairs and maintenance	48,488	653	1,664	1,135	149	213	213	833	1,074	14,221	22,792	47.0%
Services	803,432	26,259	27,926	45,156	68,066	27,372	47,971	55,026	43,534	65,203	406,513	50.6%
Supplies	297,239	3,438	12,645	23,232	21,789	26,953	19,308	15,924	22,380	17,022	162,691	54.7%
Insurance	47,008	2,815	29,934	997	2,513	-	3,118	609	3,120	-	43,106	91.7%
Other	39,326	1,278	3,369	1,919	5,368	3,228	1,365	99	2,704	2,217	21,547	54.8%
Depreciation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0%
Capital outlay	83,731	-	-	-	23,731	-	-	-	-	55,150	78,881	94.2%
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<b>3,842,044</b>	<b>126,622</b>	<b>225,649</b>	<b>323,982</b>	<b>263,487</b>	<b>226,684</b>	<b>249,029</b>	<b>246,100</b>	<b>249,150</b>	<b>440,967</b>	<b>2,375,401</b>	<b>61.8%</b>
Net Operating Income (Loss)	-	604,124	40,536	(79,676)	(1,428)	28,807	44,748	9,099	(4,363)	(180,872)	437,240	

**Animal Service Center of the Mesilla Valley  
Grants and Donations Schedule  
as of March 31, 2022**

Fund	Project	Project Name	Award Amount	Life-to-Date Expenditures	Remaining Balance	Type	End Date	Purpose
7440	11924	Best Friends Executive Leadership	\$ 5,000	1,249	\$ 3,751	Local Grant	Until Spent	To cover any expenses associated with the Best Friends Executive Leadership Program
7440	11943	Carroll Petrie Foundation	\$ 25,000	19,788	\$ 5,212	Local Grant	Until Spent	No stipulations
7440	11944	Maddie's Pet Foster Care COVID Stimulus	\$ 10,000	3,888	\$ 6,112	Local Grant	Until Spent	Supports ASCMV Foster Care Efforts
7441	11627	Stern Donation	\$ 50,000	48,202	\$ 1,798	Donation	Upon completion	The Kern donation provides funding strictly for costs associated with the renovation of the cat room.
7440	12049	Carroll Petrie Foundation	\$ 150,000	27,450	\$ 122,550	Local Grant	Until Spent	For general operating Support
7440	12097	Best Friends Animal Society	\$ 20,000	8,722	\$ 11,278	Local Grant	Until Spent	
7440	Unassigned	Pet Smart Charities	\$ 1,000	-	\$ 1,000	Local Grant	Until Spent	

**Signature:** *Joshua Saffell*  
Joshua Saffell (Apr 19, 2022 12:48 MDT)

**Email:** jsaffell@las-cruces.org

**Signature:** *Jose Trevino*

**Email:** jotrevino@las-cruces.org

**Signature:** *Leeann Demouche*  
Leeann Demouche (Apr 21, 2022 12:32 MDT)

**Email:** ldemouche@las-cruces.org










# ASCMV FS 03312022

Final Audit Report

2022-04-21

Created:	2022-04-19
By:	Joshua Saffell (jsaffell@las-cruces.org)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAZHBM69oY0BLied4hzsTrQqUtnwt7GTtq

## "ASCMV FS 03312022" History

-  Document created by Joshua Saffell (jsaffell@las-cruces.org)  
2022-04-19 - 6:46:48 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by Joshua Saffell (jsaffell@las-cruces.org)  
Signature Date: 2022-04-19 - 6:48:01 PM GMT - Time Source: server
-  Document emailed to Josie Trevino (jotrevino@las-cruces.org) for signature  
2022-04-19 - 6:48:03 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Josie Trevino (jotrevino@las-cruces.org)  
2022-04-19 - 6:57:45 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by Josie Trevino (jotrevino@las-cruces.org)  
Signature Date: 2022-04-19 - 7:36:03 PM GMT - Time Source: server
-  Document emailed to Leeann Demouche (ldemouche@las-cruces.org) for signature  
2022-04-19 - 7:36:05 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Leeann Demouche (ldemouche@las-cruces.org)  
2022-04-21 - 6:32:13 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by Leeann Demouche (ldemouche@las-cruces.org)  
Signature Date: 2022-04-21 - 6:32:41 PM GMT - Time Source: server
-  Agreement completed.  
2022-04-21 - 6:32:41 PM GMT





