



OFFICE OF THE CITY AUDITOR

August 18, 2026

Gina Ortiz Jones
Mayor

Sukh Kaur
Councilwoman, District 1

Jalen McKee-Rodriguez
Councilman, District 2

Phyllis Viagran
Councilwoman, District 3

Edward Mungia
Councilman, District 4

Teri Castillo
Councilwoman, District 5

Ric Galvan
Councilman, District 6

Marina Alderete Gavito
Councilwoman, District 7

Ivalis Meza Gonzalez
Councilwoman, District 8

Misty Spears
Councilwoman, District 9

Marc Whyte
Councilman, District 10

SUBJECT: Audit Report of Animal Care Services (ACS) Dangerous & Aggressive Dog Program

Mayor and Council Members:

We are pleased to send you the final report of the ACS Dangerous & Aggressive Dog Program. This audit began in June 2025 and concluded with an exit meeting with department management in July 2026. Management's verbatim response is included in Appendix C of the report. ACS management and staff should be commended for their cooperation and assistance during this audit.

The Office of the City Auditor is available to discuss this report with you individually at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Buddy Vargas, CPA, CIA, CFE
City Auditor
City of San Antonio

Distribution:

Erik Walsh, City Manager

David McCary, Assistant City Manager

Ben Gorzell, Chief of Financial and Administrative Services

Jonathan Gary, Director, Animal Care Services

Andrew Segovia, City Attorney

Debbie Racca-Sittre, City Clerk

Andrew Fuentes, Chief of Staff, Office of the Mayor

Joe Frank Picazo, Assistant to the City Manager, Office of the City Manager

Trisha Taino, Audit Committee Member

Daniel Pacheco, Audit Committee Member

**CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF THE CITY AUDITOR**

ANIMAL CARE SERVICES DEPARTMENT
AUDIT OF DANGEROUS & AGGRESSIVE DOG
PROGRAM
PROJECT NO. AU25-003
AUGUST 18, 2026

BUDDY VARGAS, CPA, CIA, CFE
CITY AUDITOR



Table of Contents

Table of Contents 1

Executive Summary..... 2

Background 3

Audit Scope and Methodology 5

Audit Results and Recommendations..... 6

 Policies & Procedures 6

 A. Documenting Investigations 6

 B. Reviewing Compliance..... 7

 C. Responding to Affidavits..... 8

 D. Assessing Fees 9

 E. User Access 10

Appendix A – Supplementary Information 11

Appendix B – Staff Acknowledgement..... 13

Appendix C – Management Response 14

Executive Summary

As part of our annual Audit Plan approved by City Council, we conducted an audit of the Animal Care Services (ACS) Department, specifically the Dangerous & Aggressive Dog Program. The objective, conclusions, and recommendations of the audit follow:

Determine if the Animal Care Services Dangerous and Aggressive Dog Program is operating effectively and in accordance with policies, procedures, and best practices.

ACS has sufficient controls in place to ensure Animal Care Officers respond to 311 customer service calls regarding dangerous and aggressive dogs within the required response time outlined in the Service Level Agreement. Additionally, ACS has effective procedures in place for properly categorizing cases as unfounded when investigation evidence does not meet the standard for a dangerous or aggressive dog classification. ACS also has effective procedures to ensure dogs are properly euthanized and the process is adequately documented. Lastly, ACS has appropriate controls to ensure Animal Care Officers are certified by the State of Texas.

However, we identified areas where controls could be improved regarding policies and procedures. Those areas include documenting investigations, reviewing compliance, responding to affidavits, assessing fees, and monitoring user access.

We provided recommendations to management to strengthen controls and resolve identified issues. ACS management agreed with the audit findings and has developed positive action plans to address them. Management's verbatim response is in Appendix C on page 14.

Background

The mission of ACS is to encourage responsible pet ownership by aiming to promote and protect the health, safety, and welfare of the residents and pets through education, enforcement, and community partnership. In the summer of 2022, ACS created a Strategic Plan to provide focus areas, goals, and objectives for the department, including: 1) increasing responsiveness to and compliance of bites and dangerous investigation cases, 2) enhancing first-response to resident calls for service, and 3) increasing the responsiveness and compliance of aggressive dog investigations.

