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"So much of what we call management consists in making it difficult for people to work."

Peter Drucker

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2014-2015 Orange County Grand Jury found that the Orange County Animal Shelter has serious problems that have needed attention for many years. In addition to the desperate need for a new shelter facility, there have been complaints and allegations from a number of sources inside and outside the Animal Shelter that have focused on the lack of leadership throughout the Orange County Community Resources and Animal Care chain of command. This alleged void in leadership has resulted in either the inability of management to define the problems at hand or, if defined, an unwillingness to correct them. It has been alleged by many that the lack in leadership has led to a few mid-management personnel assuming control of the Animal Shelter daily operations with little or no oversight from upper management.

Additional information has led the Orange County Grand Jury to investigate concerns regarding employee morale, human and animal health issues, feral cat policies, and allegations of criminal behavior. Also, there have been indications of conflict between veterinarians and management staff with regard to medical decisions. The Orange County Grand Jury investigation found substantial factual support for all these allegations. In 2014, a workplace investigation report of the Animal Shelter was ordered by the Board of Supervisors and conducted by an outside firm whose findings revealed that there is significant evidence to support the complaints and allegations.

BACKGROUND

In 1941, the Orange County Animal Shelter was built and placed under the direction of the Orange County Health Care Agency. The animal care function was transferred to the newly created Orange County Community Resources Department in 2008 under the aegis of Orange County Animal Care (OC Animal Care). Over the years, various cities have contracted with the County for the provision of animal care services.

The 2014-2015 Orange County Grand Jury (OCGJ) discovered that the OC Animal Care has been of countywide concern for several years, as indicated by three prior OCGJ reports. The reports focused on deficiencies in policies and procedures; inadequate staffing; poor employee attitudes; low morale; and lack of communication and cooperation among management, veterinary staff, and kennel staff. The County agreed with the previous OCGJ findings, but chose not to implement the Grand Jury recommendations.

There have been some recent legal challenges involving Animal Shelter management. Two lawsuits were initiated against OC Animal Care in 2014, one in July by an animal rescue group alleging a pattern of abuse and neglect at the Animal Shelter.
Shelter, and a second filed in October by a former employee who claimed he was retaliated against for “whistleblowing” after he voiced his concerns about safety issues.

The July 2014 lawsuit (Logan v. Orange County Animal Care) involved a nonprofit animal rescue organization whose $2.5 million legal action alleged that the Animal Shelter staff failed to provide injured animals with appropriate veterinary care, and routinely euthanized healthy, adoptable animals while failing to hold the animals for adoption for the period mandated by law.

The October lawsuit (Maniaci v. County of Orange) was initiated by a former animal control officer who was terminated after he filed a complaint over lack of proper safety equipment and training for animal control officers. In addition, he had filed a complaint with the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (known as Cal/OSHA) in May 2012. These complaints resulted in the OC Animal Care being fined $6,750 for a serious safety violation.

**REASON FOR STUDY**

The 2014-2015 OCGJ received written and verbal complaints from current and former employees, including veterinarians, and from various humane organizations. Many of these alleged problems were the same as those discussed in the 1999-2000, 2003-2004, and 2007-2008 OCGJ reports: organizational malfunctions relative to poor morale, unfair hiring and promotion practices; and, mistreatment and mishandling of the animals. As a result of these complaints and allegations, the 2014-2015 OCGJ launched an investigation to determine whether the various claims were valid and whether prior OCGJ recommendations had been implemented.

**METHODOLOGY**

The OCGJ initiated an investigation that involved site visits of the Animal Shelter and other animal shelters inside and outside of Orange County. Numerous personal interviews of current and former shelter personnel were conducted and existing investigative studies of the Animal Shelter were analyzed. The following lists provide specific examples of the various sources of information utilized in completing this report.