	Dogs	Cats	Rabbits	Reptiles	Pocket Pets	Avian E	Avian L, W	Livestock (horse, goat, sheep, pig, donkey)	Wildlife (skunk, bat, coyote, fox, raccoon)	Total
Medical - HW Positive - TX										0
Medical - HW Positive - Non TX										0
Medical - Mange - TX										0
Medical - Mange - Non TX										0
Medical - Mass	1	0								1
Medical - Neurological										0
Medical - Organ Failure										0
Medical - Parvo - Exposed	2	0								2
Medical - Parvo - TX	1	0								1
Medical - Parvo - Non TX	5	0								5
Medical - Pregnant										0
Medical - Prolapse										0
Medical - Respiratory Signs - TX	18	0								18
Medical - Respiratory Signs - Non TX	2	0								2
Medical - Ringworm										0
Offsite Euthanasia										0
Rabies Suspect - General	2	1								3
Rabies Suspect - Injured										0
Rabies Suspect - Sick/Symptomatic										0
Rabies Suspect - Wildlife										0
Severe Injuries - Animal Attack	1	0								1
Severe Injuries - General										0
Severe Injuries - Hit By Car	1	2								3
Space - Behavior										0
Space - General										0
Space - Medical	3	0								3
Wildlife - Nuisance										0
<b>Subtotal Euthanized</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>Euthanasia Rate</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>15.8%</b>
<b>Total Outcome</b>	<b>491</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>705</b>

<b>Grand Total</b>	Intake*	456	189	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	645
	Outcome*	491	213	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	705
<b>Statistics</b>	Live Release Rate	79.7%	94.4%	na	na	#DIV/0!	na	na	na	na	84.1%
	Euthanized, Expired in Care, DOA	96	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
	Average Intake/day	14.7	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.8
	Average Outcome/day	15.8	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.7
	Average Euthanizations/day	2.9	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
	Average RTO/day	3.2	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5
	Average Adoptions/day	3.6	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8

\*\*ASCMV Website Page Views -- 41,676      \*\*ASCMV Instagram -- 25,920 people reached; 282,536 impressions; 142 ad clicks

\*\*ASCMV Facebook Page Views -- 3,215      \*\*ASCMV Snapchat -- impressions; ad clicks



**ANIMAL SERVICES CENTER OF THE MESILLA VALLEY  
RESOLUTION NO. 2022-05**

**A RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT THE \$50,000 PETCO LOVE ANIMAL WELFARE ORGANIZATION GRANT AND ADJUST THE ADOPTED FY2022 BUDGET ALLOWING THE GRANT.**

The Animal Services Center of the Mesilla Valley (ASCMV) Board of Directors is hereby informed that:

**WHEREAS** the ASCMV applied for and received a Petco Love Animal Welfare Organization grant; and

**WHEREAS** the funds were requested in support of Operation Catapult at the ASCMV to facilitate and foster ASCMV-community partnerships in the City of Las Cruces that will model positive animal welfare practices in general and the humane reduction of community cat numbers in particular. The basis of this program is working with select “hotspot” communities according to data gathered by City of Las Cruces Animal Control.

**NOW THEREFORE** be it resolved by the Board of Directors for the Animal Services Center of the Mesilla Valley:

**(I)**

**THAT** the FY2022 adopted budget will be hereby amended as shown in Exhibit A attached hereto and made part of this resolution and is hereby adopted.

**(II)**

**THAT** once approved, a copy of the signed, recorded resolution and any supporting documentation will be submitted to the City of Las Cruces, as fiscal agent for submission to the Department of Finance and Administration (DFA) for approval and incorporation into its (City of Las Cruces) respective budget for inclusion in the FY2022 budget for the ASCMV.

(III)

THAT ASCMV staff are hereby authorized to take any action necessary to implement and comply with the budget submitted and approved as part of this resolution.