The Dangerous and Aggressive Dog Program is regulated by the Texas Health and Safety Code and a City ordinance. ACS has partnered with San Antonio's 311 Customer Service Department to address animal-related service request calls within the city limits. During FY 2025, ACS received 88,040 calls, of which 27,106 calls were placed in categories that might lead to dangerous or aggressive dog investigations. See Table 1 below for the quantity of calls by type and the required response time.

Table 1 - ACS Calls from 311 Customer Service During FY 2025

Type of Call	Quantity of Calls	Required Response Time
Bite Critical	765	3 hours
Bite Non-Critical	2,676	3 calendar days
Aggressive Critical	3,425	12 hours
Aggressive Non-Critical	20,240	5 calendar days

Sources: Chameleon for the quantity of calls; the ACS Service Level Agreement for the response times

ACS First Responders are typically the first to respond to dangerous or aggressive dog calls. If a First Responder believes a case may qualify as dangerous or aggressive, then the Dangerous Dogs Team is notified about the case. The Dangerous Dogs Team is comprised of 4 investigators and 2 supervisors who report to the Special Operations Manager. An Assistant Director (AD) oversees the entire program. The ACS Director or AD makes the final decision on a dog's designation.

To begin a dangerous or aggressive dog investigation, a complainant must file an affidavit describing the incident that took place. ACS will investigate the incident to determine if there has been a violation of the existing law. Each investigation can lead to 3 possible outcomes: a dangerous dog designation, an aggressive dog designation, or an unfounded designation. If a dog is deemed dangerous or aggressive, owners must abide by legal restrictions and may be responsible for paying fees associated with the designation. In Appendix A, see Table 2 for the definition and duration of dangerous and aggressive classifications. If dog owners do not abide by legal restrictions, they may be held liable for both civil and criminal infractions.

If an incident occurred in which a dog caused serious bodily injury (SBI), a Dangerous Dog Investigator may initiate an investigation with an officer affidavit in lieu of a complainant affidavit.

Audit of Animal Care Services Dangerous & Aggressive Dog Program

SBI is defined as an injury characterized by severe bite wounds or severe ripping and tearing of muscle that would cause a reasonably prudent person to seek treatment from a medical professional and would require hospitalization without regard to whether the person sought medical treatment. For SBI investigations, investigators gather and present evidence to the City Attorney's Office. The City Attorney's Office is responsible for trying SBI cases in front of a municipal court judge.

ACS monitors dogs that have been designated as dangerous or aggressive. Investigators perform 30-day inspections and subsequent annual inspections to ensure dog owners are complying with applicable requirements. In Appendix A, see Table 3 for the dangerous and aggressive dog requirements. If a dog owner fails to comply with the applicable regulations, then an investigator performs a non-compliance investigation. This investigation may lead to a non-compliance hearing which occurs in front of a municipal court judge.

Only a judge may determine if a dog has committed SBI or if a designated dog is not in compliance with regulations. The judge may then issue a court order to euthanize the dog. Additionally, any dog surrendered to ACS that is designated Dangerous, Aggressive Type 2, or Aggressive Type 3 must be euthanized by ACS. ACS is required to euthanize dogs through humane methods.

ACS uses Chameleon as the system of record for the Dangerous and Aggressive Dog Program. In addition, ACS operates a channel in Microsoft Teams for the purpose of storing documents used in investigations. The "Dangerous" Channel limits access to only those personnel involved in the Dangerous and Aggressive Dog Program.

Audit Scope and Methodology

The audit scope included operations related to the ACS Dangerous & Aggressive Dog Program from October 1, 2024, through September 30, 2025. However, testing for annual compliance with dangerous and aggressive dog requirements included inspections that began as early as October 1, 2023. The scope included ACS responses to 311 calls, investigations, compliance inspections, assessment of fees, Animal Care Officer (ACO) certifications, and all documents and systems used to monitor the Dangerous and Aggressive Dog Program. We specifically excluded the municipal court collection of fines from citations related to dangerous & aggressive dog cases because collection of municipal court fines is the objective of an upcoming audit.

To gain an understanding of department operations, we interviewed ACS personnel and conducted walkthroughs of the processes involved with responding to 311 calls, conducting investigations, monitoring designated dogs for compliance, assessing fees, and euthanizing dogs ordered for destruction. Section 822 of the Texas Health and Safety Code and City Ordinance 2017-10-05-0755 were our primary criteria for this audit.