**Site Visits**

1. OC Animal Shelter  
2. Riverside County (Jurupa) Animal Shelter  
3. City of Mission Viejo Animal Shelter

**Interviews**

1. Current and former OC Animal Care employees and staff, including past and present executive level staff and management, the employed and contract veterinarians, and executive level management at both the Riverside County (Jurupa) Animal Shelter and the City of Mission Viejo Animal Shelter
2. Executive management of the Office of the Auditor-Controller, the County Executive Office, the Office of Community Resources and the Office of the County Performance Auditor
3. OC Vector Control executive management and case investigators
4. OC Health Care Agency executive management at Public Health Services
5. OC Sheriff’s Department, management at the Office of Research and Development

Previous Grand Jury Reports
1. 1999-2000, We Can Do Better…Improving Animal Care in Orange County
2. 2003-2004, The Orange County Animal Shelter – Are Improvements Needed?
3. 2007-2008, Is Orange County Going to the Dogs?

Independent Investigative Reports on the Orange County Animal Shelter
2. JVR Shelter Strategies, Orange County Animal Care, Shelter Consultation Summary, June 16, 2014 (JVR Shelter Strategies, 2014)
4. A workplace investigation report ordered by the OC Board of Supervisors (BOS) in May 2014, and submitted to OC Internal Auditor in October, 2014 (Workplace Investigation Report, 2014)

INVESTIGATION AND ANALYSIS

During an initial visit, the 2014-2015 OCGJ immediately noted that the Animal Shelter was rundown and in dire need of major repair or replacement. During the ensuing investigation, the OCGJ looked into several areas of concern. Among these were the following: health risks, environmental concerns, inhumane treatment of animals, staff training, alleged criminal behavior, and personnel issues.

Zoonotic Diseases

This investigation determined that there are potential problems with preventing zoonotic diseases that can be passed between animals and humans. Zoonotic diseases are very common and can be caused by viruses, bacteria, parasites, and fungi. They are commonly spread through animal urine and feces, or from being bitten by a flea, tick, or mosquito (Zoonotic diseases, n.d.). Serious concerns have been expressed by Vector Control about potential zoonotic diseases at the Animal Shelter (Vector Control personal communication, October 31, 2014).

Examples of those diseases are as follows:

- Leptospirosis is a bacterial disease that affects humans and animals. In humans, it can cause a wide range of symptoms, some of which may be mistaken for other diseases. Some infected persons may show no symptoms at all. Without treatment, leptospirosis can lead to kidney
damage, meningitis, liver failure, respiratory distress, and death. The bacteria are commonly spread through animal urine (Leptospirosis, n.d.).

- **Psittacosis** is an infection that is acquired by inhaling dried secretions from infected birds. Although all birds are susceptible, pet birds (parrots, parakeets, and macaws) and poultry (turkeys and ducks) are most frequently involved in transmission to humans. In humans, fever, chills, headache, muscle aches, and a dry cough are common symptoms, and pneumonia may also occur (Psittacosis, n.d.).

- **Rabies** is a viral disease of mammals most often transmitted through the bite of a rabid animal. The majority of cases reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) are traced to wild animals like raccoons, skunks, bats, and foxes. Rabies is a virus that attacks the central nervous system, ultimately causing disease in the brain and, if not treated, results in death (Rabies, n.d.).

- **Typhus** is an infectious disease caused by bacteria of *Rickettsia* transmitted by fleas, mites, lice, and ticks during their feeding. The common symptoms include headache, malaise, skin rash, and sometimes nausea and vomiting. No vaccine is available for preventing the infection (Typhus, n.d.).

### Feral Free Program

The Feral Free Program is also known as a trap-neuter-return (TNR) program. The feral cats are trapped or apprehended and brought to the Animal Shelter where they are micro-chipped, vaccinated, neutered, and then returned to the areas from which they were taken. This practice does not take into account the fact that feral cat colonies are found, not only in residential neighborhoods and industrial sites, but also at schools, college campuses, hospital facilities, parks, and beaches.

OC Animal Care implemented the Feral Free Program in 2013, and it is endorsed by several animal rights groups throughout the country. Proponents believe the program helps reduce the number of feral cats without euthanizing them. In 2014, OC Animal Care released 1,705 neutered and micro-chipped feral cats back into the communities (OC Animal Care, 2015).