PASSED AND APPROVED this 28<sup>th</sup> day of April 2022.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Chair

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

VOTE:

Becky Corran, Chair \_\_\_\_\_  yea  nay

Lynn Ellins, Vice-chair \_\_\_\_\_  yes  nay

Yvonne Flores, Member \_\_\_\_\_  yea  nay

Kasandra Gandara, Member \_\_\_\_\_  yea  nay

Fernando Macias, Member \_\_\_\_\_  yea  nay

Manuel Sanchez, Member \_\_\_\_\_  yea  nay

Eric Enriquez, Ex-officio Member \_\_\_\_\_  yea  nay

Mary Lou Ward, Ex-officio Member \_\_\_\_\_  yea  nay

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Amanda López Askin, Ph. D., County Clerk





**ANIMAL SERVICE CENTER OF THE MESILLA VALLEY  
RESOLUTION NO. 2022-06**

**A RESOLUTION ADOPTING FISCAL YEAR 2023 ANNUAL BUDGET PER “EXHIBIT A”.**

The Animal Service Center of the Mesilla Valley (ASCMV) Board of Directors is hereby informed that:

**WHEREAS**, the ASCMV requires a Fiscal Year 2023 Annual Budget, and

**NOW THEREFORE**, be it resolved by the Board of Directors for the Animal Service Center of the Mesilla Valley:

**(I)**

**THAT** the ASCMV’s Fiscal Year 2023 Annual Budget as reflected in Exhibit “A” attached hereto and made part of this resolution is hereby approved.

**(II)**

**THAT**, ASCMV staff is hereby authorized to take any action necessary to implement and comply with the budget submitted and approved as part of this resolution.

**PASSED AND APPROVED** this 28<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2022

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Chair

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

VOTE:

Becky Corran, Chair \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_yea \_\_\_nay  
Lynn Ellins, Vice-chair \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_yes \_\_\_nay  
Yvonne Flores, Member \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_yea \_\_\_nay  
Kasandra Gandara, Member \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_yea \_\_\_nay  
Fernando Macias, Member \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_yea \_\_\_nay  
Manuel Sanchez, Member \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_yea \_\_\_nay  
Eric Enriquez, Ex-officio Member \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_yea \_\_\_nay  
Mary Lou Ward, Ex-officio Member \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_yea \_\_\_nay

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Amanda López Askin, Ph. D., County Clerk

ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	FY21 BUDGET	FY22 BUDGET	FY23 Proposed BUDGET
ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES	\$475,751	\$537,961	\$734,818
CLASSIFIED	1,327,972	1,221,459	1,498,954
PART-TIME - REGULAR	0	0	0
CONTRACT EMPLOYEES	175,091	132,000	132,000
STANDBY PAY	4,200	3,501	3,540
SCHEDULED OVERTIME	90,037	48,914	59,450
FICA MEDICARE	21,357	29,172	38,310
FICA SOCIAL SECURITY	92,822	121,239	163,806
PERA	265,704	248,296	376,716
PENSION EXPENSE	50,390	50,390	0
OPEB PENSION EXPENSE	8,511	8,511	0
DENTAL INS	14,143	9,618	19,118
HEALTH INS	188,753	123,409	326,924
WORKERS COMPENSATION	756	612	852
CELL PHONE STIPEND	3,603	3,180	3,720
VEHICLE ALLOWANCE	3,600	3,600	3,600
ACCRUED ANNUAL & SICK LEAVE	0	0	0
LIFE AND DISABILITY INS	2,986	2,832	4,092
CONTRIB TO DEFERRED COMPENS	0	0	0
RETIREMENT HEALTH CARE INS	36,008	35,027	55,844
TEMP AGENCY SERVICES	70,000	0	0
<b>Subtotal Personnel Services</b>	<b>\$2,831,684</b>	<b>\$2,520,821</b>	<b>\$3,421,745</b>
SUPPLIES GENERAL	\$188,303	\$164,155	\$151,500
SOFTWARE	4,414	2,000	1,500
ADVERTISING	32,722	46,899	50,000
PRINT & COPY FEES	2,000	2,000	500
POSTAGE AND FREIGHT	2,500	2,500	2,500
AWARDS	2,700	400	400
MEDICAL SUPPLIES	272,538	216,000	150,000
SAFETY SUPPLIES	4,225	4,225	2,000
MINOR EQUIPMENT	20,154	65,239	63,828
SHOP SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	2,500	2,500	2,500
UNIFORMS & SAFETY WEAR APPAREL	2,926	3,600	12,400
ELECTRICITY	32,000	32,000	59,000
GENERAL UTILITY SERVICES	18,000	18,000	22,000
TELEPHONE & CELL PHONES	12,667	14,500	22,000
AUDITING & FINANCIAL SERVICES	15,000	15,000	15,000
MEDICAL/DRUG TESTING SERVICES	0	0	0
MEMBERSHIP & DUES	2,900	2,500	2,000
PROFESSIONAL/TECHNICAL SERVICE	191,000	75,900	58,000
TEMP AGENCY SERVICES	0	0	50,000
PURCHASED SERVICES GENERAL	79,361	131,930	107,000
PURCHASED SERVICES-OUTSOURCING	0	0	0
VEHICLE REPAIR & MAINTENANCE	12,548	6,274	25,000
FUEL	6,517	6,517	7,500

ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	FY21 BUDGET	FY22 BUDGET	FY23 Proposed BUDGET	
VEHICLE TIRES & TUBES	500	0	0	
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	26,952	20,214	20,000	
BUILDING RENTALS	1,800	2,000	31,200	
TRAVEL	12,700	7,688	4,000	
TRANSPORTATION	23,376	11,688	25,000	
PER DIEM	0	0	0	
REGISTRATION/CONFERENCE FEES	23,089	14,000	7,000	
ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGES	111,000	215,000	215,000	
LIABILITY INSURANCE PREMIUMS	19,413	19,413	55,000	
UNEMPLOYMENT COMPEN PREMIUMS	3,846	2,000	7,500	
WORKERS COMP INS PREMIUMS	29,095	29,095	25,000	
CHEMICAL SUPPLIES	0	0	0	
FOOD & BEVERAGE	1,425	1,425	1,000	
VOLUNTEER MEALS	500	500	500	
LATE FEES	0	0	0	
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CHARGES	0	0	0	
LICENSES/PERMITS/CERTIFICATION	5,200	5,200	4,500	
AUDIO/MAGAZINE/PERIODICAL/BOOK	250	250	0	
INFORMATION TECH SUPPORT	0	0	0	
TRAINING MATERIALS	1,000	500	500	
TUITION REIMBURSEMENT	0	0	10,000	
DEPRECIATION EXPENSE	0	0	0	
PCARD TRANSACTIONS	0	0	0	
ROLLING EQUIPT	0	0	0	
MAJOR EQUIPMENT	40,000	0	75,000	
SUPPLIES GENERAL	0	18,990	15,000	GRANT FUNDED
POSTAGE & FREIGHT	0	0	500	GRANT FUNDED
MINOR EQUIPMENT	0	45,003	85,000	GRANT FUNDED
PROFESSIONAL/TECHNICAL SERVICE	0	10,000	10,000	GRANT FUNDED
PROFESSIONAL/TECHNICAL SERVICE	0	9,000	9,000	GRANT FUNDED
MEDICAL SUPPLIES	0	896	2,000	GRANT FUNDED
PURCHASED SERVICES GENERAL	0	6,750	5,000	GRANT FUNDED
MAJOR EQUIPMENT	0	83,731	55,000	GRANT FUNDED
<b>Subtotal Non-Personnel Services</b>	<b>\$1,205,120</b>	<b>\$1,315,482</b>	<b>\$1,467,328</b>	<b>GRANT FUNDED</b>
<b>Subtotal Personnel Services</b>	<b>\$2,831,684</b>	<b>\$2,520,821</b>	<b>\$3,421,745</b>	
<b>Subtotal Non-Personnel Services</b>	<b>\$1,205,120</b>	<b>\$1,315,482</b>	<b>\$1,467,328</b>	
<b>DEPARTMENT TOTAL</b>	<b>\$4,036,804</b>	<b>\$3,836,313</b>	<b>\$4,889,083</b>	