We also assessed internal controls relevant to the audit objective. This included a review of ACS policies and procedures. As part of our testing procedures, we reviewed responses to 311 calls to verify that ACS responded within the required times per the Service Level Agreement. Additionally, we reviewed investigations to verify that investigators followed proper procedures. We also reviewed compliance inspections for dangerous and aggressive dogs to determine if ACS performed 30-day and annual inspections to ensure compliance with requirements.

Furthermore, we reviewed fees to verify they were appropriately assessed. Additionally, we reviewed documentation in Chameleon to determine if ACS appropriately euthanized dogs and effectively documented the process. We also reviewed ACO certifications to determine if ACS First Responders and Dangerous Dog Investigators were properly certified. Lastly, we reviewed user access to Chameleon and the Microsoft Teams Dangerous Dogs Channel to determine if user access was appropriate.

We relied on computer-processed data in Chameleon and Microsoft Teams to validate response times, investigation details, and case documentation. Our reliance was based on performing direct tests on the data rather than evaluating the system's general and application controls. We do not believe that the absence of testing general and application controls affected the results of our audit.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

Audit Results and Recommendations

ACS has sufficient controls in place to ensure Animal Care Officers are responding to 311 customer service calls within the required response time. We tested a sample of 25 calls from each of the four categories of calls that may potentially lead to dangerous and aggressive dog investigations for a total of 100 calls. We determined that ACS responded to all 100 calls and met the allotted response time for 89 calls (89%). Since not every 311 call turns into an investigation, we also reviewed 44 investigations (25 dangerous dog cases, 9 aggressive dog cases, and 10 serious bodily injury [SBI] cases) and confirmed that ACS responded to all 44 initial calls and met the allotted response time for 42 calls (95%).

ACS is correctly declaring cases as “unfounded” when evidence from the investigations does not meet the standards established by regulations. We reviewed a sample of 25 cases in which the outcome of the investigation was declared unfounded. We determined that all 25 unfounded designations contained appropriate support documentation demonstrating the standards were not met.

ACS is properly ensuring that dogs declared for destruction are euthanized by humane methods. We reviewed a sample of 44 euthanized dogs, which included 19 dogs ordered for destruction by the municipal court judge and 25 dogs ordered for destruction by ACS. We confirmed that all 44 dogs contained a euthanasia order and were euthanized in accordance with policy.

ACS appropriately ensures Animal Care Officers (First Responders and Dangerous Dog Investigators) in the department are certified by the State of Texas. We reviewed the certifications for 68 Animal Care Officers (59 First Responders and 9 Investigators) and verified that all 68 officers were appropriately certified.

However, we identified other areas where controls could be improved involving policies and procedures.

Policies & Procedures

ACS lacks or has insufficient policies and procedures to effectively manage the Dangerous and Aggressive Dog Program. As a result, ACS did not consistently execute tasks involving documenting investigations, reviewing compliance, responding to affidavits, assessing fees, and monitoring user access.

A. Documenting Investigations

ACS does not consistently record and store required communications, case information, and supporting documents.

Dangerous & Aggressive Dog Investigations:

We reviewed 35 cases involving Dangerous and Aggressive Dog investigations. We determined 33 cases (94%) did not contain documented notification of the dog’s designation to both the dog

owner and the affiant (the person who submitted the affidavit) by certified mail. Additionally, 35 cases did not contain documentation required for the investigation, such as the Notice of Investigation and photographs or videos from the scene of the incident and of applicable injuries.

The Investigation SOP and the Dangerous & Aggressive Investigation Checklist identify necessary notifications and required documents for conducting Dangerous & Aggressive Dog investigations.

SBI Investigations:

We reviewed 16 cases involving SBI investigations. We determined 15 cases (94%) did not contain updated results of the investigations; 15 cases (94%) did not contain documentation of required communications, such as notification to the victim of the SBI hearing; and 16 cases did not contain documentation required for the investigation, such as affidavits, medical records, and bite reports.

The SBI Investigation Checklist outlines the necessary notifications and required documents for conducting SBI investigations.

Non-Compliance Investigations:

We reviewed 20 cases involving Non-Compliance investigations. We determined that 9 cases (45%) did not contain documentation indicating the investigator performed all required communications, such as notifying the dog owner that compliance had not been met. We further determined that 19 cases (95%) did not include all documentation required for the investigation, such as a Non-Compliance Application and a Notice of Hearing.