Opponents of the program, including the Orange County Vector Control District (Vector Control), question its effectiveness. Vector Control is the agency that protects the public from vector-borne diseases spread by public health pests, such as mosquitoes, flies, fleas, and rodents. Vector Control’s major concern is that released feral cats could easily become hosts to flea-borne typhus, a bacterial disease found in fleas and transmitted to humans by a bite (Vector Control personal communication, October 31, 2014). American Bird Conservancy also opposes the program because outdoor, free roaming cats pose a serious threat to birds and endangered wildlife (Shimura, 2015, April 19).

Due to the presence of feral cats at the Animal Shelter and at nearby Theo Lacy Jail and Juvenile Hall facilities, at least one illness has been reported that was attributed to fleas from feral cats. This occurred when an employee of the Sheriff’s Department’s
Research and Development organization, located near the Animal Shelter, called in sick on June 14, 2012. On June 24, 2012, the employee was diagnosed with Endemic Typhus and was hospitalized (Research & Development personal communication, November 20, 2014).

As a consequence of the illness, Vector Control conducted an investigation, citing the fact that there was a noticeable presence of feral cats at the Animal Shelter property. On March 3, 2013, Vector Control personnel were at the Animal Shelter and observed at least five feral cats on top of the cages and a dead rodent on the ground. When this observation was reported to a high-ranking official of the Animal Shelter, Vector Control personnel were told that only three feral cats were living at the Animal Shelter and they were used as “mousers.” The Animal Shelter official said that perhaps some additional feral cats had “escaped” (Vector Control personal communication, October 31, 2014).

Vector Control had issued multiple previous warnings to OC Animal Care regarding flea-borne typhus exposure risks at the Animal Shelter and adjoining properties, including Theo Lacy Jail and the Orangewood Children’s home. The OC Health Care Agency has asked that OC Animal Care comply with Vector Control’s recommendation that it conduct a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review of the Feral Free Program in order to address the public health risk of flea-borne typhus and the legal liabilities posed by the release of these cats in areas where the disease is endemic (Vector Control personal communication, October 31, 2014).

OC Animal Care chose not to comply with Vector Control’s recommendations (OC Animal Care personal communications, November 13, 2014). Independent investigations (Workplace Investigation Report, 2014) have confirmed that current conditions at the Animal Shelter could pose a risk to public health. However, interviews with senior OC Animal Care officials have indicated that they support the Feral Free Program (OC Animal Care personal communications, September 11, 2014 and January 5, 2015).

It should be noted that OC Animal Care receives at least two grants to continue the Feral Free Program. One is the annual, recurring, $100,000 Free-Roaming Cat Spay/Neuter Grant from PetSmart Charities. The other is the annual, recurring, $50,000 Feral Freedom Grant from American Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) (OC Community Resources, FY 2015-16, Annual Grants Table).

Further, the 2014 Workplace Investigation Report states that witness statements, documentary evidence, and preponderance of evidence indicated that:

- a minimum of three feral cats reside upon, and are maintained and fed by staff, on the premises of the Animal Shelter, and many more cats have been seen lounging on the premises last year;
- County-employed medical personnel and veterinarians have advised against the TNR program, calling it a potential public health hazard, ineffective, and a waste of tax dollars; and
The report substantiated instances of OC Animal Care’s delaying the spaying, neutering, and emergency treatment of domestic dogs and cats awaiting adoption. The adoptable animals have, on occasion, been assigned a lower priority for surgery than the spaying, neutering, and micro-chipping of feral cats.

Some veterinary experts are of the opinion that emergency treatment of domestic dogs and cats should be given priority over feral cats. According to a chief veterinarian from another California county, some counties have abandoned feral free programs (Veterinarian personal communication, October 27, 2014).

Vector Control personnel indicated that, during their investigation, they asked OC Animal Control personnel whether they kept records or had any data on the Feral Free Program concerning the locations and the names of the citizens who had called to have feral cats removed. Vector Control personnel were told that there were accurate records, but Animal Shelter personnel refused to share that information. The Vector Control personnel requested that the Animal Shelter notify them of the areas in which they were releasing the feral cats so those neighborhoods could be monitored for the flea borne typhus, but the Animal Shelter personnel refused to do so (Vector Control personal communication, October 31, 2014).