The Non-Compliance Checklist outlines the necessary notifications and required documents for conducting Non-Compliance investigations.

The department lacks written policies and procedures for conducting SBI and Non-Compliance investigations. In addition, the department is not effectively executing the existing controls for ensuring investigations are conducted in accordance with the investigation checklists.

A lack of policies and ineffective execution of controls may result in inadequate investigations and noncompliance with State and City regulations which could increase the City's liability.

Recommendation

The ACS Director establish written policies and procedures to address SBI Investigations and Non-Compliance Investigations. Additionally, ensure the existing controls for monitoring investigations are conducted properly.

B. Reviewing Compliance

ACS is not consistently performing and documenting required 30-day and annual compliance inspections to ensure dangerous and aggressive dog owners comply with regulations. We

tested 16 dangerous or aggressive dogs requiring a 30-day inspection during FY 2025. We determined case notes for 8 dogs (50%) did not contain documentation to support communication with dog owners to schedule and perform a 30-day inspection. Additionally, for 14 dogs (88%), ACS did not have documentation to indicate compliance was achieved within 30 days of designation. Of those 14 dogs, 3 came into compliance between 60 and 196 days after designation. For the remaining 11 dogs (69%), ACS did not have documentation to indicate compliance was achieved.

Furthermore, we tested 50 dangerous or aggressive dogs requiring an annual inspection during FY 2025. We determined case notes for 45 dogs (90%) did not contain documentation to support that annual inspections occurred or that dogs complied with regulations.

The Texas Health and Safety Code Section 822.042 (a) states that dangerous dog owners must come into compliance with dangerous dog requirements within 30 days of receiving notification of a designation. Furthermore, ACS Policy 37-06-002 states ACOs are responsible for performing annual compliance inspections and ensuring dog owners continue to comply with dangerous and aggressive dog requirements.

ACS lacks procedures for appropriately performing and documenting 30-day and annual compliance inspections of dangerous and aggressive dogs. The lack of procedures for compliance inspections may cause safety risks to the citizens of San Antonio.

Recommendation

The ACS Director establish procedures to ensure that compliance inspections for dangerous and aggressive dog cases are appropriately performed and documented. In addition, establish controls to ensure procedures are executed as intended.

C. Responding to Affidavits

Recording Dangerous & Aggressive Affidavits:

ACS does not document and track the receipt of affidavits submitted for dangerous and aggressive dogs. Without a record of submitted affidavits, we could not determine if ACS is responding to all affidavits involving dangerous and aggressive dogs.

City Ordinance 2017-10-05-0755 requires receipt of an affidavit to begin a dangerous or aggressive dog investigation. ACS lacks policies and procedures for documenting the receipt of affidavits. Without policies and procedures for recording incoming affidavits, some submitted affidavits may not receive a response from ACS, and potential dangerous and aggressive dogs may remain undesignated and increase the public safety risk to citizens.

Timely Communication After Receipt of Affidavits:

Dangerous Dog Investigators are not adequately documenting timely contact with the affiant and the dog owner. We tested a sample of 35 dangerous and aggressive dog investigations from

FY 2025 and determined that 28 cases (80%) did not contain documentation to indicate the affiant was contacted within 3 days and the dog owner was contacted within 5 days.

The ACS Dangerous and Aggressive Dog Investigations SOP provides response times for contacting the affiant (within 3 days) and the dog owner (within 5 days) after the receipt of the affidavit. ACS lacks controls to appropriately monitor investigator communications with affiants and dog owners. Without appropriate monitoring controls, untimely responses to reported dangerous and aggressive dog incidents may increase the public safety risk to citizens.

Recommendations

The ACS Director:

- Establish a policy and procedure for documenting and tracking the receipt of affidavits submitted for dangerous and aggressive dogs. Additionally, create controls to ensure the policy and procedure are properly executed.
- Create controls to ensure investigators are monitored for timely responses to affidavit submissions.

D. Assessing Fees

ACS is not consistently assessing applicable Dangerous & Aggressive Dog Program fees, primarily euthanasia fees. We tested a sample of 41 cases that involved \$7,107 in fees owed by dog owners. We determined that 22 cases (54%) included waived fees totaling \$736, of which 19 cases (46%) included waived euthanasia fees totaling \$475.

The Texas Health and Safety Code Chapter 822 requires dog owners to pay any fee assessed by the municipality or county related to the seizure, acceptance, impoundment, or destruction of a dog. The governing body of the municipality or county may prescribe the amount of the fees.

ACS lacks a policy and procedure outlining the criteria and process for waiving fees. ACS management stated that waiving euthanasia fees is common since ACS considers the public safety risk of not euthanizing dangerous and aggressive dogs greater than the financial risk of lost revenue.

Without policies and procedures to address the waiving of fees, fees may be waived excessively, resulting in lost revenue to the City and hindering the department's ability to offset Dangerous & Aggressive Dog Program costs.

Recommendations

The ACS Director establish a policy and procedure to address the criteria and process for waiving fees. Additionally, create controls to ensure that the procedures for waiving fees are executed as intended.

E. Monitoring User Access

ACS does not periodically perform or document reviews of user access to Chameleon or the Microsoft Teams Dangerous Channel. While user access to the Microsoft Teams Dangerous Channel was appropriate, user access to Chameleon was inappropriate. We reviewed user access for 260 users of Chameleon and determined that 19 users (7%) did not currently work for ACS and did not require access. Of the remaining 241 Chameleon users, we tested a sample of 30 users and determined that 1 user had separated from the City and no longer needed access to Chameleon.

Administrative Directive 7.8d Access Control states that access to COSA assets is based on an individual's membership in a group, job function and/or role in their assigned City department. ACS lacks procedures for periodically performing and documenting reviews of user access to Chameleon and the Microsoft Teams Dangerous Channel. The absence of periodic user access reviews may result in users having inappropriate access to Chameleon or the Microsoft Teams Dangerous Channel.

Recommendation

The ACS Director establish procedures for periodically reviewing and documenting user access to Chameleon and the Microsoft Teams Dangerous Channel. In addition, establish controls to ensure the procedures are executed as intended.

Appendix A – Supplementary Information

Table 2: Definitions and Durations for Dangerous and Aggressive Dogs

Classification	Definition	Duration of Classification
Dangerous	There are two incidences that could cause a dog to be classified as dangerous. 1) A dog makes an unprovoked attack on a person that causes bodily injury. The incident will have occurred in a place other than an enclosure in which the dog was being kept and was reasonably certain to prevent the dog from leaving the enclosure on its own. 2) A dog commits unprovoked acts in a place other than an enclosure in which the dog was being kept and was reasonably certain to prevent the dog from leaving the enclosure on its own and those acts cause a person to reasonably believe that the dog will attack and cause bodily injury to that person.	Permanent
Aggressive Level 1	Level 1 behavior is established if: a) A dog, while in an enclosure in which the animal was being kept, acts to cause a person to reasonably believe that the animal will engage in an unprovoked attack and cause bodily injury to that person; or b) An unrestrained dog is found to menace, chase, display threatening or unprovoked aggressive behavior or otherwise threaten or endanger the safety of a domestic animal.	1 Year*
Aggressive Level 2	Level 2 behavior is established if a dog, while unrestrained, causes physical injury to any domestic animal or livestock.	1 Year*
Aggressive Level 3	Level 3 behavior is established if: a) A dog, while unrestrained, kills or causes the death of any domestic animal or livestock; or b) A dog classified as a level 2 aggressive dog repeats level 2 behavior after the owner receives notice of the level 2 classification.	2 Years*

*Aggressive dogs may be declassified after one or two years. Declassified dogs no longer need to abide by aggressive dog regulations except for a secure enclosure for Aggressive Level 3 dogs. Declassifications are based on dogs having no further incidents after the original classification.

Source: City Ordinance 2017-10-05-0755, Article IV. Dangerous and Aggressive Dogs

Table 3: Requirements for Dangerous and Aggressive Dogs

Dangerous Dog Requirements	Aggressive Dog Requirements
The dog must: • Be microchipped • Be spayed/neutered • Be vaccinated for rabies* • Be kept in a secure enclosure • Wear a muzzle when outside • Wear a “dangerous dog” collar The owner must: • Obtain a license annually • Post “dangerous dog” warning signs • Complete a pet ownership class • Purchase a \$100,000 insurance policy • Allow an annual inspection	The dog must: • Be microchipped • Be spayed/neutered • Be vaccinated for rabies* • Be restrained in a physical structure • Wear a muzzle when outside The dog may be required to: • Wear a special collar The owner must: • Obtain a license annually • Post “aggressive dog” warning signs • Complete a pet ownership class The owner may be required to: • Purchase a \$100,000 insurance policy

*Rabies vaccinations are required for all dogs in the City of San Antonio.