Vector Control representatives stated that the Feral Free Program could possibly contribute to the spread of typhus in Orange County and believed the program, as currently administered, violates the CEQA and the Clean Water Act. Vector Control believes that a program returning feral cats into other areas should have a CEQA review to determine if it would adversely impact the environment (Vector Control personal communication, October 31, 2014). Independent investigations have confirmed that the present conditions at the Animal Shelter could pose a risk to public health (UC Davis Report, 2008; Workplace Investigation Report, 2014).

**Impound and Euthanasia Facts**

The OC Animal Care Impound Summary sheet highlights, among other things, the extensive shelter workload based solely on the number of cat impounds and corresponding number of cats euthanized (OC Animal Care, 2015). For example, in 2014, 44% of cats that were impounded (5,581 cats) were euthanized. During that same period, 16% of the cats (2,007 cats) were adopted. In addition, 19% of the cats (1,689 cats) were feral free and released after being micro-chipped, vaccinated, and neutered (OC Animal Care Impound Summary March 5, 2015).

**Soaking the Dogs**

During the Animal Shelter inspection, the OCGJ observed that the kennels were hosed down while dogs were in the kennels. The OCGJ has confirmed during various interviews that this was a common, everyday practice. The OCGJ could find no justification to support the practice of soaking the dogs. The accepted standard for cleaning kennels is the “move-one-down” method to avoid soaking the animals. This is accomplished by moving the dog from an adjacent kennel down one kennel into an...
empty clean kennel. The “move-one-down” method for cleaning kennels is considered one of the best methods in the industry as it helps to lower the dogs’ susceptibility to disease (JVR Shelter Strategies, 2014, p. 15; UC Davis, 2007).

**Wasted Water**

During the Grand Jury inspection, it was noted that the kennel attendants use large, industrial type water hoses for cleaning purposes. The water was running constantly even when the attendants were not present. There were no nozzles on the hoses, which necessitated walking to the end of the kennel row to turn off the water. Based on observations and subsequent interviews, the OCGJ concluded that this common practice could result in hundreds, if not thousands, of gallons of water wasted each day at the Animal Shelter.

**Cat Trailers**

During the inspection of the Animal Shelter, Grand Jury members entered one of the cat trailers and were overwhelmed by the strong odor of cat urine. In the two main trailers that house cats, there was limited air flow and no air conditioning. There was also a small cat isolation structure that was in total disrepair. These cat structures had environments that increased the vulnerability and exposure to disease (JVR Shelter Strategies, 2014, p.18).

**Lack of Training and Equipment**

Another major OCGJ concern is the lack of training for the Animal Control Officers (ACOs) and the absence of appropriate tools and equipment to deal with animals that need to be tranquilized or euthanized. In September 2014, two ACOs were accused of allegedly slaughtering a deer impaled on a fence in Anaheim Hills by slitting its throat. When the officers arrived at the scene and observed the deer hanging upside down on the fence, they were unable to remove the animal from the fence and determined that it should be euthanized (Ritchie, February 2015). A local veterinarian who witnessed the incident asked the animal control officers whether they had euthanasia drugs, and they told her that they were no longer allowed to carry them (Ritchie, February 2015). Although the veterinarian offered to administer the drug under her Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) license, the officers decided to kill the animal by cutting its throat so it would bleed to death (Ritchie, February 2015). Another veterinarian, familiar with wildlife, conducted a review of the incident and referred to the American Veterinary Medical Association guidelines, which state that an animal’s throat cannot be cut in order to allow bleeding out unless it is under anesthesia (Ritchie, February 2015). Following an internal investigation, the two officers were dismissed (Ritchie, April 2015).

ACOs have stated that they do not have required professional training and procedures to deal with such a situation. In addition, they assert that they do not have the proper equipment to tranquilize or euthanize animals in the field, making it difficult to expect them to deal with such circumstances in a professional manner (Animal Shelter staff, personal communication, November 20, 2014).
Personnel Vacancies

The OCGJ learned during an interview with OC Animal Care management that OC Animal Care was understaffed by approximately 20%. Due to this shortage of personnel, the quality of service has degraded. There are fewer kennel attendants, which has resulted in a less-than-thorough cleaning of kennels and cages, and exercising the dogs. The JVR Shelter Consultation Summary of June 16 2014 revealed that, based on the Shelter’s population on the date observed, it would require 18 staff members cleaning and feeding for eight hours to ensure basic care for every animal (JVR Shelter Strategies, 2014. p.4). At the time of the OCGJ site visit, only two kennel attendants were observed to be present.

The loss of ACOs has caused significant delays in field services, wherein dead animals in the field have been exposed to public view for several days. One former ACO stated that there had been a dead deer in front of a residence for five days before he was able to respond to the call. Although there is a need for 10-12 ACOs in the field on a normal day, there have been times when there was only one ACO available to respond to service calls throughout the entire County (OC Animal Care staff, personal communications, November 6, 2014).

It is common to have 70-100 unassigned calls for service with only two ACOs available to respond (Animal Shelter personal communication, November 6, 2014). In fact, on any given day, especially on Monday morning, there are commonly 100 calls backlogged. Many of those calls are minor in nature and many are handled telephonically. The delay for dead animals to be picked up can be longer than a week (Animal Shelter personal communication, November 10, 2014).

OC Animal Care hired a Chief Veterinarian and also appointed her as the Director of the Animal Shelter. OC Animal Care was operating at approximately 80% of authorized staffing or 112 employees (Organizational chart provided by Shelter Director, September 11, 2014). On November 4, 2014, the Grand Jury learned that there were 29 vacant Animal Shelter positions that would be filled as soon as possible. As of February 2015, eight of those 29 positions had been filled. On March 31, 2015, there were still four vacant ACO positions and eight vacant Kennel Attendant positions. The ACOs are required to complete a six-month training program before they receive an assignment. The recent ACO training session started with eight candidates with seven completing the course. Since then, three have resigned, leaving only four candidates to fill the void (OC Animal Care management, personal interviews, April 7, 2015).

There is also an acute shortage of Kennel Attendants, who only receive on-the-job training. Their duties include cleaning the kennels, which is critical to the health and welfare of the animals (Animal Care personal communication, April 7, 2015).

Morale Issues

During the investigation, the majority of the present and former shelter employees who were interviewed complained of morale problems. Those who discussed the morale issues identified specific management personnel who had created a “toxic” environment. Virtually every mid-level and lower-level employee identified the
same individuals in management as those who were responsible for low morale (Employee interviews, 2014 – 2015).

**Potential Criminal Behavior and Other Serious Concerns**

During the investigation, serious allegations of criminal behavior and other serious matters were brought to the OCGJ’s attention. Since the OCGJ is not authorized to investigate criminal activity in a civil report, those complaints of a criminal nature were referred to the District Attorney’s Office for investigation.

**FINDINGS**

In accordance with California Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, the 2014-2015 Grand Jury requires (or, as noted, requests) responses from each agency affected by the findings presented in this section. The responses are to be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court.

Based on its investigation titled, “If Animals Could Talk About the Orange County Animal Shelter,” the 2014-2015 Orange County Grand Jury has arrived at ten principal findings, as follows:

**F.1** There are serious morale issues among Animal Shelter staff, many of which can be attributed to poor management practices and lack of effective leadership.

**F.2.** The trap, neuter, and return practice is reportedly delaying the spaying, neutering, and treatment of domestic dogs and cats awaiting adoption and is evidence that the domestic animals have been assigned a lower priority for surgery than the spaying, neutering, and micro-chipping of the feral cats.

**F.3.** Feral cats have been allowed to roam freely in and around the Animal Shelter and have been fed by Animal Shelter staff, possibly contributing to human and animal exposure to zoonotic diseases.

**F.4.** Animal Control Officers do not have effective equipment or appropriate procedural options to deal with unique, emergency circumstances that may require special procedures such as tranquilizing and euthanizing in the field.