Source: City Ordinance 2017-10-05-0755, Article IV. *Dangerous and Aggressive Dogs*

Appendix B – Staff Acknowledgement

Michael Gutierrez, CFE, Audit Manager
Abigail Estevez, CPA, CIA, CISA, Audit Manager
Jeffrey Barrs, CPA, CFE, Auditor in Charge
Brandy Durand, CFE, Auditor
Mason Wenzel, Auditor
Sabrina Saldaña, Auditor
Francisco Narvaez, Auditor

Appendix C – Management Response



OFFICE OF THE CITY AUDITOR

July 10, 2026

Buddy Vargas, CPA, CIA, CFE
City Auditor
San Antonio, Texas

RE: Management's Corrective Action Plan for Audit of Animal Care Services Dangerous & Aggressive Dog Program

The Animal Care Services Department has reviewed the audit report and has developed the Corrective Action Plan below corresponding to the report recommendations.

Recommendation					
#	Description	Audit Report Page	Accept, Decline	Responsible Person's Name/Title	Completion Date
A	Documenting Investigations The ACS Director establish written policies and procedures to address SBI Investigations and Non-Compliance Investigations. Additionally, ensure the existing controls for monitoring investigations are conducted properly.	7	Accept	Bethany Snowden, Interim Assistant Director	6/2026
Action plan: ACS Director and Interim Assistant Director created an SOP to address tracking and documenting of SBI Investigations and Non-compliance investigations.					
B	Reviewing Compliance The ACS Director establish procedures to ensure that compliance inspections for dangerous and aggressive dog cases are appropriately performed and documented. In addition, establish controls to ensure procedures are executed as intended.	8	Accept	Bethany Snowden, Interim Assistant Director	6/2026

Audit of Animal Care Services
Dangerous & Aggressive Dog Program

Recommendation					
#	Description	Audit Report Page	Accept, Decline	Responsible Person's Name/Title	Completion Date
	Action plan: The Director and Interim Assistant Director created an SOP to ensure compliance inspections for Dangerous and Aggressive dog cases.				
C	Responding to Affidavits The ACS Director: - Establish a policy and procedure for documenting and tracking the receipt of affidavits submitted for dangerous and aggressive dogs. Additionally, create controls to ensure the policy and procedure are properly executed. - Create controls to ensure investigators are monitored for timely responses to affidavit submissions.	9	Accept	Bethany Snowden, Interim Assistant Director	8/2026
	Action plan: The Policy for Responding to Affidavits has been updated and the Dangerous/Aggressive Dog Affidavit Tracker, an Excel tracking sheet, has been created to ensure proper documentation and tracking of affidavits. Implementation begins August 2026.				
D	Assessing Fees The ACS Director establish a policy and procedure to address the criteria and process for waiving fees. Additionally, create controls to ensure that the procedures for waiving fees are executed as intended.	9	Accept	Bethany Snowden, Interim Assistant Director	8/2026
	Action plan: The Director and Interim Assistant Director are working on adding the procedures for waving fees to the current Dangerous/Aggressive policy. Implementation is scheduled to begin in August 2026.				

Audit of Animal Care Services
Dangerous & Aggressive Dog Program

Recommendation					
#	Description	Audit Report Page	Accept, Decline	Responsible Person's Name/Title	Completion Date
E	Monitoring User Access The ACS Director establish procedures for periodically reviewing and documenting user access to Chameleon and the Microsoft Teams Dangerous Channel. In addition, establish controls to ensure the procedures are executed as intended.	10	Accept	Hayden Hale, Data Administrator	08/2026
Action plan: ACS Director and ACS Data Administrator created an SOP to implement periodic review and documentation of user access to Chameleon. Implementation is scheduled for the start of FY2027 and will be conducted on a quarterly basis. Additionally, the Interim Field Assistant Director will routinely monitor and update access to the Microsoft Teams Dangerous Channel, as detailed in the SOP for Aggressive and Dangerous Dog Investigations.					

We are committed to addressing the recommendation in the audit report and the plan of action presented above.

Sincerely,


 Jonathan Gary
 Director
 Animal Care Services

8/6/24
 Date


 David McCary
 Assistant City Manager
 City Manager's Office

8/6/26
 Date