**F.5.** OC Animal Care is currently operating with a shortage of personnel, including Animal Control Officers (ACOs), thereby making it much more difficult for them to respond to calls in a timely manner throughout such a large county, especially since there is only one shelter to serve all of Orange County.

**F.6.** There is little evidence that the Feral Free Program has been successful in reducing the feral cat population, which could be a contributing factor to the spread of zoonotic diseases.

**F.7.** Kennels are hosed down with dogs still present in the kennels, resulting in the dogs getting soaked and becoming more susceptible to disease.
F.8. Kennel attendants were observed leaving the large water hoses running when not being used for cleaning purposes, thereby wasting large quantities of water.

F.9. There is limited airflow and no air conditioning in the cat trailers. The conditions in these trailers increase the vulnerability to disease.

F.10. There is a rodent problem, creating additional risk of humans and animals contracting zoonotic diseases.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In accordance with California Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, the 2014-2015 Grand Jury requires (or, as noted, requests) responses from each agency affected by the recommendations presented in this section. The responses are to be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court.

Based on its investigation titled “If Animals Could Talk About the Orange County Animal Shelter,” the 2014-2015 Orange County Grand Jury makes the following ten recommendations:

R.1. Consider a change of leadership within the Orange County Community Resources Department and arrange for mandatory leadership training for all managers and supervisors that includes a curriculum of leadership skills, people skills, and diversity (F.1.).

R.2. Discontinue the practice of giving feral cats priority for surgery over the domestic dogs and cats awaiting adoption (F.2.).

R.3. Discontinue feeding feral cats and allowing feral cats to roam freely in and around the Animal Shelter (F.3.).

R.4. Develop proper protocols for Animal Control Officers to follow when confronted with unique circumstances in the field that require tranquilizing or euthanizing animals and take all measures necessary to ensure that the Animal Control Officers can be given the proper equipment and training in that regard (F.4.).

R.5. Establish a more aggressive approach in hiring qualified personnel on a timely basis, especially with the position of Animal Control Officer (F.5.).

R.6. Conduct an evaluation of the Feral Free Program to determine its effectiveness in the reduction of zoonotic diseases. (F.6.).

R.7. Utilize the “move-one-down” method for cleaning kennels to avoid soaking the animals. (F.7.).

R.8. Place nozzles on all water hoses and direct kennel attendants to turn off the water when not being used. (F.8.).

R.9. Improve the ventilation system in all cat trailers for the health and survival of the cats (F.9.).
R.10 Promptly control the rodent population in order to reduce the possibility of spreading diseases to human beings and animals (F.10.).

REQUIRED RESPONSES

The California Penal Code section 933 requires the governing body of any public agency which the Grand Jury has reviewed, and about which it has issued a final report, to comment to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the governing body. Such comment shall be made no later than 90 days after the Grand Jury publishes its report (filed with the Clerk of the Court). Additionally, in the case of a report containing findings and recommendations pertaining to a department or agency headed by an elected County official (e.g. District Attorney, Sheriff, etc.), such elected official shall comment on the findings and recommendations pertaining to the matters under that elected official's control within 60 days to the Presiding Judge with an information copy sent to the Board of Supervisors.

Furthermore, California Penal Code section 933.05, subdivisions (a), (b), and (c), provides as follows, the manner in which such comment(s) are to be made:

(a) As to each Grand Jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:

(1) The respondent agrees with the finding

(2) The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefore.

(b) As to each Grand Jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:

(1) The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.

(2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for implementation.

(3) The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This time frame shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury report.

(4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefore.

(c) If a finding or recommendation of the Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a county agency or department headed by an elected officer, both the
agency or department head and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Grand Jury, but the response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only those budgetary/or personnel matters over which it has some decision making authority. The response of the elected agency or department head shall address all aspects of the findings or recommendations affecting his or her agency or department.

Comments to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court in compliance with Penal Code section 933.05 are required from:

Responses are required from the Orange County Board of Supervisors for Findings F.1. through F.10. and Recommendations R.1. through R.10.

Responses are requested from the Director of OC Community Resources and from the OC Animal Shelter Director for Findings F.1. through F.10. and Recommendations R.1. through R.10.
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